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1. Introduction

In Japanese, there are a lexical noun koto ‘fact’ and an indefinite pronoun no ‘one.’ When koto and no are preceded by clausal complements, it has been said that they are referred to as complementizers. See the following example:¹ ²

(1) Watasi-wa [ano hito-ga uso-o tuiteiru] koto/no-o
I-TOP that person-NOM a lie-ACC telling COMP-ACC
sittei-ta.
know-PAST
‘I knew that that person was telling a lie.’

A great number of attempts have been made by scholars to show the difference between koto and no (e.g. Hashimoto 1990, Horie 1997, Kuno 1973, Shinzato 1996, Suzuki 1994, 2000, Wrona 2005). What seems to be lacking, however, is that those scholars do not pay attention to the difference within koto and no themselves. This paper shows that there are different types of those two complementizers.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 first takes a brief look at the different distribution between koto and no. Then, we will point out that
there are different types of *koto* and *no*, respectively. In order to account for the empirical data observed in section 2, basic assumptions will be discussed in section 3. Section 4 will argue how these data shown in section 2 should be treated and present a new descriptive generalization. In addition, we will provide a tentative analysis in terms of the recent minimalist framework. Section 5 summarizes our discussions.

2. Empirical Arguments

2.1. *Koto* and *No* are Different

Over the last few decades, many researchers have attempted to identify *koto* and *no* in terms of semantic notions such as abstract/concrete and direct/indirect. For instance, *koto* and *no* clauses are differently interpreted, according to how the events of those complements of the complementizers are interpreted. In order to see the distinction, consider the following examples:

(2) a. Karera-wa [zikken-ga seikōsi-ta] no-o
they-TOP experiment-NOM succeed-PAST COMP-ACC
yorocon-da.
be. pleased-PAST
‘They were pleased that the experiment went well.’

daughter-NOM happy-COP COMP-ACC be-pleased
‘I am pleased that my daughter is happy.’

Example (2a) can be interpreted as follows: They saw that the experiment was undergone successfully and they were pleased with it. This is because what
represents *no* is a concrete event, that is, a directly perceived event (cf. Kuno 1973). In this way, *no* is often used as complements of perception verbs such as *miru* ‘see,’ *kiku* ‘hear’ and *kanziru* ‘feel.’ The complements of (2b), on the other hand, do not have to be a concrete event, but an abstract concept. For instance, (2b) can be interpreted as follows: As long as my daughter is happy, I am pleased. The complement of (2b) doesn’t have to be directly perceived.

There are additional data that are important for understanding the difference between *koto* and *no*. Consider the following examples:

(3) a. Kantoku-wa sensyutati-ni renyū-o itijikan entyōsuru
    coach-TOP players-to practice-ACC one hour extend
    koto/*no-o tutae-ta.
    COMP-ACC tell-PAST
    ‘The coach told the players to extend a workout session by one hour.’
    (Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 19)

b. Watasi-wa rainen doitu-ni ryūgakusuru koto/*no-o
    I-TOP next year Germany study abroad COMP-ACC
    ketuisi-ta.
    decide-PAST
    ‘I have decided to study in Germany next year.’
    (Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 19)

c. Korerano dēta-wa keiki-ga kaihukusitutuaru
    these data-TOP economic conditions-NOM getting better
    koto/*no-o simesiteiru.
    COMP-ACC show
    ‘These data shows that the economic conditions are getting better.’
    (Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 20)
What the sentences in (3) indicate is that no cannot occur in the complements of speaking verbs such as tutaeru ‘tell,’ hanasu ‘speak’ and meziru ‘order’ (3a), thinking verbs such as ketuisuru ‘decide,’ omou ‘think’ and kangaeru ‘consider’ (3b) and relating verbs such as simesu ‘show, indicate’ and imisuru ‘mean’ (3c).

Next, see the following examples:

(4) a. Husinna otoko-ga ginkō-ni haitteiku *koto/no-o mi-ta.
   suspicious man-NOM bank-to go into COMP-ACC see-PAST
   ‘I saw a suspicious man going into the bank.’
   (Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 21)

   b. Ane to watasi-wa maisyokugo haha-ga syokki-o
   older sister and I-TOP after every meal mother-NOM dishes-ACC
   arau *koto/no-o tetudaimasu.
   wash COMP-ACC help
   ‘My older sister and I help my mother do the dishes after every meal.’
   (Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 21)

   c. Kogarana rōhuzin-ga ōkina inu-o sanpo saseteiru *koto/no-ni
   small old lady-NOM big dog-ACC walk make COMP-DAT
   meet-PAST
   ‘I found a small old lady walking a big dog.’
   (Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 21)

Contrary to (3), koto cannot appear in the complements of perception verbs like miru ‘see’ and mokugekisuru ‘witness’ (4a), helping and making verbs like tetuduau ‘help’ and samatageru ‘prevent’ (4b) and motion verbs like deau ‘meet’ and butukaru ‘bump into’ (4c).
The difference is also taken into consideration in terms of the co-occurrence restriction with modal verbs (cf. Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 and Sasaki 2011):\(^5\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(5) Zissaini} & \text{ kore-wa sahodo yakudata-nai darō koto/\text{*no-o}} \\
\text{in fact} & \text{ this-TOP that useful not might COMP-ACC} \\
\text{sōzōsuru.} & \text{ imagine} \\
\text{‘In fact, I imagine that this might not be that useful.’}
\end{align*}\]

As shown in (5), certain epistemic modal verbs do not appear in \textit{no}-complements.

\textbf{2.2. \textit{Koto} and \textit{No} are Similar}

As shown above, many linguists have discussed the difference between \textit{koto} and \textit{no}. It is not our main concern here to scrutinize their works. Rather, more attention will be paid to the difference within those complementizers themselves. The clausal complements of \textit{koto} and \textit{no} are often called nominal clauses. It is likely that a topic cannot appear in the nominal clauses, as illustrated below:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(6) a. Satō-wa,} & \text{ [Suzuki-ga/\text{*wa tikazuite-kuru] no-o}} \\
\text{Sato-TOP} & \text{ Suzuki-NOM/TOP close-come COMP-ACC} \\
\text{mite,} & \text{ te-o hut-ta.} \\
\text{see} & \text{ hand-ACC wave-PAST} \\
\text{‘Seeing Suzuki coming close, Sato waved at him.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2008 : 16)} \\
\text{b. Tanaka-wa} & \text{ [Satō-ga/\text{*wa koibito-o uragitta]} \\
\text{Tanaka-TOP} & \text{ Sato-NOM/TOP girlfriend betrayed}
\end{align*}\]
Tanaka was surprised that Sato betrayed his girlfriend.

(Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai 2009: 216)

Everyone forgets that I went to Vietnam last year.

(Hasegawa 2007: 352)

Note, however, that *wa*-marked phrases can occur within the nominal complements under certain circumstances, as shown in (7) from Nihongo kizyutu bunpō kenkyūkai (2009:216):

(7) a. Zissaini kurasitemite, [Kyō-to-no natu-ga/wa actually living Kyoto-GEN summer-NOM/TOP
musiatui] no-o zikkansi-ta.
   humid COMP-ACC realize-PAST
   ‘After I actually lived in Kyoto, I realized that the summer is humid there.’

b. Musuko-wa [kōmori-ga/wa honyūrui dearu] koto-o
   son-TOP bats-NOM/TOP mammals COP COMP-ACC
   sira-nakat-ta.
   know-not-PAST
   ‘My son didn’t know that bats are mammals.’

Notice that topics can appear in complements of *koto* and *no*. 
In addition to (6) and (7), certain ga-marked phrases tend not to appear in the no-complements. See the following contrast:

(8) a. Watasi-wa kinō [zibun-i-no kodomo-ga Yamada-i-san-no
I-TOP yesterday self-GEN child-NOM Yamada-Mr.-GEN
proud-COP-PAST COMP-ACC be. pleased-COP
‘Yesterday, I was pleased that Mr. Yamada was proud of his own child.’
b. Watasi-wa kinō [zibun-i-no kodomo-ga Yamada-i-san-no
I-TOP yesterday self-GEN child-NOM Yamada-Mr.-GEN
hokori-dat-ta] koto/??no-o tasikame-ta.
proud-COP-PAST COMP-ACC confirm-PAST
‘Yesterday, I confirmed that Mr. Yamada was proud of his own child.’
c. Watasi-wa kinō [zibun-i-no kodomo-ga Yamada-i-san-no
I-TOP yesterday self-GEN child-NOM Yamada-Mr.-GEN
proud-COP-PAST COMP-DAT realize-PAST
‘Yesterday, I realized that Mr. Yamada was proud of his own child.’

As shown above, ga-marked phrases do not appear in no-complements.6)

One might point out that the ungrammaticality of no-complements of (8a-c) is
due to the fact that the main verbs cannot take no-complements. However, that is
not the case here:

(9) a. Karera-wa zikken-ga seikōsita koto/no-o
they-TOP experiment-NOM succeeded COMP-ACC
yorokon-da.
be. pleased-PAST

‘They were pleased that the experiment went well.’

b. Watasi-wa mawarini hito-ga inai koto/no-o
   I-TOP around people-NOM no COMP-ACC
tasikame-ta.
see-PAST
‘I saw that there were no people around.’

c. Watasi-wa ie-e kaette saihu-ga nai koto/no-ni
   I-TOP home-to went wallet-COMP lose COMP-DAT
kizui-ta.
notice-PAST
‘When I got home, I noticed that I had lost my wallet.’

We are, then, led to conclude that the non-occurrence of *no* in (8a-c) is not due to the selectional restriction of main verbs, but the relationship between the embedded sentences and the complementizers.

At first sight, looking at complementizers only in (8) might lead one to conclude that *koto* is different from *no* in the same line as discussed in (3)-(5). Those in (6) and (7), however, show that *koto* and *no* are similar in a sense. What is, then, the difference between (8) on the one hand and (6) and (7) on the other? Thus far, the difference between *koto* and *no* seems to have been paid attention to. In this paper, much attention is paid to the difference within the complementizers themselves. That is, we must distinguish at least two types of *koto* and *no*, respectively. Before proceeding to the analysis, some basic assumptions will be discussed in the next section.
3. Basic Assumptions

It is well known that the distribution of *koto* is different from that of *no* (e.g. Inoue 1976, Kuno 1973, Suzuki 2000 and Watanabe 2009). It is not, however, clear whether or not there are different kinds of *koto* on the one hand and *no* on the other. In order to substantiate this remark, I restrict myself at this point to introducing Kuroda (2005), which argues the contrast between *wa*, a topic marker, and *ga*, a subject marker, and Endo (2007), which considers topicality in backward binding.

3.1. *Wa* and *Ga* : A New Perspective

Kuroda (2005) makes several important statements on *wa* and *ga* in Japanese, claiming that *wa* is not a topic marker and *ga* is not a focus marker. First, what is crucial for Kuroda’s argument is that “a topic *wa*-phrase can occupy a focus position” (Kuroda 2005:6). It has been argued that a topic cannot appear at a focus position since the former conveys old information, while the latter new information. Therefore, Kuroda’s claim seems to be contradictory. See the following examples, in which *wa*-phrases can function as responses to *wh*-questions:

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad \text{a. Dare-ga Nihon iti-no sakka desu ka?} \\
& \quad \text{who-NOM Japan one-GEN writer be Q} \\
& \quad \text{‘Who is the greatest writer of Japan?’} \quad \text{(Kuroda 2005:8)} \\
& \quad \text{b. Natume Sōseki-wa Nihon iti-no sakka desu.} \\
& \quad \text{Natsume Soseki-TOP Japan one-GEN writer be} \\
& \quad \text{‘Natsume Soseki is the greatest writer of Japan.’} \quad \text{(Kuroda 2005:9)}
\end{align*}
\]
The fact that a *wa*-phrase can be used in (10b) illustrates that the *wa*-phrase can stay at a focus position, where a focused *ga*-phrase can occur. Furthermore, it should be noted that *Natume Sōseki* in (10b) is a focus, since it is considered to be an answer to (10a). This means, then, that there are two functions of topic *wa*.

Second, let us consider *ga*-phrases. The important point to note is that a *ga*-marked phrase comes to be a topic, as shown in (11), which is taken from Kuroda (2005: 12):

(11) a. Ano hito-wa dare desu ka?
    that person-TOP who be Q
    ‘Who is that person?’

    b. Ano hito-wa/ga ano yūmeina Microsoft-no syatyō-no
    that person-WA/GA that famous Microsoft-GEN president-GEN
    Gates-san desu yo.
    Gates-Mr. be PRT
    ‘He is that famous president of Microsoft, Mr. Gates.’

In (11b), *ano hito* ‘that person’ is a topic, while *ano yūmeina Microsoft-no syatyō-no Gates-san* ‘that famous president of Microsoft, Mr. Gates’ is a focus. Note that a *wa*-phrase in (11b) cannot be focused, like in (10b).

It has been said that *wa* is a topic and *ga* has an exhaustive reading, which is a focus. This notion, however, is objected by Kuroda (2005). Examples (10) and (11) show that there are a focused *wa* (10b) and a topic *ga* (11b).

3.2. On Backward Binding

As many researchers argue, anaphors can be bound in a backward way under certain circumstances:
Anaphors like *each other* have to be c-commanded by their antecedents in a local domain. Although *each other* in (12) is not c-commanded by *them*, (12) is grammatical. The binding in (12) is called backward binding.

(12) Pictures of each other annoy them. (Reuland and Everaert 2001 : 642)

Endo (2007) discusses backward binding sentences in Japanese concerning the anaphor *zibun* ‘self.’ See the following example:

(13) Zibun-no kodomo-ga Yamada-san-no hokori-da.
    self-GEN child-NOM Yamada-Mr.-GEN pride COP

Lit. ‘Child of himself is Mr. Yamada’s pride.’

‘Mr. Yamada is proud of his son.’ (Endo 2007 : 69)

It is likely that the anaphor *zibun* in (13) is not c-commanded by its antecedent. Sentence (13) contrasts with the following:

(14) *Zibun-no kodomo-wa Yamada-san-no hokori-da.
    self-GEN child-TOP Yamada-Mr.-GEN pride-COP

Lit. ‘As for self’s child, he is Mr. Yamada’s pride.’

‘Mr. Yamada is proud of his son.’ (Endo 2007 : 75)

Notice that (14) is minimally different from (13). What is intriguing is that once the subject is marked by *wa*, the sentence turns out to be deviant. According to Endo (2007), *ga* in (13) is a focus, while *wa* in (14) is a topic. With (13) and (14) as background, we have the following descriptive generalization:

(15) Backward binding is not possible in a construction involving a topic.
In this section, we have seen that *wa* and *ga* can be treated differently from what has been considered. Bearing the assumptions provided in this section in mind, the next section discusses the consequences and their implications.

4. Analyzing Distribution of *Koto* and *No* as Complementizer Agreement

4.1. Some Consequences

Our main concern here is how we should deal with different types of *koto* and *no*, respectively. Then, the question is, in what way do the consequences that we have seen in section 3 implicate *koto* and *no*? To answer this question, I will proceed along the following path: the occurrence of *koto* and *no* is dependent upon the functions of *ga* and *wa*. Consider (6) repeated here as (16):

(16) a. Satō-wa, [Suzuki-ga/*wa tikazuite-kuru] no-o
    Sato-TOP Suzuki-NOM/TOP close-come COMP-ACC
    mite, te-o hutta.
    see hand-ACC waved
    ‘Seeing Suzuki coming close, Sato waved at him.’

b. Tanaka-wa [Satō-ga/*wa koibito-o uragit-ta]
    Tanaka-TOP Sato-NOM/TOP girlfriend betray-PAST
    koto-ni odoroi-ta.
    COMP-ACC surprise-PAST
    ‘Tanaka was surprised that Sato betrayed his girlfriend.’

c. Minna-wa watasi-ga/*wa sakunen betonamu-ni it-ta
    everyone I-NOM/TOP last year Vietnam-to go-PAST
koto-o wasureteiru.

COMP-ACC forget

‘Everyone forgets that I went to Vietnam last year.’

Notice that *ga-marked phrases can appear in (16a-c), while *wa-marked phrases cannot. What function, then, does *ga in (16) have? I suggest that the one in (16) is descriptive, as argued in Kuno (1973).

To be brief, descriptive *ga represents actions or temporary states (Kuno 1973: 38). To show this point, the following example is relevant:

(17) a. Ame-ga hutte imasu.
    rain-NOM falling is

    ‘It is raining.’

b. *Ame-wa hutte imasu.
    rain-TOP falling is

    ‘It is raining.’

How is (17) related to (16)? As the deviancy in (17b) shows, *wa, which is counted as a topic, cannot appear. With this in mind, let us consider (16). In (16a-c), *wa-marked phrases, which are counted as topics, do not occur. It should be noted here that *ga in (16a-c) is regarded as descriptive. From the grammatical contrast found in (16), therefore, it is adequate to say that descriptive *ga can co-occur with *koto and *no. In this paper, I will call those complementizers descriptive *koto and *no, respectively.

Next, let us proceed to (7) repeated as (18) below:
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humid COMP-ACC realize-PAS

‘After I lived in Kyoto, I realized that the summer there is humid.’

b. Musuko-wa [kōmori-ga/wa honyūrui dearu] koto-o son-TOP bats-NOM/TOP mammals COP COMP-ACC
siranakat-ta.

not-know-PAST

‘My son didn’t know that bats are mammals.’

In (18), both *ga* and *wa* are possible. At first sight, (18) is contradictory since *ga* and *wa* occur, the former of which is not supposed to have a topic reading. However, we have seen above that certain kinds of *ga* can be considered a topic. Kuroda (2005) points out that once an embedded sentence with a topic *ga* comes to be an independent sentence, the sentence becomes unnatural, as illustrated below:


John-TOP earth-NOM round that think-is

‘John believes that the earth is round.’ (Kuroda 2005: 19)

b. Tikyū-ga marui.

earth-NOM round

‘The earth is round.’ (Kuroda 2005: 20)

In (19a), *tikyū-ga* ‘earth-NOM’ does not have an exhaustive listing reading. On the other hand, unless *tikyū-ga* in (19b) is regarded as having an exhaustive reading, the sentence turns out to be unnatural.
With this much as background, consider (18) again. In (11b) repeated here as (20), both ga and wa can occur:

(20) Ano hito-wa/ga ano yūmeina Microsoft-no syatyō-no
gate-WA/GA that famous Microsoft-GEN president-GEN
Gates-san desu yo.
Gates-Mr. be PRT
‘He is that famous president of Microsoft, Mr. Gates.’

Notice that ano hito ‘that person’ is a topic, and ga is attached to the phrase. If this is on the right track, (11b), (18a, b) and (19a) can be treated in a parallel way. This is borne out by the following example, in which the embedded clauses in (18 a, b) are independent clauses:

(21) a. Kyōto-no natu-ga musiatui.
Kyoto-GEN summer-NOM humid
‘The summer in Kyoto is humid.’

b. Kōmori-ga honyūrui dearu
bats-NOM mammals COP
‘Bats are mammals.’

Notice that as long as the ga-marked phases in (21) have an exhaustive listing implication, (21a, b) sound natural. That is way (11b), (18a, b) and (19a) can be dealt with in the same manner, and ga as well as wa can be taken to be a topic. Then, I will call those complementizers in (18a, b) topic koto and no, respectively.

Thirdly, let us consider (8) repeated here as (22):
proud-COP-PAST COMP-ACC be. pleased-COP
‘Yesterday, I was pleased that Mr. Yamada was proud of his own child.’
proud-COP-PAST COMP-ACC confirm-PAST
‘Yesterday, I confirmed that Mr. Yamada was proud of his own child.’
proud-COP-PAST COMP-DAT realize-PAST
‘Yesterday, I realized that Mr. Yamada was proud of his own child.’

It should be noted that the embedded complements in (22a-c) involve backward
binding. In 3.2, we have seen that backward binding is not possible in a
construction with a topic. In other words, backward binding is possible as long as
a given sentence does not have a wa-marked phrase. Consider (13), which is
repeated below as (23), again:

（23）Zibuni-no kodomo-ga Yamada-i-san-no hokori-da.
self-GEN child-NOM Yamada-Mr.-GEN pride-COP
Lit. ‘Child of himself is Mr. Yamada’s pride.’
‘Mr. Yamada is proud of his son.’ (Endo 2007 : 69)
Compare (23) with the following sentence:

(24) 10-nen mae-(wa) zibunī-no kodomo-WA Yamada-sa-san-no
  10 years ago-(TOP) self-GEN child-WA Yamada-Mr.-GEN
  hokori COP-PAST
  ‘10 years ago, Mr. Yamada was proud of his son, not others.’
  (Endo 2007: 87)

The *wa*-marked element in (24) is not a topic, but a contrastively focalized element. This means that if *wa* is a contrastive, that is, focused, a given sentence turns out to be grammatical.

Bearing this in mind, let us consider (23). What function does the *ga*-marked phrase have? I assume that the *ga*-marked element has an exhaustive listing implication, which is regarded as focused. Thus, it can be concluded that backward binding is possible with a focused subject. It is, then, possible to say that the embedded complements in (22a-c) are involved with focus positions. What is intriguing in (22a-c) is that *no* cannot appear. I will call the complementizer in (22a-c) focus *koto*.

Finally, from what we have seen so far, the following can be provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>koto</em></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>no</em></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What (25) shows is that there are three types of *koto*, while there are two types of *no*. 
4.2. A Tentative Analysis

In the previous section, the premise was posited that there are different types of *koto* and *no*, respectively, according to functions of *ga* and *wa*. How is this implicated in syntax? In order to show this, let us consider the relationship between C and T within the recent minimalist framework.

C as well as T is involved with the nominative Case valuation (e.g. Chomsky 2004, 2007, 2008, Mihara and Hiraiwa 2006, Miyagawa 2010 and Watanabe 1996 among others). Consider the following structure from Mihara and Hiraiwa (2006: 325):\(^9\)

\[
(26)
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{\text{subj}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

Notice here that an amalgam of C and T values the Case feature of DP in SPEC-\(v\). In other words, C plays a significant role for the nominative Case valuation. If this is on the right track, it can be concluded that the complementizer choice of *koto* and *no* observed in the previous section is attributed to the feature valuation from C. With regard to this feature valuation, Miyagawa (2010) is suggestive.

Our main concern here is the relationship between C and a subject. Miyagawa (2010: 18) maintains that in discourse-configurational languages like Japanese, “topic/focus, which occurs on C, ultimately shows up on lower node such as T, triggering A-movement to this lower node.” Thus, we have the following:
Bearing (26) and (27) in mind, let us assume that \( C_0 \)-probe can have Topic, Focus and Descriptive features. If so, I provide the following structure for the complementizer choice:

Therefore, the complementizer choice that we have seen in the previous section can be reduced to the feature valuation between \( C-T \) and DP. In other words, the complementizer choice is due to AGREE between \( C \) and \( \text{DP}_{\text{subj}} \).

It is interesting to point out that the complementizer choice in this paper is similar to the complementizer agreement in West Flemish argued in Haegeman (1992). In West Flemish, the complementizer *dat* ‘that’ agrees with the subject DP in an embedded clause. See the following examples from Haegeman (1992: 49):

\[
\text{(27)}
\]

\[
\text{(28)}
\]
(29) a. Kpeinzen dan-k (ik) morgen goan.
   I-think that-I I tomorrow go
   ‘I think that I’ll go tomorrow.’

b. Kpeinzen dan-j (gie) morgen goan.
   I-think that-you sg you tomorrow go
   ‘I think that you’ll go tomorrow.’

c. Kpeinzen dan-se (zie) morgen goan.
   I-think that-she she tomorrow go
   ‘I think that she’ll go tomorrow.’

d. Kpeinzen dan-me (wunder) morgen goan.
   I-think that-we we tomorrow go
   ‘I think that we’ll go tomorrow.’

Given that person feature, which is inherited by T, occurs on C, the ø-probe, C agrees with the subjects. According to Miyagawa(2010), West Flemish is a subject-verb agreement language, while Japanese is a discourse-configurational language. It is, then, adequate to say that Japanese and West Flemish can be treated in the same way in terms of the complementizer choice, and that the complementizer choice of (16), (18) and (22) is taken to be complementizer agreement.

5. Summary

Under the assumption that when koto and no are preceded by clausal complements, they are taken as complementizers, section 2 discussed the distribution of these complementizers. Different from what has been said, those complementizers behave in the same way under certain circumstances. In order to
account for the distribution, section 3 introduced basic assumptions, in which we have seen *ga* and *wa* as well as backward binding constructions. With the assumptions introduced in section 3, the next section considered what is implicated in empirical data observed in section 2, and provided a descriptive generalization: there are three types of *koto* and two types of *no*. Furthermore, we provided a tentative analysis for the distribution of *koto* and *no* in terms of the recent minimalist program, proposing that the distribution is similar to the complementizer agreement in West Flemish.

However, there are issues that we have left unanswered. For example, in addition to *koto* and *no*, Japanese has at least one more complementizer: *tokoro* ‘V-ing.’ Thus, a finer distinction among those complementizers needs elaboration. Moreover, this paper considers only complement clauses, although those complementizers are also used in subject position. I leave these for future research.
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In this paper, abbreviations are used in the gloss as follows: ACC (usative), COMP (lementizer), COP (ula), DAT (ive), FOC (us), GEN (itive), GER (undive), LOC (ative), NOM (inative), PAST (past tense), PRT (particle), Q (uestion), QUOT (ation) and TOP (ic).

Examples without citation are extracted briefly from Google.

According to Dixon (1991), relating verbs are indicate, show, demonstrate and suggest.

Verbs like prevent and stop are making verbs. These verbs have an independent role, the causer, “who does something to bring about an event or state, referred to by a complement clause.” (Dixon 1991: 193)

Other epistemic modal verbs like kamosirenai ‘may, might’ cannot occur with no, either. On the other hand, rasii ‘seem’ can appear with both koto and no (Sasaki 2011: 198).

Furthermore, modal verbs themselves do not appear in complements of verbs like meijiru ‘order’ and tanomu ‘ask,’ and ketuisuru ‘decide’ and kessinsuru ‘make up one’s mind.’

In (8), it is also possible that watasi ‘I’ and zibun ‘self’ can be co-indexed.

As pointed out by Kuroda himself, (10b) might sound odd. He further provides the following example as a response to (10a):

(i) Natume Sōseki-wa dare-ga nan-to itte-mo
    Natsume Soseki-TOP who-NOM what-QUOT say-though
    Nihon iti-no sakka desu.
    Japan one-GEN writer be
    ‘Natsume Soseki, whoever says what, is the greatest writer of Japan.’

(Kuroda 2005: 9)

The above example sounds natural as an answer to (10a).

In my judgment, (14) becomes grammatical if the wa-marked phrase is counted as constrastive:

(i) Murata-san-no musuko denaku, zibun-no musuko-wa
    Murata-Mr.-GEN son not self-GEN son-TOP
    Yamada-san-no hokori desu.
    Yamada-Mr.-GEN pride COP
    ‘Mr. Yamada is proud of his own son, not of Mr. Murata’s.’

In the system of Mihara and Hiraïwa (2006), C in (26) is, in fact, C2, which is Fin of Rizzi (1997). They make use of the cartographic structure advocated in Rizzi (1997).
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