

PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF SO-CALLED COMPLEMENTIZERS
IN JAPANESE: *KOTO* AND *NO*¹

Reiko Makino
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
r-makino@uiuc.edu

This paper provides a pragmatic account of the uses of the Japanese abstract nouns *koto* (intangible 'thing' such as 'situation') and *no* (indefinite pronoun) that have traditionally been categorized as complementizers. *Koto* and *no*, when they take a clausal complement, have been analyzed in terms of notions such as factive presupposition or concreteness/abstractness of an eventuality denoted by the complement clause. This paper shows that the key issue in explaining the distribution and interpretation of *koto* and *no* is the speaker's belief concerning whether or not eventuality denoted by their complement clause has been in the addressee's focus. It also demonstrates that the use of *koto* or *no* is a function of the speaker's goal and intention in making the utterance, as well as societal aspects.

1. Introduction

The lexical noun *koto* and the indefinite pronoun *no* occur in the head position of noun phrases taking sentential complements as their sister, as shown in (1) and (2).²

- (1) Watasi-wa [Taroo-ga Amerika-e itta] **koto**-o sitta.
I-TOP Taroo-NOM USA-to went situation-ACC got to know
'I got to know that Taroo went to the USA.'
- (2) Watasi-wa [Taroo-ga Amerika-e itta] **no**-o sitta.
I-TOP Taroo-NOM USA-to went one-ACC got to know
'I got to know that Taroo went to the USA.'

Previous accounts of the uses of *koto* and *no* occurring in this syntactic position have analyzed them in terms of the speaker's presupposition or conviction of the truth of the clausal content (Kuno 1973, Suzuki 1996). *Koto* and *no* have also been semantically analyzed in terms of events or propositions (Terakura 1980; Horie 1993), or the abstractness and concreteness of the clausal content (Kuno 1973). These are suggestive, but do not adequately describe the occurrence and nonoccurrence of *koto* and *no*.

This paper argues that *no* is used when the speaker believes and wishes to convey the impression that the addressee has been aware of the information. In contrast, *koto* is used when the speaker does not wish to convey this impression. Furthermore, this paper shows that speakers routinely exploit this distinction between *koto* and *no* in order to achieve their goals for the linguistic interaction.

Koto and *no* can be utilized to organize a narrative, for example, to show a discussion boundary. The speaker's beliefs and intentions are subjected to various interpretations arising from the inferences made through the uses of *koto* and *no* as well as from social conventions in Japanese society (i.e., what is socially acceptable or non-acceptable).

Section 2 of this paper shows that the past analyses of *koto* and *no* in this kind of construction are not descriptively adequate. Section 3 provides an analysis that explains the distribution and interpretation of *koto* and *no* and defines terms used in the subsequent discussions. Section 4 demonstrates how the proposed analysis explains the uses and interpretations of *koto* and *no*. Finally, Section 5 represents the conclusion of the study.

2. Motivation of the study

Concerning the characteristics common to both *koto* and *no*, it has typically been claimed that the complement clause of *koto* and *no* represents a state of affairs that the speaker presupposes to be true based on the semantics of the predicate (Kuno 1973). For example, *koto* and *no* are used for the complement clause of factive predicates, such as *wasureru* 'forget'.

- (3) Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga gakusee dearu] **koto**-o wasurete-ita.
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM student COP situation-ACC forgot
 'Taroo forgot that Hanako was a student.'
- (4) Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga gakusee dearu] **no**-o wasurete-ita.
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM student COP one-ACC forgot
 'Taroo forgot that Hanako was a student.'

Suzuki 1996 argues that *koto* and *no* are used when the speaker is convinced that the denoted information is factual. These analyses in terms of the speaker's belief in the truth of the denoted proposition are not adequate because both *koto* and *no* can occur with a nonfactive predicate, like *sinziru* 'believe', as shown in (5) and (6).

- (5) [Oneetyan-ga kekkon-suru] **koto**-o sinzite-ita no ka.
 Elder sister-NOM get married situation-ACC have been believing Q
 'You've been believing that your elder sister is getting married?!'
- (6) [Oneetyan-ga kekkon-suru] **no**-o sinzite-ita no ka.
 Elder sister-NOM get married one-ACC have been believing Q
 'You've been believing that your elder sister is getting married?!'

Thus, the main predicate does not determine the occurrence or nonoccurrence of *koto* and *no*, as Suzuki 1996 shows. Furthermore, in examples (5) and (6), *koto* and *no* are used when the speaker is convinced that the state of affairs denoted by the *koto*-clause or *no*-clause does not obtain. This fact shows that whether or not the speaker is convinced of the information expressed by the complement clause does not predict whether she will use *koto* or *no*.

Second, regarding the difference between *koto* and *no*, it has been claimed that *no* is used to denote a concrete state of affairs perceived through sensory organs and thus, is a spatio-temporal entity (Kuno 1973;³ Terakura 1980; Horie 1993). In contrast, it has been claimed that *koto* is used to denote an abstract concept (Kuno 1973), or non-spatio-temporal entity (Terakura 1980;⁴ Horie 1993⁵). There are, however, cases in which a *no*-clause is used for non-spatio-temporal entities. For example, a predicate that requires a concept-type argument can take the *no*-clause, such as *gomen da* 'not want'. One such situation is when the speaker repeats what the addressee has said. The content of the complement clause is not a situation the speaker is observing in the speech context⁶ or has observed in the past. For example, in (7), the protagonist uses *no* to express an idea the addressee proposed: hiring a maid for their elderly father.

- (7) [Uti-ni tanin-ga hairikomu] **no**-wa gomen da tte.
 House-in outsider-NOM enter one-TOP not want COP QT.
 'He said that he does not want others to come into the house.'
 (Murasaki 1992:1.43)

A clause that denotes a state of affairs realized by the speaker's senses can occur with *koto*, as shown in (8). In this example, the complement clause denotes the speaker's physical desire.

- (8) Sooda yo, [osikko-si-tai] **koto**-nante wasuretyae.
 That's right, SFP go to the bathroom-want situation-TOP let's forget
 'That's right, let's forget about wanting to go to the bathroom.'
 (The speaker is talking to herself.) (Sakura 1988:3.115)

There are also cases in which *koto* occurs with an event-type predicate. For example, a *koto*-clause can occur with *hazimatta*, 'began', which is classified as an event-type predicate in Vendler 1967. An example is shown in (9).

- (9) Kurasu de [mainichi san mairu hasiru] **koto**-ga hazimatta.
 Class-in everyday three mile run situation-NOM began
 'Running three miles everyday in class has started.'

If *koto* is used only to refer to a non-spatio-temporal proposition, these uses of *koto* in (8) and (9) are not explained.

The following sections argue that the distribution of *koto* and *no* in this construction is predicted by general pragmatic principles that consider the speaker's belief — in particular her beliefs about whether or not the eventuality denoted by the complement clause is in the addressee's focus, and the speaker's intention of how she wants to represent herself in uttering the sentence that includes *koto* and *no*. In order to explain the interpretation of the clause containing *koto* or *no*, a satisfactory description needs to take the addressee's inference into account following the Cooperative Principle and Japanese social conventions.

3. Hypotheses and definitions

The rest of this paper presents evidence to support the hypothesis that *no* is used when the speaker believes that the eventuality expressed by the complement

clause is accessible to the addressee, while *koto* is used when the speaker does not believe this.⁷

The term *eventuality* denotes a proposition and an open proposition. A proposition is something one can find to be true or false. An open proposition is a proposition in which some arguments are unspecified.

An eventuality denoted by a clause is ACCESSIBLE when it has been active (i.e., in the addressee's focus) or semiactive (i.e., not focused, but not completely out of focus) in the addressee's mind, following Chafe 1994. An ACCESSIBLE eventuality is one that is introduced as new and remains active or extralinguistically salient; an eventuality that is introduced into a discourse and becomes semiactive; an eventuality that is associated with a given eventuality; or an eventuality that is extralinguistically present in the speech context.

The term REFLEXIVE BELIEF is the speaker's belief the addressee believes that the speaker and the addressee share. For example, the speaker may know that it is snowing. Furthermore, the speaker believes that the addressee is aware that the speaker knows that the addressee knows that it is snowing. In this paper, it argued that when *no* is used, in contrast to *koto*, the speaker REFLEXIVELY believes that the addressee can access the eventuality.

4. Predictions

The following sections demonstrate situations in which *koto* is acceptable and *no* unacceptable, and vice versa. An explanation of why they are acceptable in each situation is also provided.

4.1 Social factors

4.1.1 *No* is used when it is socially acceptable for the speaker to demonstrate her belief about the addressee

One situation in which the speaker can display her belief about the addressee is when the speaker talks to a socially equal or lower-ranking addressee in an informal situation. In such a situation, it is socially acceptable for the speaker to express explicitly her belief about such an addressee: whether the addressee can access the eventuality denoted by the complement clause or not. Thus, when the speaker believes studying linguistics is focused or semi-focused in the addressee's mind, *no* can be used as shown in (10).

- (10) [Gengogaku-o benkyoosuru] no-wa omosiroi.
Linguistics-ACC study one-TOP fun
'Studying linguistics is fun.'

If *koto* is used in the same situation, the speaker sounds cold and detached. This is because the speaker is not acknowledging the fact that the relationship between the speaker and the addressee is close enough to demonstrate the speaker's belief about the addressee in her speech.

4.1.2 *Koto* is used when it is socially unacceptable for the speaker to demonstrate her belief about the addressee

When it is not socially appropriate for the speaker to display her belief that the addressee can access the eventuality denoted by the complement clause, *koto* heads the noun phrase. One such situation is when the speaker is engaging in formal conversation with a socially higher-ranking addressee. Even though it is possible for the speaker to make an assumption that the addressee can access the eventuality, it is socially unacceptable to demonstrate this. For example, when talking to a senior member of society, *koto* occurs as in (11).

- (11) [Sensee-no go-kenkyuu-ga subarasii] *koto*-ga wakarimasita.
 Teacher-GEN study-NOM wonderful situation-NOM understood
 'I understood well that your research is wonderful'

If *no* is used in the above situation, the speaker sounds presumptuous.

4.2 Reflexive belief

4.2.1 *No* is used when the speaker has a reflexive belief

The hypothesis states that *no* can be used when the speaker reflexively believes that the eventuality expressed by the complement clause is accessible to the addressee. A situation where the speaker can have such a belief is when the speaker and the addressee are doing things together at the same location at the time of utterance. This is because in this kind of situation, the speaker can believe that the action expressed by the complement clause of *no* is accessible to the addressee, and the speaker can also believe that the addressee is aware that the speaker knows that.

For example, a husband and wife are eating dinner together; seated on the floor in traditional Japanese style. The wife draws attention to this state of affairs by using *no*, as shown in (12).

- (12) [Suwatte taberu] *no*, hisasiburi.
 Sit-ADV eat one it has been long.
 'It has been a long time since I ate sitting on the floor.'
 (Murasaki 1992:1.72)

No is used because the wife can believe that the husband is aware that they are eating Japanese style, and also that the husband knows that (i.e., the husband is aware that the wife knows that the husband knows that they are eating Japanese style). If *koto* is used, the wife sounds as if she does not think that the husband is aware of their eating Japanese style. This could be because she believes that her husband is absent-minded or thinking of something else at the time of her utterance.

4.2.2 *Koto* is used when the speaker does not have a reflexive belief

The hypothesis states that *koto* is used when the speaker does not reflexively believe that the eventuality expressed by the complement clause is accessible to the addressee. For example, when a grade-school class representative calls a classmate to inform her that school will be closed due to bad weather, he hears her

voice full of excitement. The class representative surmises by her excited voice that she expects that he is calling to inform her of the school closing. In responding to her query into the nature of the call, he asks if she is expecting school to close due to the bad weather, using *koto*, as shown in (13).

- (13) Sono hazunda koe-wa, [kyoo gakkoo-ga yasumi-ni-naru]
 that excited voice-TOP today school-NOM close-become
koto-o yosoositemasu ne?
 situation-ACC expecting SFP

'By that excited voice, you must be expecting school to be closed to day, aren't you?' (Sakura 1988:2.20)

The reason the class representative chooses to use *koto* is because he can believe from the girl's excited voice that she is expecting the school to close, but he cannot know, especially over the phone, the girl's belief about his knowledge of her belief. In fact, in the prior utterance, the girl is trying to hide her expectations by asking what kind of business the class representative has with her. The conditions for reflexive belief have not been met. If *no* is used instead of *koto* in this example, the class representative sounds as if he already knows not only that the girl is expecting the school to close for the day, but also, that she realizes that he knows that she is expecting the school will be closed. Thus *koto* is appropriate in the above situation.

4.3 When the speaker believes the addressee is conscious of the eventuality vs. when the speaker does not: confirming or reminding

The use of *no* reflects the speaker's belief that the eventuality expressed by the embedded clause is accessible to the addressee. Thus, when the speaker expects the addressee to be conscious of the eventuality denoted by the embedded clause at the time of the utterance, such as in confirming what the speaker believes the addressee ought to know, the speaker can use *no*. For example, when a teacher wants to begin giving an exam by confirming to the students that they know that the class will have an exam, she will use *no* as shown below. The teacher believes that the students are all well aware of the fact that there will be an exam.

- (14) [Kyoo siken-o suru] no-o oboete-imasu ka.
 today exam-ACC do one-ACC remember-PRG Q
 'You remember that we will have an exam today, don't you?'
 ('You are supposed to be aware of it.')

If *koto* is used, the speaker sounds as if the students are not aware of the exam.

In contrast, it is predicted that the speaker will use *koto* when she reminds the students of the exam ahead of the time. This is because in reminding someone of something, the speaker does not have to expect the addressee to be aware of the reminded matter at the time of the utterance. Thus, when the teacher reminds the students about an upcoming exam, she uses *koto* as in (15).

- (15) [Asita siken-ga aru] koto-o oboeteimasu ka.
 tomorrow exam-NOM exist situation-ACC remember Q
 'Do you remember that we will have an exam tomorrow?'
 ('I am not expecting you to be aware of it at this moment.')

If *no* is used, the speaker sounds as if she is implicating that the students ought to remember that they will have an exam. Under the spatio-temporal analysis, in both cases (14) and (15), *koto* is predicted to occur, but not *no*. This is because the exam has not taken place yet and is not perceived yet — thus, it is not a spatio-temporal entity. As shown in (14), however, *no* can be used when the speaker believes the addressee can access the eventuality denoted by the complement clause.

4.4 Discourse organization and *koto* and *no*

By implicating that the addressee is or is not aware of the eventuality described by the embedded clause, the speaker can organize the discourse. The following three sections show that *koto* and *no* are used to shift a topic, make a discussion boundary, and to organize comments about the story and the real world.

4.4.1 Topic shift

Since the use of *koto* implicates that the speaker believes the addressee is not aware of the eventuality denoted by the sister clause, the speaker can use *koto* when she introduces a new topic to the conversation, or goes back to a topic discussed prior to the utterance. For example, after the addressee talked about how a man she likes viewed her, by using *koto*, the speaker can shift the topic to whether or not the addressee has already informed him of her moving, which was mentioned before, as shown in (16).

- (16) [Pari-ni iku] koto, moo Yano-kun-ni?
 Paris-to go situation already Mr. Yano-to
 'Have you already talked to Yano about going to Paris?'
 (Ogura 1983:3.150)

This is because in such a situation, the speaker does not expect the addressee to be focusing or semifocusing on the eventuality denoted by the complement of the clause at the time of the utterance, which is not directly related to the current topic. If *no* is used, the speaker sounds as though she is assuming that the addressee has already pulled the topic into the addressee's consciousness.

4.4.2 Discussion boundary

The distinction between *koto* and *no* is also exploited to make a discussion boundary, such as when a speaker wishes to raise the issue again as another discussion, even though the speaker has talked about the issue in the prior discussion, and thus assumes that the addressee is fully aware of it. In this case, the speaker appears to conflict with the maxim of Quality I (i.e., Do not say what you believe to be false (Grice 1975)).⁸ The addressee, assuming that the speaker is behaving rationally, would infer that the speaker has begun a new discussion by

using *koto* to make it look as though the eventuality is not accessible to the addressee yet.

One such situation occurs when the speaker is in the course of trying repeatedly to persuade the addressee on a topic. For example, parents are trying to persuade their high-school daughter not to go to a discotheque. The mother makes a first attempt only to fail. The father then tries and also fails. The daughter is still not convinced. So the mother raises the issue (not go to a discotheque) again from a different point of view. It is predicted that the mother can use *koto* to raise the issue in her daughter's consciousness, even though going to a discotheque has been the topic of the discussion, and the daughter has been aware of it, as in (17).

- (17) Disuko nante, [itta] **koto-ga** bare tara.
 Disco TOP went-situation NOM is discovered if
 teegaku ka taigaku desho.
 suspension or expulsion from school COP-probably
 'As for going to the disco, if one's going there is discovered, one
 would be suspended or expelled from school, wouldn't he/she?'
 (Sakura 1987:1.154)

If *no* is used, the mother sounds as if she has not begun her second round of persuasion and is still in the previous discussion. This is because the use of *no* implicates that the mother believes the daughter is fully aware of the issue, i.e., going to a discotheque, and thus it is not necessary to reintroduce the issue to the addressee.

4.4.3 Narrator's comments

In the case of narratives, when a narrator makes a comment in the background in which she does not refer to the current scene in the story line, *koto* can be used. This is because the narrator does not refer to the eventuality that is in the addressee's focus, that is, the eventuality that refers to the story scene. Thus, the narrator can signal to the reader that her comment is not about the story line, but about such a situation in general in the real world.

For example, in a background of a comic frame, when the speaker talks about a general tendency of children in the real world, *koto* is used, as in (18). In the frame, children are carrying lots of items on the last day of the school term and see some excitement ahead of them. Forgetting about their burden and the heat, they run towards the excitement. The writer makes a comment to the side of the frame, using *koto*.

- (18) Nanika omosirosoo na **koto-ga** mitsukaru to,
 something interesting COP situation-NOM is found when,
 [omoi] **koto mo** [atsui] **koto mo** wasurete-simau.
 heavy thingalso hot thingalso forget-completely

'When running into something fascinating, we completely forget that things we carry are heavy or that it is hot.' (Sakura 1987:1.7)

If *no* is used, the speaker sounds as though she is describing the very scene by pulling the reader into the scene. This is because the use of *no* limits the narrator's comment to the children in the story scene that the speaker believes the addressee can access.

Under the spatio-temporal analysis, *no* is predicted to be used in example (18). This is because being heavy or being hot is something one perceives physically, not by logical reasoning. However, as shown in (18), *koto* is used. This is not explained by the spatio-temporal analysis.

4.5 Inner speech

When one talks to oneself, the speaker acts as if she is of two minds. The hypothesis predicts that, in the case of inner speech, when an eventuality denoted by the complement clause newly comes into or re-enters the addressee's consciousness, such as when the speaker newly realizes something, or when the speaker has forgotten about the eventuality and remembers it again, *koto* can be used. This is because the speaker has not been aware of the eventuality, and thus, the speaker cannot act as though another mind has been focusing on the eventuality. For example, when a child has an urge to go to the bathroom at night, but is scared about going there alone, she suddenly concocts an idea of forgetting about her need. The *koto*-clause can be used to express the speaker's desire to go to the bathroom, as in (19). This is because even though her desire has been in her mind, it comes into the speaker's consciousness as part of a new realization.

- (19) Sooda yo, [osikko-si-tai] koto-nante wasure-tyae!
 That's right, go to the bathroom-want situation-TOP forget-let's
 'That's right, let's forget about wanting to go to the bathroom!'
 (Sakura 1988:3.115)

If *no* is used, the speaker does not sound as excited as when *koto* is used. This is because the use of *no* implicates that the other mind has been focusing on, and thus is already familiar with the idea.

This use of *koto* is not explained by the previous accounts (facts/concept; Terakura 1980) or proposition (Horie 1993), because the desire of wanting to go to the bathroom is something the speaker becomes aware of through physical senses, not by logical reasoning.

In contrast, it is predicted that when the speaker is not debating in her mind about the eventuality described by the complement clause, *no* can be used. This is because in such a situation, an eventuality does not newly come into, or return to, the addressee's focus. For example, when the speaker is sent by her mother to clean her room because her homeroom teacher will be visiting, she can use a *no*-clause to express 'leaving her room as it is' when she talks to herself, as shown in (20).

- (20) [Sonomama-ni-site-oku] no-ga syooziki (te) mon yo.
 As it is-leave one-NOM honesty thingSFP
 'Leaving my room as it is is honesty.' (Sakura 1988:2.6)

If *koto* is used, the speaker sounds as if she has just realized the idea, or the speaker is debating it in her mind with another mind, since the use of *koto* implicates that the speaker acts as if the other mind is not aware of the idea of leaving her room messed up.

Again, this use of *no* is not explained by the previous accounts (spatio-temporal entity (Terakura 1980; Horie 1993)) because the idea of leaving her room as it is is not something the speaker becomes aware of through physical senses, but by logical reasoning.

4.7 Politeness effect

If the use of *koto* or *no* depends on the speaker's belief about whether or not the addressee has been focusing on the eventuality described by the complement clause, it is predicted that the uses of *koto* and *no* can be either face-threatening or face-saving to the addressee, since the speaker is making an assumption about the addressee. As further supporting arguments, the following sections demonstrate how and why the use of *koto* and *no* can affect the politeness of the utterance.

4.7.1 Use of *no*

When the speaker and the addressee believe that the addressee ought to know, but does not know an eventuality denoted by the complement clause, the use of *no* is face-saving to the addressee. This is because by using *no*, the speaker implicates her belief that the addressee can access the eventuality. Thus when the speaker and the addressee believe the addressee ought to know the information described by the complement clause, as when the speaker confirms with the addressee about something (Section 4.3), and the addressee actually does not know it or has forgotten about it, the use of *no* saves the addressee's face. In example (21), a teacher is giving a reminder to some students who seem to have forgotten about the day's examination. By using *no*, she represents herself as believing that the students are aware of the exam. This spares them the embarrassment of being identified as someone the teacher assumes has forgotten.

- (21) [Kyoo siken-o suru] no-o oboeteimasu ka.
 today exam-ACC do one-ACC remember Q
 'You remember that we will have an exam today, don't you?'
 '(I believe you are aware of it.)'

On the other hand, the use of *no* is face-threatening to the addressee when the speaker demonstrates his belief that the addressee has been aware of the information described by the embedded clause when, in fact, the speaker and the addressee believe the addressee ought not to know. This is because the use of *no* reflects the speaker's belief that the addressee can access the eventuality. For example, when a policeman asks a person a question in which the policeman uses the *no*-clause to express an eventuality that only the criminal would know, the use of the *no*-clause becomes face-threatening to the addressee. The policeman sounds as though he is assuming that the addressee shares this incriminating knowledge, as shown in (22).

- (22) [Taroo-ga kuruma-no kagi-o kakenai] **no-o** sitteimasu ka.
 Taroo-NOM car-GEN key-ACC lock one-ACC know Q
 'Do you know that Taroo does not lock the car door?'
 ('I believe you are aware of it.')

4.7.2 Use of *koto*

The use of *koto* can become face-saving to the addressee when the speaker and the addressee believe that the addressee ought not to know an eventuality denoted by the complement clause, and the reality is just the opposite. This is because the speaker implicates, by using *koto*, that she does not believe that the addressee has been aware of the eventuality. In (23), by using a *koto*-clause, the policeman is signaling to the addressee that understanding the information described by the embedded clause is not presumed by the addressee.

- (23) [Taroo-ga kuruma-no kagi-o kakenai] **koto-o** sitteimasu ka.
 Taroo-NOM car-GEN key-ACC lock situation-ACC know Q
 'Do you know that Taroo does not lock the car door?'
 ('I have no belief that you are aware of it.')

The use of *koto* is face-threatening to the addressee, on the other hand, if the speaker and the addressee believe that the addressee ought to know the eventuality expressed by the embedded clause, and the addressee does not know it in reality. This is because the use of *koto* does not implicate that the speaker believes that the addressee has been aware of the information. For example, when a teacher repeats the student's remark that the student forgot about the exam just before the teacher starts the exam, the teacher's use of *koto* is face-threatening to the students.

- (24) [Kyoo siken-o suru] **koto-o** sira-nai?
 today exam-ACC do situation-ACC know-NEG
 'You do not know that we will have an exam?'
 ('I do not believe you are aware of it.')

The spatio-temporal analysis does not explain this difference in the politeness effect. This is because whether or not the referent is a spatio-temporal entity has nothing to do with the speaker's belief about the addressee.

5. Conclusion

This paper has provided a pragmatic account for the distribution and interpretation of *koto* and *no* when taking a sentential complement. The uses of *koto* and *no* follow from the speaker's belief regarding whether or not the addressee can access the eventuality denoted by the complement clause. *No* is used when the speaker believes that the addressee can access the eventuality. *Koto* is used when the speaker does not believe this. It also shows that the distribution of *koto* and *no* follow from the speaker's goal and intention of how she wants to represent herself in the context of the utterance and from how one should behave in Japanese society.

The previous analyses must stipulate ad hoc principles to explain the various uses of *koto* and *no* discussed in this paper. For example, the previous analyses would have to stipulate that *koto* is used for formal style and *no* is used for casual style (section 4.1). The fact is that the uses follow from the *koto* and *no* analysis and what is socially acceptable and unacceptable in Japanese society. The polite style effect is not inherent in *koto* and *no*.

The proposed analyses provide a general framework from which to understand why and when the speaker uses *koto* or *no*. Further, this paper demonstrates how the analysis can explain nuances conveyed through their various uses. The approach presented in this paper explains the uses of *koto* and *no* without stipulating independent principles for their diverse uses.

NOTES

¹ I am very grateful for the invaluable comments I have received from Georgia Green, Peter Lasersohn, Adele Goldberg, Hiroko Yamashita, and David Baxter. All errors and inadequacies are solely my own.

² This paper focuses on cases in which either *koto* or *no* is possible in different speech contexts, and excludes the uses of *no* that do not alternate with *koto* in any situation.

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: ACC (accusative), ADV (adverb), COP (copula), GEN (genitive), NEG (negative), NOM (nominative), POL (polite), Q (question), QT (quotation), SFP (sentence final particle), and TOP (topic).

³ Kuno 1973 claims that this condition holds when *no* occurs with a predicate that has no factive presupposition.

⁴ Terakura 1980 claims two categories under nonspatio-temporal entities: '*facts*' and '*concepts*'. "'Facts" are what we know, remember, or mention; and what surprises us, pleases us, or is causal in nature' (Terakura 1980:65). 'Facts do not last nor end nor do they occur or take place' (ibid.: 66). The term '*concept*' is used in the sense of Vendler 1972. For example, "'drinking" in "I like drinking" is expressed for the understanding of something that can be liked or disliked by people' (Terakura 1980:144, footnote 10).

⁵ Horie 1993 defines propositions as states of affairs conceived of and registered in the mind (Horie 1993:15).

⁶ Although Terakura 1980 claims that the concept can be expressed by a *no*-clause when the speaker is observing the denoted concept, example demonstrates that this is not always the case.

⁷ Chafe 1994 uses the term ACCESSIBLE only for a referent that has been semiactive in the addressee's mind. A referent that has been active is called GIVEN. However, since all GIVEN information is ACCESSIBLE, the term ACCESSIBLE is used for both GIVEN and ACCESSIBLE in this paper.

⁸ See Green's 1996 reformulation of the conversational maxims.

REFERENCES

- CHAFE, Wallace L. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- GREEN, Georgia M. 1996. *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. 2^d ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- GRICE, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, ed. by P. Cole & J. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- HORIE, Kaoru. 1993. A cross-linguistic study of perception and cognition verb complements: A cognitive perspective. University of Southern California, Ph.D. dissertation.
- KUNO, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- SUZUKI, Satoko. 1996. Incorporation of information and complementizers in Japanese. *Pragmatics*, 6:4. 511-51.
- TERAKURA, Hiroko. 1980. Some aspects of complementation in Japanese: A study of *to yuu*. University of Wisconsin, Madison, Ph.D. dissertation.
- VENDLER, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- VENDLER, Zeno. 1972. *Res Cogitans: An Essay in Rational Psychology*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

DATA SOURCES

- MURASAKI, K. 1992. *Springtime Family1*. Tokyo: NKK Software.
- OGURA, F. 1983. *Sayonara nante ienai*. 3. Tokyo: Shueisha.
- SAKURA, M. 1987. *Chibi maruko chan*. 1. Tokyo: Shueisha.
- SAKURA, M. 1988. *Chibi maruko chan*. 2. Tokyo: Shueisha.
- SAKURA, M. 1988. *Chibi maruko chan*. 3. Tokyo: Shueisha.

