

A New Form of Nominal Ellipsis in Japanese*

RICHARD K. LARSON & HIROKO YAMAKIDO
Stony Brook University

1. Introduction

Nominal ellipsis in Japanese has been widely discussed in the case of genitives containing the morpheme *-no*, such as (1a,b) (Kitagawa & Ross 1982; Saito & Murasugi 1990, 1999):

- (1) a. Kono hon-wa **Taroo no hon** da.
this book-TOP **T. GEN book** is
'This book is Taroo's book.'
b. Kono hon-wa **Taroo no** da.
this book-TOP **T. GEN** is
'This book is Taroo's.'

In this paper we will explore a different form of nominal ellipsis, involving time and place adjectives and the morpheme *-ku*. The basic case is illus-

*We would like to thank audience members at J/K 11 and the LSA 2001 Annual Meeting for helpful comments and discussion. We also thank John Bailyn, Yoshio Endo, Naomi Harada, Satoshi Kinsui, Susumu Kuno, Keiko Murasugi, Miyuki Sawada, and Natsuko Tsujimura.

trated in (2) and (3). (2a) shows the overt nominal *basyo* 'place' modified by a spatial adjective bearing the "attributive marker" *-i*, glossed as "ATR".¹ In (2b) the nominal is absent, and the adjective appears inflected with *-ku*. (3a,b) involve a temporal adjective and are similar.

- (2) a. Taroo-ga **too-i** **basyo-e** itta.
 T.-NOM **far-ATR** **place**-to went
 'Taroo went to a distant place.'
- b. Taroo-ga **too-ku-e** itta.
 T.-NOM **far-KU**-to went
 'Taroo went to a distant place.'
- (3) a. Kono densetu-ga **huru-i** **zidai-kara** aru.
 this legend-NOM **old-ATR** **time**-from be
 'This legend is from old times.'
- b. Kono densetu-ga **huru-ku-kara** aru.
 this legend-NOM **old-KU**-from be
 'This legend is from old times.'

To our knowledge, examples like (2b) and (3b) have not been discussed in the literature of generative grammar on Japanese, and we are not aware of parallel phenomena in other languages. As we show, the *-ku* construction displays a complex and interesting distribution. We argue that these *ku*-forms are not nominalizations, but rather contain a null spatio-temporal pronoun (*pro*). We present an account that explains constraints on this construction in terms of Rizzi's (1986) account of *pro* licensing. We tie our account to other instances of spatio-temporal *pro* in Japanese.

2. Licensing the *-Ku* Construction

The *-ku* construction appears to have three basic licensing conditions.

2.1 The *-Ku* Requirement

First, it requires a local adjective inflected with *-ku*. This is illustrated in (4a,b), which contrast with (2b) and (3b). Although Japanese attributive adjectives typically appear in the "attributive conjugation," marked with *-i*, (4a,b) show that the attributive conjugation is not sufficient to license the *ku*-construction:

- (4) a. *Taroo-ga **too-i-e** itta.
 T.-NOM **far-ATR**-to went
 'Taroo went to a distant place.'
- b. *Kono densetu-ga **huru-i-kara** aru.
 this legend-NOM **old-ATR**-from be
 'This legend is from old times.'

¹For recent work on the status of the attributive marker, see Nishiyama (1999), and Yamakido (2000), which argues against Nishiyama's proposals.

Furthermore, the *ku*-marked adjective must occur adjacent to the site of the "missing noun". Japanese allows multiple attributive adjectives to modify a single noun. In such cases, all but the right-most occurrence of *-i* can be replaced with *-ku*, with no change of meaning; compare (5a-d):

- (5) a. *ooki-i taka-i aka-i kuruma*
 big-ATR expensive-ATR red-ATR car
 'big, expensive, red car'
 b. *ooki-ku taka-i aka-i kuruma*
 c. *ooki-ku taka-ku aka-i kuruma*
 d. **ooki-ku taka-ku aka-ku kuruma*

Observe now in (6) that in a sequence consisting of a *ku*-marked spatio-temporal adjective followed by an adjective with *-i*, a missing nominal is not allowed:

- (6) a. *Taroo-ga too-ku utukusi-i basyo-e itta.*
 T.-NOM far-KU pretty-ATR place-to went
 'Taroo went to a distant, beautiful place.'
 b. **Taroo-ga too-ku utukusi-i _____ -e itta.*
 T.-NOM far-KU pretty-ATR _____ -to went
 'Taroo went to a distant, beautiful place.'

So, the *ku*-marked adjective must be immediately adjacent to where the "missing noun" would go.

2.2 The Spatio-Temporal Adjective Requirement

The second requirement is that the *ku*-inflected adjective must be spatio-temporal. This is illustrated in (7) and (8), which contrast with (2) and (3), respectively. Although the nominal *basyo* 'place' accepts the adjective *utukusi* 'pretty', ellipsis is not licensed. Similarly for the adjective *kura* 'dark' in (8).

- (7) a. *Taroo-ga utukusi-i basyo-e itta.*
 T.-NOM pretty-ATR place-to went
 'Taroo went to a lovely place.'
 b. **Taroo-ga utukusi-ku-e itta.*
 T.-NOM pretty-KU-to went
 'Taroo went to a lovely place.'
- (8) a. *Kono densetu-ga kura-i zidai-kara aru.*
 this legend-NOM dark-ATR time-from be
 'This legend is from dark days.'
 b. **Kono densetu-ga kura-ku-kara aru.*
 this legend-NOM dark-KU-from be
 'This legend is from dark days.'

This result is general. The list of adjectives participating in the *-ku* construction is shown in (9). With one exception, all of these forms are spatial

and/or temporal in meaning; furthermore, the nominals formed from these modifiers are ones referring to locations or time intervals, as illustrated in (10a-k):

- (9) a. too-i 'far (away)' g. haya-i 'early'
 b. tika-i 'near (in space or time)' h. oso-i 'late'
 c. huka-i 'deep' i. huru-i 'old'
 d. asa-i 'shallow' j. waka-i 'young'
 e. taka-i 'high' k. osana-i 'young'
 f. hiku-i 'low' l. oo-i 'many, much'
- (10) a. Hanako-ga **too-ku-e** itta.
 H.-NOM **far-KU**-to went
 'Hanako went to a great distance/ far-off.'
 b. Hanako-ga **tika-ku-e** itta.
 H.-NOM **near-KU**-to went
 'Hanako went to a nearby place.'
 c. Hanako-ga 12-zi **tika-ku**-made benkyoo-sita.
 H.-NOM 12-o'clock **near-KU**-until study-did
 'Hanako studied nearly until 12 o'clock.'
 d. Taroo-ga **haya-ku-kara** **oso-ku**-made hataraita.
 T.-NOM **early-KU**-from **late-KU**-till worked
 'Taroo worked from early to late.'
 e. Taroo-ga kanari **huka-ku**-made mogutta.
 T.-NOM pretty **deep-KU**-to dived
 'Taroo dived down into a pretty deep point.'
 f. ?Sono hune-wa kekkoo **asa-ku**-ni sizun-de ita.
 that boat-TOP pretty **shallow-KU**-at sink was
 'The boat sank in a pretty shallow point.'
 g. Taroo-ga kanari **taka-ku**-made ton-da.
 T.-NOM pretty **high-KU**-to flew/jumped
 'Taroo flew up/jumped to a pretty high point.'
 h. ?Hanako-wa tiisa-i node, **hiku-ku-kara** zyanpu site yokatta.
 H.-TOP little because **low-KU**-from jump do right
 'Because she was little, Hanako could jump from a low place.'
 i. Kono densetu-wa **huru-ku-kara** tutae-rare-te iru.
 this legend-TOP **old-KU**-from hand down-PASSIVE is
 'This legend has been handed down from old days/ancient times.'
 j. ?Taroo-wa **waka-ku**-ni nakunatta.
 T.-TOP **young-KU**-in passed away
 'Taroo passed away in his youth.'
 k. Taroo-ga **osana-ku**-yori sai sugure-te ita. (Kawabata 1976)
 T.-NOM **young-KU**-from talent excellent was
 'Taroo has been talented since he was young.'

The one exception is the adjective *oo-i* 'many, much' (91). Although this form is not spatio-temporal in meaning, *oo-ku* is well-formed; moreover, elliptical nominals with *oo-ku* need not refer to locations or times, as seen in (11):

- (11) Hanako-ni hagemasi no tegami-ga **oo-ku-kara** yoserareta
 H.-DAT encouragement GEN letter-NOM **many-KU**-from was sent
 'Letters of encouragement were sent by many (people) to Hanako.'

We will return to this form later.

2.3 The Need for Spatio-Temporal P

Finally, the *-ku* construction seems in general to be available only in the context of a governing spatio-temporal postposition like *-e* 'to', *-kara* 'from', *-ni* 'at/in' or *-made* 'until'. This is shown in (12a-e) (which repeat some earlier examples):

- (12) a. Hanako-ga too-ku-e itta.
 H.-NOM distant-KU-**to** went
 'Hanako went to a great distance/ far-off.'
 b. Sono tegami-ga too-ku-**kara** kita.
 the letter-NOM far-KU-**from** came
 'The letter came from a distance.'
 c. Taroo-ga eki no tika-ku-**ni** sundeiru.
 T.-NOM station GEN near-KU-**at** lives
 'Taroo lives near the station.'
 d. Hanako-ga 12-zi tika-ku-**made** benkyoo-sita.
 H.-NOM 12-oclock near-KU-**until** study-did
 'Hanako studied nearly until 12 o'clock.'
 e. Taroo-ga haya-ku-**kara** oso-ku-**made** hataraita.
 T.-NOM early-KU-**from** late-KU-**until** worked
 'Taroo worked from early to late.'

Ku-elliptical nominals are generally disallowed as subjects or objects, in genitives, or as the objects of non-spatio-temporal postpositions (13a-d):

- (13) a. ***Huru-ku-ga** yomigaetta. (Subject)
old-KU-NOM revived
 'The old days arose in my mind.'
 (cf. Huru-i zidai-ga yomigaetta.
 old-ATR time/days-NOM revived)
 b. *Hanako-ga **taka-ku-o** katazuketa. (Object)
 H.-NOM **high-KU-ACC** tidied
 'Hanako tidied up a high place.'
 (cf. Hanako-ga taka-i tokoro-o katazuketa.
 H.-NOM high-ATR place-ACC tidied)

- c. *Taroo-ga **haya-ku** no meeting-e itta. (Genitive)
 T.-NOM **early-KU** GEN meeting-to went
 'Taroo went to an early meeting.'
 (cf. Taroo-ga haya-i zikan no meeting-e itta.
 T.-NOM early-ATR time GEN meeting-to went)
- d. *Taroo-ga **huru-ku-ni** tuite hanasita. (Object of P)
 T.-NOM **old-KU-DAT** about talked
 'Taroo talked about the old times.'
 (cf. Taroo-ga huru-i zidai-ni tuite hanasita.
 T.-NOM old-ATR time-DAT about talked)

To our knowledge, there are only three exceptions to this generalization. The form *oo-ku* 'many of them' may appear in positions just discussed, see (14a-c):

- (14) a. Sono party-de **oo-ku-ga** yopparatta. (Subject)
 the party-at **many-KU-NOM** got drunk
 'Many got drunk at the party.'
- b. Hanako-ga sore-ni tuite **oo-ku-o** kataranakatta. (Object)
 H.-NOM it-DAT about **much-KU-ACC** did not talk
 'Hanako did not talk much about it.'
- c. Hanako-ga **oo-ku** no hito-ni atta. (Genitive)
 H.-NOM **many-KU** GEN person-DAT met
 'Hanako met many people.'

The remaining two exceptions are the pair of adjectives *too-i* 'far(away)' and *tika-i* 'near(by)'. These can appear in genitives (15), and in the object and subject positions of verbs (16):

- (15) a. **too-ku** no mati b. **tika-ku** no eki
far-KU GEN town **near-KU** GEN station
 'a distant/far-off town' 'a nearby station'
- (16) a. Hanako-ga **too-ku-o** mita. b. **Too-ku-ga** mieta.
 H.-NOM **far-KU-ACC** saw **far-KU-NOM** was visible
 'Hanako saw the distant place.' 'The distant place could be seen.'

3. Two Analyses

In considering these data, two natural ideas present themselves. One is that *-ku* represents a nominalizing morpheme, which affixes to a spatio-temporal adjective and creates a noun with spatio-temporal reference. Call this "Analysis 1".²

²An analysis of this kind is suggested in Martin (1975: 398). We are grateful to S. Kuno for this reference.

Analysis 1 (Nominalization): *-ku* is a nominalizing morpheme, which converts a spatio-temporal A into an N:

[_A too] 'distant' → [_N [_A too] *-ku*] 'distant place'

The second idea is that the *ku*-construction is elliptical, containing a covert noun or pronoun \emptyset referring to LOCATION or TIME. Call this "Analysis 2".³

Analysis 2 (Ellipsis): The *ku*-construction is elliptical, containing a covert noun \emptyset referring to LOCATION or TIME:

[_{NP} [_{AP} too-i] basyo] 'distant place'

[_{NP} [_{AP} too-ku] \emptyset] 'distant place'

Analysis 1 is simple, and it accounts for the first two constraints on the *-ku* construction directly. The need for the morpheme *-ku* follows immediately from its status as the nominalizing element. The need for the *ku*-marked adjective to occur adjacent to where the "missing nominal" would have been follows from the fact that adjective + *ku* constitutes a derived noun. Finally, the fact that *-ku* is restricted to spatio-temporal adjectives, and the existence of exceptions, might be seen as reflecting lexical constraints on this derivational morpheme.

Despite these virtues, there are reasons to doubt the nominalization account. We noted *ku*-marking in attributive adjective sequences like (5b,c). So far as we can see, these *ku*-marked adjectives cannot plausibly be analyzed as nominalizations. If that is correct, a nominalization account will not yield a unified treatment of attributive *-ku*. By contrast, the ellipsis account takes the *ku*-marked adjective to be in construction with a noun or noun projection – just as in (5b,c); hence, it offers the possibility of a unified account.

Analysis 1 also encounters difficulty with the third constraint noted earlier: the fact that the *-ku* construction is largely restricted to the complements of spatio-temporal postpositions. On the nominalization account, it is hard to see why this restriction should hold, given that examples with overt time and place nominals are not similarly restricted. Compare (17a,b):

- (17) a. Taroo-ga **huru-i** **zidai**-o hurikaetta.
 T.-NOM **old-ATR** **time**-ACC looked back
 'Taroo looked back upon the old times.'
 b. *Taroo-ga **huru-ku**-o hurikaetta.
 T.-NOM **old-KU**-ACC looked back

By contrast, the ellipsis analysis offers an approach to these facts in terms of recoverability. As we will discuss, it is natural to understand the need for a spatio-temporal adjective or postposition in terms of the need to recover a spatio-temporal noun in the ellipsis site.

³An analysis of this kind (in a non-generative framework) is anticipated in Kawabata (1976).

3.1 Spatio-Temporal *pro*

There is an additional, interesting piece of data supporting the ellipsis account. The grammar of Japanese exhibits a strong requirement on nominal modifiers that they occur in pre-nominal position. Examples (18a,b) illustrate this constraint:

- (18) a. ano **too-i** **basyo-kara** b. *ano **basyo too-i-kara**
 that **far-ATR place**-from that **place far-ATR**-from
 'from that distant place'

Surprisingly, in certain contexts *ku*-inflected adjectives appear to violate this constraint. They can occur postnominally, as in (19) (where "|" indicates a strong pause break):⁴

- (19) a. ano **basyo (haruka) too-ku-kara** b. ano **basyo | tika-ku-e**
 that **place very far-KU**-from that **place near-KU**-to
 'from that very distant place' 'to that nearby place'

We believe that work by Murasugi (1991) on topicalization of adjunct phrases in Japanese can illuminate cases like (19) under analysis 2. Murasugi observes that location and time adjuncts undergo topicalization (20), whereas reason and manner adjuncts do not (21).

- (20) a. Sono kyoositu-wa Mary-ga siken-o uketa. (Location)
 that classroom-TOP M.-NOM exam-ACC took
 'As for that classroom, Mary took an exam there.'
 b. Sono hi-wa Mary-ga siken-o uketa. (Time)
 that day-TOP M.-NOM exam-ACC took
 'As for that day, Mary took an exam then.'
- (21) a. *Sono riyuu-wa Mary-ga kubi ni natta. (Reason)
 that reason-TOP M.-NOM was-fired
 'As for that reason, Mary was fired for it.'
 b. *Sono hoo-hoo-wa Mary-ga teiri-o syoomeisita. (Manner)
 that method-TOP M.-NOM theorem-ACC proved
 'As for that method, Mary proved a theorem with it.'

Murasugi attributes this difference to a differential availability of *pro*. In brief, she proposes that Japanese topicalizations are actually left-dislocation structures involving a null pronoun, and that the contrast between (20) and (21) reflects the fact that Japanese contains null pronouns of location and time, *pro*_{LOC} and *pro*_{TEMP}, but does not contain equivalent forms for reason

⁴Another example of this construction is:

- (i) ano **zidai huru-ku-kara** 'from those old times'
 that **time old-KU**-from

In oral presentation of this paper, a number of speakers objected to examples like (19a,b) and (i). We are unable to account for these judgments at present since a large number of speakers (including the second author) find these cases fully acceptable. We are currently investigating the construction using published on-line sources.

and manner, pro_{REASON} and pro_{MANNER} . (20a,b) are thus acceptable because the structure in (22a) is available to them; by contrast, (21a,b) are unacceptable, because the structure in (22b) is unavailable since the required pro-forms are absent:

- (22) a. DP . . . $pro_{LOC/TEMP}$ √
 b. DP . . . $pro_{REASON/MANNER}$ ×

Note that Murasugi's basic contrast is visible in English dislocations as well; compare (20) vs. (21) with (23) vs. (24).

- (23) a. That place, I saw him there. (Location)
 b. That day, I was sick then. (Time)
 (cf. That man, I saw him.)
- (24) a. *That reason, I left therefore. (Reason)
 b. *?That way, I spoke so/thus. (Manner)

We get time and place dislocations quite freely in English, but not reason and manner dislocations.

Suppose now that we adopt analysis 2 and take the missing noun \emptyset in *ku*-ellipsis to be one of Murasugi's empty pronouns pro_{LOC} or pro_{TEMP} , as shown in (25a). Then we can analyze (19a,b) as DP-internal left dislocations, as shown in (25b):

- (25) a. [_{NP} [_{AP} too-ku] pro_{LOC}]
 b. [_{PP} [_{DP} **ano basyo**_i [_{NP} too-ku **pro**_i]]-kara]

Notice that under this proposal, the modifier *too-ku* does not follow the noun it modifies, but rather precedes it, following the normal pattern of attributives in Japanese. It is simply that the noun being modified is not the overt nominal *basyo*, but rather the null nominal *pro*. The analysis in (25) is further supported by the pause break that Japanese speakers perceive between N and A-ku in examples like (19a,b), indicative of a dislocation structure. Thus under analysis 2, the apparent word order problem raised by (19a,b) can be neatly resolved.

4. Licensing *pro* (Rizzi 1986)

Appeal to small *pro* not only explains superficially anomalous examples like (19a,b); it also offers an attractive approach to the constraints on the *ku*-construction discussed earlier. Specifically, we can understand these constraints in terms of the general theory of *pro* licensing advanced by Rizzi (1986).

According to Rizzi, *pro* is subject to a dual licensing requirement: *pro* must have a formal licenser, which identifies its presence and position; and it must also have what we will call a "material licenser", which identifies its content:

(26) **Pro Licensing** (Rizzi 1986)

- a. Formal licensor: identifies presence and position
- b. Material licensor: identifies featural content

Kester (1995,1996) has applied these proposals to nominal ellipsis constructions in Dutch.⁵ (27) and (28) are sample cases. (27a) is an instance of the so-called "Partitive Genitive Construction", whose structure for Kester is roughly as in (27b):

(27) **Partitive Genitive Construction**

- a. Er is [iets verschrikkelijk-s] gebeurd.
there is something terrible happened
'Something terrible has happened.'
- b. [_{DP} iets [_{AgrP} [_{AP} verschrikkelijk] -s *pro*]]
- c. Formal licensor: genitive -s
Material licensor: mass noun that forms part of the quantifier *iets* 'something'

(28a) is what we will call the "Attributive Construction", with structure in (28b):

(28) **Attributive Construction**

- a. Jan had de rode auto en [de groen-e] gekocht.
Jan had the red car and the green bought
'Jan bought the red car and the green one.'
- b. [_{DP} de [_{AgrP} [_{AP} groen] -e *pro*]]
- c. Formal licensor: default case element -e
Material licensor: antecedent noun *auto* 'car'

Very briefly, in the Partitive Genitive Construction, the adjectival inflection -s is analyzed as the formal licensor of *pro*; the material licensor of *pro* – the element that supplies its featural content – is a mass nominal element that is incorporated within the quantifier *iets* 'something'. A similar story holds for the Attributive Construction in (28). The formal licensor of *pro* is the adjectival inflection -e; the material licensor of *pro* is the antecedent noun *auto*.

4.1 Licensing *pro*_{LOC/TEMP}

We suggest an extension of these ideas to the Japanese *ku*-construction.

First, we would like to propose that in the *ku*-construction, -*ku* is a form of agreement, which heads an agreement phrase (AgrP) and is the formal licensor of *pro*, as shown in (29b):

- (29) a. Kono densetu-wa **huru-ku**-kara aru.
this legend-TOP **old-KU**-from be
'This legend is from old times.'

⁵Kester's analysis applies proposals on ellipsis due to Lobeck (1995).

- b. [DP [AgrP [AP huru] **-ku pro**]]

_____ **FORMAL LICENSING**

This accounts for why *-ku* must be present in this construction, and also why it must be local to the ellipsis site (*pro*). The need for a local, formal licenser holds in all cases of *pro* licensing. The situation is fully parallel to the Dutch cases just discussed.

The question of the material licenser in the *ku*-construction is a bit more involved. As noted earlier, under the ellipsis analysis we can view the need for a spatio-temporal adjective and/or postposition as reflecting the need to recover a null noun of space or time. Under this reasoning it seems that either the adjective or the postposition might be the material licenser of *pro*. But which one?

We believe that the postposition should be analyzed as the true material licenser of *pro*, so that in (30a), *pro* gets its locative features from *-kara* 'from' (30b):

- (30) a. Kono densetu-wa **huru-ku-kara** aru.
 this legend-TOP **old-KU**-from be
 'This legend is from old times.'

- b. [PP [DP [AgrP [AP too] **-ku pro**]] **-kara**]

_____ **MATERIAL LICENSING**

Our reasoning here is simple. If the adjective were the licenser, then there would be no reason why a spatio-temporal postposition would be required higher up in the structure. Recall that a temporal adjective + an overt temporal noun can occur without a temporal postposition (31a); by contrast, the equivalent *ku*-form cannot (31b). If *pro* were licensed by *-ku* and the adjective, then all licensing would be complete within DP, hence it would be quite unclear why (31b) is bad.

- (31) a. Taroo-ga [DP **huru-i zidai**]-o hurikaetta.
 T.-NOM **old-ATR time** -ACC looked back
 'Taroo looked back upon the old times.'
 b. *Taroo-ga [DP **huru-ku pro_{TEMP}**]-o hurikaetta.
 T.-NOM **old-KU** -ACC looked back
 'Taroo looked back upon the old times.'

By contrast, if the postposition is the material licenser, then its presence is required to supply *pro*'s content. The need for an appropriate adjective can then be understood as a semantic fact. If we take *pro_{LOC}* and *pro_{TEMP}* to be "pure" spatial and temporal proforms, then they can be modified only by semantically compatible adjectives, one sharing the same interpretable features, that is, an adjective of space or time.

There is one puzzle that arises with this proposal that deserves comment. In the Dutch cases in (27) and (28), nominal *pro* is materially licensed by a nominal source. In the Partitive Genitive Construction it is licensed by the

mass nominal incorporated into the determiner. In the Attributive Construction it is licensed by an antecedent noun. But under the proposal in (30b), for example, this pattern appears to fail. *Pro* appears to be materially licensed by a non-nominal source, P.

We would like to suggest a tentative solution to this puzzle based on research by Watanabe (1993) on spatio-temporal prepositions and postpositions. Beginning from data on Navaho and Celtic, he argues that spatio-temporal prepositions and postpositions are in fact universally composed of two distinct parts: a pure relational element (P) and a nominal location phrase (LP). On this idea, (32a) is underlyingly structured as in (32b):

- (32) a. [_P in [_{DP} the house]]
 b. [_P in [_{LP} LOCATION OF [_{DP} the house]]]

In some languages or language families, like Navaho and Celtic, the nominal location element is spelled out morphologically; in others, it is presumably incorporated into P.

Notice now that if Watanabe's proposal is correct, it provides a solution to our puzzle. If we take the material licenser of *pro* to be Watanabe's nominal LP (33), then our problem disappears.

- (33) [_{PP} [_{LP} [_{DP} [_{AgRP} [_{AP} huru] -ku *pro*]] **LOCATION OF**] -kara]

We tentatively suggest this as our account of why *A-ku* must co-occur with a spatio-temporal P.

4.2 Exceptions

Earlier we noted certain exceptions to the claim that *ku*-ellipsis requires a space-time adjective and a governing space-time postposition. We observed that the adjective *oo-* 'many, much' is not spatio-temporal in meaning; nonetheless *oo-ku* is well-formed, occurring with non-spatio-temporal reference. This was illustrated in (11) (repeated below):

- (11) Hanako-ni hagemasi no tegami-ga **oo-ku-kara** yoserareta
 H.-DAT encouragement GEN letter-NOM **many-KU**-from was sent
 'Letters of encouragement were sent by many (people) to Hanako.'

Furthermore, *oo-ku*, *too-ku*, or *tika-ku* can all appear without a space-time postposition, as shown in (14a) and (16a,b) (repeated below):

- (14) a. Sono party-de **oo-ku-ga** yopparatta.
 the party-at **many-KU**-NOM got drunk
 'Many got drunk at the party.'
- (16) a. Hanako-ga **too-ku-o** mita. b. **Too-ku-ga** mieta.
 H.-NOM **far-KU**-ACC saw **far-KU**-NOM was visible
 'Hanako saw the distant place.' 'The distant place could be seen.'

A natural question is: How do we handle these cases under the proposals

advanced above?

Our contention about the ellipsis in *oo-ku* is that it represents a fundamentally different phenomenon than that at issue here. To our knowledge, only Japanese shows ellipsis of a spatio-temporal noun with the properties described above. By contrast, many world languages, including English, show nominal ellipsis with the equivalents of *many* and *much* (34). In fact, the latter appears to be part of a more general pattern with partitive determiners/adjectives (35) (Sleeman 1996):

- (34) a. **Many *pro*** will enter; few will win.
b. **Much *pro*** remains to be done.
- (35) a. **All / many / most / several / a lot / few / none *pro*** (of the people) were surprised.
b. **All / much / most / some / lots / little / none *pro*** (of the gold) was recovered.

We suggest that the empty noun in *oo-ku* constructions like (11) and (14a) is equivalent to the *pro* occurring in (34) and (35). Specifically, although this *pro* is formally licensed by *-ku*, as usual, it is materially licensed in a fundamentally different way, equivalent to what happens with other partitives. We note that in Japanese, concepts like 'most', 'several', 'few', and 'none' are not expressed by adjectives, but rather by nouns. The only exception is *oo-* 'many/much'. Hence we speculate that the reason why partitive *pro* is observed only with *oo-* 'many/much' is simply that other relevant items that might have licensed it are missing from the category of A.

Regarding *too-ku* and *tika-ku*, our account of their apparent exceptional behavior is rather different, but also related to something observable in the counterpart English forms. Observe first that English *near* and *far*, when they occur as attributive adjectives, seem to require the "extra" morphemes *by* and *away* (36a,b), despite the fact that the latter seem to be redundant (36c,d). In effect, *by* and *away* seem to be pleonastic elements in the dictionary sense, repeating information in the adjective, but nonetheless necessary for well formedness:

- (36) a. a near ***(by)** house c. **near** the house/**by** the house
b. a far ***(away)** land d. **far** from the house /**away** from the house

Something similar is observed with *too-* in Japanese, as pointed out to us by Y. Endo (p.c.). In the *ku*-construction, *too-ku* can co-occur optionally with the nominal morpheme *enpoo* and *kanata*, both of which mean '(far) distance' (37). The relationship between the adjective and noun is not modification, as shown by the impossibility of modificational structures like (38); rather the presence of *enpoo/kanata* is pleonastic:

- (37) a. *too-ku* (*enpoo*) -kara b. *too-ku* (*kanata*) -e
far-KU distance -from far-KU distance -to
'from a distant place' 'to a distant place'

- (38) a. #*too-i enpoo -kara*
 far-ATR distance -from
 b. #*too-ku no kanata -kara*
 far-KU GEN distance -from
 'from a distant place'

We tentatively suggest that Japanese *too-ku* and *tika-ku*, like English *far* and *near*, always require a pleonastic element when they occur attributively. The difference is that in Japanese, unlike English, this pleonastic element is nominal and can occur covertly. We furthermore propose that this nominal pleonastic element, which refers to location and which can surface lexically as *enpoo* or *kanata* in the first case, is the material licenser for spatial *pro*. In effect, our suggestion is that *too-ku* and *tika-ku* can occur without the support of a locative postposition because they already contain the nominal location element that a postposition typically supplies. Since the formal and material licensing of *pro*_{LOC/TEMP} is complete within NP/DP, in principle such *ku*-nominals can occur freely.

References

- Kawabata, Y. 1976. Yōgen. *Nihongo 6: Bunpō I*, 169-217. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kester, E-P. 1995. Adjectival Inflection and the Licensing of Empty Categories in DP. *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 57-78.
- Kester, E-P. 1996. *The Nature of Adjectival Inflection*. Utrecht University: OTS.
- Kitagawa, C. and C. Ross. 1982. Prenominal Modification in Chinese and Japanese. *Linguistic Analysis* 9: 19-53.
- Lobeck, A. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional Heads, Licensing, and Identification*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr.
- Martin, S. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
- Murasugi, K. 1991. Locative/Temporal vs. Reason/Manner Phrases. *Papers in English Linguistics and Literature* 33: 153-170. Kinjo Gakuin University.
- Nishiyama, K. 1999. Adjectives and the Copula in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7: 183-222.
- Rizzi, L. 1986. Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 501-557.
- Saito, M. and K. Murasugi. 1990. N'-deletion in Japanese. *UConn Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 87-107.
- Saito, M. and K. Murasugi. 1999. Subject Predication within IP and DP. *Beyond Principles and Parameters*, eds. K. Johnson and I. Roberts, 167-188. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Sleeman, P. 1996. Licensing Empty Nouns in French. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Watanabe, A. 1993. Agr-based Case Theory and its Interaction with the A-bar System. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Yamakido, H. 2000. Japanese Attributive Adjectives are Not (All) Relative Clauses. *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*, eds. Billerey and Lillehaugen, 588-602. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.