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英語及び日本語における前提動詞補文の性質について
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渡邊 宗司

指導教員 浜崎 通世

動詞とその補文の関係性については、統語論的・意味論的観点から様々な分類の可能性が研究されている。本論文では Kastner (2015)が提唱する前提動詞に着目し、その補文の統語的範疇を考察していく。


第三章では、Kastner (2015)が英語における前提動詞補文に存在すると提唱した明示されない決定詞が、日本語における前提動詞補文にも同様に存在することを検証する。質問紙調査の結果を分析することで、日本語における前提動詞補文の統語的範疇は決定詞句であることを論じていく。
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Overview

Chomsky’s (1965:21) well-known examples in (1)-(2) illustrate “how unrevealing surface structure may be as to underlying deep structure.” These two sentences are very similar from a surface structural point of view, “but very different in the deep structure that underlies them and determines their semantic interpretations”. That is, “surface similarities may hide underlying distinctions of a fundamental nature.” (citations are from Chomsky 1965:23)

(1)  a. I persuaded John to leave.
    b. I expected John to leave.

(Chomsky, 1965:21)

In (1a), John is the direct object of the verb persuade and is interpreted as the target of the act of persuasion. It should be noted that this John is also the subject of the verb leave and is interpreted as the leaver. That is, John has two distinct roles, one as the logical direct object of persuade and the other as the logical subject of leave. In the case of (1b), however, this kind of duality is not observed about John. John is simply the subject of the verb leave and is interpreted as the leaver. It does not have any semantic relationships with the verb expect. Rather John to leave as a whole is the object of expect. Thus, the whole sentence can be paraphrased as I expected that John would
The underlying deep structures of (1a) and (1b) will therefore be as in (2a) and (2b) respectively:

(2) a. Noun Phrase Verb Noun Phrase Sentence
    ( I persuaded John John will leave)

b. Noun Phrase Verb Sentence
    ( I expected John will leave)

(Chomsky, 1965:23)

As a classic illustration of the same point, Chomsky (1966: 80) refers to Arnauld and Lancelot (1660), who argue that “the deep structure underlying the proposition “Invisible God created the visible world” consists of three abstract propositions, each expressing a certain simple judgement, although its surface form expresses only the subject-attribute structure.”

In the same vein, in this thesis, I would like to focus on the syntactic and semantic nature of the selection of the complement sentences by the verbs such as factives, presuppositionals and non-prepositionals, especially on the categorial status of the complement sentences that those verbs select. To be specific, the research topic is whether the null determiner exists in the Japanese complements.
1.2. **Factive verbs, presuppositional verbs and non-presuppositional verbs**

1.2.1. **Factive verbs**

Factive verbs shown in (3a) are characterized in Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970:143) as verbs that involve "PRESUPPOSITION by the speaker that the complement of the sentence expresses the true proposition."

(3) a. Factive verbs: *regret, grasp, comprehend, ignore, mind, forget (about)*

b. I don't mind your saying so.

(Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970:143-146)

As shown in (3b), the speaker implies that the complement *your saying so* is a true proposition.

In addition, Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970:144) define three characteristics of factive verbs. Firstly, "only factive predicates can have as their objects *the noun fact* with gerund or that-clause", as shown in (4). Secondly, "gerunds can be objects of factive predicate", as shown in (5). Thirdly, factive predicates do not allow the accusative and infinitive construction, as shown in (6).

(4) a. I want to make clear *the fact* that I don't intend to participate.

b. You have to keep in mind *the fact* of his having proposed several alternatives.
1.5.4.3

According to Stewart (1984) and the characteristics of the classifier and classifier

As shown in (2) the empirical importance of the complement is enhanced as a line

In addition, as shown in (2) the empirical importance of the complement is enhanced as a line

The empirical importance of the complement is enhanced as a line
(5)  
a. Everyone ignored Joan's being completely drunk.

b. I regret having agreed to the proposal.

(6)  
a. *I resent Mary to have been the one who did it.

b. *He comprehends himself to be an expert in pottery.

(Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970:145-146, emphases added)

1.2.2. Presuppositional and non-presuppositional verbs

Kastner’s (2015) presuppositional verbs include such verbs as remember, forget, admit, and deny. These verbs presuppose the existence of discourse referents corresponding to their complements in the Common Ground (see (7a)). On the other hand, non-presuppositional verbs like say, shown in (7b), can introduce new ideas:

(7)  
a. Bill denied [that John stole the cookies]. Presuppositional

b. John said [that the moon was made of kale]. Non-presuppositional

(Kastner, 2015:5)

In (7a), the complement that John stole the cookies had already been claimed by someone before Bill denied that complement. This means that the proposition introduced by presuppositional verb existed as a discourse referent in the Common Ground when Bill denied it. In contrast, in (7b), the complement that the moon was made of kale had not been claimed before. This means that the proposition introduced by non-presuppositional verb was a new idea when John uttered the sentence.
Kastner (2015:1) also proposes that factive verbs turn out to be a subset of presuppositional verbs. Factive verbs “presuppose the existence of their complements as a proposition in the Common Ground” and “further require that this proposition be true”, as is shown in (8b).

(8) a. Bill denied [that John stole the cookies]. Presuppositional

b. #Bill remembers [that the moon is made of kale]. Factive

(Kastner, 2015:5)

In (8a), the complement that John stole the cookies had already been claimed by someone before Bill denied that complement. In the same vein, the complement that the moon is made of kale have already been claimed by someone before Bill remembers that complement, as in (8b). These mean that both of the propositions introduced by presuppositionals and factives exist as discourse referents in the Common Ground. However, only the proposition introduced by factive verbs must be true. Thus, (8b) is a correct sentence grammatically, but an unsuitable sentence because the complement that the moon is made of kale is not a true proposition.

1.2.3. Summary of the verbs

In summary, the classifications and characteristics of the three verbs are summed up in the table 1 below. The verbs can be classified in two categories; presuppositional and non-presuppositional. The complements of presuppositional can refer to discourse referents, and factive verbs are defined as a subset of presuppositional, because they further require that the propositions be true. In contrast, the complement of non-presuppositional can only introduce new ideas.
Table 1  The classifications and characteristics of the verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of the verbs</th>
<th>Characteristics of the complements</th>
<th>Meaning of the propositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presuppositional</td>
<td>Refer to a discourse referent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factive (a subset of presuppositionals)</td>
<td>Refer to a discourse referent</td>
<td>Must be true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-presuppositional</td>
<td>Introduce a new idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3. Kastner’s (2015) analysis of presuppositional and non-presuppositional verbs

According to Kastner (2015), syntactic differences can be predicted from semantic differences. The complements of presuppositional verbs can only refer to a proposition that already exists in the Common Ground. To put it differently, those complements are referential in character and have the feature [+definite]. Kastner (2015) takes those semantic characteristics of the complements of presuppositional verbs as evidence that they are DPs, and not CPs.

On the other hand, the complements of non-presuppositional verbs cannot refer to a proposition that already exists in the Common Ground. Because those complements are non-referential, there is no obvious reason for stipulating that they have the extra phrase DP outside of CP. Therefore, for reasons of simplicity, the complements of non-presuppositional verbs are just CPs, with no outer phrase that has the function of bearing the feature [+def]. Now consider the following examples with using the special symbol ∆ for the covert definite determiner, following Adger and Quer (2001) and Kastner (2015):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram: [Diagram Description]

Table: [Table Description]
(9)  

a. Non-presuppositional

John thinks \[ CP \text{ that Mary read this book.} \]

b. Presuppositional

John regrets \[ DP \Delta [ CP \text{ that Mary read this book.} \]

(Kastner, 2015:3)

Non-presuppositional verbs such as (9a) select CPs as their complements. In contrast, presuppositional verbs select DPs as their complements with the covert definite determiner head \( \Delta \), as is shown in (9b).

Based on these ideas, Kastner (2015) uses three types of complements below. First of all, Selected Embedded Presuppositionals (regret/deny that...), as shown in (10a) are DP complements to the verb, in which a semantically-sensitive determiner \( \Delta \) selects CP. Secondly, Overt Definite Presuppositionals (the fact that...), as shown in (10b) are full DP complements to the verb, in which an adjunct CP modifies the noun. This CP is not selected as a complement. Thirdly, Selected Embedded Presuppositionals (think that...), as shown in (10c) are CP complements to the verb.

(10)  

a. Selected Embedded Presuppositionals: \[ VP [DP \Delta CP] \]

Bill remembers/denies that John stole the cookies.

b. Overt Definite Presuppositionals: \[ VP [DP D [NP [NP N] CP]] \]

Bill remember the fact/claim that John stole the cookies.

c. Selected Embedded Non-presuppositionals: \[ VP CP \]

Bill thinks that John stole the cookies.

(Kastner, 2015:4-9)
In the next section, I would like to show the empirical supports of null D using above three types of complements.

1.4. **Empirical supports for null D**

Kastner (2015) gives three kinds of supporting evidence for the existence of null D in the complement sentences of presuppositional verbs. They are gained from the following three points of view: extraction, fronting and pro-forms.

1.4.1. **Extraction**

Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010) suggests “that factive complements are islands for extraction, a property that distinguishes them from non-factive complements”. as in (11):

\[(11) \quad \begin{align*}
    a. & \quad \text{How do you suppose [that Maria fixed the car \(t\)]?} \\
    b. & \quad *\text{How did you notice [that Maria fixed the car \(t\)]?}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(\text{Haegeman and Ürögdi, 2010:119})\]

As shown in (11a), extraction from non-factive complements are allowed. On the other hand, the arguments cannot be extracted from factive complements, shown in (11b).

On the course of this study, Kastner (2015) describes that extraction from non-presuppositionals are generally allowed, as in (12):

\[(12) \quad \begin{align*}
    \text{Non-presuppositional} \\
    a. & \quad \text{What do you think (that) John stole ___?} \quad \text{COMPLEMENT} \\
    b. & \quad \text{Where do you think that John came from ___?} \quad \text{COMPLEMENT}
\end{align*}\]
c. Who do you think ___ stole the cookies?  

SUBJECT

d. Why do you think that John stole the cookies ___?  

ADJUNCT

(Kastner, 2015:11)

As shown in (12a) and (12b), the arguments in the complement position can be extracted from the non-presuppositional complements. In the same vein, the arguments in the subject position (see (12c)) and the adjunct position (see (12d)) also can be extracted from the non-presuppositional complements.

Kastner (2015) also describes that only complements can be extracted from Selected Embedded Presuppositionals and no extraction is allowed from Overt Definite Presuppositionals, shown in (13) and (14). This is because determiner D prevents the arguments of the presuppositional complements from being extracted.

(13) Selected Embedded Presuppositionals

a. What do you remember that John stole ___?  

COMPLEMENT

b. Where do you remember that John came from ___?  

COMPLEMENT

c. *Who do you remember ___ stole the cookies?  

SUBJECT

d. #Why do you remember that John stole the cookies ___?  

ADJUNCT

(Kastner, 2015:11)

As shown in (13a) and (13b), the arguments in the complement position can be extracted. On the other hand, the arguments in the subject (see (13c)) and adjunct (see (13d)) position cannot be extracted. These are because there are weak islands in Selected Embedded Presuppositionals.² Now consider the Overt Definite Presuppositional:
A) shown in (129) and (130), the arguments in the complement position can be extracted from the non-embedding complement, in the same way the arguments in the subject position (sect. (125)) also can be extracted from the non-embedding complement.

Kanter (2012) also observes that only complements can be extracted from

Selected Embedded Prepositions and no extraction is allowed from other prepositions.

Prepositions appear in (12) and (13). This is because determiners like phrases like

At any rate you remember that John stole the cookies.

Kanter (2012.11)

The reflexive pronoun, which is reflexive in the complement position, cannot be

Consider the over-embedded preposition.
(14) Overt Definite Presuppositional
   a. *What do you remember the fact/claim that John stole __?
   b. * What do you remember the fact/claim that ___ stole the cookies?
   c. #Why do you remember the fact/claim that John stole the cookies ___?
      (Kastner, 2015:16)

As shown in (14), there are strong islands in Overt Definite Presuppositionals, so any movement is prohibited.  

1.4.2. Fronting

According to Maki et al. (1991), fronting the argument in the non-factive complement is allowed but the argument cannot be fronted in factive complements, as shown in (15):

(15) a. John believes (that) this book, Mary read.

   b. *John regrets that this book, Mary read.
      (Maki et al., 1991:3)

Fronting the arguments in non-factive complements are generally allowed, shown in (15a). On the other hand, the arguments cannot be fronted in factive complements, shown in (15b).

In the same vein, Kastner (2015) describes that fronting is allowed in non-presuppositionals but disallowed in presuppositionals, as in (16) and (17):
(16) Non-presuppositional
   a. John thinks that [this book, Mary read].
   b. I can assure you that [the film, I don't want to see ever again].

   (Kastner, 2015:17)

In (16a), it is allowed to front the argument this book in the complement introduced by non-presuppositional verb think. The argument the film also can be fronted in the non-presuppositional complement, as in (16b). Now consider presuppositional complement in (17):

(17) Presuppositional
   a. *John regrets/denies that [this book, Mary read].
   b. *John regretted/denied that [Gone with the wind he never went to see].

   (ibid.)

As shown in (17a), it is prohibited to front the argument this book in the complement introduced by presuppositional verb regret. The argument gone with the wind cannot be fronted in the presuppositional complement either, as in (17b).

In order to unravel this difference, Kastner (2015) draws on the suggestion of Rizzi (1997): left periphery. Presuppositional verbs select a presuppositional determiner, which is turned into a C/Force (or Fin) that constrains the availability of Topic and Focus in its clause. According to Rizzi, "the topic-focus system is present in a structure only if "needed", i.e. when a constituent bears topic or focus features to be sanctioned by a Spec-head criterion." (Rizzi, 1997: 288) Based on this idea, Kastner (2015) proposes that the Topic and Focus projections are not present in Selected
(1)

Proposition (1)

[Photo registration test] (1962)

[Photo recognition test] (1962)

(2)

As shown in (1962), it is important to learn the meaning of the components as a whole. The component shown by the new learner is the component of the propositional component that differs in (1962).

In order to measure this difference, Kress (1962) uses a photo-elicitation method to elicit a description of the component. Kress (1962) notes that the component is not a Tophi, as suggested by the previous criterion. (Kress, 1962: 288)
Embedded Presuppositionals because fronted elements do not have landing sites. More specifically, $\Delta$ licenses a Force with a presuppositional feature, and a presuppositional Force does not license Topic or Focus. Now consider the following examples: (Kastner, 2015:18-20)

(18) Presuppositional

a. John regrets/denies that [Mary read this book].

$[\text{Force}_P \text{Force}_\Delta [\text{Fin}_P \text{Fin}(\Delta) [\text{CP} \text{that} [\text{TP} \text{Mary read this book}]]]]$.

b. *John regrets/denies that [this book, Mary read].

Following Kastner (2015), the structure of presuppositional left periphery can be illustrated as (18a). Thus, in (18b), null D turns Force and it prevents the argument this book from fronting the place of Topic.

1.4.3. Pro-forms

According to Potts (2002), as is a CP pro-form for clauses and the relevant pro-forms for a DP is which, as shown in (19) and (20).

(19) a. Ames was a spy, as we could tell just by looking in his martini glass.

b. *Ames was a spy, which we could tell just by looking in his martini glass.

(Potts, 2002:65)
As shown in (19a), the CP *Ames was a spy* is referred back to by a pro-form *as*. The ungrammaticality of (19b) shows that *which* cannot be used as a pro-form of CP. Now consider the following examples:

(20) a. Joan hates parties, which was the problem.

b. *John hates parties, as was the problem.

(Potts, 2002:66)

As shown in (20a), the DP *John hates parties* is referred back to by a pro-form *which*. Therefore, *as* cannot be used as a pro-form of DP, as in (20b).

Kastner (2015) argues that presuppositional verbs select DPs as their complements.

(21) Presuppositional

a. [Americans got cheap oil], *which* the whole world remembers ___. (DP)

b. *[Americans got cheap oil], as the whole world remembers ___. (CP)

(Kastner, 2015:24)

As shown in (21), the verb *remember* is presuppositional, so the DP-form *which* can be used and the CP-form *as* cannot be used.

On the other hand, non-presuppositional verbs select CP as their complements, so only the CP-form *as* can be used, as shown in (22):

(22) Non-presuppositional

a. [American should get cheap oil], *as* the whole world says ___. (CP)
Consider the following situation:

a. Jane faces the problem as the programmer.

b. John faces the problem as the programmer.

As shown in (30), the DP is a decomposing task in a cascaded problem of the program.

Therefore, we cannot pass on a program of the DP as in (30).

Keenan (2012) argues that prepositionless verbs select DPs as their complement.

(31) Prepositionless

a. [v A-mentioning SM and O. the whole word on the synthesizer]

b. [v A-mentioning SM and O. the whole word on the synthesizer]

(Keanan 2012)

As shown in (31), the core arguments in prepositionless verbs are DPs, which can be neces-
sary, and the DP-form cannot be needed.

On the other hand, non-prepositionless verbs select CPs as their complements:

(32) Non-prepositionless

a. [v A-mentioning SM and O. the whole word on the synthesizer]

As shown in (32), the core argument in non-prepositionless verbs is the DP-form and the DP-
form cannot be needed.
b. *[American should get cheap oil], which the whole world says ___. (DP) (ibid.)

The verb say is non-presuppositionals, so the pro-form of CP as can be used (see (22a)) and the pro-form of DP which cannot be used (see (22b)).

1.5 Summary

As I mentioned in section 1.2.1., Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) propose that factive verbs such as regret and ignore require their complements to be true:

(23) I regret that it is raining.

(Kiparsky and Kiparsky, 1970:147)

Factive verb, shown in (23) presupposes that the proposition of the complement it is raining should be a true event.

Based on the course of this research, Kastner (2015) proposes that differences of meaning are reflected in structure, as in (24):

(24) a. Bill denied that John stole the cookies. Presuppositional

b. John said that the moon was made of kale. Non-presuppositional

(Kastner, 2015:5)

The proposition of presuppositional complement such as (24a) refers to a discourse referent in Common Ground. On the other hand, the proposition of non-presuppositional complement such as (24b) can introduce a new idea. These differences
The verb "be in non-situational" is the preposition of CP and can be used (see 2.1). and the preposition of DP with common prepositional (see 1.2).

1.5 Summary

As I mentioned in Section 1.5.1, Kiperlen and Zemanek (1990) proposed that active verbs such as 'speak' and 'write' require their complements to be noun phrases. I suggest that it is misleading (Kiperlen and Zemanek 1990: 147).

Further work shown in (2.1) prepositions that prepositions are obligatory complements and meaning should be a nounAPH or a nominal prepositional phrase in the case of the preposition 'in'.

meaning was listed as a nounAPH as in (2.1):

(2.1) and 3.1=15
John sent the moon was made of kale

Non-prepositional

The proposal of prepositional complementation such as (2.1) refers to a grammatical region in common ground. On the other hand, the proposition of non-prepositional complementation such as (2.1) can introduce a new noun. Two differences
are reflected in structure, as shown in (25):

(25)  a. Presuppositional

Bill denied [DP Δ [CP that John stole the cookies]].

b. Non-presuppositional

John said [CP that the moon was made of kale].

Kastner (2015) proposes that presuppositional verbs take DPs as their complements, because covert definite determiner Δ exists and it selects CPs, shown in (25a). This existence of null D is confirmed by the three empirical supports extraction, fronting, and pro-forms, in section 1.4. In contrast, non-presuppositional verbs simply take CPs, shown in (25b)

In the next chapter, I would like to review the studies, in which research the relationships between verbs and their complements from the viewpoint of Japanese-English comparison.
Notes to Chapter 1

1. Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010:121) also investigate the relationships between verbs and their complements and suggest the idea, “referential” verbs. They argue that referential verbs take CPs as their complements with referentiality (RCPs) and “RCPs have a null wh-operator in their left periphery.”

2. Karttuen (1976:9-10) proposes the notion, “discourse referents”. They “exist in the realm-world as seen by the speaker. However, the non-factive verbs establishes referents in other realms and are ambiguous as far as the speaker concerned.”

3. Kastner (2015:16) defines “indefinite D + N (indefinite DP)” as week islands. Therefore, extraction from the subject and adjunct position cannot be allowed in the complement of Selected Embedded Presuppositionals.

Chapter 2

Complementizers in English and Japanese

In Chapter 1, I reviewed Kastner’s (2015) argument that presuppositional verbs take DPs as their complements. In Chapter 2, I will look at the problem of the categorial status of the presuppositional complements from a cross-linguistic point of view, investigating some Japanese data.

Japanese complementizers to and no are two of the counterparts of the English complementizer that. In section 2.1, I will review some analyses of these two complementizers. To be specific, I will review in section 2.1.1, Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976), in which it is observed that the complementizer no implies the factivity of the complement clause and that the complementizer to does not have such an implication. In section 2.1.2, I will review Saito’s (2016) proposal that complementizer to is specialized in paraphrasing the direct quotation and the complementizer no is specialized in embedding the propositions. In section 2.2., I would like to demonstrate the research topic and methodology; whether null D exists in Japanese complements. Then, I will give explanations of the materials and items in my questionnaire in section 2.2.1. In section 2.2.2., I will confirm the reliability of the results of my questionnaire with Mann-Whitney U test. Then, I will summarize this chapter in section 2.3.

2.1. The characteristic of Japanese complementizers to and no

2.1.1. Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976)

According to Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976), the Japanese complements ending
Chapter 7

Chapter 7 focuses on English and Japanese compressions.

In Chapter 6, we focused on the honeycomb-shaped shape. In Chapter 7, we will focus on the properties of the compressions to prepare for the next chapter.

In Chapter 7, we will focus on the properties of the compressions to prepare for the next chapter.

In Section 7.1, we will review some of the previous sections and discuss the compressions in English and Japanese. In Section 7.2, we will discuss the compressions in English and Japanese with examples. In Section 7.3, we will compare the compressions in English and Japanese with examples.

In Section 7.4, we will summarize the chapter in Section 7.5.

Japanese (1979) and Japanese (1979)
with complementizer *no* imply that the content of the clause such as action, state, or event is a true proposition. On the other hand, the Japanese complements ending with complementizer *to* do not have such implications, as in (1).


(Kuno, 1973:138-140)

In (1a), the proposition *Hanako-ga Tokyo-ni iru* is a true statement. However, the proposition *Taro-ga hannin da* in (1b) is not necessarily a true statement. Kuno (1973) considers that such semantic differences can be explained in terms of factivity. Factive verbs such as *wasureru* take the complementizer *no* (see (1a)) and non-factive verbs such as *omou* (see (1b)) take the complementizer *to*.

In addition to such factive distinction, Inoue (1976) takes the case of counter-factive verbs and observes that the characteristics of the verbs are reflected in the selection of complementizers. The predicates of counter-factive verbs such as *omoichigaiosuru*, *gokaisuru*, and *hayagatensuru* presuppose that the propositions of complements are false. Moreover, counter-factive verbs as well as non-factive verbs take the complementizer *to*.

Now consider the following examples:

(2) a. Katoshi-wa jibun-ga senkyosareru to omotta.
    b. Gakuseitachi-wa shiken-ga enkininatta to omoichigaishita.

(Inoue, 1976:254)
As shown in (2a), the proposition *jibun-ga senkyosareru* is not necessarily a true statement, but the proposition *shiken-ga enkininatta* must be a false statement. Furthermore, non-factive verbs such as *omou* take the complementizer *to* (see (2a)) and counter-factive verbs such as *omoichigau* also take the complementizer *to* (see (2b)).

2.1.2. Saito (2016)

Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976) propose that factive verbs take complementizer *no*. On the other hand, non-factive and counter-factive verbs take the complementizer *to*. However, these ideas seem to be controversial in light of examples such as (3):


As shown in (3), the verb *kitaisuru* is not a factive verb, because the proposition *Hanako-ga Tokyo-ni iru* is not necessarily a true statement. However, the verb *kitaisuru* can take the factive complementizer *no*. Thus, the proposal of Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976) lose the empirical supports.

Based on the ideas in Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976) that complementizer *to* and *no* have different characteristics, Saito (2013) lists some Japanese verbs co-occurring with Japanese complementizer *to* and *no*, as in (4).

(4) a. to: *omou, kangaeru, shinjiru, iu, sakebu, shuchousuru, tazuneru, kitaisuru, kanjiru*

b. no: *wasureru, koukaisuru, miru, matsu, tamerau, kyohisuru, ukeireru, kitaisuru, kannjiru*

(Saito, 2013:231)
As shown in (3), the proposed formulation is not a priori valid, because the proposition is not true. The "effective" competitiveness factor is not necessary in the statement. However, the proposed formulation can lead to false conclusions.

In (4), the proposed framework supports the above discussion. The proposed formulation in (3) takes some Japanese cases as co-existing with the proposed competitiveness in (4).
The verbs shown in (4a) are "verbs of saying and thinking", and direct quotations can occur with such verbs. On the other hand, the predicates of the verbs shown in (4b) take events, actions or states as their arguments.

Then, Saito (2016) suggests that complementizer to is specialized to introducing a direct quotation and the complementizer no is specialized to embedding a proposition. Now consider the following examples:

(5)  


(Saito, 2016:39)

In (5a), the TP sensyuu London-ni itta is a direct quotation of Taro's saying. Thus, the direct quotation can be embedded in the sentence by the complementizer to. In contrast, the TP sensyuu London-ni itta in (5b) is a proposition and it does not matter whether the content of the proposition is true or not. Thus, a proposition can be embedded in the sentence by the complementizer no.

Saito (2016) also suggests that the English complementizer that bears the same two roles given to the Japanese complementizers to and no respectively. This means that English complementizer that also has these two roles, one is to paraphrase a direct quotation and the other is to embed a proposition, as shown in (6):

(6)  

a. John said [CP that he went to London last week].

b. John regrets [CP that he went to London last week].

(Saito, 2016:39)
The verb "speak" in (5e) is a verb of expressing and implying. On the other hand, the verb "speak" in (5d) is a verb of expressing an opinion or idea.

Jaffe and Sabo (2016) suggest that the complementiser in English is restricted to adverbial clauses.

In contrast, the complementiser "that" in English is restricted to declarative clauses.

We can construct the following examples:

(5a) I believe that John is a good speaker.

(5b) I believe John is a good speaker.

The words "that" and "a" in (5a) are expressions of the complementiser and the noun "speaker." In contrast, the words "John" and "is" in (5b) are expressions of the complementiser and the noun "a good."
There seems to be no explicit difference in English, but in (6a), the complement that he went to London last week is a paraphrase of John’s saying I went to London last week. This means that the complementizer that (see (6a)) is specialized to paraphrasing a direct quotation. On the other hand, the complement he went to London last week shown in (6b) is simply a proposition, especially an event. This means that the complementizer that (see (6b)) is specialized to embedding a proposition.

2.2. The research topic and methodology

Haegman and Ürögdi (2010) and Saito (2016) conclude that presuppositional verbs take CPs as their complements.¹ In contrast, Adger and Quer (2001) and Kastner (2015) propose that presuppositional verbs select DPs as their complements, which is very similar to the classical idea in Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970:157) that the noun fact exists in front of the complement sentence in “syntactic deep structure”.² Now consider the following examples:

(7)  a. Saito (2016:39)

John regrets [CP that Mary read this book].

b. Kastner (2015:3)

John regrets [DP Δ [CP that Mary read this book]].

As shown in (7a), Saito (2016) proposes that presuppositional verbs take CPs as their complements. On the other hand, Kastner (2015) proposes that presuppositional verbs take DPs as their complements with the covert definite determiner head Δ, shown in (7b). Thus, I defined the research topic as whether the presuppositional verbs take DPs or CPs as their complements from a cross-linguistic point of view, especially
The research topic and methodology

The research topic is to explore the potential of using artificial intelligence in enhancing the comprehension of complex texts. The methodology involves the use of deep learning algorithms to analyze and interpret the content of the text. The research aims to identify patterns and relationships within the text, which can then be used to improve the understanding and retention of the information.

John reports (John Maynard Keynes) [in 'The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money']

D. Keynes (1936)

As shown in (d), Saino (2010) proposes that the problem of identifying the relationship between the complement and the subject is a complex one. However, recent advances in natural language processing (NLP) have made it possible to tackle this problem more effectively.

D.P. O. C.E. in Art, from complement to a cross-mapping point of view (essential...
2.2.1. Materials and explanation of item

I conducted the research using a questionnaire and it consists of the two parts.\(^4\) It uses 5-point scale from 1 (\textit{absolutely natural}) to 5 (\textit{absolutely unnatural}). The questionnaire is designed in Japanese and has 66 items. 67 students at Aichi University of Education participated in this research. It was distributed in two English class in December, 2017. The students were asked to fill in the instruments in the class.

The Part 1 has 20 items based on Kastner (2015). He investigates whether the argument of the complement can be extracted in English, as I mentioned in Chapter 1 section 1.4.1. Thus, the main purpose of the items in this part is to investigate whether such extraction can be allowed in Japanese (e.g., ‘Taro-ha jibun-ga pan-o tabeta no-o oboeteimasu.’, ‘Taro-ha jibun-ga nani-o tabeta no-o oboeteirunodesu-ka.’, ‘Taro-ha jibun-ga nani-o taberu-to omotteimasu-ka.’).

The Part 2 has 44 items based on Maki et al. (1991). They investigate whether the argument of the complement can be fronted in English, as I mentioned in Chapter 1 section 1.4.2. Moreover, I added the questions from the presuppositional point of view based on Kastner (2015), as shown in Chapter1 section 1.4.1. The main purpose of the items in this part is to investigate whether such fronting can be allowed in Japanese (e.g., ‘Jyon-wa konohon-o yonda.’, ‘Jyon-wa Meary-ga konohon-o yonda-to omotteiru.’, ‘Jyon-wa konohon-o Meary-ga yonda-to omotteiru.’).

2.2.2. Data analysis

The collected data were computer-coded and analyzed using MS Excel 2013. Firstly, all questions are grouped into two groups, Group A and B. Group A is the
collection of questions in which non-presuppositional verbs are used, and Group B is the collection of questions in which presuppositional verbs are used. Secondly, I calculate the average of answered numbers from the all participants.

Thirdly, I conduct Mann-Whitney U test in order to confirm the reliability of the data. First, I assume that there is no statistically significant difference and calculate the test statistic U. In Part 1, the taste statistic U is calculated to be 5. Second, I compare U with statistical numerical table of Mann-Whitney U test. If U is less than or equal to the rejection limit, the hypothesis ‘there is no statistically significant difference’ can be rejected. According to Aoki (2002), the rejection limit is 13 when the modulus \( n_1 = 8, n_2 = 8 \) and two-sided test with a significance level 5% As a result, \( U = 5 \leq 13 \), so I have concluded that there are statistically significant differences between Group A and B in Part 1. In the same way, the taste statistic U is calculated to be 69 in Part 2. According to Aoki (2002), the rejection limit is 120 when the modulus \( n_1 = 16, n_2 = 24 \), \( U = 69 \) and two-sided test with a significance level 5%. As a result, \( U = 69 \leq 120 \), so I also have concluded that there are statistically significant differences between Group A and B in Part 2.

Thus, I have concluded that the data obtained from the questionnaire is highly reliable.

2.3. Summary

In this chapter, I summarized the previous studies from a cross-linguistic point of view, especially Japanese-English comparison. Saito (2016) suggests that Japanese complementizer to is specialized to paraphrasing a direct quotation and no is specialized to embedding a proposition. Moreover, he also suggests that English complementizer that also has the same two roles:
collection of observations in which non-linguistic variables are not at issue.

Similarly, in a study of the effects of foreign languages on cognitive development, researchers found that bilingual children tend to have higher levels of cognitive flexibility than monolingual children. However, this finding has been contested by some researchers who argue that the effects of bilingualism on cognitive development are not as significant as previously believed.

In this chapter, we will explore the various factors that influence the development of bilingualism, including genetics, environmental factors, and cultural practices. We will also examine the benefits and challenges of multilingualism for individuals and society as a whole.

5.1 Key Concepts

In this section, we will discuss the fundamental concepts of bilingualism and multilingualism, including language acquisition, code-switching, and linguistic shift. We will also consider the role of language in shaping identity and culture.

5.2 Case Studies

We will examine several case studies of bilingual communities, including the Naga people of India and the Francophone communities of Quebec, Canada. These case studies will provide insights into the challenges and opportunities of multilingualism in different cultural contexts.

5.3 Implications for Education

Finally, we will discuss the implications of bilingualism and multilingualism for education, including the importance of language diversity in schools and the need for multilingual education programs.

Appendix

This appendix provides additional resources and references for further study on bilingualism and multilingualism.
(8)  
a. John said [CP that he went to London last week].

b. John regrets [CP that he went to London last week].

(Saito, 2016:39)

As shown in (8a), the complementizer *that* is specialized as a marker of paraphrasing a direct quotation. In contrast, the complementizer *that* in (8b) is specialized as a marker of embedding a proposition.

As I mentioned in Chapter 1 and 2, there are many studies investigating the relationships between verbs and their complements. However, the opinions are split among the researchers on the categorial status of presuppositional complements: CPs or DPs. Therefore, I defined the research topic as whether the covert definite determiner Δ exists in Japanese presuppositional complements. Then, I described how my research was conducted and the obtained data were collected and analyzed.

In the next chapter, I will present the results of the questionnaire and discuss whether the covert definite determiner Δ exists in Japanese presuppositional complements.
As shown in (8), the complementation view is specialized as a matter of
comparative global distribution. In contrast, the complementation view in (8)
identifies as a matter of combining a proposition

As I mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, there are many subtle inconsistencies in
information between parts and their complements. However, this diversity is striking
among the resources on the core set of the comparative complementarity model.

I recently identified the necessary property as another type of comparison complementarity.

These in turn presuppose the comparative complementarity. There are several other resources
with complementation and the operatic chain more generally and specifically

In the next chapter, I will present the results of the discussion and conclusions

important contributions to comparative complementarity. A variety in Japanese comparative complementarity
Notes to Chapter 2

1. Haegman and Ürögdi (2010:132) investigate whether presuppositional verbs take DPs or CPs as their complements. They claim that “both DPs and RCPs are referential”, but the selection of the complement can be explained from “operator movement”. Thus, they conclude that presuppositional verbs take CPs as their complements.

2. Adger and Quer (2001:109) call the occurrence “of if-clause under Proposition-selecting-predicates UNSELECTED EMBEDDED QUESTIONES (UEQs)” and suggest that “a UEQ in English is headed by a covert determiner.” (citation are from Adger and Quer 2001:117)

3. Saito (2016) enumerates some of the verbs in Japanese that take the complementizers to and no. However, he does not present a clear classification of those verbs. On the other hand, Kastner (2015) suggests that presuppositional verbs postulate that their complements refer to the discourse referents in the Common Ground and non-presuppositional verbs can introduce new ideas. This classification of the verbs is more comprehensive than that of Saito (2016). Thus, I apply Kastner’s (2015) presuppositional classification to Japanese and make my questionnaire.

4. Kastner (2015) proposes that covert definite determiner $\Delta$ exists in presuppositional complements with investigating extraction, fronting, and pro-forms in English. However, Japanese has no equivalent to English relative pronouns, so I exclude the case of Japanese pro-forms from my questionnaire.
Chapter 3

Results and discussions

As I have shown in Chapter 2, I investigated whether covert definite determiner \( \Delta \) exists in Japanese presuppositional complements with using the questionnaire. It consists of two parts, Part 1 is asking about extraction and Part 2 is asking about fronting in Japanese complement.

In Chapter 3, I would like to discuss the results of the questionnaire. In section 3.1 and 3.2., I will focus on the statistic differences between Japanese presuppositional and non-presuppositional complements from the results of the questionnaire and demonstrate that null D seems to exist in Japanese. In section 3.3., I would like to describe the limitation of this study, and then I will summarize this thesis in section 3.4.

3.1. Extraction from the Japanese complement

Table 1 and 2 show the mean, the average degree of naturalness of the sentences in Part 1. These are from all participants in this questionnaire study. Group A is the collection of questions in which non-presuppositional verbs are used, and Group B is the collection of questions in which presuppositional verbs are used. As table 1 indicates, to extract the argument from Japanese non-presuppositional complements such as *omou* and *kangaeru* are allowed. Now consider the following example:

(1) Non-presuppositional

a. Taro-wa Hanako-ga nanio taberi-to omotteimasuka?   **COMPLEMENT**
Chapter 3

Result and Discussion

In Chapter 2, I have shown [equation or data]. In this chapter, the discussion will focus on the relationship between psychological interaction and psychological symptoms. A detailed analysis of the data collected in the experiment is presented in Part 2. In Part 3, I will discuss the implications of these findings and their potential applications.

In Part 3, I will also discuss the results of the discussion presented in Section 3.1 and 3.2. I will focus on the analysis of the relationship between psychological interaction and psychological symptoms. A comprehensive analysis of the data collected in the experiment is presented in Section 3.4. In Part 4, I will conclude this discussion by summarizing the key findings.


tables and figures from the previous chapter

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of the participants' responses. A comparison of the means between Group A and Group B indicates a significant difference in the level of psychological symptoms. As Table 1 illustrates, the level of psychological symptoms in Group B was significantly higher than that in Group A.

In conclusion, the findings from this study suggest that psychological interaction significantly affects psychological symptoms. These results have important implications for future research and practice.

Non-parametric

Comment

In the non-parametric analysis, we considered the following examples:

1. [Example 1]

[Further analysis and discussion]
b. Taro-wa Jyon-ga natsuyasumini **dono** kuni-e
   itta-to omotteimasuka?  COMPLEMENT

c. Taro-wa **dare**-ga kukkii-o nusunda-to omotteimasuka?  SUBJECT

d. Anata-wa **naze** Jyon-ga kukkii-o nusunda-to omotteimasuka?  ADJUNCT

As shown in (1a) and (1b), the arguments in the complement positions can be fronted from Japanese non-presuppositional complements. In the same vein, the arguments in the subject (see (1c)) and adjunct (see (1d)) positions also can be allowed in Japanese. In the study of Haegman and Ürögdi (2010), extraction from English non-presuppositionals are also allowed, as I mentioned in Chapter 1, section 1.4.1. Therefore, the results on extraction from non-presuppositional complements are similar between Japanese and English.

Moreover, as table 2 indicates, to extract the arguments from the complements introduced by Japanese presuppositional verbs such as oboeru and koukaisuru are not allowed. Now consider the following examples:

(2) Presuppositional

a. *Taro-wa jibun-ga **nanio** tabetano-o koukaishiteimasuka?  COMPLEMENT

b. *Jyon-wa jibun-ga natsuyasumini **dono** kuni-e
   ittakoto-o koukaishiteimasuka?  COMPLEMENT

c. *Taro-wa **dare**-ga sukki-o nusundano-o koukaishiteimasuka?  SUBJECT

d. *Anata-wa **naze** Jyon-ga sukki-o
   nusundano-o koukaishiteimasuka?  ADJUNCT
As shown in (2), extracting the argument from presuppositional complement such as complements, subjects, and adjuncts is not allowed in Japanese. In the study of Kastner (2015), only the arguments in the complement position can be extracted from SEP as I mentioned in Chapter 1, section 1.4.1. Therefore, the results on extraction from presuppositional complements are similar between Japanese and English. Moreover, it can infer that Japanese presuppositional complements seem to be stronger islands than those of English, because any movement is prohibited in Japanese presuppositional complements.

To sum up, extracting the arguments from the complements introduced by presuppositional verbs do not seem to be allowed in Japanese. Thus, it can be presumed that the covert definite determiner $\Delta$ exists in Japanese and it prevents the arguments of the presuppositional complements from being extracted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2. Fronting in the Japanese complement

Table 3 and 4 show the mean, the average degree of naturalness of the sentences in the questionnaire. These are from all participants in this questionnaire study. Group A is the collection of questions in which non-presuppositional verbs are used, and Group B is the collection of questions in which presuppositional verbs are used. As table 3 indicates, to front the argument in Japanese non-presuppositional complement is allowed in light of examples such as (3):

(3) Non-presuppositional

a. Jyon-wa [Meari-ga konohon-o t yondano]-o oboeteiru.

b. Jyon-wa [konohon-o Meari-ga t yondano]-o oboeteiru.

As shown in (3a), fronting the argument Meari-ga in non-presuppositional complement is allowed in Japanese. In the same vein, the argument konohon-o also can be fronted in non-presuppositional complements, as in (3b). In the study of Maki et al. (1991), fronting the argument in the complement introduced by non-presuppositionals is also allowed in English. Therefore, the results on fronting in non-presuppositional complement are similar between Japanese and English.

Moreover, as table 4 indicates, to front the argument in Japanese non-presuppositional complement is not allowed in light of examples such as (4):

(4) Presuppositional

a. *Jyon-wa [Meari-wa konohon-o t yondano]-o koukaishiteiru.

b. *Jyon-wa [konohon-wa Meari-ga t yondano]-o koukaishiteiru.
As shown in (4a), fronting the argument Meari-wa in presuppositional complement is not allowed in Japanese. In the same vein, the argument konohon-wa cannot be fronted in presuppositional complement either, as in (4b). In the study of Kastner (2015), fronting the argument in the complement introduced by presuppositionals is not allowed in English. Therefore, the results on fronting in presuppositional complement are similar between Japanese and English, excepting the cases which the arguments are fronted with postpositional particles ga and o.

To sum up, fronting the arguments in the complement introduced by presuppositional verbs do not seem to be allowed in Japanese either. Thus, it can be presumed that the covert definite determiner $\Delta$ exists in Japanese and it prevents the arguments of presuppositional complements from being fronted.

Table 3 Group A in Part 2 (CP)        Table 4 Group B in Part 2 (DP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in (1.4) (4.13) the treatment of components in the propositional calculus is not if the same as the treatment of components in (4.3) (4.2). The treatment of propositional calculus in (4.4) is similar to the treatment of propositional calculus in English.

Theorem 3.6.10 on joining in propositional calculus is similar to the theorem on joining in English.

Propositional calculus gives a new way.

To sum up, joining the components in the propositional calculus gives a new way.

A propositional calculus does not seem to allow in Japanese either.

Table 2 A probe in Part 3 (Cp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 A probe in Part 3 (Cp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Further researches

Part 1 of the questionnaire reveals that extracting the argument in the complement position of a presuppositional complement clause is disallowed in Japanese but allowed in English. This means that Japanese presuppositional complements seem to be stronger islands than those of English. Moreover, Part 2 of the questionnaire brings it to light that in Japanese presuppositional complement clauses, fronting the argument with postpositional particles が and を seem to be more natural than fronting the argument with a postpositional particle わ. Thus, the properties of Japanese presuppositional complement clauses still await further investigations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further resources

Part 2 of the determination presents the extraction of the pronunciation in the complement component of a Japanese component phrase as established in the research.

The results show that the Japanese component phrase is spoken in English. This means that the Japanese component phrase is spoken in the acoustic phonetic manner. Further investigation of the Japanese component phrase is still required to better understand the pronunciation and to more accurately determine the pronunciation with a phonetic pronunciation scheme. The phonetic scheme of Japanese pronunciation

complement component still needs further investigation.
Furthermore, Kastner (2015) limits the discussion on finite clauses in English, and proposes that presuppositional verbs take DPs as their complements. Therefore, a further study of whether infinite clauses such as gerund clauses and infinitival clauses also take DPs as their complements should be conducted in English.

3.4. Conclusion

This thesis attempted to explore the relationships between the verbs and their complements. I found that presuppositional verbs seem to take DPs as their complement in Japanese. It means that the covert definite determiner \( \Delta \) seems to exist in Japanese.

In Chapter 1, I reviewed the studies on the relationships between verbs and their complements in English, especially categorial status of the complements. Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) propose that factive verbs such as regret and forget presuppose that the proposition of the complement is true. Remodeling Kiparsky and Kiparsky's (1970) classic idea of postulating the existence of the noun fact in front of the complement sentence in "syntactic deep structure", Kastner (2015) proposes that presuppositional verbs such as remember and deny take DPs headed by the covert definite determiner \( \Delta \) as their complements in English.

In Chapter 2, I reviewed the studies on the relationships between verbs and their complements from a cross-linguistic point of view, investigating some Japanese data. Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976) propose that factive predicates correspond to Japanese complementizer no. Saito (2016) refines the proposals in Kuno (1973) and Inoue (1976). He suggests that Japanese complementizer to is specialized to paraphrasing a direct quotation and Japanese complementizer no is specialized to embedding a proposition. Moreover, he also suggests that the English complementizer that bears the same two roles given to the Japanese complementizers to and no respectively. According to Kastner
(2015), presuppositional verbs take DPs as their complements with the covert definite determiner head \( \Delta \). On the other hand, Saito (2016) proposes that presuppositional verbs take CPs as their complements. Thus, I defined the research topic as whether presuppositional verbs take DPs as their complements from a cross-linguistic point of view, especially Japanese.

In Chapter 3, I analyzed the results of the questionnaire. It consists of two parts, Part 1 is asking about extraction and Part 2 is asking about fronting in Japanese complements. As the results of the questionnaire, to extract the argument from presuppositional complements cannot be allowed in Japanese and to front the argument in presuppositional complements cannot be allowed in Japanese either. Kastner (2015) proposes that the covert definite determiner \( \Delta \) exists in English, with investigating extraction, fronting and describes that extraction and fronting in presuppositional complements cannot be allowed. These results are quite similar between Japanese and English.

Therefore, I have concluded that the categorial status of Japanese presuppositional complements are DPs because the complements are headed by the covert definite determiner \( \Delta \), as far as the results of the questionnaire are concerned.
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Appendix
日本語の動詞と補文に関する調査

愛知教育大学 教育学部 英語専攻 4年 渡邊 宗司

この調査は私の卒業論文研究の参考資料にするためのものです。個人が特定されるものではありません。ご協力よろしくお願い致します。
調査は2つのセクションで成り立っています。それぞれの項目に、記入漏れのないように、周りの方と相談せずに記入してください。
この調査で得た情報は、研究の目的にのみ使用し、その他の目的では一切使用いたしません。よろしくお願い致します。

(学年) 年 ( 初等・中等 ) ( 選修・専攻 )

次の日本語の文を読んでどう感じますか、一番当てはまると思う番号に○をつけさせてください。
基準は以下の通りです。

1 —— 2 —— 3 —— 4 —— 5

1 = 全く自然だ
2 = かなり自然だ
3 = どちらとも言えない
4 = かなり不自然だ
5 = 全く不自然だ

（例）

a. 太郎が、昨日花子に手紙を書いた
   1 —— 2 —— 3 —— 4 —— 5

b. 太郎が、花子を昨日で手紙と書いた
   1 —— 2 —— 3 —— 4 —— 5
Part 1

a. 太郎は自分がパンを食べたのを覚えています。

b. 太郎は自分が何を食べたのを覚えているのですか。

c. 太郎は自分が何を食べたのを後悔していますか。

d. 太郎は花子が何を食べると思っていたか。

e. 太郎は昼食に何を食べたいと考えていますか。

f. 太郎はジョンがアメリカから来たのを覚えています。

g. 太郎はジョンがどこから来たのか覚えていますか。

h. ジョンは自分が夏休みにどこから行ったことを後悔していますか。

i. 太郎はジョンが夏休みにどの国へ行ったと思ったか。

j. 太郎は学生たちを夏休みにどの国へ送ろうと考えていますか。

k. 太郎はジョンがケーキを盗んだのを覚えている。

l. 太郎は誰がケーキを盗んだのを覚えていますか。

m. 太郎は誰がケーキを盗んだのを後悔していますか。

n. 太郎は誰がケーキを盗んだと思っていませんか。

o. 太郎は夏休みにどの学生がアメリカに行くべきと考えていますか。
p. ジョンはお腹がすいて
クッキーを盗んだのを覚えている。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

q. あなたはなぜジョンが
クッキーを盗んだのを覚えていますか。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

r. あなたはなぜジョンが
クッキーを盗んだのを後悔していますか。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

s. あなたはなぜジョンが
クッキーを盗んだと思ってますか。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

t. あなたはなぜジョンが
学校を休んだと考えますか。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

Part 2

a. ジョンはこの本を読んだ。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

b. この本はジョンが読んだ。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

c. ジョンはメアリーがこの本を読んだと思っている。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

d. ジョンはメアリーはこの本を読んだと思っている。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

e. ジョンはその学生が留学すべきだと考えています。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

f. ジョンはその学生は留学すべきだと考えています。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

g. ジョンはメアリーがこの本を読んだのを覚えている。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

h. ジョンはメアリーはこの本を読んだのを覚えている。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5

i. ジョンはメアリーがこの本を読んだのを後悔している。
1 — 2 — 3 — 4 — 5
j. ジョンはメアリーはこの本を読んだのを後悔している。
   1 2 3 4 5

k. ジョンはメアリーがこの本を読んだのを否定している。
   1 2 3 4 5

l. ジョンはメアリーはこの本を読んだのを否定している。
   1 2 3 4 5

m. ジョンはこの本は
   メアリーが読んだと思っている。
   1 2 3 4 5

n. ジョンはこの本を
   メアリーが読んだと思っている。
   1 2 3 4 5

o. ジョンはこの本は
   学生が読むべきだと考えている。
   1 2 3 4 5

p. ジョンはこの本を
   学生が読むべきだと考えている。
   1 2 3 4 5

q. ジョンはこの本は
   メアリーが読んだのを覚えている。
   1 2 3 4 5

r. ジョンはこの本を
   メアリーが読んだのを覚えている。
   1 2 3 4 5

s. ジョンはこの本は
   メアリーが読んだのを後悔している。
   1 2 3 4 5

t. ジョンはこの本を
   メアリーが読んだのを後悔している。
   1 2 3 4 5

u. ジョンはこの本は
   メアリーが読んだのを否定している。
   1 2 3 4 5

v. ジョンはこの本を
   メアリーが読んだのを否定している。
   1 2 3 4 5
w. 太郎はその映画を見た。
x. その映画は太郎が見た。
y. 太郎は花子がその映画を見たと思っている。
z. 太郎は花子はその映画を見たと思っている。
A. 太郎は生徒達がその映画を見るべきだと考えている。
B. 太郎は生徒達はその映画を見るべきだと考えている。
C. 太郎は花子がその映画を見たのを覚えている。
D. 太郎は花子はその映画を見たのを覚えている。
E. 太郎は花子がその映画を見たのを後悔している。
F. 太郎は花子はその映画を見たのを後悔している。
G. 太郎は花子がその映画を見たのを否定している。
H. 太郎は花子はその映画を見たのを否定している。
I. 太郎はその映画は
   花子が見たと思っている。
J. 太郎はその映画を
   花子が見たと思っている。
K. 太郎はその映画は
   生徒達が見るべきだと考えている。
L. 太郎はその映画を
   生徒達が見るべきだと考えている。
M. 太郎はその映画は
    花子が見たのを覚えている。

N. 太郎はその映画を
    花子が見たのを覚えている。

O. 太郎はその映画は
    花子が見たのを後悔している。

P. 太郎はその映画を
    花子が見たのを後悔している。

Q. 太郎はその映画は
    花子が見たのを否定している。

R. 太郎はその映画を
    花子が見たのを否定している。

質問内容は以上です。ご協力ありがとうございました。