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SUMMARY

The aim of this thesis is to explain the observed case-alternation occurring with the three Japanese predicates *suki* ‘like’, *kirai* ‘dislike’ and *hoshii* ‘want’ from a Cognitive Linguistic standpoint. These three predicates alternately appear in a construction in which the second nominal receives nominative and accusative marking, with the nominative considered to be the ‘standard’. The goal of this thesis is to assess whether the observed ‘non-standard’ accusative marking on these predicates’ second nominals can be accounted for by appealing to the semantic nuances of the sentences in which they occur. More specifically, the hypothesis tested is that the case-alternation can be explained by the predicate-containing sentences taking on an interpretation more closely resembling the experiential category of ‘prototypical transitive event’.

The findings which emerged from analyzing the various materials (previous research, language corpora, speaker judgments) seem to provide a relatively strong case for the validity of this hypothesis. In particular, transitivity-related factors such as ‘event-likeness’, ‘object affectedness’, ‘dynamicity’, ‘volition’ and ‘object-likeness’ had significant explanatory value in accounting for the use of accusative marking on the predicates’ second nominals, although the observed effect was more apparent for the *suki* and *kirai* predicates. The correlations between the presence of these factors and accusative marking were stronger than those found for previously hypothesized causes. Additionally, the empirical analyses hinted at the existence of a ‘semantic split’, in which the predicates with accusatively marked second nominals express ‘feelings’, while those with traditional nominatively marked second nominals express ‘preferences’. This seems to suggest that the alternation can, to a large extent, be accounted for by a difference in the meaning that the utterer wishes to convey.

The relative success of the hypothesis in accounting for the phenomenon at hand has several important implications. Firstly, it shows the validity of the Cognitive Linguistics approach in accounting for empirical language data, giving particular weight to Ronald W. Langacker’s definition of transitivity. Furthermore, I believe that this thesis has led to insights related to the use of accusative marking, both in conjunction with the *suki, kirai, and hoshii* predicates, and in general. These observations may contribute towards developing a new way of instructing non-native speakers to use such marking in a more ‘natural’ way.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

\textit{Atashi wa ōji-sama o suki na no desu.}  
\textit{Inochi o jū demo sashiage-ta-i.}  

‘I love the prince. I would give him my life, ten times over.’

The passage above is taken from the book \textit{Hashire, Melos!} (1940), written by Japanese author Osamu Dazai. Dazai was an extremely influential writer – and is still widely read in Japan today, but this thesis is not about his literary prowess. Rather, I would direct your attention to the first of the two sentences above.

If, like me, you have had the privilege of receiving a formal training in Japanese, you might recognize that something seems a bit off. The nominal adjective (henceforth NA)\(^1\)\textit{ suki} ‘like’ appears here not with the standard nominative case particle \textit{ga}, but rather with an accusative marker \textit{o}.\(^2\) While this non-standard case marking of the nominal could easily be dismissed as a one-off phenomenon – a mistake on the part of the author – a broader look at Japanese literature both pre-dating and following Dazai’s book, shows that this phenomenon is perhaps not so uncommon. The following passages are gathered from Ton Satomi’s \textit{Anjō-ke no kyōdai} (1931) and Banana Yoshimoto’s \textit{Kitchen} (1988):

1) \textit{Anata ga atashi o suki da to iu no wa ureshi-i.}  
\textit{Atashi mo anata ga suki da.}  

you NOM I ACC like COP COMP say NMZ TOP happy-PRS  
I too you NOM like COP  
‘I’m happy that you like me. I like you too.’  
\hfill (Satomi, 1931)

2) \textit{Mikage wa hontō-ni daidokoro-shigoto o suki na-n da naa.}  
\textit{Mikage TOP really kitchen-work ACC like COP-NMZ COP PTCL}  

‘Mikage, you really like kitchen-work, huh.’  
\hfill (Yoshimoto 1988)

---

\(^1\) Nominal adjectives are alternatively named “adjectival nominals” and glossed as “AdjN”. A justification for the choice of “nominal adjective” over other terms such as “adjectival nominals”, see section 4.1 of Chapter 4.

\(^2\) The peripheral (non-standard) nature of the o-marking can in part be shown by the lack of examples of this form in Japanese-textbooks and reference-grammars (e.g. Banno et al. 2011, 134; Pedersen, Kudo-Hubendick & Vestre, 2017, 210; Makino 1986, 426; Akiyama & Akiyama 2012, 181.)
Additionally, suki ‘like’ is not the only predicate with which such accusative marking can be observed. Most notably, the NA kirai ‘dislike’ and the adjective (henceforth A) hoshii ‘want’ also exhibit a similar pattern. Consider the following examples from Teru Miyamoto’s Umibe no tobira and Haruki Murakami’s Nejimakitori Kuronikuru:

3) Efī wa, aitsu o kirai dat-ta.
   ‘Effy disliked him.’ (Miyamoto 1991)

4) Juppun dake de i-i kara jikan o hoshii-i no.
   ‘Ten minutes is fine, I only want some time.’ (Murakami 1994)

This observation is not limited to written texts, either. Indeed, the phenomenon of the second nominal (henceforth N2) of As and NAs appearing with accusative marking in spontaneous speech was pointed out by Susumu Kuno as far back as 1973 (Kuno 1973b, 49), and spoken language corpora contain myriad examples of the same phenomenon (see the discussion in Chapter 6). Based on the sheer scope of the phenomenon, it seems unlikely that the case-alternation observed with the three stative predicates is merely a result of mistypings or slips-of-the-tongue. What, then, could cause native speakers of Japanese to choose the non-standard marking over the standard one?

1.2  Research question

At the outset of writing, the aim of this thesis was to elucidate the cause for the case-alternation observed with these three predicates. In considering the previous literature in the field (a review of which can be found in Chapter 5), I adopted the hypothesis that the choice of case-marker is related to the perceived transitivity (see section 2.4.3 of Chapter 2) of the clause in which it occurs, with a higher degree of transitivity coinciding with a stronger preference for accusative marking. Additionally, I also came to take up the view that the prevalence of the case-alternation with the various predicates is, in part, related to the frequency of use of related predicates with similar semantic content (see section 6.2.5). In addition to attempting to assess the validity of this hypothesis, I also explore a number of other related issues, such as why the case-alternation occurs with these predicates in

---

3 For a discussion of the nature of nominals occurring with adjectives and nominal adjectives, see Chapter 5. For the moment, I will simply refer to them as “N2s” for the sake of simplicity.
particular (sections 4.2.2, 4.4 and 4.5), and whether or not the alternation is a new phenomenon (section 5.1).

1.3 Structure of the thesis

As evident from the Table of Contents, this thesis is divided into 8 separate chapters. However, more broad divisions can still be made. Disregarding chapters 1 and 8 (the introductory and the conclusory chapters), the thesis can be roughly split into two parts: preliminaries and analysis.

The preliminaries – consisting of chapters 2 through 4 – are devoted to providing a foundation upon which to build the analysis conducted in the following chapters. In Chapter 2, I present the theoretical framework made use of in the thesis. I also delineate some of the most important concepts relevant to the topic at hand, the most significant of which being the notion of transitivity. In Chapter 3, I demonstrate the explanatory value of this interpretation of transitivity as it pertains to the Japanese language. I make use of examples to illustrate that examining a sentence’s similarity to the transitive prototype is a valid way of explaining its syntactic form (distributional features). After the evidence for the validity of the theory from Chapter 2 is presented in Chapter 3, I have devoted Chapter 4 to situating the three predicates (suki, kirai, and hoshii) within the greater scope of the language, as well as looking at how they diverge from their encapsulating word-classes.

In the second part – the analysis – encompassing chapters 5 through 7, I examine the case-alternation phenomenon based on the foundation built in the previous part. In Chapter 5, I present some of the earlier research done on the case-alternation and related topics. Where applicable, this research is re-interpreted within the theoretical framework described in Chapter 2. Chapter 6 marks the beginning of the ‘empirical’ portion of the thesis. In this chapter, I present the methodology and results of a two-part study of two Japanese corpora, in an attempt to assess the validity of the hypothesis put forth above (and during the discussion in chapter 5). In Chapter 7, the empirical examinations continue, as I present and analyze the results of an acceptability judgment questionnaire aimed at native speakers. This chapter provides both a chance to re-examine some of the findings from the previous Chapter 6, as well as testing out other factors not possible in the corpus-study.
Lastly, in the final Chapter 8, I provide a summary of the findings made in chapters 5, 6 and 7, and attempt to assess the state of the original hypothesis.

1.4 Glossing and translation

To maintain consistency throughout the thesis, all examples (both borrowed and original) are glossed in accordance with the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Japanese-English translations have been conducted with an emphasis on conveying the nuances of the Japanese versions, while maintaining some degree of intelligibility in English. When directly borrowing examples from other literature, the translations have not been modified unless otherwise stated. As the reader has likely noticed, the three predicate which are the subject of this thesis are glossed in English as the verbs ‘like’, ‘dislike’ and ‘want’, despite belonging to the grammatical classes of adjectives and nominal adjectives. This choice was in part made to adhere to translation norms (e.g. Medium Sized Progressive Japanese-English Dictionary n.d. a,b,c), but also because their semantic content and predicative scope are more similar to these verbs than to, for instance, ‘likable’, ‘dislikable’ and ‘wantable’. For a discussion of this, see Chapter 4.

1.5 Abbreviations and terminology

A glossary with explanations of relevant terminology – as well as a list of all abbreviations and their definitions – can be found in section 10.1 of the appendix, under the headline “Glossary”.

---

4 A full list of these rules can be found at https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php
2 Theoretical Framework

2.0 Purpose of the chapter

Contemporary linguistics consists of a myriad of different fields, each with their own theoretical frameworks and interdisciplinary connections. From formal studies of (primarily) syntax such as Generative Grammar, with its obvious ties to mathematics and predicate logic, to sociolinguistic studies on perceptions about language, to psycholinguists studying the intersection between language and psychology, linguistics is an incredibly broad discipline. Because of this, referring to a bit of research as a “linguistic study” is not particularly enlightening. For this reason, the following chapter is dedicated to delineating the particular linguistic approach made use of in this thesis. In broad terms, the approach taken can be described as a type of Cognitive Linguistics (henceforth CL). The main theoretical framework I employ is Ronald W. Langacker’s “Cognitive Grammar”, but I also draw on works by a number of scholars within slightly different fields, such as Joan Bybee’s Exemplar-based approach (Chapter 6), Prototype theory as put forth by Eleanor Rosch and John R. Taylor, in addition to W.M. Jacobsen’s studies of transitivity in Japanese (Chapter 3). References are also made to Croft’s Radical Construction Grammar (Chapter 5) and Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor theory.

2.0.1 Structure of the chapter

The chapter is split into two major parts. In the first part – consisting of sections 2.1 through 2.2.5 – I provide a brief overview of the history and common beliefs of Cognitive linguistics, with allusions to other, competing paradigms. More specifically, section 2.1 deals with the emergence of CL, while the following sections assess shared beliefs between CL and formal approaches (2.2.1), the link between grammar and cognition (2.2.2), the nature of grammar (2.2.3), the acquisition of linguistic competence (2.2.4), and the methodological consequences of these beliefs (2.2.5).

In part two, encompassing sections 2.3 through 2.4.3. I provide a deeper discussion of several important concepts related to Cognitive Linguistics, which are essential to understanding the arguments put forth in the thesis’ following chapters. More specifically, sections 2.3 and 2.3.1 delineate the dominant view of categories within CL (prototype theory), while the following
sections are dedicated to applying prototype-theory to subjecthood (2.4.1) and objecthood (2.4.2), discussing the embodied nature of grammar (2.4.3.0) and presenting a prototype for transitivity (2.4.3). Lastly, section 2.5 concerns the relation between physical and mental events, showing how conceptualizations can be extended by means of metaphor and analogy.

2.1 The advent and nature of Cognitive Linguistics

In the greater scope of linguistics, Cognitive Linguistics is a relatively new discipline. It began its development in the late 1970s, but did not fully take form until the publication of George Lakoff’s “Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things” and Ronald W. Langacker’s “Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol. 1” in 1987 (Taylor 2010, 5). Although it mainly started as a study of semantics, Cognitive Linguistics has since been applied in a number of other areas, such as phonology, language acquisition and historical linguistics (Croft 2004, 1). The body of Cognitive Linguistics literature has also undergone a drastic increase in the later years (Langacker 2000, vii). An unfortunate consequence of its relatively late emergence, however, is that Cognitive Linguistics often seems to be defined not by what it is, but rather by what it is not (Taylor 2010, 3). And what it is not is Generative Grammar.

That is not to say that Cognitive Linguistics isn’t a full discipline in its own right, but rather that it cannot escape the comparison with earlier formal theories. In addition to CL-linguists overtly distancing themselves from previous linguistic traditions, many of the important contributions to the paradigm are also characterized by a polemical streak, as Taylor (2010, 1) puts it, and this has further spiked the discord between the two linguistic camps. Going through this chapter, the reader will likely notice that I am no better in regards to sidestepping the trap of viewing Cognitive Linguistics ‘profiled’ against the ‘base’ of Generative Grammar. However, I do have my reasons for doing so. Firstly, I believe it will make the framework much clearer for readers who have had the privilege of receiving a training in formal theories of grammar theories. Secondly, many of the assumptions held by cognitive linguists become much more easily understandable when contrasted with the assumptions held in approaches such as Generative Grammar.
2.2 Theoretical assumptions of Cognitive Linguistics

The following sub-sections are dedicated to explaining the theoretical assumptions of Cognitive Linguistics, contrasting them with those of Generative Grammar where applicable. It is not meant as an exhaustive list of assumptions, but rather as an introduction to the discipline, along with some topics of particular relevance to the case-alternation discussed in the following chapters.

2.2.1 Shared beliefs – the goal of linguistic study

A fundamental assumption held by most (if not all) linguistic disciplines, is that linguistics is *the study of mental representations of language* (Taylor 2010, 6). Whether they believe these mental representations to be best explained by syntactic trees and deep structures (see Chomsky 1965), exemplars (see Bybee 2006), image schemas (see Langacker, 1987, 1991a, 1991b), or patterns of activation in the brain (see Ahlsén 2006), the common goal of linguistics as a whole is to provide insight into how we understand and use language. Explaining our intuitions about language, as well as certain facts of usage, therefore fall within the scope of most of the disciplines above, despite their theoretical and methodological differences.

2.2.2 The “language organ” – or lack thereof

In regards to Generative and Cognitive linguistics, however, the shared beliefs concerning the ultimate goal of linguistics is about where the similarities end. The first diverging aspect of CL I will discuss is the notion that language is grounded in general cognition. Unlike (many) generativists, who believe in the existence of a *language organ*,5 innate and separate from other aspects of cognition, cognitive linguists hold that language is subsumed under the same cognitive principles that govern other cognitive processes (Langacker 2008, 8; Croft 2004, 2). Although the configuration of cognitive abilities involved in language-use (i.e. the real-time perception and production of discrete, structured symbolic units) might be unique to language,

---

5 Do note that the nature of this language organ is still up for discussion within GG. Although it is generally conceived of as a more-or-less autonomous system, separate from general cognitive abilities, it is recognized that it is not necessarily anatomically localized and concrete in the same way as the heart or the kidneys (Anderson and Lightfoot 2000, 19)
the cognitive abilities required for language use (e.g. perception, memory and categorization (Langacker 2008, 8)) are not (Croft 2004, 2). This assumption has a number of important consequences. For one, it means that theories about language-use need to be compatible with what we know about the cognitive abilities required. As such, linguistic theorization needs to be unifiable with established ‘truths’ within psychology and other cognitive sciences. Secondly, it means that language should be exhaustively explainable by referring to established cognitive abilities, and precludes appeals to autonomous linguistic systems, such as those posed by many generativists (see Taylor 2010, 9). Thirdly, it entails that linguistic knowledge is ultimately a type of conceptual structure – a term for the internal structure of thoughts, concepts, images, and mental experience in general (Langacker 1987, 97–98).

2.2.3 Grammar as conceptualization

Another important characteristic of cognitive linguistics is the view that ‘grammar is conceptualization’ (Croft 2004, 3). What this means is that the conceptual structure brought up in the previous section cannot be accounted for merely by truth-conditional correspondences with the real world, but that things and events need to be conceptualized before being expressed linguistically. To more clearly illustrate this, I will borrow an example from Langacker (2008, 44):

Figure 2-1 Construal

The image-schema 0) on the far left above is meant to describe a conceptualization of a glass container with water taking up about half its volume. We are presumably able – at the conceptual level – to imagine this situation with a relative degree of neutrality. If we attempt to describe the situation linguistically, we might come up with some of the following descriptions: 1) *the glass with water in it*; 2) *the water in the glass*; 3) *the glass is half-full*;
and 4) the glass is half-empty. We can see, however, that these ways of describing the object/situation are less neutral: 1) designates the container (the glass); 2) designates the liquid contained by the glass (the water); 3) designates a situation where the water occupies half the potential volume of the glass; and 4) designates a situation in which a ‘void’ occupies half the potential volume of the glass (Langacker 2008, 43). The different ways in which the situation is construed thus yield sentences with differing word-order and word-usage, and hearing the constructed sentences likewise invokes different construals of the situation. Although this example is relatively simple, the argument goes that the same is true for more advanced sentences and grammatical constructions. Different grammatical constructions pertaining to the same entities in the same configuration can nevertheless construe the situation in different ways. In regards to this thesis, and the discussion in the following chapters, one could therefore perhaps consider the sentences in which the predicates appear together with nominatively and accusatively marked NPs to invoke different conceptualizations of the same situation/event (more on this in Chapter 5).

2.2.4 Linguistic knowledge emerges from language use

The idea that language use and language knowledge are interconnected is by no means a novel idea unique to ‘modern’ cognitive linguistics. In fact, it was proposed by Hermann Paul in The Principles of the History of Language all the way back in 1891 (Paul 1891, 15). With the advent of Generative Grammar, however, this idea was more or less abandoned in favor of systems governed by rules. Rather than a product of mutual communication and influence, grammar was analyzed as a result of a number of biologically predetermined categories and rules created by an innate language faculty (Diessel 2017, 2). These rules and categories were considered significantly robust and unchanging, and little significance was given to constructions’ prevalence and usage-trends (see, for instance, Newmeyer 2003).

Within CL, however, usage is again elevated as a factor which affects constructions and grammar in language. In particular, usage influences the process of categorization to a substantial degree. The reasoning goes that categories in language (e.g. semantic categories such as ‘bird’, or syntactic categories, such as ‘noun’ or ‘relative clause’) are created through repeated exposure to similar instantiations of the category, and that a large enough number of novel, peripheral uses may contribute to the restructuring of said category (Langacker 1987,
This topic is addressed in regards to the case-alternation in section 6.2.5 of Chapter 6.

### 2.2.5 On the scope of valid data

The reduced importance assigned to formal rules of transformation and derivation, as well as the increased significance attributed to usage, also has consequences for what is considered valid data within CL. For one, it increases the scope of data to include not only the most common, rule-adhering constructions, but also peripheral, idiosyncratic phenomena. This is directly opposed to the Generative tradition, which has been aiming for high-level generalizations, and has left idiosyncratic constructions ‘out in the cold’, in favor of the central ‘core’ of the language system (Taylor 2010, 7). As such, much of the literature within Generative Grammar has been focused on a relatively small number of central phenomena such as *wh*-movement, anaphors and raising, while a large bulk of the CL-literature has been devoted to examining the properties of individual lexical items and uncommon grammatical constructions (ibid., 12). This also has consequences for CL-scholars’ willingness to study emergent and non-standard language use, such as the phenomenon which is the topic of this thesis.

Additionally, the idea that usage shapes conceptualizations of language means that sources of empirical language data, such as language corpora, become increasingly important tools in the study of linguistic phenomena (Bybee 2006, 712). If the frequency of use of a given construction is relevant to that construction’s perceived grammaticality, and if large numbers of slightly deviating instantiations of a construction can result in category-reformation, the examination of these frequencies in spontaneous language data naturally becomes more relevant. Additionally, since language is believed to be shaped by mutual communication, it also makes more sense to gather acceptability-data from a larger group of participants, rather than from a single individual. While GG mostly focuses on the competence of single speakers, CL-scholars are often more concerned with how constructions are conventionalized through language-use (Geeraerts and Cuyckens 2010), and therefore study trends across populations to a larger extent. It is this consequence of the belief delineated in 2.3.4 that led me to make use of corpus-studies and an acceptability-judgment-questionnaire in this thesis.
2.3 Important concepts within Cognitive Linguistics

The three central beliefs outlined in sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4 provide the foundation on which Cognitive Linguistics was built. There are, however, a number of other important assumptions and principles which are emblematic of the CL-approach. These include assumptions about the structure and boundaries of categories, the interface between experience and language, as well as analogy and generalization. In the following sections, I outline some of the tenets of Cognitive Linguistics which are particularly important in regards to the subject of the thesis.

2.3.1 Categorization and prototype-theory

In section 2.2.2, I stated that CL views language-use as an amalgamation of a number of established, central cognitive processes. One of the processes of particular interest is that of categorization. Categorization is said to be the most basic phenomenon of cognition, to the extent that some scholars argue that “cognition is categorization” (Harnad 2005, 40). In the classical theory of categorization – which Cognitive linguists often identify as linked to formal approaches to language (Saeed 2016, 356) – categories were thought of as defined by certain necessary and sufficient features. Whether an entity in the world could be defined by a certain word, or whether a word could be defined as a member of a certain category, depended on whether or not the entity/word exhibited all the features associated with the word/category (Saeed 2016, 33). In its strictest sense, it requires all members to display all the properties associated with the category, while no non-member is allowed to have all of these features (Langacker 2004, 132). A word-meaning definition of bachelor, for instance, could be based on whether or not an entity exhibits the characteristics [+HUMAN] [+MALE] and [-MARRIED]. In regards to word-category membership, whether a word could be considered a noun would depend on the distributional characteristics of that word (Carnie 2013). Note, also, that traditional analyses thus reject semantic categorization of grammatical classes (e.g. nouns) (Jackendoff 1994, 69), in favor of categorization by distributional features (e.g. being able to appear with plural endings) (ibid., 70).

---

6 In English, some of these characteristics include having endings such as –er/er, -ism, -ment and -tion; being able to take the genitive case; having singular and plural forms; and occurring together with a determiner such as a or the.
Within CL, however, the main model of category structure made use of is that called the **Prototype model of categorization, or Prototype theory** (Croft 2004, 77; Aberra 2006, 2). The theoretical work on prototype theory was pioneered by Eleanor Rosch, based on color and form categories in Rosch (1973a) and more generally in Rosch (1978). While this early work mainly pertained to non-linguistic categories, several more recent studies have found evidence for prototype-effects for abstract linguistic constructions (e.g. Taylor 1998, Ibottson et al. 2012). In contrast to the classical, binary view of categorization, the prototype model supposes that the boundary between different categories of words and constructions is gradient, and that words/phrases fit within categories to varying degrees (Langacker 2004, 133). To use a simple example, consider the word *bird*. Rather than defining whether or not a given animal is describable by the word *bird* by means of truth-conditions such as [+WINGS] [+CAN FLY] [+FEATHERS] [+BEAK], and excluding all entities which do not possess all of these characteristics (e.g. penguins for [-CAN FLY] and kiwis for [-WINGS] and [-CAN FLY]), category-membership is determined by how strongly the animal resembles the *bird*-prototype. A psychology experiment conducted by Rosch (1973b) in which speakers were asked to assess the validity of the statement “X is a bird” revealed that good examples of a category were identified more quickly than others. A figure showing the prototypicality of various birds, based on Rosch’s findings, is given below (from Aitchison 2003, 56):

**Figure 2-2   Bird-prototypicality**

![Bird-prototypicality](image)

Note, however, that category-membership is not to be defined in terms of similarity to the category’s prototypical entities as such, but rather by the degree to which they exhibit the
characteristics associated with the prototype (Taylor 2008, 44). Figure 2-2 is not to be interpreted to mean that whether or not an animal is a bird is determined by its resemblance to a robin, but rather implies that the robin is a prototypical example of a bird because it exhibits most of (if not all) of the *bird-like* characteristics. Furthermore, because it is not seen as necessary for all entities defined as birds to exhibit all bird-related characteristics, non-typical birds such as penguins, ostriches and kiwis can also be included without difficulty. This thus accommodates our intuition that these animals are, indeed, birds. Another characteristic of prototype categorization within CL is that belonging to a linguistic category is often defined in regards to semantics rather than syntactic distribution (see, for instance, sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 below).

In addition to taxonomical categories such as birds, several prototypes for linguistic constructions have also been proposed. For instance, Langacker (2008, 104) presents the following prototypical characteristics for nouns: 1) they are physical objects; 2) they primarily reside in space, are bounded and have their own location; 3) they are atemporal, in the sense that they may persist indefinitely; and 4) they are conceptually autonomous, in the sense that they can be conceived independently of participation in a specific event. A prototypical noun, such as *ball*, would exhibit strongly all these characteristics. The noun-status of words which have traditionally been used as examples of the impossibility of semantic part-of-speech classification, such as *explosion*, can be explained by pointing out that the word (unlike its verbal counterpart *explode*) construes the explosion event as an abstract thing (Langacker 2008, 95), which makes it more atemporal and conceptually autonomous.

### 2.4 Applying prototype-theory

Although the scope of this chapter precludes a complete analysis of the full extent of prototype-theory, suffice it to say that these principles of gradient category-membership and non-binary categorization apply to many other linguistic categories, such as grammatical constructions and word-classes. Due to their particular relevance for the analysis presented in the following chapters, however, I will now detail how prototype-theory applies to three linguistic concepts: *subjecthood*, *objecthood*, and *transitivity*. Since the general tenets of
prototype theory have been explained in 2.3.1, the next sections rather focus on establishing prototypes for the three concepts.\footnote{I recognize that what linguistic categories to which I apply prototype-theory might feel somewhat arbitrary to the reader. The reason for subject, object, and transitivity to be examined as closely as they are, is that much of the previous research conducted on the A/NA case alternation (or similar alternations) in various ways discusses or is linked to these concepts. While it would potentially be possible to present the previous research before delineating my theoretical framework (e.g. switching up the order of the chapters), I believe a preliminary understanding of some of these concepts and ideas to be extremely advantageous in making sense of what previous scholars have had to say about the topic. My hope is that, upon reading Chapter 5, the reader will understand and agree with my motivations for structuring the thesis in this particular way.}

## 2.4.1 The subject-prototype

Consider the sentence *Jane broke the vase*. Even across the cognitive/generative divide, most (if not all) linguists would likely agree that in this sentence, “Jane” functions as the subject, while “the vase” functions as the object (Langacker 2008, 363). There are, however, great discrepancies in the approaches theorists use to define the subject (Langacker 1991b, 304–305). In regards to characterizing the role of the subject, Langacker (1991b) argues that grammatical structure (e.g. in what order the nominals appear, along with other grammatical behavior) is at best symptomatic of the subject-role, and does not elucidate the features at the core of subjecthood. Instead, he claims that the defining feature of subjects is their high degree of topicality.\footnote{Note that topicality is often supposed to exist outside the realm of semantics, rather belonging to either pragmatics or discourse. In Langacker’s analysis, topicality is seen as subsumed under semantics, as he rejects traditional semantics/pragmatics-discourse divides (Langacker 1978, 306).} Langacker proposes a number of factors related to topicality, the first being that the subject is prototypically an agent, acting as the first mover, so to speak, in the action-chain\footnote{The “action-chain” is a basic model for the concept of a “prototypical action”, and involves transfer of energy from one entity (the agent) to another (the patient).} described by the sentence. In regards to the example above, “Jane” serves as the agent inflicting the change (breaking) on “the vase”. A second topicality factor proposed by Langacker is the entity’s position on what he refers to as the empathy hierarchy, which he describes as “reflect[ing] an egocentric assessment of the various sorts of entities that populate the world” (Langacker 1991b, 306–307). Langacker’s empathy-hierarchy is rendered below:

**Empathy hierarchy:**

speaker > hearer > human > animal > physical object > abstract entity
Commonsensically, the highest rated entity on the empathy-hierarchy is the speaker. This is followed by hearer (addressee), other humans, physical objects, and abstract entities. As such, speakers are maximally topical, while abstract entities are minimally topical. The effect that position on the empathy-hierarchy has on subjecthood is evident in the acceptability of sentences like the following:

1) *Watashi wa inu o ot-ta.*  
   ‘I chased the dog.’

2) *Inu wa watashi o ot-ta.*  
   ‘The dog chased me.’

3) *Watashi wa inu ni ow-are-ta.*  
   ‘I was chased by the dog.’

4) *Inu wa watashi ni ow-are-ta.*  
   ‘The dog was chased by me.’

While all the active sentences in 1) and 2) are acceptable, the passive in 4) – in which *inu* ‘dog’ is allotted the subject position and topic-marking – seems somewhat off. The difference between 3) and 4) – and likely what renders 4) somewhat unacceptable – is that 4) does not conform to the hierarchy, but rather selects a less ‘empathetic’ entity as its subject (Langacker 1991b, 307). The third topicality-factor Langacker posits is that of definiteness. This factor is relatively subjective, pertaining to whether the speaker and listener have established *mental contact* (e.g. are directing their attention towards) a specific object. Definiteness is most easily illustrated using examples (sentences 5 and 6 taken from Langacker (1991b, 308)):

5) The lake is in that valley.  \(\textbf{Definite}\)

6) *A lake is in that valley.*  \(\textbf{indefinite}\)  
   (judgment in original)

In 5), the subject is referring to a specific lake, presumably known to both speaker and hearer, while in 6), the “a lake” subject refers to an entity with which the speaker/hearer has not yet established this mental contact, thus the strangeness of the sentence. In English, indefinite subjects are usually avoided by constructions similar to 7):

7) There is a lake in that valley.
Further distinctions of definiteness can be made between proper and common nouns (e.g. “Ronald Langacker” vs. “the author”), between count nouns and mass nouns (“linguist” vs. “water”), and between singular and plural (“example” vs. “examples”), among others.10

The last topicality factor Langacker presents is figure/ground organization. This is tied to the idea that in relational predications – e.g. predications with more than one conceptual participant – there is always one entity which is focused (Langacker 1978, 231). Thus, the sentences My cousin resembles Brad Pitt and Brad Pitt resembles my cousin are not strictly synonymous, because the participants are not equally salient in both sentences. If we allow for a small oversimplification, we might say that “my cousin” is the figure in the first example, with “Brad Pitt” being the ground, and that these NPs have opposite roles in the second sentence. A visual representation of a figure/ground relation can be seen by looking at the famous “Rubin-vase” from Edgar Rubin’s Visual Figures (1967, 30).11

Figure 2-3 Visualization of figure-ground organization

Like the situation described by the sentences involving my cousin and Brad Pitt, the image above can be construed as a figure of two faces talking to each other against a white background, or as a figure of a vase against a black background (Ungerer and Schmid 1996, 157-158; emphasis added). In regards to the connection between figure/ground organization and topicality, it is believed that the figure is more topical (Langacker 1991b, 308). Summing up, the four prototypical features for a subject is that it: 1. serves as an agent; 2. is human; 3.

10 Unfortunately, determining the definiteness of NPs in Japanese is substantially more difficult than in English, due to the absence of determiners such as a and the.
11 Rubin (1967) does not provide page numbers for pages containing figures. Figure 2-3 is located between page 30 and page 31.
is definite; and 4. is a *figure* in the figure-ground relation. In one NP, the prototypical subject is an *agentive, human, definite figure*.

### 2.4.2 The object-prototype

The first thing to note about objects is that the existence of an object presupposes the existence of a subject (Langacker 1991b, 321). Objects do not appear in clauses in isolation (at least conceptually), but always in conjunction with some type of subject. Because of this, objects are also closely associated with *transitivity* (see section 2.4.3). One way of characterizing objects is to say that they correspond to “the second most prominent clausal participant” (ibid., 321) in a sentence, but this definition does not do much in terms of explaining features typically associated with objects. This note on prominence does, however, lead into Langacker’s definition of *objecthood*: “a prototypical object is also salient by virtue of its high ranking on these [topicality] parameters, but in each case it ranks below a prototypical subject” (ibid., 321). In regards to semantic role, the object functions as a patient, strongly associated with the ability to serve as a receiver of energy. The primacy of agent over patient (and thus subject over object) has basis not only in introspection, as Langacker points out that it has also been shown through psychological experimentation (ibid., 322). As for the typical object’s position on the empathy hierarchy, Langacker proposes the following model:

**Empathy hierarchy (revised)**

```
[AN human > animal AN] > [INAN physical object > abstract entity INAN]
```

While, as we established in the previous section, prototypical subjects correspond to items at the top of the hierarchy as a whole, prototypical objects are thought to correspond to items at the top of the inanimate portion of the hierarchy. The emboldened “physical object” is thus thought to be the prototypical empathy-hierarchy location for objects. For a further discussion of this model, see section 6.2.4 of Chapter 6.

When discussing the definiteness of objects, Langacker remarks that they are often definite, but that indefinite objects are both more natural and more frequent than indefinite subjects. Thus, the sentence *Jane was so angry she broke a vase* is perfectly natural (cf. *A girl was so*

---

12 In this section, I treat the term “object” as shorthand for “direct object”. The discussion thus only pertains to direct objects, and not to indirect ones.

13 Objects can, however, be the only overt NP in a given clause. For a discussion of this, see Chapter 5.

14 AN stands for “animate”, while “INAN” stands for “inanimate”.

---
angry she broke the vase). However, even when indefinite, objects seem to be specific in most contexts – in the example above, “a vase” likely refers to a specific vase. It would seem that objects rank relatively high, but still below subjects, on the first three topicality factors (i.e. semantic role, empathy-hierarchy ranking and discreteness). In what way, however, should we describe them in regards to figure/ground organization? Since the subject is the most prominent participant in a relational predicate, it naturally takes up the figure-role, but simply referring to the object as the ground does not seem to match its role as second most prominent. Rather, Langacker views the object as “an especially salient facet of the ground, i.e. some entity that stands out from the remainder of the ground as a secondary figure when attention is focused on the primary figure” (Langacker 1991b, 323, emphasis in original). In one (albeit slightly convoluted) NP, the prototypical object is a patient-like, physical inanimate, relatively definite, prominent ground-element.

2.4.3.0 A small digression – on the embodied nature of grammar

Before we go into the discussion of the transitive prototype, allow me a slight digression to talk about another important assumption of CL: the embodied nature of grammar. In section 2.2.2 above, I discussed the rejection of the existence of a “language organ”. In committing to this rejection, one must also reject the idea that grammatical patterns are in any way inherent in biology – at least in the sense that they cannot be innate manifestations of some complex algorithmic language-faculty system. If clause structure and grammar are not simply chosen from a predetermined set of parameters – as in Chomsky’s minimalist framework (Chomsky 1995) – how do they emerge and how are they understood? The answer to these questions is that clause structure is “grounded in basic human experience” (Langacker 2008, 355).

Through interacting with the world, observing and taking part in events, and generalizing on the basis of these, we “derive some consistent conceptual archetypes” (such as agent, patient, experiencer), and these archetypes “combine in various ways to form more complex conceptualizations” (e.g. prototypical action, prototypical perceptual experience, etc.) (Rice 1987, 72). Insofar as linguistic expressions convey conceptual content (see section 2.2.3) linguistic patterns are also thought to have their basis in these complex conceptualizations. A natural consequence of this is that a change in the conceptualization of an event could lead to a change in the linguistic patterns used to convey that particular event. In relation to the case-alternation discussed in this thesis, this means that a reinterpretation of the predicates’
conceptualization (or the conceptualization of clauses containing the predicates) could potentially provide a rationale for the emergence of a new clause structure pattern (e.g. from NOM-NOM to NOM-ACC). Section 2.4.3 below, then, is dedicated to delineating which conceptual factors are associated with the “prototypical transitive event” conceptualization, which has strong ties to the NOM-ACC-pattern.

2.4.3 Transitivity

Now that I have put forth potential prototypes for subjects and objects, it is time to move onto the third major field to which we will be applying prototype theory – namely transitivity. In my view, the most transparent and orderly account of the features/criteria of the prototypically transitive clause is that presented in Langacker (1991b, 302), drawing on works such as Hopper & Thompson (1980) and Rice (1987):

1. It has two participants expressed by overt nominals that function as subject and object.
2. It describes an event (as opposed to a static situation).
3. The event is energetic, relatively brief, and has a well-defined endpoint.
4. The subject and object represent discrete, highly individuated physical entities.
5. These entities already exist when the event occurs (i.e. they are not products of the event).
6. The subject and object are fully distinct and participate in a strongly asymmetrical relationship.
7. The subject’s participation is volitional, while that of the object is non-volitional.
8. The subject is the source of the energy, and the object is its target.
9. The object is totally affected by the action.

Although I consider Langacker’s phrasing to be relatively straightforward, I will nevertheless err on the side of caution and provide a short explanation of the various criteria. To help illustrate the factors, I present an example of a sentence which conforms closely to the transitive prototype:

8) John wa waza to bōru o nage-ta.
   John TOP intentionally ball ACC throw-PST
   John intentionally threw the ball.

Criterion 1 can be split into two sub-criteria: Participant Number and Participant Role. Participant Number refers to the existence of two participating entities (NPs). In the case of the sentence above, those two participants are John and bōru (the ball).15 Participant Role,
then, refers to the extent to which these two NPs conform to the subject and object prototypes presented in the previous two sections. Criterion 2, Event Likeness, refers to the construal of the sentence as something that ‘takes place’, rather than something which just ‘exists’. The throwing of the ball by John in 8) is an event, rather than a static situation. Criterion 3, Dynamicity,\(^\text{16}\) is an amalgamation of Hopper & Thompson’s (1980, 252) Punctuality and Kinesis factors, and pertains to how the event takes place over time, as well the degree to which it involves a transfer of energy. In the sentence above, John throwing the ball involves a transfer of energy from John to the ball; the event is likely over in a second or two, making it relatively brief; and it has a well-defined endpoint as marked by both the conceptual content of the verb “throw” as well as the past-tense inflection. Criterion 4, Participant Discreteness, refers to two things: that the participants should represent entities separate from each other (e.g. not involving reflexives), and that the entities are discrete and separate in relation to the ground (e.g. the degree of mental contact discussed in the definiteness-section of 2.4.1) (Hopper and Thompson 1980, 252-253). The participants in sentence 8) are discrete both in terms of being two separate entities, and because they are a proper noun (John) and a noun referring to a specific object (the ball in English), respectively. Criterion 5, Pre-existence of Participants, relates to whether or not the participants existed before the conception of the event. In contrast with sentences such as “I made a sandwich”, in which the sandwich did not exist until my action brought it into the world by means of combining ingredients, the entities in sentence 8) above are not products of the throwing-event. Criterion 6, Asymmetry, concerns the relationship between the two nominals in a given clause. If the relationship is symmetrical, reversing the NPs does not yield a substantially different event-description. This is evident in a previous example from section 2.4.1. My cousin resembles Brad Pitt, and Brad Pitt resembles my cousin might have nuance-differences, but they both describe a situation in which the two participants resemble each other. Reversing sentence 8) into “The ball threw John”, however, describes a radically different (and now nonsensical) event, compared to the original sentence 8. For this reason, we say that the relationship between the NPs in 8) is asymmetrical. Criterion 7, Volitionality, pertains to the subject’s intentional participation –

\(^{\text{16}}\)Although far from an established linguistic term, I have chosen to make use of the term “Dynamicity” to describe Langacker’s third criterion. Since this criterion involves several different factors, pertaining to temporal delimitation and energy, it is difficult to find one word which encapsulates all of these nuances. I believe, however, that “dynamicity” might suffice, as it encapsulates the energetic (dynamic) nature of the event, as well as commonly being separated from states (e.g. Comrie 1976, 48). The temporal boundedness element is also somewhat present in this term, as dynamic events must have some sort of endpoint, and are usually more brief than states.
and the object’s unintentional participation – in the event. In sentence 8), John intentionally participates by throwing the ball, and the ball – presumably – did not intend to be thrown. Note that the subject’s intentional participation and the object’s unintentional participation do not need to both be present in order to raise the transitivity of a clause. Also, as we shall see in section 3.2.7, the subject’s intentional participation seems especially important in regards to Japanese transitives. Criterion 8, Energy-direction, refers to the tendency for energy to move from subjects to objects. In sentence 8), the energy-transfer taking place travels from the thrower-subject (John), to the thrown-object (the ball), and not the other way. Lastly, the 9th criterion of Object Affectedness concerns whether or not the action initiated by the subject produces a significant change in the object. While not-quite-so-prototypical transitive sentences such as “John saw the ball” also describe an ‘action’ initiated by John towards the ball, the object (the ball) does not seem to undergo any significant change. In 8), however, the ball undergoes a rapid change in position as a result of being thrown.

2.5 Metaphorical extension to other domains

One thing to note is that many of the features described above (i.e. 2, 3, 5 and 8) to a certain extent only apply to events taking place in the physical domain. Energy-transfer, existence, and, indeed, events in general, are thought to be something that actually take place, consisting of bodies moving around and interacting in the real world. This does not mean, however, that ‘mental events’, such as those in Paulo despises Christmas or Peter solved the problem are inherently intransitive. As pointed out in Rice (1978, 79) and Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 59), nonphysical ‘events’ such as emotions and experiences are often conceptualized in terms of physical experiences. Metaphorical constructions such as LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE (e.g. ‘I was magnetically drawn to her’), SEEING IS TOUCHING (‘Her eyes picked out every detail of the pattern’) and EMOTIONAL EFFECT IS PHYSICAL CONTACT (‘I was touched by his remark’) (Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 49-50, emphasis in original) allow language users to view mental events as being energetic or bringing about an effect in the object. Insofar as this type of conceptualization takes place, it is therefore not necessary for the situation described by a given clause to have any tangible effect in the physical world in order for it to be considered transitive.
2.6 Summary

In this chapter, I have provided some important characteristics of the broader framework utilized in this thesis – Cognitive Linguistics – as well as presented and explained various concepts of particular import to the case-alternation in question. We have seen how cognitive linguists treat topics such as the nature of language, the conceptual basis of grammar, the acquisition of linguistic competence, as well as the scope of valid data for linguistic examinations. To give a very brief summary of these views, Cognitive Linguistics perceives language as a part of general cognition (2.2.2), and treats linguistic and grammatical knowledge as emergent from language-use (2.2.4) and categorized in terms of the construal of mental worlds (2.2.3). These conceptualizations have their basis in real-world experiences as well as metaphorical extensions of real-world events (2.4.3.0 and 2.5). As a consequence of the usage-based theory of linguistic competence, research-methods which examine populations of speakers (e.g. corpus-research and aggregated acceptability-judgment-tasks) have become increasingly valuable ways of gathering data (2.2.5). Additionally, we have seen how (most) cognitive linguists approach categorization, through the examination of prototype-theory. The empirical basis of prototype theory was delineated (2.3.1), and prototype-theory was further examined and applied in regards to subjecthood (2.4.1), objecthood (2.4.2) and transitivity (2.4.3).
3 A transitive prototype for Japanese

3.0 Purpose of the chapter

In the previous chapter, I presented and delineated Langacker’s (1991b) transitive prototype, after providing a cognitive basis for categories such as subject and object. The discussion of the prototype in Chapter 2 was, however, mainly focused on conceptualization, and made little reference to actual linguistic phenomena to provide an empirical basis for the features of said prototype. While I consider the arguments for the features included in the prototype to be relatively sound, I have not yet shown the prototype explaining any features of linguistic expression. This chapter is therefore aimed at demonstrating the explanatory power of the prototype in accounting for the various phenomena of transitive marking in Japanese. In this chapter, I borrow heavily from Wesley M. Jacobsen’s (1992; 2016) and Fujimura’s (2009) work on Japanese transitivity.

3.0.1 Structure of the chapter

The chapter is split into two major parts, the latter of which being allotted the most space. In the first part – 3.1 – I assess the issue of cross-linguistic coding of transitivity, and explain how Japanese codes transitivity both syntactically and morphologically. In the second major part, containing sections 3.2-3.2.9, I begin with a brief explanation of the form of the arguments used to demonstrate the relevance of the transitivity criteria (3.2), before continuing on to discuss them. The order in which the criteria are discussed is the same as in which they were presented in 2.4.3, namely participant number/role (3.2.1), event likeness (3.2.2), dynamicity (3.2.3), participant discreteness (3.2.4), pre-existence of participants (3.2.5), asymmetry (3.2.6), volitionality (3.2.7), energy direction (3.2.8) and object affectedness (3.2.9).

That is not to say that the prototype was not originally created based on empirical observations about language – which it very much was – but rather that I have not yet presented any of these observations here.
3.1 Coding of transitivity in Japanese

Although the way transitive clauses are linguistically coded varies greatly cross-linguistically, the transitivity-prototype established in the previous sections is thought to be relatively common across languages. This is due to the fact that it is entrenched in basic cognitive systems common to all humans. This does not mean, however, that all languages are expected to conform to the prototype to the same degree – there are myriad examples of peripheral cases which are considered transitive in one language and intransitive in another. For instance, the concept of ENTITY1 --- POSITIVE FEELINGS --> ENTITY2 is coded as a transitive clause in English (I like it), as a source-experiencer (DAT-NOM) clause in OE/EModE (the lykor (liquor) [NOM] liked them [DAT] so well) (Traugott and Trousdale 2013, 70), and as an alternating source-experiencer/transitive construction in Japanese (Boku wa sore ga/o [NOM/ACC] suki da). Additionally, some languages are stricter than others in regards to which criteria need to be fulfilled for a clause to receive transitive marking. For this reason, this chapter is dedicated to examining the transitive prototype as it pertains to Japanese.

In the previous paragraph, I stated that transitive clauses are coded differently in different languages. In English, transitivity is usually marked by having a noun (the object) directly following the verb without any intervening adverbs or prepositions (Jacobsen 1992, 47). Consider the following sentences:

1) Misaki ran to John (*Misaki ran John) [Intransitive]
2) Misaki punched John (*Misaki punched to John) [Transitive]

Sentence 1 is intransitive, as evidenced by the presence of a preposition ‘to’ between the verb and the noun, while sentence 2 is transitive due to the noun directly following the verb. As we can see in the parenthesized sentences, removing an element from – or inserting an element into – the space between the verb and the noun yields unacceptable sentences. In Japanese, however, transitivity is not expressed in the ordering or relative position of the various sentence-components. Rather, transitivity is marked by the presence of an accusative marker (o) directly after the object-NP, in addition to certain morphological properties of the verb (Jacobsen 1992, 20). These properties are presented (and underlined) in the following sentences:

3) Misaki wa John o nagut-ta.
   Misaki TOP John ACC punch-PST
   ‘Misaki punched John.’ [Transitive]
There is thus both a syntactic aspect (the case marker) and a morphological aspect (verb-morphology) that help identify a clause as transitive. The morphological characteristics of transitivity are not always straightforward, however, as intransitive/transitive alternations of verb endings follow several different patterns (see, for example, Jacobsen 2016, 22). Additionally, the morphological aspect is only applicable when the predicate of the sentence is a verb, and is therefore not available in the analysis of adjectives and nominal adjectives. The most surefire way of determining the transitive marking of a clause therefore becomes the presence or absence of an accusative o-marker on one of the nominal participants.

3.2 Langacker’s transitivity criteria and Japanese transitivity research

The following sub-sections are dedicated to examining the significance of Langacker’s (1991b) transitivity-criteria in explaining the (in-)transitive marking of predicates and clauses in Japanese. The arguments are primarily made by comparing clauses with intransitively and transitively marked NPs, and arguing how the 9 transitivity criteria might explain the different choice of marking. Additionally, the transitivity factors are also used to explain the canonical transitive marking on sentences which are seemingly very far from the transitive prototype (e.g. peripheral cases).

18 Sentences 5) and 6) have had their case-particles (ga and o, respectively) omitted to illustrate that transitivity can also be expressed by verb-morphology alone. This type of particle-omission is relatively common in casual speech.
3.2.1 Participant number and Participant role in Japanese

Due to the large amount of subject-ellipsis present in Japanese, it is often erroneous to equate the number of overt participants in a sentence with the number of conceptual participants in the situation described by the sentence. Although the two sentences below have the same amount of overt NPs, the amount of conceptual NPs is not the same:

7) Kabin o kowa-shi-ta. (2 participants)
   vase ACC break-TR-PST
   ‘(Someone) broke the vase.’

8) Kabin ga kowa-re-ta. (1 participant)
   vase NOM break-ITR-PST
   ‘The vase broke.’

As evident from the English translations, the former sentence involves the tacit presence of an entity which brought about the event, while the latter sentence conceptualizes the event as occurring more or less spontaneously. In this case, the choice of transitive/intransitive marking seems to be dependent on the semantic content of the predicates – while the transitive kowasu ‘break’ presupposes a causer of the event, the intransitive kowareru ‘break’ does not. There are, however, cases in which the choice of transitive/intransitive marker seems to be decided not by the predicate’s meaning as such, but rather by the number of participants (either overt or covert) present in the clause. This is the case for many Sino-Japanese predicates such as idō-suru ‘move’:

9) Untenshu ga kuruma o idō-shi-ta.
   driver NOM car ACC move-do-PST
   ‘The driver moved the car.’

10) Kuruma ga idō-shi-ta.\(^{19}\)
    car NOM move-do-PST
    ‘The car moved.’

The occurrence of alternations such as the one above may receive two interpretations: 1. the predicate idō-suru ‘move’ allows for more than one argument structure, or 2. there are two phonetically identical predicates taking the form idō-suru, each with its own meaning. As Jacobsen points out, however, the second interpretation runs counter to our intuitions that they are indeed the same predicate with the same meaning (Jacobsen 1992, 5). This leaves us with

\(^{19}\) Note that if the sentence takes the form of kuruma o idō-shi-ta, where the kuruma ‘car’ NP is accusatively marked, the verb suddenly profiles a second participant, as the interpretation of this sentence is something like “(I/someone) moved the car”. What this implies is that the second participant does not necessarily have to be overtly mentioned in the sentence, as the o-marker already triggers the “2 participants interpretation”.

---
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option number one, where the predicate allows two different argument structures. In this case, it would seem that what determines the usage of intransitive/transitive marking is the presence or absence of an overt or conceptual second participant, which supports the idea that, in Japanese, two-participant clauses are ‘more transitive’ than single-participant ones.

The importance of **Participant Role**, or the subject- and object-likeness of the two NPs, can in part be illustrated by the relative unacceptability of transitive sentences with inanimate subjects that rank far down on the empathy hierarchy (see section 2.4.1 of Chapter 2). It is generally accepted that Japanese is less free than, for example, English, when it comes to allowing personified inanimate objects as subjects of transitive sentences. Consider the following two unnatural Japanese examples, whose English translation counterparts are perfectly acceptable:

11) ??*Kono kusuri wa anata o kibun-yoku-suru de-sho.*
   this medicine TOP you ACC feeling-good-doPRS COP-PRSUs
   ‘This medicine will make you feel better.’

12) ??*Sōfun no aruki ga watashi-tachi o kōen ni tsurete-it-ta.*
   a few minutes GEN walk NOM us ACC park DAT bring-go-PST
   ‘A few minutes’ walk brought us to the park.’ (judgments in original, Tsushima 2011, 31-32)

While the inanimate *kono kusuri* ‘this medicine’ and the inanimate abstract *sōfun no aruki* ‘a few minutes’ walk’ are acceptable transitive subjects in English, Japanese does not usually allow these kinds of entities in this position. That is not to say that there are no instances of inanimate transitive subjects in Japanese, but rather that Japanese seems generally stricter in allowing these types of subjects (Kunihiro 1967, 100; Chamberlain 1971, 276; Kojima 1988, 192; Kimura 1993, 90; Kashino 2010, 269; Andō 2007, 68). Additional, Tsunoda (1991 in Ying 2014, 111) showed that transitive sentences in which the object outranks the subject on the empathy hierarchy are often deemed unacceptable, supporting Langacker’s (1991b) idea of the subject and object as ‘most prominent participant’ and ‘second most prominent participant’, respectively (see section 2.4.2). We can therefore see that the two factors Participant Number and Participant Role seem to apply to Japanese to a large extent.
3.2.2 Event likeness in Japanese

The link between event-likeness and transitivity in Japanese can be shown by the meanings of transitive/intransitive verbs with the attached progressive -iru auxiliary, as well as through observing the case-alternation between plain adjectival forms and adjectival forms with -garu auxiliary attachments. Let us first consider the -iru progressive. Morphological transitive/intransitive verb-pairs such as kimeru ‘decide’ and kimaru ‘be decided’, along with pairs such as kowasu ‘break-TR’ and kowareru ‘break-ITR’ exhibit different behavior when occurring together with the progressive auxiliary affix -iru. Consider the following examples, borrowed from Jacobsen (1992, 176):

13) Kodomotachi ga oni o kim-er-u.
   the children NOM it[lit:demon] ACC decide-TR-PRS
   ‘The children decide who’s it.’

14) Oni ga kim-ar-u
    it [lit:demon] NOM decide-ITR-PRS
    ‘Who’s it is decided.’

15) Kodomotachi ga oni o kim-ete-iru.
    the children NOM it[lit:demon] ACC decide-TR-PROG
    ‘The children are deciding who’s it.’

16) Oni ga kim-atte-iru.
    it[lit:demon] NOM decide-ITR-PROG
    ‘It is (has been) decided who’s it.’

While the plain forms of both the transitive and intransitive verbs can have an event-like interpretation (that ‘who’s it’ is decided, either by an outside causer or spontaneously), only the transitive retains this meaning in the progressive. While the progressive in 15) implies that the children are currently in the process of deciding ‘who’s it’, the progressive in 16) simply implies the state of ‘who’s it’ being decided. We therefore see that the sentence with the transitive verb preserves its event-like interpretation, while this is less cemented in the intransitive, which takes on a state-like meaning in the progressive.

Additionally, the existence of morphological suffixes such as -garu provide some evidence of the link between event-likeness and transitivity. The -garu suffix is used when talking about emotional or experiential states as experienced by a third party. Plain forms of adjectives such as kowai ‘fearful’ or desideratives such as tabetai ‘want to eat’ are perfectly acceptable when speaking about oneself, but not so much when used about other people. For this reason, the suffix -garu is normally used when one wants to express something like the following:
Observe that the case-marker associated with the second nominal changes from the nominative *ga* to the accusative *o* with the affixation of the *-garu* suffix. Of course, this could potentially be a syntactic issue of *-garu* being an auxiliary-verb – a class of words which are arguably more susceptible to accusative marking – but a semantic explanation is also possible. As Kuno (1973) points out, the *-garu* suffix does not merely syntactically change the adjective into a verb, but also produces a slightly different nuance, namely “outward manifestation of internal feeling” (ibid., 84). In this case, the choice of accusative marker could also be a consequence of the fact that this type of outward manifestation (e.g. Ken fidgeting nervously as a spider climbs on his desk) resembles an event to a larger degree than the stative interpretation of ‘being fearful of spiders’. Given that translation 2 (T2) above is a valid way of interpreting the sentence, the case-alternation phenomenon with *-garu* suffixation seems to support the ‘increased event likeness = increased transitivity’ claim for Japanese.

### 3.2.3 Dynamicity in Japanese

Because the dynamicity factor encompasses several different criteria (e.g. energeticness and temporal boundedness), the phenomena I will be using to elucidate its explanatory value in accounting for case-marking in Japanese will not necessarily fulfil both of these criteria at once. Allow me, therefore, to first focus on the temporal boundedness-element. By means of empirical inquiry in the form of asking informants to provide acceptability judgments, Fujimura (1989) found that sentences with predicates with perfective interpretations are more likely to receive accusative case-marking, while those with imperfective interpretations more often tend towards the nominative (Fujimura 2009, 80). Consider these examples:

18) a)  
\[\text{three days INST sweater ACC knit-POT-PRS}\]
\[\text{‘I can knit a sweater in three days.’}\]
\[\leq\]

b)  
\[\text{three days INST sweater ACC knit-complete-POT-PRS}\]
\[\text{‘I can complete knitting a sweater in three days.’}\]

The \(\leq\) indicates that the latter sentence was preferred by Fujimura’s informants.
According to Fujimura’s informants, the sentences in which the activity described by the predicate was more ‘complete’ (18b and 19a), were preferred for accusative marking (18b $\geq$ 18a), while the opposite was true for nominative marking (19a $\leq$ 19b). Since perfective interpretations arguably have more defined endpoints than imperfective ones, this seems to provide some evidence of the explanatory value of the temporal boundedness aspect of the dynamicity factor. Additionally, Mano (2004), argues that low time-stability (temporal boundedness) is, in addition to participant number, one of the most important characteristics of transitive predicates in Japanese (see the discussion in section 5.3.3).

In regards to the energeticness-element of the dynamicity factor, some of the examples raised in the previous sections might be relevant here as well. The differences in case-marking between the two sentences in 17) are thought to be a product of the sentences’ event-likeness, with a higher degree of event-likeness correlating with accusative marking. The situation described by the ACC-marked sentence, however, arguably express situations higher in energeticness than the one marked nominatively. This is because ‘showing signs of something’ presumably involves more kinetic energy than ‘feeling something’.

3.2.4 Participant discreteness in Japanese

At first glance, there does not seem to be any rule which demands that the participants of transitive sentences in Japanese have to be particularly discrete. Consider the following examples:

20) Takeshi wa jibun o seme-ta.
   Takeshi TOP oneself ACC blame-PST
   ‘Takeshi blamed himself.’

21) Hito wa kane o hoshi-gar-u.
   people TOP money ACC want-3P.EXP-PRS
   ‘People want money.’
The existence and acceptability of uncontroversially transitive sentences such as 20 – containing a reflexive object – and 21 – containing two very non-discrete NPs – shows that there is no minimum-value of discreteness required for the assignment of accusative case-marking. This does not entail, however, that the discreteness of the participants does not matter in regards to the transitivity of the clause which contains them. Indeed, according to Fujimura (2009), the discreteness of the participants can affect the choice of case-marker they are assigned. Consider the following examples:

22) ??Yamada-san no musuko ga koroshi-ta-i.
   Mr.Yamada GEN son NOM kill-DESID-PRS
   ‘I want to kill Mr. Yamada’s son.’

23) Hito ga koroshi-ta-i.
   person NOM kill-DESID-PRS
   ‘I want to kill someone.’
   (judgments in original; ibid., 81)

While desideratives are generally acceptable with both nominative and accusative marking, Fujimura argues that nominative marking is somewhat unnatural when attached to very definite NPs. This explains the judgment that 22) is strange, while 23) is perfectly acceptable. While she does not suggest an alternative marking for 22), it is perhaps fair to assume that she thinks o-marking would be more natural (as this is the only feasible alternative). Additionally, she presents two sentences with the same participant-NPs, and seems to argue that the case marker affects how the sentences are interpreted:

24) Kuruma o uri-tai.
   car ACC sell-DESID-PRS
   (I want to personally sell my own car)

   car NOM sell-DESID-PRS
   (I want to sell cars as a profession)
   (ibid., 81)

Fujimura suggests that the parenthesized translations on the right are the appropriate interpretations of the sentences on the left. This would seem to indicate that not only do very discrete participants trigger accusative marking, but accusative marking also triggers more discrete interpretations of the participants to which it attaches (‘my car’ is more discrete than ‘cars’). If Fujimura’s intuitions on this are to be trusted, there seems to be quite a good case for including participant discreteness as a transitivity-raising factor for Japanese.
3.2.5 Pre-existence of participants in Japanese

Although I have, unfortunately, been unable to find any research suggesting a link between the participants’ pre-existence and transitivity, I believe that certain commonsensical observations can help cement this connection. One of these observations is the apparent non-existence of transitive clauses in which the subject is a product of the event. While there exist myriad intransitive predicates describing the ‘bringing-about’ of their subjects (dekiru ‘be made’, arawareru ‘appear’, dekiagaru ‘get ready’, etc.), transitive predicates expressing ‘about-bringing’ of the subject are – to my knowledge – nonexistent. This is perhaps obvious, as it is impossible (or at least very difficult) to conceive of an action initiated by a non-existent entity, which also brings about some sort of change in another entity. In regards to the pre-existence of the object, however, the evidence is somewhat less clear. There is no lack of transitive predicates (such as tsukuru ‘create/make’, hatsumei-suru ‘invent’, yaku ‘bake’), whose objects are arguably products of the event. It should be noted, however, that many of these predicates do not involve the sudden appearance of the object out of thin air, but rather that the object is created through re-structuring other entities into new configurations (e.g. combining ingredients to yaku ‘bake’ a cake, or various electrical components to tsukuru ‘make’ a computer). To the best of my knowledge, there is no transitive verb paralleling intransitives such as arawareru ‘appear’, which is interpretable as something appearing out of nowhere.

3.2.6 Asymmetry in Japanese

Another factor Jacobsen (1992) describes as characteristic of transitive clauses is that the two NPs participate in a highly asymmetrical relationship, where one NP (the subject) dominates the other NP (the object). This is believed to stem from the similarity between this type of asymmetry, and the relationship of dominance of the subject over the object in prototypical transitive events (ibid., 52). This explains the transitivity of certain constructions such as the verb kakomu ‘surround’ in the following sentence:

26) Jōheki ga machi o kakonde-iru
    castle.wall NOM town ACC surround-PROG
    ‘A castle wall surrounds the town.

Although there is no notion of volition, nor any clear indication of affectedness of the object (see section 3.2.9 below) in the clause above, the predicate nevertheless appears with
accusative marking, something which might be explained by the high degree of asymmetry between the two NPs. One way of assessing this kind of asymmetry of NPs in sentences is to have the NPs switch places and then see whether or not the sentence retains its original meaning. Consider the following examples:

27) Kanako ga tomodachi ni at-ta.
   Kanako NOM friend DAT meet-PST
   ‘Kanako met a friend.’

28) Tomodachi ga Kanako ni at-ta.
   Friend NOM Kanako DAT meet-PST
   ‘A friend met Kanako’

29) Misaki ga John o nagut-ta.
   Misaki NOM John ACC punch-PST
   ‘Misaki punched John.’

30) John ga Misaki o nagut-ta.
   John NOM Misaki ACC punch-PST
   ‘John punched Misaki.’

While the switching of the NPs in 27/28 results in sentences with nearly identical meaning, save for the perspective from which the event is viewed, switching the NPs in 29/30 radically changes the meaning of the sentence. From this, we can conclude that *au* ‘meet’ (or at least this case of the predicate) describes a highly symmetrical relationship between the participants, while *naguru* ‘punch’ profiles a more asymmetrical relation.

### 3.2.7 Volitionality in Japanese

One of the most important factors for transitivity in Japanese is whether or not the clause contains elements of volition. Japanese is generally stricter than other languages such as English in requiring intentional meaning in transitive expressions (Jacobsen 1992, 49). This might help explain the unacceptability of inanimate entities as subjects in transitive constructions (see 3.2.1), since inanimate entities are conceptually incapable of volitionally acting upon other entities. The unacceptability of (low-volition) sentences like 11) and 12) above might thus provide some support for volition as a transitivity-increasing factor.

Evidence for volition as a transitivity-raising factor can also be found by comparing differently marked predicates. Comparing emotional predicates and perception verbs, Jacobsen argues that the relation between predicates like *miru* ‘look at’ and *mieru* ‘be visible’
is similar to that of *konomu* ‘like’ and *suki* ‘like’, glossing them in English as “look at/be visible” and “like (by choice)/like (involuntarily)”. The nature of the difference between the predicates – the former of which appear in transitive constructions and the latter (usually) in intransitive ones – is thus one of intentionality; whether or not there is a conscious choice to undergo the action described by the predicate (Jacobsen 1992, 31). Although Jacobsen does not comment upon this himself, it is worth noting that while the A/NAs which are the subject of this thesis exhibit a NOM/ACC case-alternation, their verbal counterparts (*suku* ‘like’, *kirau* ‘hate’ and *hossuru* ‘want’) only appear with the accusative marking. If Jacobsen’s analysis of the volitionality of these predicates is correct, it would seem that the more volitional pattern also exhibits a higher degree of transitivity. He further mentions the verbs *matsu* ‘wait’ and *sagasu* ‘look for’ as examples of canonically transitive verbs with a high degree of volitionality. Unlike the A/NAs and perceptual verbs such as *mieru* ‘see/be visible’ and *kikoeru* ‘hear/be heard’, these highly volitional verbs always appear in canonically transitive patterns (despite exhibiting a very low degree of object-affectedness), suggesting that the notion of the action being a conscious choice correlates well with highly transitive structures.

### 3.2.8 Energy direction in Japanese

I believe there to be three felicitous ways of assessing the explanatory value of (subject→object) energy direction as a transitivity-increasing factor in Japanese. These all include showing that sentences which imply unidirectional subject→object energy transfer are more likely to be marked transitively than sentences which: 1. imply object→subject energy transfer, 2. imply bilateral (subject→object and object→subject) energy transfer, and 3. do not imply energy transfer at all.

One can perhaps say that the directionality of the energy-transfer expressed by most Japanese transitive verbs takes the form [subject→object]. Typical transitive verbs such as *kowasu* ‘break-TR’, *yaburu* ‘rip’ and *naguru* ‘punch’ all involve energy directed from the subject towards the object (e.g *kare wa kabin o kowashita* ‘he broke the vase’). If we compare these predicates with other predicates such as *odoroku* ‘be surprised’ which can also take two participants, we observe a difference in case-marking:

```
31) Kare wa tomodachi o nagut-ta.
    he TOP friend ACC punch-PST
  ‘He punched his friend.’
```
32) Kare wa tomodachi no kōdō ni odoroi-ta.\(^{22}\)
   he TOP friend GEN behavior DAT be.surprised-PST
   ‘He was surprised by his friend’s behavior.’

We see that while the typical transitive predicate naguru ‘punch’ – which involves
subject→object energy transfer – appears with accusative marking, the odoroku ‘be surprised’
predicate assigns the source of the energy (tomodachi no kōdō ‘friend’s behavior’) the dative
case-marker ni. Note that the transitive variant of this predicate (odorokasu ‘surprise’)
exhibits canonical transitive marking. There might, however, be some disagreement as to how
to conceptualize odoroku ‘be surprised’ sentences. Although the object→subject interpretation
might seem plausible, one should also note that it could potentially go the other way
(subject→object), if the (indirect) object is conceptualized as a goal, rather than a source (e.g.
surprised at vs. surprised by).\(^{23}\) For this reason, I will present a second type of construction
which expresses object→subject energy transfer: passives. In Japanese, passives are generally
formed by ‘promoting’ the object of a transitive sentence to a subject, and then rendering the
original subject as a dative-marked NP:

33) Misaki wa John o nagut-ta.
    Misaki TOP John ACC punch-PST
    ‘Misaki punched John.’

34) John wa Misaki ni nagur-are-ta.
    John TOP Misaki DAT punch-PASS-PST
    ‘John was punched by Misaki.’

Both of these sentences describe the same ‘objective’ situation, only differing in regards to
construal (particularly in regards to the topicality of the elements) (see sections 2.2.3 and
2.4.1 of Chapter 2). The main difference between the two sentences is that the most prominent
entity (the subject) is the agentive participant in 33), while the subject is the patient in 34).
What I would like to point out is that when the subject is changed into a patient (meaning that
the energy direction is reversed, so that the source of the energy-transfer is the entity that is
not the subject, the case-marker assigned by the verb also changes from accusative to dative,
rendering the clause intransitive. If the sentences above are indeed differentiated only by the
energy direction (from subject vs. towards subject), this seems to indicate that transitivity and
subject→object energy transfer are closely linked.

\(^{22}\) cf. Kare wa tomodachi o odorokashita ‘He surprised his friend’.
\(^{23}\) Native speakers consulted in conjunction with this thesis have expressed differing intuitions about the
directionality of the energy-transfer expressed by the odoroku-verb.
The typical transitive predicates also contrast sharply with predicates like *tatakau* ‘fight’, which do not imply unidirectional energy-transfer from subject to object (or $N_1$ to $N_2$), but rather *bidirectional energy-transfer*, in the sense that the two NPs attempt to elicit change in the each other:

35) *Kare* wa *kabin* o *kowa-shi-ta.*  
   he TOP vase ACC break-TR-PST  
   ‘He broke the vase’.

36) *Kare* wa *teki* to *tatakat-ta.*  
   he TOP enemy COM fight-PST  
   ‘He fought with his enemy.’

Note, here, that while the typical transitive verb *kowasu* ‘break’ (also *yaburu* ‘rip’ and *naguru* ‘punch’) take the accusative case-marker *o*, the more symmetrical *tatakau* ‘fight’ predicate takes the comitative *to* (*with* in English). A similar phenomenon can be observed in the differences between plain verbs and verbs appearing with the auxiliary *-au* ‘V one another’ which expresses mutual action. Consider the following sentences:

37) *Kare* wa *kanojo* o *shikkari to* *dai-ta.*  
   he TOP her ACC tightly hold-PST  
   ‘He held her tightly.’

38) *Kare* wa *kanojo* to *daki-at-ta.*  
   he TOP her COM hold-one.another-PST  
   ‘They (he and she) held each other.’

Once again, we observe that when the energy-transfer is bidirectional rather than unidirectional, the non-transitivity-related *to* case-marker is preferred. This strongly suggests that implied unidirectional energy transfer heightens a clause’s transitivity.

### 3.2.9 Object affectedness in Japanese

The last factor - *object affectedness* – also seems to figure into transitivity in Japanese. To illustrate this, Jacobsen (1992) makes use of the examples *rouka o hashiru* ‘run down the hall’ and *rouka de hashiru* ‘run in the hall’ and argues that the conceptual difference in the two sentences is that the object is more completely traversed in the accusatively (*o*)-marked sentence (ibid., 32). According to Jacobsen, the first sentence describes a situation in which the entire corridor is traversed, while in the locatively (*de*)-marked sentence, the subject merely moves from point A to point B *within* the corridor. Although the ‘object’ in these two
sentences (the corridor) does not appear to be ‘affected’ by the action in the strictest sense of the word, Jacobsen argues that the transitive marking on the first sentence occurs because it parallels the ‘total’ affectedness of the object in prototypical cases” (ibid., 33). An apparent conceptual link to the transitive prototype thus seems to increase the transitivity of the clause (c.f. section 2.5 of Chapter 2), even though there seems to be a significant divergence from said prototype.

Additionally, Fujimura (2009) observed that there are differences in the preference for nominative/accusative markings with desideratives, depending on the degree of affectedness of the object. Consider the following examples:

39) Oya no kao ?ga/o bunnaguri-ta-i.
   parents GEN face NOM/ACC sock-DESID-PRS
   ‘I want to sock my parents in the face.’

40) Oya no kao ga/?o mi-ta-i.
   parents GEN face NOM/ACC see-DESID-PRS
   ‘I want to see my parents’ faces’  
   (judgments in original; ibid., 81)

The object (oya no kao ‘parents’ faces’) of the two sentences above is arguably more affected in the former than in the latter, because being punched in the face has a significant higher influence on one than merely being looked at. This, Fujimura argues, has consequences for the choice of case-marker used with the ‘object’-NP. While the sentence in which the object is most overly affected (39) is most natural with accusative-marking, the sentence in which the object is less overtly affected (40) seems to be most acceptable with the nominative.

Lastly, some auxiliaries such as -kakaru ‘come at’, which de-emphasize object affectedness, seem to lead to differences in object marking. Consider the following sentences:

41) Boku wa kare o nagut-ta.
   I TOP him ACC punch-PST
   ‘I punched him.’

42) Boku wa kare ni naguri-kakat-ta. (cf.* Boku wa kare o nagurikakatta)
   I TOP him DAT punch-come.at-PST (my judgment)
   ‘I punched at him.’

The point to be made here is that while the sentence with the plain past verb nagutta ‘punch’ appears with accusative marking, the addition of the auxiliary kakaru ‘come at’ results in dative marking. This is perhaps due to the fact that it is not necessarily implied that the subject (boku ‘I’) was able to make physical contact with – and thereby prompt a change in –
the object (kare ‘him’), thereby lowering the ‘object-affectedness’ of the sentence. This also has the same effect in the English versions of the sentences, illustrated by the presence of the preposition ‘at’ between the verb and the object.

3.3 Summary

In this chapter, we have seen how features of the transitive prototype help explain the accusative marking of the objects of several disparate Japanese predicates. From the discussion above, it would appear that all the transitivity-criteria have some degree of explanatory value in accounting for the various case-marking patterns exhibited by Japanese. While I have not been able to assign any relative weight to the various factors (e.g. stating which ones are the most important), I believe that I have successfully demonstrated that they all seem to have some degree of significance. Although most of the effects are (expectedly) similar to those found in English, there were also some cross-linguistic discrepancies, such as the greater relative importance of participant role (manifested in the common unacceptability of inanimate transitive subjects) and volitionality in Japanese. I believe this discussion can serve as a foundation on which to base the assessment of transitivity of Japanese sentences with adjectives and nominal adjectives, as I will be doing in Chapters 6 and 7.
4 On the nature of suki, kirai, and hoshii

4.0 Purpose of the chapter

In the previous chapter, I made use of various examples to illustrate the explanatory power of Langacker’s (1991b) transitivity criteria for overt transitive marking in Japanese. This was mainly done by contrasting verbs whose NPs appear with various case-markings. In a thesis discussing a phenomenon pertaining to one adjective and two nominal adjectives, it might appear strange that so much time is allotted to discussing verbs. The reason for this, however, is also precisely what makes the phenomenon examined in this thesis so interesting – in languages such as English and Japanese, transitivity is strongly associated with verbs, whereas adjectives and nominal adjectives are usually considered intransitive (Shibatani 2001, 195).24 Such a statement, however, has little value unless one is familiar with the categories to which it pertains. This chapter is therefore dedicated to providing a short rundown of what exactly characterizes adjectives and nominal adjectives, as well as showing how the three predicates discussed in this thesis significantly diverge from other members of their respective categories. I also make the argument that the distinction between adjectives/nominal adjectives and verbs is not as clear cut as one might originally assume.

4.0.1 Structure of the Chapter

This chapter is separated into three major parts. In the first part, corresponding to section 4.1, I address the terminology used to describe the category of “nominal adjective”, making the case that this is the term which best illustrates the category. In the second part, spanning sections 4.2 through 4.2.2, I deal with the semantics of these lexical categories. Here, I demonstrate that there is no significant semantic divide between the two categories (As and NAs) (4.2.1), but make the case that there are significant internal differences between predicates of the same category (e.g. between different NAs) (4.2.2). In the third part – made up of sections 4.3 through 4.5 – I address some other topics related to A/NAs in general, and to the three predicates (suki, kirai, and hoshii) in particular. I first present the etymological

---

24 Indeed, scholars such as Jackendoff (1977) and van Riemsdijk (1983) believe it to be a universal that adjectives do not assign accusative case (the most robust marker of transitivity in Japanese) to their complements (Yamakido 2005, 37).
origin of the three predicates (4.3), arguing that they are related to transitive verbs, before moving on to discussing their subsumption under the category of “stative predicates” (4.4). Lastly, in section 4.5, I argue that while the prototypical instances of A/NAs are semantically quite different from the prototypical instances of verbs, there are nevertheless cases in which the two categories approximate each other, rendering the boundaries between them fuzzy.

4.1 “Nominal adjectives” or “adjectival nominals”?

Various linguists make use of different terminology in referring to predicates such as suki ‘like’ and kirai ‘dislike’. Some scholars call them “adjectival nominals” (Shibatani 2001), others “nominal adjectives” (Kuno 1973; Uehara 1998; 2003; Mano 2004; Yamakido 2005), while others still refer to them simply as “adjectives” (Caluianu 2009). As the reader has likely noticed – seeing as the term has been used extensively in the preceding three chapters – I have chosen to follow scholars such as Uehara and Yamakido in making use of the “nominal adjectives” term. I considered the last of the three options above – “adjectives” – to be rather easily dismissible, because it precludes distinguishing predicates like these from ‘true adjectives’ such as hoshii ‘want’. The choice between the former two options, however, required somewhat more consideration. However, it is generally the case that, in a given English noun phrase, the lattermost noun is the one allotted the most prominence – a ‘food truck’ is a type of truck, and not a type of food, and ‘desk lamp’ describes a type of lamp rather than a type of desk. As such, the term “adjectival nominal” construes the predicates as a type of nominal with adjective-like features, while the term “nominal adjective” construes them as adjectives with noun-like features. In a sense, the choice between these terms is therefore dependent on whether one considers them primarily as nominals, or primarily as adjectives. In regards to semantic aspects, nominal adjectives are more similar to adjectives, in the sense that they usually describe features, properties, or even something akin to processes (see section 4.2.2). Because of this, I have chosen to make use of the “nominal adjective” term here.
4.2 Adjectives and nominal adjectives

In the following sub-sections, I discuss the semantics of these two word-classes. Understanding the semantics of the two classes is essential in following the analysis of the transitivity of the predicates in the following chapters.

4.2.1 Semantics of adjectives and nominal adjectives 1: inter-category comparison

The general view on any semantic difference between As and NAs seems to be that “the conceptual difference between the two is non-existent and that membership of the two categories is arbitrary and not predictable from its meaning” (Uehara 1998, 180). To illustrate this, consider the following list, slightly edited from Yamakido (2005, 25):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Nominal adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. utskushi-i</td>
<td>‘beautiful’</td>
<td>kirei-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. abuna-i</td>
<td>‘dangerous, risky’</td>
<td>kiken-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. yasashi-i</td>
<td>‘easy, simple’</td>
<td>kantan-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. uma-i</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
<td>jōzu-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. muzakshi-i</td>
<td>‘difficult, hard’</td>
<td>konnan-na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows no significant systematic difference between the meaning components of the adjectives and the nominal adjectives. Additionally, to further cement the claim that there is no clear semantic divide, I will point out that there exist predicates which can behave both as adjectives and nominal adjectives, without a significant change in meaning. Among these are ōki-i/ōki-na ‘big’, chiisa-i/chiisa-na ‘small’, and yawara-ka/i/yawara-ka-na ‘soft’. Although the two word-classes exhibit diverging syntactic patterns, there does not seem to be any significant semantic distinction between the classes as a whole. In regards to the hypothesis tested in this thesis – that the degree of transitivity is a significant factor in the observed case-alternation with the predicates – this means that we should not necessarily expect differences between hoshii and suki and kirai solely on the basis of them being members of different word-classes.
4.2.2 Semantics of adjectives and nominal adjectives 2: intra-category semantic differences

Despite there being no clear-cut semantic divide between adjectives and nominal adjectives, there seems to be a significant difference between the three predicates considered in this thesis, and more typical ones like those provided above. Let me present some examples and clarify what I mean by this:

1) _Ano hito wa kirei da._
   That person is pretty.

2) _Ano kuruma wa kakkoii-PRS._
   That car is cool.

3) _Boku wa ano hito ga/kirai da._
   I like/dislike that person / As for me, that person is likable/dislikable.

4) _Boku wa ano kuruma ga/hoshi-PRS._
   I want that car / As for me, that car is desirable.

The interpretation of the two first examples is relatively straightforward: the nominal adjective (_kirei_ ‘pretty’) and adjective (_kakkoii_ ‘cool’) describe features of the nominal they follow (_hito_ ‘person’, and _kuruma_ ‘car’, respectively). The predicate thus tells us something about the features of the NP. As for the two latter examples, however, it is more challenging to provide a satisfying explanation of what is going on, as evident from the English translations provided below the originals. While translation norms would support the first translation (“N₁ Vs N₂”), analyzing Japanese based on how it is translated in English is arguably not a very felicitous approach. While a native English-speaker might utter 3)’s first translation in the same situation as a native Japanese speaker would utter 3), it is not entirely clear that the semantic content is identical between the two. On the other hand, a more ‘adjective-like’ interpretation in line with the former two examples would perhaps fit the second suggested translation: “As for N₁, N₂ is A”. However, it is not trivially true that this interpretation is correct, either. Whether to interpret the situation as “As for N₁, N₂ exhibits characteristic A”, or, “N₁ experiences A about N₂ (N₁ Vs N₂)” is difficult, and although these interpretations might seem similar, they are actually quite different. One could of course argue

25 See, for instance, the entries for _suki_, _kirai_, and _hoshii_ in the Medium Sized Progressive Japanese-English dictionary (n.d. a,b,c.)
that also other adjectives (such as kirei ‘pretty’ and kakkoii ‘cool’) require an experiencer: beauty is in the eye of the beholder, so to speak. Different people have different experiences of what is beautiful, cool, difficult or dangerous, and objects and situations cannot be described in these ways unless someone experiences them as such. In this scenario, the two former sentences (1 and 2) might also be interpreted as “As for SPEAKER, N₁ exhibits characteristic A”. I would argue, however, that there is still a difference between the two former and the two latter examples above. Consider the following exchanges:  

5) **Person A:** Ano hito wa kirei da. that person TOP pretty COP ‘That person is pretty.’  
**Person B:** Iya, kirei ja-nai yo. no pretty COP-NEG PTCL ‘No, he/she isn’t pretty’

6) **Person A:** Ano hito ga/?:o suki/kirai da. that person NOM/ACC like/dislike COP ‘(I) like/dislike that person / (As for me,) that person is likable/dislikable.’  
**Person B:** ??Iya, suki/kirai ja-nai yo. no like/dislike COP-NEG PTCL ‘No, (you) don’t like/dislike that person / No, (as for you,) that person isn’t likable/dislikable.’ (my judgments)

While the first exchange seems perfectly natural, the second exchange is somewhat dubious. This is likely because, while 5) only makes overt reference to the characteristics of the first nominal (ano hito ‘that person’), 6) also describes something about its omitted ‘I’ subject (here corresponding to the speaker). The negation of Person A’s statement in 6) appears strange, because one would not expect Person B to have a clearer understanding of the inner life of Person A, than Person A him-/herself. On the other hand, the negation in 5) is unproblematic, because it is interpreted as Person B challenging Person A’s interpretation of the ‘objective’ world, and not Person B’s inner world. Of course, this evidence is not decisive enough to conclude that the predicates suki, kirai, and hoshii are more subjective than, for example, kirei, but at the very least, it appears that the experiencer is more prominent in these predicates. The differing degree of prominence of this additional experiencer entity is similar to the distinction between intransitive and transitive verbs, in the sense that the former only profiles an entity undergoing a (spontaneous) change (e.g. kabin ga kowareta ‘the vase broke’), while the latter also profiles a ‘causer’ who brought about the change in the entity (e.g. kabin o kowashita ‘(he/she) broke the vase’. Insofar as the prominence of the participants is concerned, then, these predicates are arguably more similar to transitive verbs than other members of their word-classes.
4.3 Transitive verbal counterparts

On the subject of transitive verbs, no account of the nature of the three predicates (suki ‘like’, kirai ‘dislike’ and hoshii ‘want’) would be complete without making reference to their transitive verbal counterparts. The three predicates all have corresponding verbs in suku ‘like’, kirau ‘dislike’ and hossuru ‘want’, respectively. Unlike the A/NAs, these predicates typically figure in constructions with canonically transitive marking on their NPs. Although the semantic content of the A/NAs and the verbs is relatively similar (also evidenced by the English glossing above), there are some who argue that there are minute distinctions between them in regards to controllability and volitionality (see sections 5.2.3 and 5.3.3 of Chapter 5). The great amount of overlap in regards to both word-form and semantic content is probably due to the fact that the words are likely etymologically related. Indeed, Uehara (1998, 222), points out that the NAs suki and kirai are the stem-form of the verbs suku and kirau, remarking that the stem-form is the minimal way of nominalizing verbs. He further posits that the NAs were originally verbs, became nouns when nominalized by the stem-form, and then changed to NAs from there (ibid., 223-224). The hoshii-hossuru connection is somewhat more unclear, but it would seem that in this case the adjective actually preceded the verb. The adjective appears in the Manyōshū and the Ryōiki as early as in the 8th century, whereas the first recorded use of the verb seems to date back to Iroha Jiruishō from around the 12th century (JapanKnowledge, n.d.a;b). It should be noted, however, that not all of the verbal predicates are as commonly used as their adjectival variants in modern Japanese. The suku ‘like’ predicate, especially, is increasingly rare in its plain form. This is discussed further in section 6.2.5 of chapter 6.

4.4 A/NAs as stative predicates

In addition to belonging to the syntactic categories of A/NA, the predicates discussed in this thesis are typically subsumed under the semantic category of “stative predicates” (Kuno 1973, 136–137; Jarkey 1999, 197; Shibatani 2001, 312). This category of predicates is typically characterized as expressing situations which persist over longer periods of time, rather than
referring to events which occur at specific temporal locations (Caluianu 2005, 3). This is evident by the fact that they are generally not able to co-occur with time adverbials.  

7) ??Kinō Tarō wa Maria ga suki/kirai dat-ta.
    yesterday Tarō TOP Maria NOM like/dislike COP-PST  
    ‘Yesterday, Tarō liked Maria.’ (judgment in original, ibid., 2)

8) ?Kinō, boku wa kodomo ga hoshi-katta.
    yesterday I TOP children NOM want-PST  
    ‘Yesterday, I wanted children.’ (my judgment)  

Although there are no grammatical constraints which prohibit sentences like those above, they are somewhat unacceptable due to the semantics of the predicates. The subsumption of these predicates into the “stative predicates” category entails that they are semantically similar to other stative predicates such as desideratives (e.g. nomitai ‘want to drink’), potentials (e.g. nomeru ‘can drink’) and perceptual verbs (e.g. mieru ‘be visible’). What is particularly interesting about this class of predicates is that they appear in non-canonical NOM-NOM (TOP-NOM) constructions (ref. 3.2.3 and 3.2.4).

4.5 A/NAs and Verbs

Lastly, I would like to briefly discuss the relationship between A/NAs and verbs. The defining difference between (prototypical) A/NAs and (prototypical) verbs, is that A/NAs describe properties (Jacobsen 1992, 120) while verbs describe processes. Typical A/NAs such as utsukushii/kirei ‘beautiful/pretty’ describe a property of the NP over which they predicate, while typical verbs such as kowasu ‘break-TR’ and hashiru ‘run’ describe processes undergone by their NP-participants. As such, kare wa hashitta ‘he ran’ describes a process in which the NP (kare ‘he’) undergoes a change in regards to his position in a given space, while ‘kanojo wa utsukushikatta/kirei datta ‘she was beautiful’ describes a feature that the NP (kanojo ‘she’) possessed at some point in time. The V and A/NA categories can, however, be said to converge, in the sense that non-prototypical instances of both classes can resemble each other. For instance, the A/NAs which are the subject of this thesis might be interpreted as mental processes of emotions of the N₁’s liking/disliking/wanting ‘moving towards’ the N₂.

26 Note, however, that this only applies to time-adverbials which express a relatively short time-interval. The predicates are perfectly acceptable with time-expressions such as kōkō-jidai ‘in high school’ and kodomo no toki ‘when I was a child’.

27 The acceptability of this sentence does, however, depend on the nature of the N₂, as a sentence such as kinō, boku wa chokoreeto ga hoshikatta ‘Yesterday, I wanted some chocolate’ is significantly more acceptable.
On the other hand, certain types of verbs, such as potentials, perceptual verbs and stative verbs (e.g. *dekiru* ‘be able to’, the aforementioned *mieru* ‘be visible’, and *wakaru* ‘to understand’) might receive a property-like interpretation. Additionally, the progressive versions of more traditionally active verbs (e.g. *yotteiru* ‘to get drunk-PROG’ and *shindeiru* ‘to die-PROG’) can potentially also be interpreted as describing features of their nominals (in part evidenced by the fact that they can be glossed in English as the adjectives ‘drunk’ and ‘dead’). In regards to conceptualization, therefore, we see that the boundary between the two categories is somewhat fuzzy. If syntactic phenomena such as case-marking are dependent on conceptualization – as argued in 2.2.3 – belonging to the A/NA-category should therefore not necessarily preclude transitive interpretations and transitive marking.

### 4.6 Summary

In this chapter, I have provided a brief description of some aspects of adjectives and nominal adjectives. As we have seen, there appears to be no clear semantic divide between adjectives and nominal adjectives (4.2.1). The meanings of predicates such as *abunai* ‘dangerous, risky’ and *kiken na* ‘dangerous, risky’ seem relatively similar despite belonging to different word-categories. Additionally, the (relatively) large amount of predicates which are able to function as both adjectives and nominal adjectives (e.g. *yawaraka-i/yawaraka na* ‘soft’) also help cement the similarity between As and NAs. In spite of the similarity between the word-classes, however, there are significant differences between different predicates within the same class, most notably in regards to the prominence of the *experiencer* participant. While the predicates which are the topic of this thesis (*suki* ‘like’, *kirai* ‘dislike’ and *hoshii* ‘want’) strongly profile two entities – an entity doing the liking/disliking/wanting, and an entity being liked/disliked/wanted – this first entity (the experiencer) is invoked to a much lesser extent in predicates such as *kirei* ‘pretty’ and *utsukushii* ‘beautiful’, which can possibly be interpreted as somewhat more ‘objective’ characterizations of the nominals over which they predicate. The semantic features of these three predicates seem, therefore, to be closer (than other A/NAs) to those of transitive verbs. These features, and their similarity to the transitive prototype, are more thoroughly explored in the next chapter. Lastly, I argued that the semantic distinction between A/NAs and verbs is not completely clear-cut, and demonstrated how the boundary between the two exhibits fuzziness-tendencies.
5 Previous research

5.0 Purpose of the chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the previous research conducted on both the NOM-ACC case-alternation, as well as the nature of the three predicates with which it occurs (suki, kirai, and hoshii). Although the primary intention of the chapter is to present previous views, these views are also discussed and considered in regard to the hypothesis (research question) presented in Chapter 1. The chapter spans nearly 70 years of research, providing both a historical overview and a broad range of interpretations of the motivation for the case-alternation. The chapter is also intended to provide features and phenomena to be examined in the empirical studies in the following two chapters.

5.0.1 Structure of the Chapter

The chapter is separated into four different parts. In the first part, corresponding to section 5.1, I provide evidence that the case-alternation which is the topic of this thesis is not a completely novel phenomenon, with observed instances dating back several hundred years. In part two, encompassing sections 5.2 through 5.2.4, I discuss the most prominent generative studies conducted on the A/NAs in question, presenting the views of Tokieda (5.2.1), Kuno (5.2.2), and Shibatani (5.2.3). After this, I devote the third part – spanning sections 5.3 through 5.3.3 – to the analyses of more cognitively inclined scholars, addressing both the semantic nature of the predicates, and the observed case-alternation. The analyses presented are those of Makino (5.3.1), Jarkey (5.3.2), and Mano (5.3.3). In the final part, covering sections 5.4 and 5.4.1, I present one of the few empirical studies conducted on the case-alternation, namely that of Caluianu (2009).

5.1 Spread and use of the case-alternation

Before diving into the previous research conducted on the predicates and their case-alternation, I would like to provide a brief overview of the usage of accusatively marked N2s with these predicates. In one of the earliest publications, Susumu Kuno (1973b, 49) remarks
that sentences where NAs occur with accusative marking are beginning to be used by the younger generation of Japanese speakers, and consequently does not devote much space to discussing the alternation. Additionally, Shibatani (1975, 478) also has the impression that these forms are more commonly used by younger people than those over 30. Indeed, the belief that accusative marking on adjectives and nominal adjectives is limited to the speech of younger generations seems to have been relatively prominent (Jarkey 1999, 200). While it might potentially be true that younger speakers use these forms more freely, it is wrong to assume that the case-alternation is a novel phenomenon. In fact, Shibatani (1978, 231) points out that accusative N2s with predicates such as *hoshii* ‘want’ have been documented as far back as 1632, and presents sentences with both nominatively and accusatively marked N2s from the Tokugawa period:

1) *Aa kanegayaku hryō hoshi-i.*
   ‘Ah, I wish I had a hundred ryō.’

2) *Oume o hoshi-i bakari de, ...*
   ‘I only want Oume.’

(Shibatani 1978, 231-232)

As mentioned in Chapter 1, there are also several instances of accusatively marked NPs with *suki* and *kirai* in contemporary literature, as well as in literature from the Shōwa-period. Additionally, looking at the corpus data to be analyzed in the following chapter reveals that the average age of users of accusative marking with these predicates is well over 50. While older people might be overrepresented in this dataset, due to the sentences being gathered from books, it at least reveals that the use of accusatively marked N2s with these types of stative predicates is not limited to younger speakers.

### 5.2 Generative analyses

Although I am working within the greater discipline of Cognitive Linguistics (as outlined in Chapter 2) in this thesis, no account of the previous research on this topic would be complete without looking at the foundation built by generative grammarians. Despite the fact that generativists and cognitivists interpret data in different ways, it is important to recognize that

---

28 Historical Japanese currency used before the adoption of the Yen.
29 Note that age is only available for half of the BCCWJ-data set (e.g. the sentences gathered from literature) as the online forum data does not provide age of utterer/writer.
scholars such as Tokieda, Kuno, and Shibatani made meaningful contributions in gathering
data and shedding light on several different phenomena. Additionally, analysing the data and
arguments put forth by these scholars by applying a CL-framework can lead to new insight.
The following sub-sections have therefore been dedicated to reviewing some of the most
influential work on this topic made by those working within various varieties of Generative
Grammar.

5.2.1 Tokieda (1941)

As early as in 1941, Tokieda observed that certain predicates such as *hoshii* differ
semantically from other adjectives (Tokieda 1990, 374). Tokieda pointed out that while most
adjectives tend to describe attributes of their NPs, these predicates rather represent subjective
feelings of one NP aimed towards the other. Let us consider the following examples, slightly
altered from Kuno (1973a), contrasting the two former with the two latter:

3) *Watashi wa kono hon no suji ga omoshiro-i.*
   I TOP this book GEN plot NOM interesting-PRS
   ‘I am fond of (find interesting) the plot of this book.’

4) *Kono hon no suji ga omoshiro-i.*
   this book GEN plot NOM interesting-PRS
   ‘It is the plot of this story that is interesting.’

5) *Watashi wa okane ga hoshi-i.*
   I TOP money NOM want-PRS
   ‘I want money.’

6) *Okane ga hoshii-i.*
   money NOM want-PRS
   ‘(I) want money.’
   (Kuno 1973a, 91-92)

We see that *omoshiroi* ‘interesting’ can be interpreted as expressing subjective feelings
towards the NP in 3, but in sentence 4, *omoshiroi* ‘interesting’ is rather describing an attribute
of the book’s plot. In contrast, *hoshii* ‘want’ implies subjective feelings towards the NP in
both cases, and the interpretation of *only* describing a feature of the NP is not available.
Although this contrast might not be one hundred percent clear, since the feature of ‘interesting’
also conceptually (although perhaps not overtly) implies someone to experience the
interesting-*ness*, one could easily present another predicate, such as *atsui* ‘hot’ or *aoi* ‘blue’,
for which an objective standard does actually exist (e.g. the presence/absence of thermal
motion, a certain wavelength of light). Sentences such as *taiyō ga atsui* ‘the sun is hot’, for
instance, clearly describe a feature of the NP more than those such as *okane ga hoshii* ‘(I) want money’ do. The consequence of this observation is perhaps that whether or not these adjectives express subjective feelings of objective characteristics is a question of degree, rather than a black/white distinction. In this context, the conclusion is that predicates such as *hoshii* (and *suki* and *kirai*) exist on the subjective end of this spectrum.

5.2.2 Kuno (1973a)

Like Tokieda, Kuno (1973a) also contrasts these predicates with other adjectives and nominal adjectives, but does so based on syntactic features rather than the interpretation of the predicates themselves. Kuno observes that the sentences in which these predicates appear most often contain two overt TOP/NOM-marked NPs, and attempts to analyze the function of these nominals. Although there are several constructions in Japanese where A/NAs appear with more than one TOP/NOM marked NP – notably the ‘double subject construction’ – Kuno argues that the predicates in question (*suki* and *hoshii* in Kuno’s analysis) exhibit characteristics different from that of these other predicates. Notably, the sentences become elliptical with the removal of one of the NPs. Consider the following sentences:

7) *Bunmeikoku ga dansei no heikin-jumyō ga mijika-i.*
   civilized.countries NOM male GEN average-life.span NOM short-PRS
   ‘It is the civilized countries that males’ average life-span is short in.’
   *(Double subject construction)*

8) *Watakushi ga eiga ga suki desu.*
   I NOM movie NOM like COP.POL
   ‘I like movies.’

9) *Dansei no heikin-jumyō ga mijika-i.*
   male GEN average-life.span NOM short-PRS
   ‘It is the males’ average life-span that is short.’

10) *Eiga ga suki desu.*
    movies NOM like COP
    ‘(I) like movies.’ *(Kuno 1973a, 80)*

Kuno points out that while the double subject construction in 7) yields a perfectly acceptable sentence even when the first NP (*bunmeikoku* ‘civilized countries’) is removed (sentence 9), the sentence with *suki* ‘like’ in 8) yields an incomplete elliptical sentence when the *watakushi* ‘I’ subject is removed (sentence 10).30 This is evident from the English translation, as

---

30 This intuition is shared by Mano (2004, 10).
sentence 10) is still interpreted as “[missing NP] likes movies”.\textsuperscript{31} Although the type of examples used are very similar to those of Tokieda, Kuno’s argument is built on the obligatory inclusion of two arguments (in this case TOP/NOM-marked NPs), and not on the subjective or objective interpretation of the predicates. Based on this analysis, Kuno refers to these particular predicates (\textit{suki, kirai, hoshii} and \textit{kowai ‘scary/fearful’}), as “transitive adjectives and nominal adjectives” (Kuno 1973a, 82). He further goes on to state that the nominal particle \textit{ga} is used for marking objects of stative predicates, and argues that the reason why we observe “non-canonical marking” (e.g. \textit{ga} instead of \textit{o}) is that these predicates express states and not actions. Based on this, it would seem that the NOM/ACC case-alternation observed with these predicates could be caused by the predicates’ interpretation becoming less state-like and more event-like, as the accusative \textit{o} marks the object of non-stative verbs. Indeed, Kuno himself comments on the fact that some derivations of these predicates – notably the \textit{garu} forms\textsuperscript{32} – occur exclusively with the accusative:

\begin{quote}
11) \textit{John wa eiga o/*ga mita-gat-ta.} \\
\text{John TOP movie ACC/*NOM watch-3P.EXP-PST} \\
\text{‘John showed a sign of being anxious to see movies.’} (judgment in original, Kuno 1973, 84)
\end{quote}

Kuno attributes this phenomenon to the fact that the addition of the \textit{-garu} suffix changes the meaning of the adjective from an internal feeling into “outward manifestation of internal feeling” (Kuno 1973, 84). As such, the reason for the change in case-particle could be attributed to the heightened event-likeness of the sentence. Within Kuno’s framework, the case-alternation which is the subject of this thesis does not seem so strange. If A/NAs are indeed transitive, and the particle \textit{ga} is used to mark objects of transitive stative predicates, a more event-like interpretation of the predicates in question would logically entail that they are given the regular accusative transitivity-marker \textit{o}. It would then simply be a case of previously irregularly-marked transitive predicates shifting to the regular marking.

\textsuperscript{31} Missing subjects usually default to the speaker, which is the reason for the (I) appearing in the translation of sentence 10.

\textsuperscript{32} See section 3.2.2 of chapter 3.
5.2.3 Shibatani (2001 and 1978) (Generative/Cognitive)\(^{33}\)

Shibatani (2001) seems to agree with Tokieda’s (1941) and Kuno’s (1973a) classifications of predicates such as suki, kirai, and hoshii as deviating from the normal, canonical constructions of Japanese, and points out that predicates expressing psychological states often figure in non-canonical patterns cross-linguistically (Shibatani 2001, 311-312). He disagrees with both Kuno and Tokieda, however, in regard to the transitive\(^{34}\) analysis of the A/NAs. Stating that he is “advancing the commonsensical hypothesis that adjectives and adjectival nominals are intransitive” (ibid., 325), Shibatani aims to show how these predicates are simply a special form of intransitive predication. His main argument is built around the claim that the N\(_2\) functions not as an object, but rather that both NPs are subjects. To illustrate this difference in view, Kuno’s, Tokieda’s and Shibatani’s analyses of sentences with this type of predicate are rendered below:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{verbatim}
12) Boku ga eiga ga suki da.
   I NOM movie NOM like COP ‘I like movies.’

13) [Boku ga eiga ga suki da] (Tokieda)\(^{36}\)
    SUBJ OBJ OBJECTIVE\(^{35}\) PRED

14) [Boku ga eiga ga suki da] (Kuno)
    SUBJ OBJ OBJ PRED

15) [Boku ga eiga ga suki da] (Shibatani)
    Large SUBJ Small SUBJ OBJ PRED
\end{verbatim}
\end{footnotesize}

Shibatani demonstrates the subject-likeness of the N\(_2\) through showing that it exhibits several characteristics traditionally associated with subjects. Among these are the ability to trigger honorification, and the ability to antecede the reflexive pronoun jibun ‘oneself’. He further states that the construction above is just a version of the double subject construction with which Kuno contrasted it, arguing that the elliptical nature of sentences such as 10) above is caused by the semantics of the predicates, in that they express subjective rather than objective

---

\(^{33}\) Shibatani began his career within the Generative framework, but his later research has taken on a more Cognitive tack. The articles which I am discussing here, however, seem to skew towards the Generative end of the spectrum, considering they mainly revolve around distributional features and diagnostics-tests.

\(^{34}\) It is debatable whether Tokieda’s (1941) analysis really conceives of the A/NAs as transitive, seeing as the term used is OBJECTIVE, rather than OBJECT. See the footnote below.

\(^{35}\) In Tokieda’s analysis, OBJECTIVE case (taishô-kaka) is used in sentences expressing psychological conditions, and is assigned to the element which elicits the emotional reaction undergone by the subject (Tokieda 1990, 374). Shibatani interprets this as an “object (goal) towards which subjective feelings are directed” (Shibatani 2001, 315)

\(^{36}\) Tokieda does not explicitly mention the suki-predicate in his analysis – instead focusing on hoshii – but the observations made readily carry over to this predicate.
features. For Shibatani, the NP (eiga ‘movie’) in 10) functions as a subject, while the N₁ included in 8) specifies a domain in which 10) is true (Shibatani 2001, 332). He shows that the same tendency is present in traditional examples of the double subject construction:

16) Zō ga/wa hana ga naga-i.
   elephant NOM/TOP nose NOM long-PRS
   ‘The elephant’s nose is long / elephants have long noses’ (Shibatani 2001, 329)

17) Ai ga/wa ano hito ga suki da.
   Ai NOM/TOP that person NOM like COP
   ‘Ai likes that person.’ (ibid., 337)

18) Hana ga/wa naga-i.
   nose NOM/TOP long-PRS
   ‘A nose is long.’ (ibid., 330)

19) ??Ano hito wa/ga suki da.
   that person NOM/TOP like COP
   ‘Like that person’
   (judgment in original, ibid., 337)

According to Shibatani, the sentences in 18) and 19) are not ungrammatical, but the strangeness is rather a consequence of the sentences’ truth-values. Because not all noses are long, and because not everyone likes ‘that person’, the sentences in 18) and 19) require a domain in which their propositions hold true. In the case of 16) and 17), this domain is limited to zō ‘elephants’ and Ai ‘Ai’, respectively.

If we adhere to Shibatani’s intransitive interpretation of the A/NAs, the reason for the case-alternation becomes less clear. If the predicates in question are intransitive, and merely predicate over the second subject-nominal – with the first specifying the domain in which the predication takes place – it is strange that such a subject should suddenly receive marking traditionally associated with objects. Shibatani briefly mentions the NOM/ACC alternation observed with suki, however, and speculates that this particular NA might be “couched in the canonical framework” (Shibatani 2001, 314). It is somewhat unclear what exactly Shibatani means by this, but it is worth noting that he – in contrasting the A/NAs with their verbal counterparts – mentions that the canonical constructions more often contain a larger degree of control or volitionality (ibid., 352). If the suki predicate is indeed “couched in the canonical framework”, perhaps this means that it exhibits some of these same volitional characteristics. Shibatani does mention, however, that it is difficult to pinpoint a difference between nominatively and accusatively marked instances of suki (ibid., 315).

---
37 The translation here is more of a literal interpretation, rather than what a native-speaker would likely interpret them to mean.
In an earlier work (Shibatani 1978), Shibatani mentions the NOM-ACC alternation in regard to a phenomenon he calls *ga-o-conversion*. In this article, he argues that the substitution of *o* for *ga* is part of a perceptual strategy to avoid ambiguity, and points out that *o*-marked objects are particularly common in sentences in which the object and the verb are separated by other elements, such as adverbials (ibid. 470). His claim is that an NP followed by a *ga* particle marks the beginning of a ‘sentential clause’, and that this can sometimes lead to perceived unacceptability of grammatically sound sentences such as the one below:

20) ??Boku *ga* sushi *ga* kimi *to* issho-*ni* tabe-*ta*-i.  
   I NOM sushi NOM you COM together-DAT eat-DESID-PRS  
‘I want to eat sushi with you.’  
(judgment in original, Shibatani 1975, 470)

The idea, then, is that *ga-o-conversion* is a tool to avoid such ambiguity – by substituting *o* for *ga*, the misleading analysis is avoided and the sentence becomes more natural:

21) Boku *ga* sushi *o* kimi *to* issho-*ni* tabe-*ta*-i.  
   I NOM sushi ACC you COM together-DAT eat-DESID-PRS  
‘I want to eat sushi with you.’  
(my judgment)

While this theory seems to explain certain occurrences of the NOM-ACC pattern, it does not readily account for all (or even most) instances of the pattern. The explanatory value of this theory is assessed in the questionnaire of chapter 7 (particularly section 7.2.5).

5.3   Cognitive analyses

Having surveyed the most important generative analyses pertaining to these particular predicates, I now move on to examining some of the research conducted within the cognitive tradition.

5.3.1   Makino (1996)

In a similar vein to Shibatani (2001), Makino (1996) argues that the second NP in sentences such as 12) is indeed a subject. He aims to show this by appealing to the rule that the *ga* marking of subjects in dependent clauses can usually be interchanged with the genitive *no*, while this substitution is not typically acceptable with objects. Consider the following
examples, where 22) is a sentence with a subordinate subject, 23) is a sentence with an object, and 24) is a subordinate clause with *suki* and an N:

22) *Furansu ga/no okonata kaku-jiken wa tsuyoku hihan-sare-ta.*
   France NOM/GEN conduct-PAST nuclear-test TOP strongly criticize-PASS-PAST
   ‘The nuclear test which France conducted was strongly criticized.’

23) *Boku ga shōsetsu o/*no kai-ta riyū wa toku-ni na-i.*
   I NOM novel ACC/GEN write-PAST reason TOP especially exist-NEG-PRS
   ‘There’s no particular reason why I wrote (this) novel.’

24) *Dōryō no Yoshikawa ga/no suki na kanojo.*
   colleague GEN Yoshikawa NOM/GEN like COP girl
   ‘The girl who likes my colleague Yoshikawa.’

As we can see, the nominative marking on the N associated with *suki* is exchangeable with the genitive *no*, leading Makino to conclude that it is a subject (Makino 1996, 98). Unlike Shibatani, however, Makino believes there to be a semantic difference between nominatively and accusatively marked instances of these types of predicates. He argues that sentences in which the second NP (N) is nominatively marked exhibit a greater degree of spontaneity, and avers that sentences like 25) below are especially unacceptable with accusative marking:

25) *Boku wa kimi ga/?o suki de suki de tamaranai-n desu.*
   I TOP you NOM/ACC like COP like COP unbearable-NMZ-COP
   ‘I like you so much I cannot bear it.’ (Judgment in original, Makino 1996, 99)

In the sentence above, the repetition of the NA *suki* and the inclusion of the adjective *tamaranai* ‘unbearable’ increase the spontaneity of the situation described by the sentence, and this leads speakers to prefer the nominative *ga* over the accusative *o* (Makino 1996, 99).

5.3.2 Jarkey (1999)

At odds with the interpretations of Shibatani and Makino above, Jarkey (1999) argues for a more straightforwardly transitive interpretation of sentences with predicates such as *suki*, seemingly based off Kuno’s (1973a) analysis. Jarkey considers the NA-predicates in conjunction with stative verbs and other derivatives, such as -*tai* desideratives and potential forms, and argues that the case-alternation observed with these predicates is a direct consequence of the transitivity of the clauses in which they occur. In Shibatani’s analysis above, these non-canonical constructions were interpreted as a special case of the intransitive double-subject construction, but in Jarkey’s framework, it rather seems like they are a special
case of canonical transitive construction. The nominative marking most commonly associated with these predicates is not a result of their derivation from double-subject constructions, but rather a consequence of their clauses’ generally low transitivity-values (Jarkey 1999, 206-207). Because clauses involving these predicates exhibit so few of the conceptual characteristics associated with transitivity, they are generally not marked as canonical transitive constructions despite containing two arguments (NPs). According to Jarkey: “in stative clauses which in some way exhibit more of the features of transitivity, the object\(^{38}\) is more likely to be marked accusatively; in stative clauses which exhibit fewer of such features, the object is more likely to be marked nominatively” (ibid., 207). Jarkey also points out that the variance in case-marker is not likely to be motivated by any single transitivity-related factor, but rather by the combination of several different factors. It is also worth noting that Jarkey does not preclude other, syntax-related, factors as playing a part in accounting for the case-alternation. Factors such as distance between the object and the predicate, as well as the historical origin (e.g. native vs. Sino-Japanese) of the predicate are also believed to influence the choice of case-marker.

Although Jarkey’s main hypothesis is that the case-alternation can be accounted for by looking at the existence of transitivity-raising factors, she believes some of these factors to be more influential than others. In particular, the three factors 1) ‘the nature of the predicate’; 2) ‘the degree of intention or control exhibited by the subject’; and 3) ‘the degree of individuation of the object’ are thought to be important, with 1 and 2 being the most significant factors (Jarkey 1999, 212). Because the first factor pertains to differences between different predicates, and not between clauses with the same predicates, it will not be examined in detail here. The two other factors, however, are tied to the NOM/ACC alternation ‘within’ predicates, and therefore warrant a closer look. As for the second factor, ‘the degree of intention or control exhibited by the subject’, Jarkey argues that accusative marking is more preferable the more volition is expressed by the clause in which it figures. She uses examples from two novels by Shinichi Hoshi (1971), and asserts that the choice of accusative marking with the suki-predicate in these cases can be explained by looking at the intentional nature of the ‘actions’. The accusative marking is invoked by this intentional nature, despite there being

\(^{38}\) The term ‘object’ is kept in direct quotations, but the NPs in question are referred to as N\(_2\)s in the remaining discussion. This is because there is still a significant amount of controversy surrounding the correct term for the second NPs of suki/kirai/hoshii-clauses, of which an exhaustive discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis.
no overt intention-raising morpheme in the clauses (Jarkey 1999, 218). This argument is also strengthened by showing that similar stative predicates exhibit the same tendencies. For desiderative predicates, which exhibit a case-alternation to the A/NAs, Jarkey presents the following examples:

26) Okashi o/ga kai-ta-i.
   sweets ACC/NOM buy-DESID-PRS
   ‘I want to buy some sweets.’

27) Okashi o/ga tabe-ta-i.
   sweets ACC/NOM eat-DESID-PRS
   ‘I want to eat some sweets.’

(judgments in original, Jarkey (1999, 207))

Jarkey’s argument is that while 27) simply expresses a “spontaneous feeling of desire”, 26) refers not only to the feeling of wanting to purchase sweets, but also an intention to actually do so. This would mean that 26) contains a more marked presence of volition, leading to a higher acceptability of the accusative marking. Jarkey also provides similar examples for potential forms of verbs.

In regard to the third factor, Jarkey argues that accusative marking seems to be associated with more individuated, definite NPs (e.g. anata ‘you’, and kono chansu ‘this chance’), while nominatively marked NPs are more often less specific and individuated (e.g. tema ‘trouble’, and daiteitaku ‘(a) large residence’). Although the number of sentences used to make this argument is relatively low (12), the accusative-marking+individuated-NP correlation seems to be relatively clear within the data.

5.3.3 Mano (2004)

Working within Radical Construction Grammar, as advocated by Croft (2001), Mano (2004) suggests that non-canonical constructions (in which these predicates figure), occupy a sort of liminal category between intransitive and transitive constructions. She argues that the differences between non-canonical constructions and the canonical transitive/intransitive constructions can be expressed by appealing to the concept of conceptual space. She presents a two dimensional model, with “time stability (jikanteki-jizokusei)” and “amount of prominent participants (takuritsu-shita sanyo shita no kazu)” as the two axes, and argues that these are the

---

39 Due to the length of the sentences, as well as the large amount of contextual information needed to show the reasoning behind Jarkey’s inferences, the examples have been omitted here. For readers interested in the details of the analysis, I refer to pages 216–219 of Jarkey (1999).
main variables explaining the differences between the various constructions. She further points out that most non-canonical constructions are state-like (which is typical for intransitives), but also contain 2 prominent participants (which is typical for transitive constructions) (Mano 2004, 8). This results in the following distribution:

**Figure 5-1  Conceptual space of non-canonical constructions**

What separates the non-canonical constructions from transitive ones is thus the stability of the event/state expressed by the construction. She also notes that there is a large overlap between predicates which undergo the NOM-ACC alternation, and predicates which yield elliptical sentences when one of the NPs is omitted (similar to Kuno’s view). Mano further makes use of Givon’s (1984) argument that emotional expressions express temporary states, and are as such less time-stable than expressions of possession (e.g. aru ‘be’, dekiru ‘be able to’, jōzu ‘skillful’) and judgments (e.g. muzukashii ‘difficult’, kantan ‘easy’). This is backed up by the fact that they are more acceptable together with expressions like isshun ‘for a moment’ (Mano 2004, 16). It follows from the lower time-stability of these expressions that they are closer to events, and thus also closer to the transitive prototype (Mano 2004, 16). In line with Shibatani, she also supposes that the main difference between the verbal and adjectival versions of the predicates (e.g. between kirau and kirai) is that the verbal counterparts contain an element of controllability (seigyo-kanō), and argues that speakers make use of the verbal versions when they wish to express this nuance (Mano 2004, 17).
5.4 Previous empirical studies

The analyses presented above are mainly based on the intuitive linguistic knowledge of the writers. They make use of their own acceptability judgments, and their personal interpretation of nominatively/accusatively marked sentences. This section is devoted to examining one of the few existing empirical studies – Caluianu (2009) – pertaining to the case alternation observed with A/NAs.

5.4.1 Caluianu (2009)

Drawing on both scholars within the Generative and Cognitive tradition, Caluianu (2009) performs one of the first empirical studies on the case-alternation with nominal adjectives. Her paper is based on the observations made by several of the scholars above, including Shibatani, Makino and Mano. Caluianu’s study is separated into three parts: 1. a small preliminary survey of the acceptability of the NOM-ACC construction with a nominal adjective, 2. an online survey using the Google search-engine, and 3. a survey involving the passive forms of kirau ‘dislike (verb)’ and suku ‘like (verb)’ in addition to a follow-up of this. I will now briefly discuss all three parts in succession.

The preliminary survey consisted of the author asking 9 university professors about their intuitions regarding the grammaticality of the NOM-ACC construction with suki. The results of this small study seem to suggest that there is a great deal of disagreement as to the grammaticality of the construction: 4/9 reported it to be grammatical, 4/9 to be ungrammatical, and 1/9 refrained from making judgment. In all cases where the construction was perceived to be ungrammatical, the participants suggested replacing the accusative marker with a nominative one (e.g. o with ga), or substituting the NAs with a corresponding verb (e.g. suki da with suku) (Caluianu 2009, 233-234).

The online survey, performed by counting the frequency of various case-marker+predicate configurations, and then surveying the 100 first usage-examples, also revealed some significant tendencies. In particular, the survey showed correlations between case-marker and the two factors of participant animacy and type of configuration (e.g. whether the predicate occurred at the end of the sentence or pre-nominally). In regard to animacy, Caluianu found that accusative marking is more strongly preferred (for suki and kirai, but not for hoshii) when the N₂ is higher on the animacy hierarchy. This tendency, which potentially suggests a less
transitive interpretation of the clauses, due to the high animacy of the direct object (see sections 2.4.2 and 6.2.4), might be partially explained by another finding Caluianu makes: Accusatively marked predicates (especially in inchoative forms, see section 6.2.2 of Chapter 6) more commonly express feelings, while nominatively marked predicates more commonly express preferences. Compare the following examples:

28) Neko wa kudamono ga suki.
cat TOP fruit NOM like
‘Cats like fruit.’

29) Tanin o suki ni nat-ta(ri)...
other.people ACC like DAT become-PST
‘Beginning to like other people…’ (slightly edited from Caluianu 2009, 236-237)

While sentence 28 above expresses the cat’s preference for fruit, sentence 29 expresses the (non-overt) subject’s feelings towards the tanin ‘other people’ NP. Caluianu suggests that this distribution might be a sign that the two different constructions involve different senses of the predicate (Caluianu 2009, 246). This would then mean that the predicates have undergone (or are undergoing) a semantic split, in which the different constructions take on slightly different meanings. This particular finding is examined in more detail in sections 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 of Chapter 6.

Another interesting observation Caluianu makes in regard to the suki-predicate is the increase in frequency of its NOM-ACC-pattern. A Google-search for this predicate in its NOM-NOM and NOM-ACC patterns conducted in July 2004 revealed the numbers 2,980,000 (for NOM-NOM) and 331,000 (for NOM-ACC). However, the same search conducted three years later in 2007, yielded the numbers 3,230,000 and 2,420,000, respectively (Caluianu 2009, 254). What this means is that while there was an increase of about 8.4% for the NOM-NOM-pattern, the NOM-ACC-pattern saw an increase of incredible 731.1%. While Caluianu does not specify exactly how she conducted these searches, and points out that the increases might be due in part to improvements in software-technology, the difference in the relative growth of the numbers is nevertheless staggering.

The last major section of Caluianu’s article deals with what she calls the “Passive Survey”. The underlying motivation for this is the hypothesis that the NOM/ACC alternation can be explained by an association between the A/NAs and the passive form of these predicates’ verbal equivalents. Caluianu therefore conducted an experiment in which she presented native speakers with sentences involving the passive forms of the verbs suku and kirau (sukareru
and kirawareru, respectively), and asked them to provide the corresponding active versions. In regard to the results, constructions involving the verbs kirau and suku accounted for 78% and 22% of the answers, respectively. Additionally, adjectives were used in 9.9% of the kirawareru-passives and 45.5% of the sukareru-passives. Of these adjectival-constructions, 22% (for kirai) and 37% (for suki) exhibited the NOM-ACC-pattern. However, Caluianu found no correlation between preference for adjective constructions and the NOM-ACC pattern – on the contrary, in the cases where many speakers chose to make use of the adjectives in writing the active sentence, the NPs were more prone to be marked nominatively. This effect is evident in Figure 2 below (Caluianu 2009, 244):40

**Figure 5-2  Proportion of adjectival constructions**

![Figure 5-2 Proportion of adjectival constructions](image)

Here, we can clearly see that the sentences which showed a high preference for adjectives (for instance 9, 12 and 14) also have significantly lower amounts of accusative markings, while some sentences in which less respondents made use of adjectives (such as 13, and to some extent 11) had a corresponding higher preference for ACC-marking. As Caluianu points out, this seems to go against the hypothesis that the association with the passive-forms is (partly) responsible for the prevalence of the NOM-ACC construction (Caluianu 2009, 245)

---

40 The numbers on the X-axis refer to the sentence-number (e.g. sentence #7 has the value 7), while the Y-axis describes the percentage of answers.
5.5 Summary

It is worth noting that while the generative studies are mostly focused on determining the transitivity/intransitivity of the constructions, the studies in the cognitive camp are more concerned with determining how transitive the constructions are. This reflects the dichotomous/gradient distinction between Generative and Cognitive linguistics (see section 2.3.1 of chapter 2). Within the Generative camp, there is a significant disagreement about the nature of the second nominals of the clauses in which the A/NAs figure. While some scholars analyze this construction as a type of offshoot of the canonical transitive construction (e.g. (Tokieda and Kuno), others view it as a special case of the double-nominative construction (e.g. Shibatani). This divide is perhaps fitting, as the constructions themselves exhibit both canonical transitive o-marking and the traditionally subject-associated ga-marking. Additionally, the various generative and cognitive scholars have different hypotheses for the motivation behind the case-alternation, but many of these show some similarities. Some of the main issues are discussed in the two sections below.

5.5.1 The predicative nature of A/NAs

One of the points of contention for the various scholars is the predicative scope of the A/NAs. While most of the scholars above seem to believe that suki, kirai, and hoshii do not merely predicate over their immediately preceding nominal (e.g. the N₂), but also over the first nominal (e.g. the N₁), Shibatani argues that the N₁ merely provides a domain in which the A/NAs predication over N₁ holds true. I believe that the way one views the predicates’ predication strongly ties into the semantic content one assigns to them, and will attempt to elucidate this with an example:

30) Misaki wa Tarō ga/o suki da.
    Misaki TOP Tarō NOM/ACC like COP
    T1: ‘When it comes to Misaki, Tarō is likable.’
    T2: ‘Misaki likes Tarō.’

Following Shibatani’s analysis, Translation 1 above is perhaps the most correct way of rendering the situation described by sentence 30. The NA predicates over Tarō (e.g. it describes a feature of Tarō), and the N₁ is a large subject which specifies the domain in which this holds true (e.g. for Misaki). In most of the other analyses, however, the predicate is perceived as predicking over both Misaki and Tarō, where Misaki is the subject and Tarō is
the ‘object’. In this case, it is less a matter of the suki-predicate denoting a feature of Tarō, but more so a matter of Misaki experiencing an emotion towards Tarō (illustrated in Translation 2). Seeing as this thesis falls within the scope of cognitive linguistics, where categories such as subject and object are gradient concepts, I do not see a need to make decisive statements as to which of these analyses is ‘correct’. I will say, however, that I personally find the emotional analysis somewhat more convincing (see the discussion in section 4.2.2 of Chapter 4).

5.5.2 Potential reasons for the case-alternation

Although the scholars whose work was discussed above are working within very different theoretical frameworks and disagree on many fronts, there seems to be some degree of consensus in the hypotheses behind the case alternation. In Kuno’s (1973a) analysis, the NOM-marking on the A/NAs N2s is explained by their stative quality. Additionally, the difference between the transitive -garu forms (which take accusative marking) and the adjectives is that the former exhibits “outward manifestation of internal feeling” (Kuno 1973a, 84), which arguably makes them closer to the transitive prototype.41 Despite his disagreements with Kuno, Shibatani (2001) seems to make the argument that certain NAs (particularly suki) are coached in the canonical transitive-framework, and perhaps suggests that the most important feature lacking in the NAs is the presence of “volition”. Although he does not overtly comment on this, it is possible that this means that more intentional interpretations would lead to a greater preference for canonical (NOM-ACC) marking. Makino (1996) has similar intuitions about this, arguing that NOM-NOM patterns are more common when the sentence exhibits a greater degree of spontaneity. By extension, the NOM-ACC pattern could potentially be motivated by an increasingly volitional interpretation. Jarkey (1999) argues that the case-alternation is a consequence of the varying transitivity of the clauses containing the predicates, highlighting the predicate’s nature (e.g. origin, derivedness), intention, and object-individuation as the main factors. Since all the predicates discussed in this thesis are undervield and of Japanese origin (as opposed to Sino-Japanese words), the two latter factors are most relevant to this particular alternation. Mano (2001) largely agrees with Jarkey regarding the claim of the transitivity of the predicate-containing clauses, but rather

41 Do note that Kuno does not refer to any ‘transitive prototype’ in his book, and that this is my personal extension of his analysis.
sees the predicates location in the “conceptual space” as the most important factor in assessing the transitivity of said clauses. She argues that two features – *time stability* and *amount of prominent participants* – are the main explanatory variables for the transitivity of a clause, and argues that predicates such as *suki, kirai,* and *hoshii* occupy a sort of liminal category in this mental space. Lastly, Caluianu argues that the case-alternation (at least for the *suki* and *kirai* predicates) is partly motivated by a semantic split, in which the accusatively marked versions of the predicates describe *(romantic) feelings*, while the nominatively marked versions express *preferences*. While this is merely conjecture, one could perhaps argue that the *(romantic) feelings* sense might be somewhat closer to the transitive prototype than the *preferences* sense. Because of the existence of conceptual metaphors such as *LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE* (see section 2.5), it might be possible that these situations are more strongly associated with the prototype. Caluianu’s other hypothesis – that the case-alternation is partly motivated by the association between the adjectives and the passives of their verbal counterparts – does not seem to have been supported by the data. Summing up, we see that most of the researchers emphasize either event-likeness (non-state-likeness or lack of time-stability) or volitionality (intentionality, controllability) as the motivation for accusative case-marking. These are both factors closely associated with *transitivity* (see section 2.4.3). The working hypothesis of this thesis is therefore in line with the findings of previous examinations – that the NOM/ACC alternation is associated with the degree of transitivity of the predicate-containing clause. This hypothesis is tested in the two following chapters (6 and 7).
6 The corpus studies

6.0 Purpose of the studies

The purpose of these corpus studies is to empirically test the transitivity-hypothesis presented in the introduction and discussed in the previous chapter. The main hypothesis which will be tested is that the case-alternation correlates with increasingly transitive interpretations of the predicates’ clauses. I will therefore be looking for the presence of the transitivity criteria presented in section 2.4.3 (and explored in Chapter 3), and comparing their presence/absence between instantiations of the predicates with nominatively and accusatively marked NPs. Additionally, I aim to examine the predicates’ frequency of use.

6.0.1 Structure of the chapter

The chapter is split into three major parts. The first part, consisting of sections 6.1 through 6.1.3.1, is devoted to a number of preliminaries, including a presentation of the corpora (6.1.1), a justification of why I chose these corpora in particular (6.1.1.1), some of the shortcomings of the corpora (6.1.1.2), an overview of the tools made use of in conducting the analysis (6.1.2), and a description of the method of analysis for both the statistical and in-depth analyses (6.1.3 through 6.1.3.2). The second part – the statistical analysis – comprises sections 6.2 through 6.2.5. With the exception of 6.2.5, all subsections are committed to presenting and analyzing the data gathered from the corpus. Section 6.2.5, however, is used to present a plausible explanation for the prevalence of the suki-predicate in the analysis. Lastly, in the third major part – encompassing sections 6.3 through 6.3.3 – I present and discuss the in-depth sentence analysis conducted on the corpora. Section 6.3.1 contains an explanation of the findings, while sections 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 are used to examine the findings from the two corpora, and looking at the possibility of a semantic split in regards to the suki and kirai predicates.

6.1 Methodology

In the following sub-sections (6.1.1 through 6.1.3.2) I present the sources of the data, and the methods applied to retrieve and analyze said data.
6.1.1 Corpora used

For my analysis I chose to make use of two separate corpora, namely the “Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese” (henceforth BCCWJ) and the “Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese” (henceforth CSJ). Both of these corpora are distributed by the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (henceforth NINJAL). As evident from the names of the corpora, BCCWJ is a written-language corpus, while CSJ is a spoken-language corpus. BCCWJ contains randomly selected data from a wide variety of sources, such as books, magazines, newspapers, internet forums and legal documents, totaling approximately 104.3 million words (NINJAL, n.d.)\(^{42}\). On the other hand, CSJ was developed by NINJAL in a joint effort with the National Institute of Information and Communications technology (NICT) and the Tokyo Institute of Technology, and consists of 658 hours of speech-recordings (the majority of which are monologues) made by these institutes (Maekawa, Kikuchi and Tsukahara 2004, 19). After being transcribed into written text, the word-count totals about 7.5 million words.

6.1.1.1 Choice of corpora

There are several reasons why I chose to make use of these corpora. Allow me first to explain my reasoning for choosing BCCWJ. BCCWJ is the first 100 million words balanced corpus for written Japanese. Although corpora with a larger total word-count exist, these are mainly created through automatic internet-crawling, and therefore contain less reliable information about word-usage and ‘part of speech’-classifications (e.g. what word-class words belong to).\(^{43}\) Additionally, the data for the BCCWJ has been gathered through randomization from several different sources, in order to maximize the representativeness of the data. A study conducted by Maekawa et al. concluded that the corpus contains a higher degree of textual diversity than other corpora previously used for linguistic studies of Japanese (Maekawa et al. 2014, 370). The BCCWJ is therefore well suited to providing an overview of the prominence and usage-frequency of the predicates and patterns which are the subject of this thesis.

\(^{42}\) For a more in-depth look on how the data-selection process was conducted, see https://www.ninjal.ac.jp/english/database/type/corpora/
\(^{43}\) It is also worth noting that these corpora are prone to not accurately represent the prevalence of constructions, as there seems to be several sites with the same phrase/sentence repeated over and over, upwards of 50 times. In an internet-crawling corpus, these would all be counted individually, leading to significant biases in the data. See, for instance, NINJAL’s “Web Japanese Corpus”, http://pj.ninjal.ac.jp/corpus_center/nwjc/
The other corpus I have made use of – CSJ – was originally envisioned to be the sole corpus on which I would base these studies. Due to the limited amount of data available, however, I decided that it would be best to also include the BCCWJ. There are two, interconnected, reasons why I wanted CSJ to be the base of the study: 1. Spoken language is generally less restricted by normative grammar-rules; and 2. CSJ is the largest available spoken language corpus of Japanese. Additionally, the transcription of CSJ involved a standardization of kanji-usage, which makes it significantly easier to conduct searches and retrieve the data (e.g. one does not have to search for both 「好き suki」and 「すき suki」 in order to find all the instantiations of suki) (Maekawa, Kikuchi and Tsukahara 2004, 2). Although, as mentioned in the previous section, the main source of data for CSJ comes from monologues, the creators of the corpus also recorded dialogues and reading data from a selection of the monologue-contributors, in order to provide a comparison for the monologue-data (and presumably to control for biases in the data) (ibid., 2).

6.1.1.2 Weaknesses of the corpora

Although the corpora used here were deemed to be the most appropriate for the study at hand, they do have their methodological weaknesses. For the sake of transparency, and to avoid unwarranted generalizations, I will here briefly outline the problems present in the two corpora.

Let us first consider the BCCWJ. Although the BCCWJ is a balanced corpus, which contains materials from a wide variety of sources, the temporal spectrum from which these materials hail is somewhat more limited. The oldest data included dates back to 1971 (although some of this was re-publishings of books which were written much earlier), with the newest having been gathered in 2008. While some material-categories – including books, legal documents and national diet-recordings – contain data from a span as large as 30 years (1976-2005), much of the data gathered from the internet stems from a singular year (such as 2005 or 2008). Because this study is – to some degree – intended to reflect current linguistic trends, a balanced corpus which also contains data for the period 2008-2019 would have been ideal, but unfortunately I have been unable to procure such a database.

The CSJ suffers from many of the same problems that the BCCWJ does. The CSJ was created between 1999 and 2003, a span of merely 4 years. Although an impressive feat on the part of
the creators, this also means that all data contained in the corpus was gathered during this
time-frame. As such, the corpus has a very synchronic nature, capturing the linguistic trends
within that specific time-frame. Ideally, one would therefore prefer a corpus with data
gathered more closely to the time of conducting this study (2018). Additionally, although the
word-count of the CSJ is impressive in its own right, studying peripheral phenomena (such as
the case-alternation which is the topic of this thesis) in a relatively small corpus likely means
getting a limited amount of results, and therefore somewhat weakens the reliability of any
statistical analysis. For this reason, the statistical searches conducted in section 6.2 and its
subsections have been limited to the larger BCCWJ.

6.1.2 Tools of analysis

The main tool of analysis used for the corpora were the two concordancers Shōnagon (for
BCCWJ) and Chūnagon (for CSJ). These concordancers allow one to count the amount of –
and retrieve a list of – all cases of a given word or phrase. In addition to allowing searches for
specific phrases, they also have a function to only include instantiations in which a second
given phrase or word occurs within 40 (10, 20, 30, 50, 100, 200 or 300 for Chūnagon)
characters of the first phrase. The concordancers also provide linguistic data – such as origin,
birth-year/age of speaker, gender of speaker, (as well as morphological information in the
case of Chūnagon) – for all instantiations listed, enabling comparisons based on these factors.

Additionally, some analysis of the suki-predicate was done in the lexical profiling system
NINJAL-LWP for BCCWJ (henceforth NLB), as this allows for counting PRED+NOUN and
PRED+COP combinations, among other things. Due to the way NLB indexes words, however,
it proved impossible to conduct the same counting on the kirai and hoshii predicates. This is
because NLB does not contain a separate entry for kirai (only for girai, a post-nominal suffix
which creates compounds with the meaning of ‘hatred for NOUN’), and because the entry for
hoshii was conflated with the entry for the transitive verb hoshi-garu ‘want-3P.EXP’.

44 Note that, to the extent that one wants to gather the data oneself, it would be very difficult to construct a
spoken-language corpus which reviews past linguistic trends (such as BCCWJ does for written language), as this
would require the project being conducted over several decades.
6.1.3 Method of analysis

The corpus-analysis was conducted in two separate ways: an examination of the frequency of the predicates with certain other parts of speech (henceforth PoS) (e.g. nouns, verbs, etc.), and an in-depth analysis of the presence of transitivity factors for a selected set of sentences from the corpora. The following two sub-sections deal with the selection and method of these two analyses.

6.1.3.1 Searches and statistical analysis

The searches to be presented in section 6.2 were conducted on the BCCWJ, by means of the concordancer Shōnagon and the lexical profiling system NLB. I first made searches of phrases such as o kirai ‘ACC dislike’ and ga kirai ‘NOM dislike’, counting the number of occurrences of these phrases. Because these searches capture more than simply all sentences with the three predicates where the N2 is accusatively or nominatively marked, several additional searches were conducted of phrases such as o suikatte ‘ACC as one pleases’, o kiraimasu ‘ACC hate’ (kirau(verb)+masu), and boku ga hoshii no wa.. ‘what I (N1) want is.’. The amount of such occurrences was then subtracted from the total amounts yielded in the first round of searches. After this, searches were conducted of compound-phrases such as suki ni-/kirai ni-/hoshiku-naru ‘PRED-become’ and of cases in which various parts of speech (see below) occurred within 40 characters of ‘NOM PRED’ or ‘ACC PRED’. In cases where manual confirmation of the relevance of the compound phrases or PRED+PoS combinations was possible (e.g. when the results did not number in the thousands), all instantiations were examined individually.

6.1.3.2 In-depth sentence analysis

Although some transitivity-factors are easily determined by looking at the presence of certain PoS or at PRED+PRED constructions, not all factors are as easily assessable. In addition to the quantitative analysis presented in the previous section and conducted in the following section, I therefore chose to also conduct a more qualitative examination of sentences with nominatively/accusatively marked N2s. 50 sentences for each case-marking+PRED combination were randomly selected from the BCCWJ (in addition to as many as could be
gathered from CSJ), and analyzed in terms of the following transitivity-factors: 1. Participant number, 2. Subject-likeness, 3. Object-likeness, 4. Event likeness/temporal boundedness, 5. Participant discreteness, 6. Volition, and 7. Object affectedness (ref. section 2.4.3). The various sentences were given scores on the various factors, ranging from -1 to 1, where -1 is transitivity-reducing and 1 is transitivity-increasing, with 0 being neutral. Depending on the factor, scores such as -0.5, 0.25, and 0.75 were also given. These scores were presented as is, but also compounded into a single transitivity-value. Both the individual scores and the compounded transitivity-value score were then compared between predicates with nominatively and accusatively marked N₂s.

6.2 Searches and statistical analysis

Before going into sentence-analysis, I carried out searches of the various predicates with different case-marking and contextual elements. The searches were conducted exclusively on the BCCWJ, due to the relative size of this corpus over CSJ. Searches for different kanji/kana-variations of suki, kirai and hoshii/hoshiku with nominative marking (「が好き/がすき」, 「が嫌い/がきらい」and 「が欲しい/がほしい/が欲しく/がほしく」) in BCCWJ yielded 6923, 910, and 2704 results, respectively. However, after removing instances in which the marking was on N₁ rather than N₂ (e.g. watashi ga suki na no wa.. ‘what I (N₁) like is..’), and instances in which the predicates figured in a different construction (e.g. sukikirai ‘preferences’, sukikatte ‘as one pleases’, hoshii mama ni suru ‘to do as one pleases’), I was left with 6771, 901 and 2667. In contrast, searches for the predicates with accusative marking yielded the amounts 1104, 289, and 215 (adjusted to 1028, 146 and 115). A table of these findings, with the percentage of NOM- and ACC-marked instances, is given below. From these findings, it is evident that the standard nominative marking is still the most prevalent.

45 For a full list of what type of instances (and how many of each) were removed, see section 10.2.1 of the appendix.
Additionally, searches were made for specific constructions, such as the inchoative PRED+nar-/PRED+nare- (nar- being the base of the verb naru ‘become’, and nare- being the base of its potential form), and the occurrence of the predicates together with certain other parts of speech.\footnote{All sentences which turned up in the search were read and examined, in order to confirm that the PoS belonged to the predicate in question, and not to another predicate within the sentence. As an example, the following sentence was not included under the “doryoku”-tab, as the doryoku is simply part of N\textsubscript{2}, and does not pertain to the suki-predicate:}

\begin{verbatim}
Soshite watashi wa josei to tomoni kawar-o-u to doryoku-sur-u dansei ga suki da.
\end{verbatim}

‘Also, I like men who make an effort to change together with the woman.’

\footnotetext{Also, I like men who make an effort to change together with the woman.’}
# Table 6-2  PRED-nar- & PRED-nare-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Nar- ‘become’</th>
<th>Nar-*POT (Nare-)’can become’</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki</td>
<td>204 (3,01)</td>
<td>26 (0,38)</td>
<td>230 (3,39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-kirai</td>
<td>63 (7,09)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>63 (7,09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-hoshii</td>
<td>194 (7,19)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>194 (7,19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>511 (49,71)</td>
<td>45 (4,38)</td>
<td>556 (54,09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>50 (34,25)</td>
<td>3 (2,05)</td>
<td>53 (36,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>4 (3,48)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>4 (3,48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Table 6-3  PRED-nar- inflection\(^{47}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naru-inflection</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>+POT</th>
<th>+POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>+POT</th>
<th>+POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>(naru)</td>
<td>(narana)</td>
<td>(narera)</td>
<td>(naren)</td>
<td>(naru)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
<td>(nar)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
<td>(naru)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
<td>(nara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki</td>
<td>36 (0.53)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>5 (0.07)</td>
<td>11 (0.16)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-kirai</td>
<td>8 (0.89)</td>
<td>3 (0.33)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-hoshii</td>
<td>77 (2.89)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (0.04)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>162 (15.76)</td>
<td>4 (0.39)</td>
<td>11 (1.07)</td>
<td>13 (1.26)</td>
<td>12 (1.17)</td>
<td>4 (0.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>15 (10.27)</td>
<td>4 (2.74)</td>
<td>1 (0.68)</td>
<td>2 (1.37)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>2 (1.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>2 (1.74)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{47}\)The meaning of the various inflectional forms are roughly as follows (from left to right): become; don’t become; can become; can’t become; let’s become; want to become.
6.2.1 Note on the tables

The tables above show the number of occurrences of the various PRED+PoS combinations, in addition to some features of the predicates or the predicates’ NPs. As mentioned earlier, the corpus contains significantly more instances of predicates with nominatively marked NPs than accusatively marked ones. If there were no correlation between case-marker and occurrence with these various parts of speech, one would therefore expect the nominative version of suki to have 6.59 (6771/1028, see Table 6-1) times more occurrences (with all the PoS) than the accusative, with the numbers for kirai and hoshii expected at 6.17 (901/146) and 23.19 (2667/115), respectively. To more readily provide a basis for interpreting the data, the percentages of the total amount of occurrences which contain the PoS in question are therefore given in parentheses beneath the absolute number. The formula for this calculation is given as:

\[
\left( \frac{\text{amount of occurrences with PoS-X}}{\text{total amount of occurrences}} \right) \times 100
\]

Additionally, PoS+PRED combinations which did not provide any base for comparison (e.g. the cases where there are no results for neither nominatively nor accusatively marked predicates) have been greyed out to make the table more readable. For readers who prefer – and are familiar with – incidence rate ratios, additional tables can be found in the appendix (section 10.2.2).

6.2.2 Consideration of Tables 6-2 & 6-3

Let us first consider Tables 6-2 and 6-3. To start with, the PRED+nar-/nare- combinations seem to make up a significantly larger portion of the absolute amount of sentences for both suki and kirai with accusative marking (556/1028, 63/146 – compare with 230/6771, 63/901 for nominative marking). Hoshii, however, displays an opposite pattern in which nar-/nare- occurs almost exclusively with nominatively marked instantiations. Additionally, there seems to be differences in the occurrence with various forms of the naru-predicate. While all of the adjectives/nominal adjectives appear compatible with the plain form present-tense naru, hoshii does not occur with any other inflectional forms of the predicate, be they +NEG, +POT, +POT&+NEG, and only occurs once (nominatively marked) with +VOL. Due to the small amount of data, it is unfortunately not possible to provide a significant comparison between the
accusatively and nominatively marked *hoshii* instances, but the two nominal adjectives provide somewhat more basis for discussion.

Contrary to *hoshii*, the two nominal adjectives seem compatible with all *nar*- inflections (except kirai not appearing with *+VOL*). If all inflections of *nar-* are considered together, we find that *suki* and *kirai* appear with the *nar*- predicate 715 (9.17% of total [7799, see Table 6-1]) and 113 (10.92% of total) times, respectively, something which seems to indicate that this construction is relatively common. This is understandable, as the real-life occurrences of the *meaning* of the nominal adjectives (e.g. that someone likes/dislikes someone/something) necessarily have to begin somewhere. It is therefore natural that construction which expresses this *beginning* should arise and become prominent.

Before I properly begin the comparison between nominatively and accusatively marked predicates, allow me to point out some things in relation to the distribution of *nar*/*nare*-inflections. Firstly, the fact that the majority of the *PRED+nar-* constructions have the *nar*- in plain form (e.g. not potential, volitional) (see Table 6-3) is to be expected, as plain-forms generally have higher rates of occurrence than potentials and volitional forms. Additionally, the fact that there seems to be more positively-inflected plain-forms than negatively inflected ones also mirrors the data for other verbs, which exhibit a higher frequency of positively inflected instantiations than negatively inflected ones.48

### 6.2.2.1 *PRED+nar-/nare*-: NOM/ACC comparison (*suki* and *kirai*)

What immediately strikes one as one examines Table 6-2 above is that the amount of instances of accusatively marked NAs together with *nar*- inflections is significantly larger than (statistically) expected. As mentioned earlier, the two NAs occur with *nar-* 715 and 113 times, respectively, and based on the absolute number of the predicates’ occurrences, one would expect the NOM/ACC distribution to be 621/94 (86.81%/13.19%) for *suki* and 97/16 (85.9%/14.1%) for *kirai* (see Table 6-1). Contrasting these with the actual numbers – 204/511 (28.5%/71.5%) and 63/50 (55.8%/44.2%) – indicates that there is indeed a correlation

---

48 To give some examples, consider the following comparisons of the frequency of positive/negative and plain/potential/volitional instantiations of the verbs *nomu* ‘drink’, *asobu* ‘play’, and *otosu* ‘drop’, taken from BCCWJ:

- *nomu/nomanai*: 3714 / 463
- *nomu/nomēru/nomō*: 3714 / 376 / 253
- *asobu/asobanai*: 1571 / 55
- *asobu/asoberu/asobō*: 1571 / 305 / 294
- *otosu/otosanai*: 1657 / 146
- *otosu/otoseru/otosō*: 1657 / 75 / 90
between case-marking and PRED+nar- combinations. Because we do not have access to the minds of the people who wrote the sentences, it is not possible to straightforwardly determine why they chose to use the non-standard ACC-marking over the standard NOM-marking, but we can make an attempt to explain the unexpected distribution:

One of the plausible explanations for the high rate of accusative marking on the predicates when they appear in conjunction with nar-, is that the verb makes the sentence more event-like (Fujimura 2009, 96). Because suki, and kirai are stative predicates, they generally express scenarios in which something lasts a long period of time. With the introduction of nar-, however, the meaning of what is described shifts from a state to an instantaneous (or at least short) inchoative process expressing change. As such, the introduction of nar- makes the sentence closer to the transitive prototype presented in 2.4.3, and this allows the speaker/writer to assign accusative case to the N2.

The presence of nar- does not only make the sentences more conceptually transitive through changing the aspect of the event from stative to inchoative, however, as many of the nar-variations also introduce an element of volition to the instantiations of the NAs. If we consider the combination of the predicates with the volitional form narō ‘let’s become; I will (intention) become’ (Table 6-3), we find that all occurrences (although it only occurs with suki, perhaps due to its limited prevalence) carry the accusative marking. Because -narō is arguably the most overt marker of volition (being the volitional form), it makes sense that it should be associated with canonical transitive marking. Additionally, the rate of occurrence of accusative marking with sentences containing the volitional PoS naritai ‘want to become’ (and its variations) is significantly higher than that of nominative marking (ACCsuki: 0,39, ACCkirai 1.37 vs NOMsuki 0,01and NOKirai 0,0). Another variation of the nar- predicate which arguably holds more volitionality than the plain form in some circumstances is the potential. Because it is not as straightforwardly understandable why this would be the case, allow me to illustrate using a few examples:

1) Kodomo no toki wa yasai ga nigate dat-ta ga, saikin suki ni nat-ta.
 child GEN time TOP vegetables NOM bad at COP-PST NOM recently like DAT become-PST
 ‘When I was a child I disliked vegetables, but recently I’ve begun to like them.’
2) *Kodomo no toki wa yasai ga nigate dat-ta ga, saikin suki ni nar-e-ta.*

‘When I was a child I disliked vegetables, but recently I’ve managed to start liking them.’

As evident from the English translations, the potential examples imply a larger extent of effort on the part of the N1. While in 1, the subject simply started to like something they did not like before, sentence 2 implies that they have made a conscious effort to change their preferences, and were successful in said endeavor. Nakano (2008) seems to share this intuition – she writes that, generally, only intention-verbs (*ishidōshi*) can occur in potential form. *naru* is usually considered a non-intention verb (*muishidōshi*), and should therefore not exhibit a potential form. However, if the agentivity of the clause is raised, the verb may be acceptable in the potential (Nakano 2008, 11). This entails that in the cases where potential verbs of *naru* do occur, they do so because of an increased nuance of agentivity in the clause.

The data, however, does not seem to show significant blanket differences in the distribution of PRED+*nar*- and PRED+*nare*- combinations. Although the results show a larger percentage of accusatively marked PRED+*nare*-combinations for *kirai* at first glance, the amount of instantiations (3) is perhaps too low to be deemed significantly different from the PRED+*nar*-combinations. Also, the results for *suki* actually indicate a weaker preference for accusatively marked N2s with the potential than with the plain form (63.38% for potentials and 71.46% for plain forms). This might suggest one of three things: 1. the amount of data is not significantly large; 2. the potential is not considered as volitional as previously assumed, or there are other features of the potential that have not been taken into account; 3. the preference for accusatively marked N2s with PRED+*nar*-combinations is motivated by other factors than volition.

In regards to possibility 2, it is perhaps worth pointing out that although the potential form of the *nar*- predicate can exhibit more volitional qualities than the plain-form, it often does so at the expense of the inchoateness which characterizes the other *nar*- inflections. This is because potentials – particularly the present-tense forms – typically express *states* rather than *actions* (Kawabata 2015, 46). Consider the following examples:

3) *Chanto renshū-sur-eba, daredemo jōzu ni nar-u.*

‘If one practices properly, anyone gets good.’
4) **Chanto renshū-sur-eba, daredemo jōzu ni nar-er-u.**
properly practice-do-COND whoever good DAT become-POT-PRS
‘If one practices properly, anyone is able to get good.’

As evident from the English translations, there is a subtle difference in the prepositions described by the two sentences. While 3) describes the result of the practice as an *event* in which the person ‘gets good’, 4) simply describes the person’s *ability* to ‘get good’. Since ‘being able to undergo a change’ is arguably less event like than ‘undergoing a change’, the present-tense form of the predicate appears to lose some of the inchoateness present in the plain-form. This fact may help explain the weaker preference for potential *nar-* forms with accusative marking.

### Table 6-4  **PRED+PoS+VOLITION & PRED+PoS-VOLITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>+VOLITION</th>
<th>-VOLITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>doryoku</td>
<td>ganbatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘effort’</td>
<td>‘to do one’s best’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki</td>
<td>2 (0,03)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-kirai</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>1 (0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-hoshii</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>5 (0,49)</td>
<td>1 (0,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
<td>(0,00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.3  **Consideration of Table 6-4**

While the previous two sections were devoted exclusively to the predicates in combination with the verb *nar-* ‘become’, I will here deal with the predicates in conjunction with other parts of speech. The PoS discussed here are similar to *nar-* in the sense that they also bring varying degrees of volition to the sentences, but differ in the fact that they do not change the syntactic category of the A/NAs. Before going into the analysis, I will briefly explain the
meaning of these PoS, and justify why I have chosen to analyze these particular \textit{PRED+PoS} combinations.

The first two PoS I will be analyzing are \textit{doryoku} ‘effort’ and \textit{ganbatte} ‘to do one’s best’. The volitional quality of these two PoS is perhaps obvious: they both refer to a conscious choice to exert oneself towards a certain goal. Sentences in which these appear in relation to – and in close proximity of – the predicates would therefore likely motivate a more intentional interpretation. On the other side of the volitionality-spectrum, we have the two PoS \textit{nazeka} ‘for some reason’ and \textit{~shikata ga nai} ‘can’t be helped’. \textit{Nazeka} implies that the speaker is unsure of the cause for the action (in this case the state of liking/disliking/wanting) taking place, and in the context of emotional predicates, this leads to a less intentional reading. This is because experiencing emotions towards something without knowing the reason, logically entails that one did not intend to experience said emotions. \textit{Nazeka} precludes a volitional reading of the predicates because one cannot intend to like/dislike/want something without knowing the reason for the liking/disliking/wanting. While \textit{nazeka} functions as an adverb preceding the main predicate, \textit{~shikata ga nai} functions as a separate clause immediately following the conjunctive form of the predicate (e.g. \textit{kare ga suki de shikata ga nai} ‘I like him so much I can’t help it’).

Another co-occurrence which has been examined is the combination of the predicates and the giving-and-receiving form of the verb \textit{iru} ‘to be’. These combinations take the shape of \textit{PRED+de-ite-kure-} and indicate that the \textit{N$_1$} \textit{intentionally} performs the action for the sake of the \textit{N$_2$}:

5) \textit{kare wa ima totemo yasashi-i shi watashi dake o suki de-ite-kure-mas-u.}
\hspace{1cm} he TOP now very kind-PRS and me only ACC like COP-be-give-POL-PRS
\hspace{1cm} ‘He is very kind now, and he (does me the favor of) only likes me.’

Obviously, the person who performs the action (or exhibits the state, if you will) which the predicate describes is not the person assessing the intentionality of said action. The person who attributes the volition is the target of the feelings described by the predicate, but is also, however, the person who constructs the sentence. As such, it is the speaker/writer’s interpretation of the situation which influences the choice of case-marker. It is therefore expected that the presence of this phrase should strongly increase the transitivity of the sentence.
6.2.3.1 PRED+PoS+VOLITION/PoS-VOLITION: NOM/ACC comparison

Unfortunately, the searches conducted of combinations of PRED+PoS+VOLITION/ PRED+PoS-VOL did not yield as many results as originally hoped. This leads to some issues in regards to determining the significance and/or the reliability of the comparison, as it is not wholly unlikely that some of the tendencies are due to chance. In addition, most of the combinations only yielded data for the predicate suki ‘like’, most likely due to its high relative frequency, compared with the two other predicates.49 Despite these shortcomings of the data, I will nevertheless give a brief overview and discussion of the findings:

I would first like to point out a tendency in the entire data-set: although the numbers are small, there seems to be a slight correlation between the volitionality of the PoS, and the occurrence together with accusatively marked predicates. In the case of suki, 90.90% (20/22) of the instantiations of the PoS+VOLITION occurred with accusative marking on the predicate, while the predicate was nominatively marked 93.75% (15/16) of the time when a PoS-VOLITION was present. Looking at the percentages, we see that the first 4 columns (with +VOLITION PoS) account for a larger relative portion of the accusative N₂ predicates for suki, while the last two columns (with -VOL PoS) account for a larger portion of the nominatively N₂-marked predicates. The most obvious difference is the combination of suki+deite-kure, where 100% of the occurrences (14 total) of this combination contain accusatively marked N₂s. Conversely, we see that predicates with nominatively marked N₂s account for 100% of the PRED+PoS. VOLITION combinations for kirai and hoshii, with accusatively N₂-marked suki only appearing once in conjunction with nazeka ‘for some reason’. Due to the very low number of total occurrences, however, it is not possible to determine whether this is due to PoS-VOLITION blocking the accusative marking of N₂, or whether it is simply statistical, owing to the greater usage-frequency of nominatively marked N₂s. Despite the relatively low number of instantiations, however, the fact that there seems to be a correlation between volition-raising PoS and accusative marking across the board, does perhaps indicate a certain link between intention and case-marker.

---

49 It is also possible that the prevalence of suki+PoS-VOLITION combinations is due to the semantic features of this predicate, as it is perhaps more likely that someone would intentionally attempt to like something/someone, than attempt to dislike/want someone/something.
6.2.4 Consideration of Table 6-5

While tables 6-2, 6-3 and 6-4 consisted of PoS which – in one way or another – increased the volitionality or affected the state/event-likeness of the sentences, Table 6-5 is aimed at examining the effect of the nature of the sentences’ $N_2$s. Based on the discussion in Langacker (1991b), the transitivity of a given sentence changes based on the object-likeness of the sentence’s object.\(^{50}\) Langacker argues that this is closely linked to the empathy hierarchy (see section 2.5.2), suggesting that object is prototypically ranked fairly high on the hierarchy, but lower than that of a prototypical subject. Langacker acknowledges, however, that the picture is somewhat more complicated, and provides the following model:

**Empathy hierarchy (edited)**

$$[\text{AN human} > \text{animal AN}] > [\text{INAN physical object} > \text{abstract entity INAN}]^{51}$$

---

\(^{50}\) In this case the $N_2$. For the object-status of $N_2$, see Chapter 3.

\(^{51}\) ‘AN’ stands for “animate”, while ‘INAN’ stands for “inanimate”.

---

Table 6-5  The nature of the $N_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>Verbal $N_2$</th>
<th>NOUN+$hou$ $ga$</th>
<th>VERB+$hou$ $ga$</th>
<th>$hou$ $ga$ (total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(VERB no $ga$ PRED)</td>
<td>‘NOUN side of comparison’</td>
<td>‘NMZ side of comparison’</td>
<td>‘side of comparison’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki</td>
<td>683 (10,09)</td>
<td>80 (1,18)</td>
<td>285 (4,21)</td>
<td>365 (5,39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-kirai</td>
<td>84 (9,32)</td>
<td>1 (0,11)</td>
<td>2 (0,22)</td>
<td>3 (0,33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-hoshii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>3 (0,11)</td>
<td>3 (0,11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>2 (0,19)</td>
<td>2 (0,19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>1 (0,68)</td>
<td>1 (0,68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
<td>0 (0,00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because animacy is associated with the ability to serve as an energy-source, subjects and objects are naturally associated with the upper and lower portion of the hierarchy, respectively. Additionally, Langacker claims that “the prototypical value of each grammatical relation is the highest-ranked element within its own sector” (Langacker 1991b, 322). This element is marked in bold above. This analysis seems to suggest the following model for object-likeness:

**Object-likeness:**

physical object > abstract entity > animal > human

What I would like to focus on here, however, is the *abstract entity*-category. Although the most common elements of this category might be, for instance, concepts such as “freedom” and “music”, the category would also contain more types of entities than this. Given that this model is exhaustive, one of the types of entities which have to be subsumed under this category is that of nominalized verbs. An example of such a nominalized verb in a sentence is given below:

6) *Watashi wa aruku no ga suki da.*
   I TOP walk NMZ NOM like COP
   ‘I like to walk.’

Here, the second nominal (object, in case of the English translation) *aru**ku no* ‘to walk’ is a nominalized verb. For lack of a different category, we would have to place this type of nominal under the *abstract entity* category. This is problematic, however, because *physical objects* are arguably less similar to these types of nominalized verb entities, than they are to animate entities such as *humans*. If we assume the object-likeness of an entity is determined by how closely it resembles the prototypical object (i.e. the *physical object*) (see section 2.3.1), it would appear that this particular subgroup of *abstract entity* is indeed less object-like than the *humans*, which sit at the top of the empathy hierarchy. Indeed, in discussing the English infinitive and participles (which are quite similar to nominalized verbs in Japanese), Langacker points out that these “non-finite verb forms” only serve to make the relation described by the verb *atemporal*, while their base is still very much a *process* (Langacker 1991a, 82). Processes (albeit atemporal) are arguably less tangible and discrete, and more distant from the physical object prototype. In light of this, I propose that the following model better captures these intuitions:

---

52 Alternatively, the animal / human categories could be switched, as Langacker does not mention whether the higher members of the animate-category are more object-like than the lower members.
Object-likeness (revised):

physical object > abstract entity > animal > human > atemporal process

If this model is correct, it would be reasonable to assume that the presence of atemporal process $N_2$s (i.e. nominalized verbs) would decrease the overall transitivity of the clause (as the $N_2$ becomes less object-like), and thus preclude accusative marking. The first column of Table 6-5, labeled “Verbal $N_2$” attempts to capture the NOM/ACC distribution of such abstract verbal entity $N_2$s.

Additionally, following both Langacker’s and the revised model above, the second, third and fourth columns examine the presence of the post-verbal / post-nominal element *hou ga* ‘side (of comparison)’ as the $N_2$ of *suki/kirai/hoshii* clauses. The presence of this element changes the interpretation of the sentence in the way the following examples suggest:

7) *Watashi wa keeki ga/o suki da.*
   I TOP cake NOM/ACC like COP
   ‘I like cake.’

8) *Watashi wa keeki no hou ga/o suki da.*
   I TOP cake GEN side NOM/ACC like COP
   ‘I prefer cake (rather than something else) [I prefer the cake-side of the comparison]’

Since the base sentence (7) refers to the target of the liking as a physical entity, while the *hou ga* sentence (8) refers to the target of the liking as one side of a comparison, the $N_2$ in 7) is perhaps more similar to the prototypical *physical object* than the $N_2$ in 8). If there is a correlation between object-likeness and transitivity – and between transitivity and accusative marking – we would expect there to be few instances of *hou ga* $N_2$s with accusatively marked predicates.

6.2.4.1 The nature of $N_2$: NOM/ACC comparison

In regard to table 6-5, we see that nominalized verbal $N_2$s occur a total of 683 times (10.09% of total) with nominatively marked *suki*, and 84 times (9.32% of total) with nominatively marked *kirai*. In contrast to this, there were no occurrences of accusatively marked *suki/kirai* with this type of verbal $N_2$. Additionally, we see that the $N_2$+*hou ga* pattern is significantly more prevalent with nominatively marked *suki* (NOM: 5.39%; ACC: 0.19%). *Kirai*, on the other hand, exhibits a slightly higher preference for $N_2$s followed by *hou ga* for accusatively
marked predicates (0.68% for ACC vs. 0.33% for NOM), but the total number of occurrences (4) is likely to low to determine whether this preference is significant. Similarly to suki, hoshii shows a preference for nominative marking when the N₂ is anteceded by hou ga (0.11% vs. 0.00%), but the amount of cases is too low to draw any proper conclusions. The only properly robust data, therefore, is that of suki, which suggests that hou ga-marked N₂s are perhaps more prevalent when the predicate is nominatively marked. From this discussion, it appears that there is perhaps a connection between object-likeness and accusative marking, or at least a negative correlation between accusative marking and very non-object-like N₂s. The effect of the nature of the N₂ on the acceptability of accusative marking will be further examined in the questionnaire in Chapter 7.

6.2.5 On frequency and existing constructions (a possible explanation for the productivity of suki)

Before proceeding to the second part of the corpus study – the in-depth sentence analysis – I would like to touch on the fact that many of the tendencies observed above seem stronger for the suki-predicate than for the other two. Suki has the largest amount of PoS+PRED combinations out of the three, and also seems to be the predicate with the strongest disposition for accusative marking in various constructions. Although it is difficult (or perhaps impossible) to provide an exhaustive explanation of the reasons for this, I will highlight two factors which might help in explaining this observation: frequency and the existence of similar constructions.

According to Bybee (2006), the frequency of a given construction greatly affects the grammaticalization of said construction. In Bybee’s model, language is organized into constructions clustered around what are called exemplars. These exemplars are, in a sense, the prototypical members of the construction, around which the other members are grouped. Exemplars are created through contact with language, but are therefore also subject to change if the language-user comes into contact with large amounts of opposing linguistic stimuli. If a member of a certain construction starts being used in a slightly different way, and this usage becomes prevalent enough, the member might break out and create a whole new construction. The example Bybee uses to illustrate this is that of ‘be going to’, which was originally part of a larger construction expressing purpose, together with verbs such as ‘travel’, ‘journey’, and ‘return’. In this use, the sentence “I am going to meet him”, roughly meant “I am moving
from point A to point B, in order to accomplish meeting him”. The verb ‘go’, however, became gradually more frequent, moving away from its source construction and created a new construction, such as in “I am going to [gonna] go to the store”, which expressed intention and future (Bybee 2006, 719).

Perhaps one could similarly hypothesize a change for the case-alternation of the A/NAs discussed in this thesis, where they were the member of a paradigm “N₁ TOP N₂ NOM A/NA” with the rough meaning of “As for N₁, N₂ exhibits A/NA”. One of the more frequent members of this construction – suki – then appears in a slightly different construction “N₁ TOP/NOM N₂ ACC suki”, and as this pattern becomes more frequent, it gradually moves away from the aforementioned paradigm and takes on new pragmatic connotations (see the end of section 6.3.2 below).

The second factor – which might actually help explain both the higher frequency of suki, and the distributional differences between the predicates – is the (non-)existence of similar constructions. As mentioned in section 4.3, these predicates all have verbal counterparts in suku ‘to like’, kirau ‘to dislike’ and hossuru ‘to want’, respectively. The prevalence and acceptability of these verbal counterparts, however, is not equal. Searches in the BCCWJ reveal 72 instances of suku, 421 instances of kirau, and 190 instances of hossuru. Additionally, the survey conducted by Caluianu (2009) revealed that, when asked to provide the corresponding active form for the passive version of the verbs (sukareri and kirawareru), speakers were less inclined to answer suku than kirau (Caluianu 2009, 243). The presence of existing constructions could, of course, facilitate the shift in case-marker for similar constructions, but could also preclude it. If the case-alternation has semantic motivations (e.g. that the accusative provides a different – more transitive – nuance than the nominative), the presence of another widely-used predicate (e.g. the verbal suku ‘like’) with this very nuance means that speakers have no need of a new construction (ACC-marking with suki). If this is indeed the case, the low frequency (and acceptability) of suku could help explain the relative prevalence of suki with accusative marking. Of course, any number of other underlying variables could also contribute to the prevalence of suki+PoS combinations, and for this reason I will avoid making any decisive conclusions as to the reason for the distributional differences between the predicates.
6.3 **In-depth sentence-analysis**

Although section 6.2 and its subsections uncovered a number of differences between the instantiations of the predicates with nominatively and accusatively marked NPs, not all of the transitivity factors presented in 6.1.3.2 are as easily assessed with corpus-searches and frequency-counting. As such, this section is devoted to uncovering the presence or absence of these factors in suki-, kirai- and hoshii-sentences containing NOM- and ACC-marked NPs. 50 sentences were selected from the BCCWJ for each predicate/case-marker combination – 25 from internet-sources, and 25 from literary sources (yielding a total number of 300 sentences). The internet-sentences were selected randomly from the 2005 and 2008 scans of “Yahoo! Chiebukurō” and “Yahoo! Blog”, and the literary-sentences were selected randomly from books published after the year 2000.

There are several reasons for this particular selection, one of which is the lack of accusatively marked hoshii sentences – precluding using only web-sources, or limiting the publishing-year to a more recent year. There are, however, also advantages to using several types of sources, because they have different strengths and weaknesses. Sentences gathered from the internet are, on the one hand, expected to reflect the least regulated and most spontaneous use of the language, making it easier for speakers/writers to ignore prescriptive grammar rules. They are, however, also likely the sentences constructed with the least amount of thought, and any tendencies observed from this data are therefore likely to represent the speakers’ subconscious use of language. Books, on the other hand, have the problems/benefits reversed: They are more likely to adhere to prescriptive language-norms (seeing as they are usually proofread before published), but any non-standard constructions that do end up making it into the finished product are more likely to be deliberately put there. Selecting half the sentences from each of these sources would – in a best case scenario – result in a good balance between spontaneous and deliberate use of case-marking. In addition to the sentences from BCCWJ, as many sentences as possible were retrieved and analyzed from the CSJ, but due to the lack of a substantial amount of ACC-kirai sentences, this predicate was omitted from the analysis.

6.3.1 **Explanation of findings**

The in-depth analysis was conducted by examining sentences in which NOM/ACC-marked predicates appeared, and then allotting them scores on 7 transitivity-factors. The scores
ranged from -1 to 1, where -1 implies the presence a markedly *intransitive* element, while 1 implies the presence of a markedly *transitive* one. The score of 0 was given when there was no noticeable transitivity-decreasing or transitivity-raising element present. The score-system is rendered in the two tables below.

**Table 6-6(1) Score-system for transitivity-factors (1/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number(^{53})</th>
<th>Subject-likeness</th>
<th>Object-likeness</th>
<th>Event likeness/temporal boundedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = one</td>
<td>-1 = abstract</td>
<td>-1 = verbal atemporal</td>
<td>-1 = long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = inanimate</td>
<td>-0,5 = process-conceptual</td>
<td>0 = unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,5 = non-human</td>
<td>0 = human</td>
<td>0,5 = shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = two</td>
<td>1 = human</td>
<td>0,75 = inanimate conceptual</td>
<td>0,5 = longer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6-6(2) Score-system for transitivity-factors (2/2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant discreteness</th>
<th>Volitional element</th>
<th>Object affectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1 = non-discrete</td>
<td>-1 = very non-volitional</td>
<td>0 = unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = unknown</td>
<td>-0,5 = slightly non-volitional</td>
<td>0 = unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,5 = semi-discrete</td>
<td>0 = unknown</td>
<td>0,5 = slightly volitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = fully discrete</td>
<td>1 = very volitional</td>
<td>1 = affected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{53}\) Note that ‘Participant Number’ here refers to the amount of overt participants in the clause. All sentences with the A/NAs are expected to ‘have’ two participants due to their semantic nature, but not all sentences overtly express both participants.

\(^{54}\) This particular category of N\(_2\)S consists of NP in the form of [human] *no koto*, which literally translates to “things about [human]”. This is a relatively common construction in sentences expressing emotions about other people, and serves to give the sentence a somewhat softer nuance. Additionally, expressions such as [human] *no subete* (everything about [human]) have been allotted the same score as the koto-sentences.
The reader will likely notice that some of the factors have larger ranges and more values than others – for instance, participant number, object affectedness and event-likeness only have values from 0 to 1. This is because there were no sentences in the data which overtly expressed a participant number lower than 2, no sentences which overtly specified non-affectedness of the object, and no sentences which overtly implied that there was no transfer of energy. An observant reader will likely also notice that the 7 factors presented here do not directly correspond to Langacker’s (1991b) 9 transitivity-criteria (c.f. sections 2.4.3). Notably, criterion 1 (Participant Number/Role) has been split into the three criteria “Participant number”, “Subject-likeness” and “Object-likeness”. This is due to practical constraints, as it is difficult to assign a single numerical value to a factor which pertains to the number of participants, as well as to the subject/object-likeness of both of these participants.

Additionally, factors 5, 6, and 8 (Pre-existence of participants, Asymmetry, and Energy-direction) have been omitted entirely. This is due to the fact that the predicates in question (suki, kirai, and hoshii) are not conceptually able to vary in regards to these factors. The predicates do not describe any entities coming into being (precluding 5), they express asymmetrical relations (precluding 6), and to the extent that they express energy-transfer, this is likely always unidirectional from subject to object/N_2 (precluding 8). Lastly, the “temporal boundedness”-sub-factor of the “Dynamicity” criteria has been considered together with the “Event likeness” criteria, and the “Energeticness”-sub-factor has not been tested for.

Because it might still be somewhat unclear how exactly the analysis was conducted, allow me to present a couple of examples:

9) Demo, kuyashiku-temo, ore wa Masato o kirai ni wa but regrettable-even.though I TOP Masato ACC dislike DAT TOP
    nar-e-na-katta.
    become-POT-NEG-PST
    ‘But, although I regret it, I couldn’t seem to dislike Masato.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Subject-likeness</th>
<th>Object-likeness</th>
<th>Event likeness/temp. bound.</th>
<th>Participant discreteness</th>
<th>Volitional element</th>
<th>Object affectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sentence 9 is given the above scores for the 7 transitivity-factors. There are two overt participants (ore ‘I’ and Masato ‘Masato’), yielding a “Participant number”-score of 1. Both the subject and the object/N2 are human, resulting in “Subject-likeness” and “Object-likeness” scores of 1 and 0, respectively. The situation is given a somewhat more event-like interpretation by the fact that the sentence is given in the past tense, and that it contains the verb naru ‘become’. However, the verb is also in the negative, which means that it does not fully describe something which actually ‘took place’. Therefore, the sentence has been given an “Event-likeness”-score of 0.5. The two participants (ore ‘I’ and Masato ‘Masato’) are maximally distinct and discrete, yielding a “Participant discreteness”-score of 1. The sentence also implies a large degree of volition, both due to the included naru ‘become’ verb being in the potential, and due to the presence of the phrase kuyashikutemo ‘although (I) regret it’. Because of this, the sentence has been given a “Volitional element”-score of 1. Lastly, the ‘object’ (Masato ‘Masato’) does not seem to be significantly affected by the situation described, yielding an “Object-affectedness”-score of 0.

In order to provide a comparison, a prototypically transitive clause is provided and analyzed below:

10) Misaki wa bōru o nage-ta.
    Misaki TOP ball ACC throw-PST
    ‘Misaki threw the ball.’

There are two overt NPs in sentence 10 (Misaki ‘Misaki’ and bōru ‘the ball’); The subject is human while the object is inanimate and physical; The event is relatively brief; The participants are maximally distinct; There is a clear presence of volition due to the semantics of the verb (throwing is a conscious, intentional action); And the object (bōru ‘the ball’) is affected in that it changes position. This yields a perfect score on all the transitivity-criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Subject-likeness</th>
<th>Object-likeness</th>
<th>Event-likeness</th>
<th>Participant discreteness</th>
<th>Volitional element</th>
<th>Object affectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that I have provided some background for interpreting the numbers, I will present the results of the analysis. These are rendered in Tables 6-7 and 6-8 below:

### Table 6-7  Transitivity-factor values (BCCWJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Subject-likeness</th>
<th>Object-likeness</th>
<th>Event likeness / temp bound.</th>
<th>Participant discreteness</th>
<th>Volitional element</th>
<th>Object-affectedness</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki</td>
<td>0,68</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-kirai</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,25</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>-0,03</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>2,77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-hoshii</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,13</td>
<td>0,45</td>
<td>0,96</td>
<td>0,09</td>
<td>0,02</td>
<td>3,15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>0,44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>3,06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,57</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0,01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6-8  Transitivity-factor values (CSJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Subject-likeness</th>
<th>Object-likeness</th>
<th>Event likeness / temp bound.</th>
<th>Participant discreteness</th>
<th>Volitional element</th>
<th>Object-affectedness</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki (N=36)</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>-0,03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-hoshii (N=10)</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki (N=36)</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>0,10</td>
<td>0,08</td>
<td>3,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii (N=10)</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,73</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 The numbers in Tables 6-7 and 6-8 are the averages of the scores of all sentences. As such, they are given as 
\[
\frac{\text{sum of all sentences}}{\text{amount of sentences}}.
\]

56 All sentences, and their scores, can be found in sections 10.2.3 and 10.2.4 in the appendix.
6.3.2 Consideration of Table 6-7

Before going into the various transitivity-factors, I would like to begin by directing the reader’s attention to the transitivity-aggregate score (created by combining the scores for all factors) in the column of the far right of Table 6-7. Although perhaps not as prominent as expected, there appears to be a tendency in which the accusatively marked versions of the predicates are ‘more transitive’. The differences between the nominatively and accusatively marked predicates are 0.19 points for suki, 0.29 points for kirai, and 0.16 points for hoshii.

Since the total value only gives us a broad overview of the transitivity of the predicates, let us now have a look at the individual factors. First, there are a number of factors in which the nominatively and accusatively marked predicates do not show any significant differences. The values in the factors Subject-likeness, Participant discreteness, and Object affectedness, do not vary much between accusatively and nominatively marked predicates, indicating that these factors perhaps do not have much explanatory power in accounting for the choice of case-marker. Additionally, there is a slight difference in the Participant number-factor, but this difference is not consistent for all the predicates (with the score being lower for accusatively marked suki and kirai, and higher for accusatively marked hoshii).

However, some of the factors do appear to exhibit significant differences. Notably, the sentences in which suki and kirai appear with accusative marking contain a greater amount of volitional elements than when the same predicates appear in the nominative (0.09 and 0.14, vs. 0 and -0.03). Additionally, the values on the Event-likeness/temporal boundedness-factor are very different for the differently marked versions of the predicates. While the values for the nominatively marked suki, kirai, and hoshii are relatively low (0.02; 0.08; 0.01), the same values for the accusatively marked suki and kirai are significantly higher (0.45 and 0.27), with hoshii at 0.07. It would therefore seem that these two factors might play a part in the choice of case-marking, at least when it comes to the NAs (e.g. suki and kirai).⁵⁷

As for the last factor of Object likeness, there appears to be a slight tendency for more object-like N₂s with accusatively marked kirai, while the opposite is true for the suki and hoshii predicates. Consistent with the findings in section 6.2.4, there were more very un-

---

⁵⁷ It should be noted, however, that the high values on both the “Volitional element” and “Event likeness/temporal boundedness” factors mainly come from sentences in which the predicates appear with the inchoative naru ‘become’. It is not, however, the case that the high values stem directly from the inchoative, as these sentences often contain other elements, such as jiyū-jizai ‘freely, with full control’ as well as tame ni ‘in order to’, which also contribute to increasing the value of the transitivity factors.
object-like N₂s with ‘nominatively marked’ suki (7/50 sentences), but a number of the nominatively marked sentences also contained very object-like N₂s (15/50). The ‘accusatively marked’ version of the predicate, however, occurs almost exclusively with human N₂s (41/50). This phenomenon is similar in regards to kirai, where there were 9 very un-object-like N₂s with nominative marking (and 0 with accusative marking), while most of the accusatively marked N₂s were humans (36/50). In accordance with the claim put forth by Caluianu (2009), it would appear that, while the standard nominative use of the predicate is most often used to express preference for things (e.g. liking a type of food or activity), the accusatively marked predicates mainly describe something akin to the notion of romantic love (e.g. expressing romantic feelings of N₁ towards N₂). Consider Table 6-9 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nuance</th>
<th>Romantic love/feeling</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM-suki</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This might suggest, as mentioned in Caluianu (2009, 238), that the predicate might be undergoing a semantic split, in which two separate – but interrelated – senses of the predicate emerge. This also seems to provide some backing for the claim that the ACC-marked suki is becoming its own construction, as suggested in section 6.2.5 above. A similar type of tendency – albeit somewhat weaker – can be found for kirai, where 34 of 50 sentences with accusative marking describe dislike aimed at people, while only 17 of the nominatively-marked sentences do so:
Table 6-10  *kirai*-nuances (BCCWJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Person/feeling</th>
<th>Thing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM-<em>suki</em></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-<em>suki</em></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 Consideration of Table 6-8

If we look at the transitivity-aggregate scores for the data from CSJ, we see that the difference between predicates with NOM-/ACC-marked NPs is even greater than what was found in the BCCWJ-data. Accusatively marked *suki*-sentences have a transitivity-aggregate score 0.44 points higher than that of nominatively marked sentences, with the difference for *hoshii* being 0.45 points. As with the BCCWJ-data, the factors which vary the most between NOM/ACC marking are **Volitional element** (for *suki*) and **Event likeness/temporal boundedness** (for both). The values for **Volitional element** are more or less the same as the ones from Table 6-10 (NOMsuki: -0.03 (0.0); ACCsuki: 0.1 (0.9)), and the data also shows a relatively strong correlation between higher values on the **Event likeness/temporal boundedness**-factor and accusative marking for both *suki* and *hoshii*. The *suki*-sentences from CSJ also showed the same increasing tendency for accusative marking (from 5.6% to 44.4%) when the clause expresses (romantic) feelings towards another person. This is rendered in the table below:

Table 6-11  *suki*-nuances (CSJ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Romantic love/feeling</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM-<em>suki</em></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-<em>suki</em></td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in all, it would seem that the results are more or less robust over the two corpora.
6.4 Summary

In this chapter, I used language corpora to examine the presence of transitivity-factors for predicates with NOM- and ACC-marked NPs. The data seems to suggest that the preference for accusatively marked NPs with these predicates is linked to cases in which the predicates function together with certain verbs such as *naru* and *(de)-iru*. As such, the alternation seems to be somewhat dependent on certain syntactic features. Looking at the nature of these PRED+VERB combinations reveals, however, that they are also strongly tied to prototypical transitive features such as event-likeness and volitionality (despite the verbs in question not being transitive themselves). Additionally, the in-depth analysis in section 6.3 and its subsections revealed a correlation between certain transitivity-factors – notably volition and event-likeness – and accusative marking. This correlation seems to hold true both for spoken-language and written-language corpora. Lastly, it was discovered that, in the case of *suki* and *kirai*, there is perhaps some evidence of a semantic split where accusatively marked predicates express emotions aimed at humans, rather than preferences for things. It should be noted that the findings made in this chapter hold the strongest for the *suki*-predicate, perhaps due to this predicate’s relatively high frequency. Since corpus-based studies only assess the presence of a given construction, and not its acceptability, many of these findings will be re-examined in the questionnaire in the next chapter.
7 Questionnaire

7.0 Purpose of the questionnaire

In essence, the purpose of this questionnaire is to re-examine the findings which arose from the corpus studies in Chapter 6, in addition to testing for factors which were not testable in these studies. Although spontaneous, naturalistic corpus data can provide positive proof for the existence of a construction, it cannot provide negative proof for the non-existence of one. In addition, the fact that utterances are found in spontaneous language data does not tell us how speakers feel about these utterances. People make mistakes, both in spoken and written language, and because of this, it is problematic to draw conclusions based solely on spontaneous recordings of speech/text. In this study, I asked native speakers to assess the acceptability of sentences which, to varying degrees, exhibit the transitivity features discussed in 2.4.3. The elicited values of sentences deemed neutral in the various (transitivity-related) factors were then compared with the values of the sentences which exhibited the factors in question. The comparison between these two groups of sentences will – hopefully – yield some insight into which factors matter and which do not.

7.0.1 Structure of the chapter

The chapter can be roughly separated into two parts. Part one, encompassing sections 7.1 through 7.1.5, consists of an explanation of various facets of the study. In sections 7.1.1 through 7.1.2.6, I provide an overview of which transitivity-related factors will be tested, in addition to showing just how I intend to test for them. After this, I present some non-transitivity-related factors which are also tested in the study (7.1.3). Lastly, sections 7.1.4 and 7.1.5 deal with the methodology of the study, and the distribution of participants, respectively. In part two – consisting of sections 7.2 through 7.2.5 – I examine the results of the study. First, I assess group variation (7.2.1), before presenting the results for the neutral control-sentences (7.2.2). Then, I analyse the results for the transitivity-related factors (7.2.3 and 7.2.4), before moving on to those not related to transitivity (7.2.5). Section 7.2.6 contains a summary of the findings of the study.
7.1 Preliminaries

The following sub-sections deal with the process leading up to the creation of the questionnaire, and the methodology of the study.

7.1.1 Factors not tested

To begin with, I would like to clarify which transitivity-factors I will be testing. Recalling Langacker’s transitive prototype (Langacker 1991b, 302), we have 9 transitivity-increasing criteria: participant number (participant role), event-likeness, dynamicity, discreteness of participants, pre-existence of participants, asymmetry, volition, energy-direction and object-affectedness (see section 2.4.3). Ideally, the optimal questionnaire would test for all of these factors, but due to both spatial and logistical constraints, some factors have had to be omitted. For instance, testing for asymmetry without contrasting the A/NAs with a more symmetrical predicate (such as niru ‘resemble’) is very difficult, and attempting to compare acceptability scores between the predicates and other verbs/adjectives would likely raise more questions than it answers.

As mentioned in section 2.5, the A/NAs dealt with in this thesis might be conceived of as involving a sort of mental energy transfer through metaphorical extensions such as EMOTIONAL EFFECT IS PHYSICAL CONTACT and LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE. These extensions allow mental events to be interpreted in regard to the physical world. However, assessing the existence and directionality of this transfer within the participants’ conceptualization of the situation is arguably not possible with this test-format. Therefore, energy-direction is not treated by this particular questionnaire.

Additionally, the factor of pre-existence of participants is not treated. Although it might be possible to create a test-sentence in which it is clear that the N2 arises from the event (for example with the A/NAs in attributive use, together with the verb dekiru ‘appear’)\(^{59}\), it is

\(^{58}\) ‘transitivity factor’ and ‘transitivity criteria’ both refer back to Langacker’s prototype. In broad terms, ‘transitivity criteria’ is used when referring to the conceptual prototype, while ‘transitivity factors’ is used when examining the presence/absence of these criteria in the test-items.

\(^{59}\) As an example, consider the following sentence:

\begin{verbatim}
Misaki wa suki na hito ga deki-ta.
\end{verbatim}

‘A person appeared whom Misaki likes / Misaki began to like someone’
uncertain whether or not the ‘arising’ would be perceived as linked to the A/NA in question. Therefore, I have chosen to omit tests for this factor.

Lastly, the energeticness aspect of the dynamicity criterion will not be examined, due to the difficulty of creating test-items with differing interpretations of the presence of (metaphorically extended) kinetic energy, while using the same predicates. For the purpose of this chapter, we can more or less equate the dynamicity factor with its sub-factor of temporal boundedness.

7.1.2 Transitivity-related factors

The remaining 6 factors, however, will all be tested in various ways. In the following subsections I attempt to explain which sentences test for which factors, in addition to how they do so. The test items are given throughout the text of this chapter, and can also be found (complete with their kanji/kana version, in the appendix (section 10.3.1)). Before presenting the various transitivity-factors and test-items, I present the control-sentences here, to give the reader an opportunity to contrast the test-items with the control-sentences her-/himself.60

1) Boku wa Misaki ga suki da.
   I TOP Misaki NOM like COP
   ‘I like Misaki.’

2) Tashika-ni kakko-i kedo, watashi wa Tarō ga kirai da.
   certainly handsome-PRS but I TOP Tarō NOM dislike COP
   ‘He’s certainly handsome, but I dislike Tarō.’

3) Watashi wa atarashi-seetaa ga hoshi-i.
   I TOP new-PRS sweater NOM want-PRS
   ‘I want a new sweater.’

4) Boku wa Misaki o suki da.
   I TOP Misaki ACC like COP
   ‘I like Misaki.’

5) Tashika-ni kakko-i kedo, watashi wa Tarō o kirai da.
   certainly handsome-PRS but I TOP Tarō ACC dislike COP
   ‘He’s certainly handsome, but I dislike Tarō.’

6) Watashi wa atarashi-seetaa o hoshi-i.
   I TOP new-PRS sweater ACC want-PRS
   ‘I want a new sweater.’

---

60 The control-sentences are intended to be ‘neutral’ in the various transitivity-factors, in the sense that any added elements are not thought to increase/decrease the sentences’ perceived transitivity.
7)  Watashi wa yoku hito o suki ni nar-u.
    ‘I often grow to like people.’

8)  Watashi wa hito o kirai ni nar-u koto ga ō-i.
    ‘I often grow to dislike people.’

9)  Boku wa denshi-kiki no CM o mi-ru to, itsumo sono shōhin
    o hoshi-ku-nar-u.
    ‘Whenever I see commercials for electronics, I always end up wanting the products.’

7.1.2.1 Participant number and participant role

Although it might appear to be the most easily testable factor at first glance, the effect of
participant number is actually rather difficult to assess. Japanese exhibits a large degree
of pronoun ellipsis, in which the pronouns are absent from the utterance or text, but still
conceptually present. The pronouns are usually derivable from the context, and in instances
where there is no obvious contextual subject, the inferred subject usually defaults to the
speaker. This means that presenting an example where the subject is removed is not radically
different from presenting the same example with an ‘I’-subject.61 Bearing this in mind, I have
nevertheless attempted to assess the effect of participant number in two ways. The first is to
introduce the reflexive pronoun jibun ‘oneself’ (see 10, 11), and comparing this with the
control-sentences.62 This renders the sentence fully reflexive, as the N₁ and the N₂ correspond
to the same entity. The second is to simply compare sentences with overt subjects (e.g. 4, 5, 6)
to sentences with no/an inferred subject (e.g. 12, 13, 14). Additionally, the significance of
participant role (e.g. subject- and object-likeness) will be tested in examples 15-19, which
have been created based on the empathy-hierarchy (see 6.2.4). If sentences 15-17 – with
subjects lower than humans on the hierarchy – are deemed less acceptable with accusative
marking, it would indicate that sentences in which the role of the participants is further from

61 Note that the N₂ is not removable from the example either, as this leads the subject (N₁) to be perceived as the
N₂, and the creation of a new subject. See:
Misaki wa/ga Tarō ga/o kirai da.
‘Misaki hates Tarō.’

Misaki wa/ga Ø Ø kirai da.
‘(I) hate Misaki.’

62 The hoshii-predicate is omitted from this assessment because it is difficult to create a semantically sound
sentence with hoshii in which the N₁ and N₂ correspond to the same entity.
the transitive prototype are negatively associated with the case-alternation. Additionally, sentences 18 and 19 have been included to examine whether very non-object like $N_2$s affect the judged acceptability of the sentences.

**Participant number (1/2 – full reflexive)**

10) **Mawari ni iroiro okor-are-ru kedo, watashi wa jibun o suki da.**

surroundings DAT various scold-PASS-PRS but TOP oneself ACC like COP

‘I often get scolded by people around me, but I like myself.’

11) **Tomodachi ni kii-ta hanashi da kedo, Haruki wa jibun o kirai seem-PRS**

friend DAT hear-PST story COP but Haruki TOP oneself ACC dislike

‘I heard this from my friend, but it seems like Haruki dislikes himself.’

**Participant number (2/2 – overt)**

12) **Itsumo yasashi-ku-shite-kure-ru kara Haruki o suki da.**

always nice-ADZ-do-give-PRS because Haruki ACC like COP

‘I like Haruki because he is always nice to me.’

13) **Itsumo benkyō-shite-iru toki ni jama o sur-u kara, otōto o dislike COP**

always study-do-PROG time DAT bother ACC do-PRS because younger-brother ACC

‘I dislike my brother, because he always bothers me while I’m studying.’

14) **Haruki wa mattaku deeto ni tsurete-itte-na-i kara, atarashi-i kareshi new-PRS boyfriend**

Haruki TOP at.all date DAT bring-go-give-NEG-PRS because TOP ACC

‘Haruki never takes me on dates, so I want a new boyfriend.’

**Participant role (1/2 – subject animacy)**

15) **Watashi wa kihonteki-ni dōbutsu ni kiraw-are-ru taipu dar kedo,**

I TOP fundamentally animals DAT dislike-PASS-PRS type.of.person COP but
Shōta no inu wa watashi o suki da.
Shōta GEN dog TOP I ACC like COP

‘I’m the type of person who is usually disliked by animals, but Shōta’s dog likes me.’

16) **Saru wa iroiro na doubutsu to naka ga waru-i ga, especially dogs ACC dislike COP**

monkey TOP various COP animals COMP relation NOM bad-PRS but

toku-ni inu o kirai da.

‘Monkeys are on bad terms with many animals, but they especially dislike dogs.’
17) *Inu wa nani-yori-mo esa o hoshi-i kara, tabemono sae ataer-eba kantan-ni nakayoku nar-er*

> Dogs want food above all else, so as long as you give them food, you can easily befriend them.

**Participant role (2/2 – object animacy)**

18) *Watashi wa fantajii no hon o yom-u no o suki da.*

> I like reading fantasy-books.

19) *Boku wa futsukayoi ga hido-i kara, osake o nom-u no o kirai da.*

> ‘I dislike drinking alcohol, because I get really bad hangovers.’

**7.1.2.2 Event likeness**

Event likeness, on the other hand, is tested by introducing the verb *naru* ‘become’ to the sentence. One can see that in sentences like 20, 21 and 22, the situation described is more dynamic and involves a change. Higher acceptability-ratings of accusatively marked test-items such as these would therefore help cement the transitivity-associated event-likeness factor as an important component in accounting for the case-alternation. However, the choice to involve another verb and (syntactically) demoting the A/NAs to adverbs – and subsequently using these results to make generalizations about the A/NA-s – might, understandably, raise some criticism. While this is a valid concern, and one I will be keeping in mind while analysing the results, I would nevertheless like to raise a defence to this objection. I imagine the most immediate criticism of this choice to be that when one demotes the A/NAs to adverbs and includes another verb, the accusative particle on the second nominal is supposed to be assigned by the verb, and not by the A/NAs (now Advs). If we look at the case-marking patterns with A/NA+V combinations, however, we see that the verb does not seem to decide the choice of case-particle on the second nominal. Consider the following examples:

*Misaki wa se ga taka-i.*

> ‘Misaki is tall (Misaki’s height is high).’

*Misaki wa se ga/*o taka-ku nat-ta.*

> ‘Misaki’s became tall (Misaki’s height became high).’
By looking at these examples, one can see that it is the adverbiaлизed NA, and not the introduced verb, that governs the case-marking on the second nominal, and that the introduction of naru ‘become’ does not syntactically influence the case-marking. I argue, therefore, that any difference in acceptability judgments found between the original and naru-appended sentences should be interpreted as being due to semantic differences in event-conceptualization.

7.1.2 Dynamicity (temporal boundedness)

Dynamicity is another transitivity-factor that will be tested in several ways. For one, the aforementioned examples 20, 21 and 22 will, in addition to testing the event-likeness, also assess event-duration. Which of the two factors account for potential differences in judgments is hard to determine, however, and therefore I have introduced another way of gauging the effect of dynamicity. The way in which I have attempted to do this is by using sentences 23, 24 and 25, in which the situation described by the predicates is presented in past-tense along with a time-restricting adverbial. Higher acceptability scores of accusatively-marked predicates in this group may therefore indicate that event-briefness and the existence of a
defined endpoint – both closely associated with transitivity – help account for the phenomenon of accusative marking.

23) *Ima wa tsumarana-i hito da to omo-u ga, ichinensei no toki, watashi wa kare o suki dat-ta.*
‘Now I think he is a boring person, but I liked him when I was a freshman.’

24) *Kodomo no toki wa yasai o kirai dat-ta ga, ima wa mainichi takusan tabete-iru.*
‘When I was a child I disliked vegetables, but now I eat a lot of them every day.’

25) *Kōkō-jidai wa gucchi no kaban o hoshii katta kedo, ima wa sonna NMZ no nante doudemo ii to omotte-ki-ta.*
‘In my high school days I wanted Gucci-bags, but now I couldn’t care less about those kinds of things.’

7.1.2.4 Participant discreteness

Another factor which will be gauged in two ways is that of participant discreteness. Firstly, the discreteness of participants will be tested along with participant number in test-items 7 and 8, where both the N₁ and the N₂ represent the same entity though reflexive constructions. Secondly, semi-reflexive test-items will be presented in which the N₂-entity is more or less part of the N₁-entity, as in sentences 26 and 27. If these prove to be less acceptable with accusative marking it is reasonable to conclude that discreteness matters in regard to the observed alternation. When interpreting the results of this however, it is important to be mindful of the fact that there is a certain amount of overlap with participant role here, as the sentences with less discrete entities such as *ashi* ‘legs’ and *yōshi* ‘appearance’ also – on the whole – contain more object-like second nominals. The second aspect of discreteness, namely definiteness, is not tested here, as the lack of a definite marker in Japanese makes it difficult to create sentences which are identical except for the definiteness of the NPs.

---

63 The *hoshii*-predicate is omitted from this assessment because it is difficult to create a semantically sound sentence with *hoshii* in which the N₁ and N₂ correspond to more or less the same entity.
26) Donna tokoro ga jiman ka to i-u shitsumon ni taishite,
what kind spot NOM pride Q COMP say-PRS question DAT in.regard.to
sono moderu wa “watashi wa toku-ni jibun no ashi o suki da” to
that model TOP I TOP especially oneself GEN legs ACC like COP COMP
katat-ta.
tell-PST
‘In response to a question about what body-part she was most happy with, the model answered
“I’m particularly fond of my legs”.’

27) Itsumo minna ni “utsukush-i” to iwar-er-u kedo, watashi wa jibun
always everyone DAT beautiful-PRS COMP say-PASS-PRS but I TOP oneself
no yōshi o kirai da.
GEN appearance ACC dislike COP
‘Everyone always tells me that I’m beautiful, but I dislike my own appearance.’

7.1.2.5 Volition

The influence of volition – perhaps expected to be one of the most important contributing
factors to the acceptability of accusative-marked A/NA-sentences – will be thoroughly tested
in several different ways. In one group of sentences – 28-30 – I have adverbialized the A/NA
and employed the potential of the verb naru ‘become’, to imbue the test-sentences with a
higher degree of overt intention. 64 These sentences also feature adverbs such as doushitemo
‘no matter what (I) do’ and nakanaka ‘not readily’ to invoke an even more volitional
interpretation. In addition to this, another group of sentences – 31, 32 and 33 – contain
features such as -tai wake janakatta no ni ‘although (I) didn’t want to become -’, keredo ‘but’
and nazeka ‘for some reason’, which create a less volitional interpretation. The less acceptable
this last group of sentences is deemed, the more important volition will appear as an
explanatory factor.

Volition (1/2 –positive volition)

28) Watashi wa ganbatte, yatto mukashi kirai dat-ta yasai o suki
I TOP endeavor finally formerly dislike COP-PST vegetables ACC like
ni nar-e-ta.
DAT become-POT-PST
‘I made an effort, and finally began to like the vegetables I had previously hated.’

64 Ideally, I would have like to use the positive potential form of the naru predicate for all sentences, but due to
the meaning of the predicates (especially kirai) it is difficult to conceive of a situation in which such a sentence
is pragmatically possible.
29) Donna hido-i koto o sarete-mo, boku wa ano ko o kirai ni
what kind cruel-PRS things ACC do.PASS-even I TOP that girl ACC dislike DAT
become-POT-NEG-PRS
‘No matter what cruel things I am subjected to (by her), I can’t seem to hate that girl.

30) Daikazoku ga i-i to i-u tsuma no kimochi o
large family NOM good-PRS COMP say-PRS wife GEN feelings ACC
rikai-shi-yō to ganbatte-wa-mi-ta ga, boku wa nakanaka kodomo
understand-do-VOL.COMP perservere-EMPH-try-PST but I TOP not.readily children
ACC want-ADZ-become-POT-NEG-PRS
‘I’ve tried my best to understand the feelings of my wife who wants a large family, but I can’t really seem to start wanting children.’

Volition (2/2 – negative volition)

31) Betsu-ni suki ni nari-ta-katta wake ja-nai keredo, watashi wa kare
particularly like DAT become-DESID-PST case COP-NEG but I TOP him
ACC like COP
‘It’s not like I particularly wanted to like him, but I do.’

32) Itsumo yasashi-ku-shite-kure-ru keredo, watashi wa nazeka ano hito o
always nice-ADZ-do-give-PRS but I TOP for.some.reason that person ACC
dislike COP
‘He is always nice to me, but for some reason I dislike that person.’

33) Watashi wa kono butsuyokushakai ga iya da keredo, nazeka
I TOP this materialistic.society NOM detestable COP but for.some.reason
shingata no keitai o hoshi-i.
new.model GEN mobile.phone ACC want-PRS
‘Even though I detest this materialistic society, I for some reason find myself wanting a new phone.’

7.1.2.6 Object affectedness

The last transitivity-related factor which will be tested in this questionnaire is that of object affectedness. This will be tested by providing sentences in which the N2 clearly undergoes some physical or mental change as a consequence of the action taking place. It is, however, difficult to conceive of actions with the A/NAs meaning having physical consequences on the receiving participant, which will mean that any sentence which implies this will be particularly low in imagery (see section 7.1.4 below). Therefore, I have chosen to add information which suggests a mental affectedness of the N2 to the sentences. The sentences in
question are sentences 34 and 35. They contain phrases such as *kimochi warui* ‘makes me sick’ and *shokku o uketa* ‘(I) was shocked’, which are presented as direct consequences of the liking and disliking.

34) *Tarō ga watashi o suki da nante, kimo-chi-waru-i yo.*
   Tarō NOM I ACC like COP such.as disgusting-PRS PTCL
   ‘Tarō liking me makes me sick.’

35) *Misaki ga boku o kirai da to kii-ta toki, sugoku shokku o uke-ta.*
   Misaki NOM I ACC dislike COP COMP hear-PST time very shock ACC incur-PST
   ‘I was shocked when I heard that Misaki dislikes me.’

7.1.3 Non-transitivity related factors

In the introduction to this thesis, I explained that I aim to explain the possibility and cause of the case-alternation observed with the A/NAs in question. Therefore, any analysis that ignores non-semantic factors (such as parsing, and language-norms), would be incomplete. Because of this, I have chosen to add a few test-items which reaffirm the previous claims made by Shibatani (1978) (see section 5.2.3) regarding ambiguity reduction, as well as the effect of degree of formality/politeness.

Ambiguity reduction as a factor is tested by providing test-items in which a large amount of elements appear between the N₂ and the A/NA. The idea is that if reduction of ambiguity is one of the driving factors behind the case-alternation, the sentences with many elements between the accusatively-marked N₂ and the verb should be deemed more acceptable, since the accusative particle helps clarify the syntactic role of the N₂. The sentences used to test this are those of 36, 37 and 38:

36) *Boku wa Misaki o kono yo no dono onna-no-ko yori-mo suki da.*
   I TOP Misaki ACC this world GEN whichever girl rather-than like COP
   ‘I like Misaki more than any other girl in the world.’

37) *Watashi wa Tarō o, ninnenmae ni fur-arete irai, zutto kirai da.*
   I TOP Tarō ACC two.years.ago DAT dump-PASS since the.whole.time dislike COP
   ‘I’ve disliked Tarō ever since he dumped me two years ago.’

Because the objects of *hoshii* clauses are most commonly non-humans, it is difficult to provide a plausible sentence which expresses (emotional) object affectedness with this predicate. Object affectedness is therefore only assessed in regards to *suki* and *kirai*.

---

65 Because the objects of *hoshii* clauses are most commonly non-humans, it is difficult to provide a plausible sentence which expresses (emotional) object affectedness with this predicate. Object affectedness is therefore only assessed in regards to *suki* and *kirai*. 
On the other hand, a higher degree of **formality/politeness** might be expected to result in lower acceptability ratings. This is due to the accusative marking still being considered non-standard (see section 1.1) and because formal language may pose higher requirements in regard to correctness, barring use of slang-expressions etc. Lower ratings of the more formal sentences 39-44, would therefore indicate that correctness and formality contribute to halting the case-alternation.

**Politeness (1/2 – polite)**

39) *Haruki wa Hanako o suki desu.*  
Haruki TOP Hanako ACC like COP.POL  
‘Haruki likes Hanako.’

40) *Tomodachi no hanashi ni yoru to, Haruki wa Tarō o kirai desu.*  
friend GEN story DAT according COMP Haruki TOP Tarō ACC dislike COP.POL  
‘According to my friend, Haruki dislikes Tarō.’

41) *Watashi wa atarashi-seetaa o hoshi-i desu.*  
I TOP new-PRS sweater ACC want-PRS COP.POL  
‘I want a new sweater.’

**Politeness (2/2 – superpolite)**

42) *Watashi wa ano kata o suki de-gozaimasu.*  
I TOP that person.POL ACC like COP-SUPERPOL  
‘I like that person.’

43) *Itsumo waru-koto koto bakari shite-iru node, watashi wa ano hito o kirai de-gozaimasu.*  
always bad-PRS things only do-PROG because.POL I TOP that person ACC dislike COP-SUPERPOL  
‘I dislike him/her, because he/she only does bad things.’

44) *Daikazoku ni akogarete-ori-masu node, watashi wa takusan no kodomo o hoshū-gozaimasu.*  
large family DAT admire-PROG;HUMB-POL because.POL I TOP many GEN children ACC want-SUPERPOL  
‘I want many children because I look up to large families.’
7.1.4 Methodology

The participants were asked to rate the acceptability of the sentences on a Likert Scale from 1 (completely unacceptable) to 5 (completely acceptable). Two base-sentences – corresponding to 1 (sentence B) and 5 (sentence A) on the scale – were provided to the participants at the beginning of the task. These sentences’ (un)acceptability was assessed beforehand by native speakers not participating in the study. Participants were also asked to provide their gender, age, academic year, and place of birth/place of longest residence in Japan, but no other personal information (e.g. names) was collected.

In addition, several measures were put into place in order to avoid potential sources of error in the data. To combat the effects of satiation, the order of sentences were randomized for each participant. Participants were also asked to disclose whether or not they had a background in linguistics. Additionally, participants were explicitly instructed to rate acceptability, rather than grammaticality. They were asked to rate the sentences based on whether or not they would sound natural if uttered by, for example, a friend, and not based on whether or not they conform to formal grammar rules. In order to avoid skewing based on the level of imagery in the sentences, the sentences were provided with context, in order to make the situations as easily imaginable as possible.

Another choice I have made in regard to the creation of the test-items, is to avoid using sentences which would likely have been deemed unacceptable regardless of the non-standard choice of case-particle (barring, of course, the base sentence B mentioned two paragraphs above). Sentences in which other elements than the case particle feel out of place would yield lower acceptability-ratings in general, and would thus void any comparison between them and the control sentences (sentences 1-9). All the sentences have therefore been confirmed to be fully acceptable with the nominative case-particle ga. The assessments were, like those of the base-sentences, made beforehand by native speakers not participating in the study.

---

66 All sentences can be found in section 10.3 in the appendix.
67 The only exceptions being those which contain the verb naru ‘become’, as they are often deemed unacceptable with the ga-particle.
7.1.5 Distribution of participants

The participants of the study belong to two groups, the first being current or previous Japanese exchange students at the University of Oslo, Norway, and the second being Japanese people living in Norway enrolled at Norwegian language schools. The majority of participants belong to the former of the two. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 38, with the majority of the participants (approximately 90%) below the age of 28 – the average being 24. The rate of female respondents was rather high, with the ratio of women/men being 29/8. The participants’ place of birth (and longest permanent residence) ranged all the way from Hokkaidō to Kyūshū, with the most represented regions being Hokkaidō (N=4), Kantō (N=9), Chūbu (N=4) and Kinki (N=15). Lastly, the majority of the participants (N=18) reported that they had previously taken linguistics-classes, but only 4/37 had majors related to linguistics. There were 0 linguistics-majors, and 15 participants who have had no experience with linguistics. In addition to this distribution, it is important to keep in mind that all the respondents have had experiences of living/studying abroad, and that they therefore make up a (relatively) restricted group of individuals. Although this might mean that the results are not completely representative for the population as a whole, they nevertheless represent the intuitions of a group of native speakers. With all this in mind, I will now present and discuss the results of the questionnaire.

7.2 Results

The following sub-sections are devoted to presenting and analyzing the results of the study.

7.2.1 Group variation

Although the purpose of this study is to find unifying tendencies within a certain population of native speakers, and not to differentiate linguistic behavior on the basis of other variables, I would like to briefly touch on some of the differences within the various groups of participants included in the study.

On the whole, the male participants rated the test-items as less acceptable than their female counterparts, with the average score for all sentences being 2.75 for male participants and 3.24 for female participants. This is perhaps natural, as women are generally thought to be at
the forefront of leading linguistic change (Labov 2001, 280-283; Shin 2013, 136). In 4 cases, the difference between male and female participants exceeded 1 point, whereas other sentences were less contested, yielding a difference of under 0.1 point. It is interesting to note, however, that 3/4 of the test-items which exhibited a gender-difference over 1 point included the suki-predicate, indicating that this is perhaps the largest point of contention.

In regard to the factor of previous experience with linguistics, the acceptability judgments of the various groups seem to be relatively similar. The average of the acceptability judgments for all sentences was 2.95 for those with no linguistic experience, 3.25 for those who had previously taken classes in linguistics, and 3.24 for those who reported themselves as majoring in a field somewhat related to linguistics. Although there is a slight difference between the groups, this is not significant enough to draw any definite conclusions about the relation between linguistic training and perceived acceptability.

As for regional differences,68 there were some differences across regions with more than one participant. The average acceptability value of all test-items was 3.64 (N=4) for Hokkaidō, 3.08 (P=9) for Kantō, 3.13 for Chūbu (P=4) and 3.01 (P=15) for Kinki. The difference between the participants from Hokkaido and the other regions is noticeable, perhaps yielding some hints about the effect of dialectical variation on the acceptability of suki- kirai- and hoshii-sentences with accusatively marked N2s.

In regard to age, there seems to be a slight negative correlation between age and judged acceptability. The average score given by participants born between 1980 and 1990 (N=5) was 2.83, the average score given by those born between 1991 and 1995 (N=10) was 3.20, and the average score given by those born between 1995 and 1999 (N=22) was 3.22. This seems to indicate that younger speakers are more accepting of NOM-ACC patterns with suki, kirai, and hoshii. Whether this is due to the age of the speaker, or their birth year (e.g. whether it is due to slight generational differences or merely speaker-maturity), however, is unclear.

68 Referring to ‘where one has lived the longest’. There was only one participant who reported differing values for ‘place of birth’ and ‘where one has lived the longest’, so these analyses have not been conducted separately.
7.2.2 Control-sentences

Table 7-1 Average acceptability-values for control-sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Control NOM-NOM (α)</th>
<th>Control NOM-ACC (β)</th>
<th>Control NOM-ACC-naru (γ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suki</td>
<td>5 (m=5, M=5)</td>
<td>2.54 (m=2, M=2)</td>
<td>4.78 (m=5, M=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirai</td>
<td>4.81 (m=5, M=5)</td>
<td>2.49 (m=2, M=2)</td>
<td>4.92 (m=5, M=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoshii</td>
<td>4.97 (m=5, M=5)</td>
<td>2.35 (m=2, M=1)</td>
<td>3.89 (m=4, M=5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beginning with the assessment of the control sentences, the test-items exhibiting the NOM-NOM pattern (sentences 1-3) accrued (nearly) perfect acceptability scores (avg: suki: 5; kirai: 4.81; hoshii: 4.97). On the other hand, the test-items exhibiting the NOM-ACC pattern showed markedly lower scores (avg: suki: 2.54; kirai: 2.49; hoshii: 2.35). While the NOM-NOM construction appears to be fully acceptable among almost all speakers, the NOM-ACC construction therefore seems to lie somewhere between total unacceptability and total acceptability, leaning towards the lower end of the spectrum. The perception of the NOM-ACC construction as peripheral and non-standard therefore seems to be in accordance with the intuitions of native speakers (Shibatani 1991, 301). In regard to the control-sentences with *naru* ‘become’, it seems that the NOM-ACC pattern rises drastically in acceptability when combined with this verb.

In order to elucidate the effects of the presence/absence of transitivity related elements in the subsequent sentences, I will be comparing them all to the NOM-ACC control-sentences. For the sake of brevity, these control-sentences (4-6) will henceforth be glossed as βsuki, βkirai and βhoshii. In the case of test-items containing the verb *naru* along with other transitivity increasing factors, these will be contrasted both with the β-versions, as well as with the NOM-ACC-naru control-sentences (7-9), which will henceforth be referred to as γsuki, γkirai, and γhoshii. To increase readability, these values have been re-rendered under every subsequent table.

---

\(^{69}\) m=median, M=mode
7.2.3 Transitivity-factors (1/2)

Table 7-2 Average acceptability values for transitivity factors (1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Participant number (reflexive)</th>
<th>Participant number (overt)</th>
<th>Participant role (Subject animacy)</th>
<th>Participant role (Object animacy)</th>
<th>Event Likeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suki</td>
<td>2,54 m=2, M=2</td>
<td>2,38 m=2, M=1</td>
<td>3,81 m=4, M=5</td>
<td>2 m=2, M=2</td>
<td>4,81 m=5, M=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirai</td>
<td>3,76 m=5, M=5</td>
<td>2,19 m=2, M=1</td>
<td>2,08 m=2, M=1</td>
<td>2,22 m=2, M=1</td>
<td>3,41 m=4, M=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoshii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,19 m=2, M=1</td>
<td>3,46 m=4, M=5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3,92 m=4, M=5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

βsuki=2,54 βkirai=2,49 βhoshii=2,35 γsuki=4,78 γkirai=4,92 γhoshii=3,89

In regard to **Participant number** (sentences 10-14), the results were rather mixed. We see that while the sentences with a lower amount of overt participants (12-14) expectedly yielded somewhat lower average acceptability-scores (-0,16; -0,30; -0,16), those with reflexive subjects (10-11) actually yielded similar (±0,00 for suki) or drastically higher (+1,27 for kirai) ratings compared with the β-sentences. Moreover, both the median and the mean for sentence 11 were 5, indicating a relatively significant divide in the judgments of the speakers. The only discernable difference between sentences 10 and 11 (apart from the differing predicates, of course) is the presence of the word rashii ‘seems like’ after the kirai-predicate. If this is indeed the cause of the discrepancy, it is a surprising one, as such words would normally be assumed to decrease transitivity, rather than increase it. However, it might be possible that this sentence could have received a similar interpretation to the garu-suffixed sentences discussed in 5.2.2, in which it describes outward manifestation of internal feelings. Without access to the minds of the respondents, however, this remains a simple conjecture.

Moving on to **Participant role** (15-19), we see similarly diverging results. As indicated by the parenthesized (-)-s, the test-items were expected to yield lower average values. The sentences with non-prototypical objects (18 and 19) received lower ratings (-0,54; -0,27),

---

70 The separation of the discussion into two parts is not thematic, but has rather been made in order to improve readability, and to avoid having to refer back several pages.

71 The parenthesized (+) and (-) indicate the expected effect of the added elements on the sentences’ acceptability. As such, the values of factors marked with (-) were expected to be lower than those of the β-sentences, while the values of factors marked with (+) were expected to be higher than those of the β-sentences.

72 value=[participant number (overt)]-[βsuki] = 2,38-2,54 = -0,16. The other calculations follow the same pattern.
which corresponds well to the relative lack of such items in the corpora analyzed in the previous chapter. The results for the test-items with non-prototypical subjects (animal subjects), however, show a different trend. Surprisingly, the effect on the judgments were +1.27 for *suki*, -0.41 for *kirai*, and +1.11 for *hoshii*. This result is particularly interesting because it seems to go against both the hypothesis that subjects higher on the empathy hierarchy increase transitivity, and the idea that the accusatively marked *suki*-instantiations are partly driven by the semantic split discussed in 6.3.2 and 6.3.3, since animals are arguably less capable of romantic feelings than humans.

Let us proceed to the first factor expected to yield higher acceptability-scores than the control-sentences, namely **Event likeness** (20-22). Although the effect was not equally large between all predicates, the change is nevertheless significant, with an increase of +2.27 for *suki*, +0.92 for *kirai*, and +1.57 for *hoshii*. This seems to indicate that accusative marking on the N₂ of these predicates becomes more natural when the situation described is more event-like, but that the size of this change is contingent on the sentences’ main predicate (e.g. higher for *suki*- and *hoshii*-sentences than for *kirai*-sentences). However, in comparing these test-items with the γ-sentences, we actually find that items 20-22 yielded similar (*suki*: +0.03, *hoshii*: +0.03) or lower (*kirai*: -1.51) scores. This seems to indicate that the effect that the added adverbial clauses – which were inserted to express a sense of instantaneousness and change – had negligible or negative results on overall acceptability. In regard to the lack of change (e.g. *suki* and *hoshii*) this might simply be because the interpretation is not significantly more event like in 20 and 22, than in γ*suki* and γ*hoshii*, or there might be other factors of the sentences which counteract the effect of the aforementioned adverbial clauses. Explaining the lower acceptability of 21 (the *kirai*-sentence) with respect to its γ-counterpart, however, is somewhat more difficult, and I do not have a satisfying theory at this time. Do not forget, however, that even though the event-like test-items do not compare favorably with their γ-counterparts, they nevertheless exhibit a significantly higher degree of acceptability than the β-sentences.
7.2.4 Transitivity-factors (2/2)

Table 7-3 Average acceptability values for transitivity factors (2/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Predicate</th>
<th>Dynamicity (endpoint) (+)</th>
<th>Participant discreteness (-)</th>
<th>Pos-Volition (+)</th>
<th>Neg-Volition (+)</th>
<th>Object affectedness (+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suki</td>
<td>3,78 m=4, M=5</td>
<td>2,41 m=2, M=2</td>
<td>4,46 m=5, M=5</td>
<td>2,51 m=2, M=2</td>
<td>4,86 m=5, M=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirai</td>
<td>3,05 m=3, M=5</td>
<td>2,16 m=2, M=1</td>
<td>4,95 m=5, M=5</td>
<td>2,86 m=2, M=3</td>
<td>4,57 m=5, M=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoshii</td>
<td>3,38 m=4, M=5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4,30 m=5, M=5</td>
<td>2,68 m=3, M=3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

βsuki=2,54  βkirai=2,49  βhoshii=2,35  γsuki=4,78  γkirai=4,92  γhoshii=3,89

The test-items with increased **Dynamicity** (in this case **temporal boundedness**), also accrued higher scores than the control-sentences, although the effect was not as marked as in the event-likeness sentences. Subtracting the control-scores from those of sentences 23 through 25 – which expressed the event as finished and temporally bounded – yields the net positive values of +1,24 for *suki*, +0,56 for *kirai* and +1,03 for *hoshii*. In all cases, the mean response was 5 ‘totally acceptable’. It would seem, then, that clauses in which the endpoint of the situation described by the stative predicate is clearly defined, native speakers are more likely to accept accusative marking on the N2. As with the event-likeness factor, however, it seems like the observable effect is strongest in regard to the *suki*-predicate, and weakest in regard to the *kirai*-predicate.

Moving on to **Participant discreteness** (26 and 27), we see that the test-items with a lesser degree of discreteness (manifested in semi-reflexive N2s such as *ashi* ‘legs’ and *yōshi* ‘appearance’) were deemed less acceptable by the participants. The observed difference between the β-sentences and sentences 26 and 27 is -0,13 for *suki* and -0,33 for *kirai*. Interestingly, these scores are lower than those of sentences 10 and 11, which contained fully reflexive N2s (in the form of *jibun* ‘oneself’). This is somewhat counterintuitive, because semi-reflexive N2s are arguably more discrete than completely reflexive N2s in reference to the N1. Note, however, that this seems to conform to the tendency that human N2s are more preferable with the NOM-ACC-pattern, perhaps due to the aforementioned semantic split.

As mentioned in the discussion above, the next factor, **Volitionality**, was expected to be one of the most important components in accounting for the acceptability of instantiations of the
predicates with ACC-marked N₂s. The results, however, are somewhat mixed. The inclusion of information which induce a more volitional interpretation in sentences 28-30 led to acceptability-increases of +1.92 for suki, +2.46 for kirai, and +1.95 for hoshii. Out of all the examined factors, an increase of volitionality led to the largest positive change in the acceptability of kirai and hoshii-sentences, in addition to a significant boost of the acceptability of the suki-sentence. However, these test-items also contain the verb naru, and must therefore also be compared with the γ-sentences. In doing so, the observed tendency is significantly less strong: the hoshii-sentence compares favorably (+0.41), the kirai-sentence seems largely identical (+0.03) and the suki-sentence actually appears less acceptable than its γ-counterpart (-0.32). Once again, it is difficult to assess whether it is the added volitionality, or the presence of the naru-verb, which leads to the sentences’ increased acceptability. The effect of the volitional elements on the sentences’ acceptability is further put into question by the judgments on the sentences with volitionality-decreasing elements. These sentences (31-33) contained elements which suggested that the situations described by the predicates were not initiated by the subject, but despite this, they yielded similar or positive values when compared with the β-sentences. The net-score of these sentences was -0.03 for suki, +0.37 for kirai, and +0.33 for hoshii. While the fact that sentences with less volitional interpretations did not seem to produce overall lower scores than the β-sentences does not directly prove that the observed change in sentences 28-31 was not caused by the volitional elements, it does suggest that volitionality is not as important as previously assumed.

Lastly, I will examine the results for the Object-affectedness factor. In sentences 32 and 33, the speaker – corresponding to the N₂ – expresses distaste or surprise as a result of the situation described by the predicate, which is arguably the closest one can get to these predicates eliciting change in their N₂s. Looking at the average scores for these sentences’ acceptability, we observe a clear change: +2.32 for suki and +2.08 for kirai. These sentences do not contain the naru-predicate, meaning that this is the largest observed change where the NAs are not adverbialized and accompanied by a verb. This is perhaps the clearest indication that the acceptability of the predicate-containing clauses benefits from an interpretation closer to the transitive prototype. Note, however, that this evidence only applies to the suki and kirai predicates.
7.2.5  Non-transitivity related factors

Table 7-4  Average acceptability values for non-transitivity related factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Politeness</th>
<th>Super-politeness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suki</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m=5, M=5</td>
<td>m=3, M=1</td>
<td>m=2, M=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirai</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m=3, M=2</td>
<td>m=2, M=1</td>
<td>m=1, M=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoshii</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m=3, M=2</td>
<td>m=2, M=1</td>
<td>m=2, M=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

βsuki=2.54  βkirai=2.49  βhoshii=2.35  γsuki=4.78  γkirai=4.92  γhoshii=3.89

Finally, I will now present the results for the non-transitivity related factors of distance and politeness/formality. Although somewhat mixed, there seems to be some validity to the claim that an increased Distance between the N₂ and the predicate strengthen the acceptability of suki/kirai/hoshii sentences in the NOM-ACC-pattern. The observed change for sentences 34 through 36 was +1.49 for suki, +0.43 for kirai, and +0.87 for hoshii. This suggests that the addition of adverbial elements between N₂ and predicate has some effect, but that this effect is not equally large for all predicates.

Pertaining to the Politeness and Super-politeness factors, the results are even more heterogeneous. In fact, the addition of polite forms such as the copula desu yielded average acceptability-judgments higher than the β-sentences for all predicates, with an increase of +0.19, +0.13, and +0.19, respectively. Do note, however, that the mean score for these judgments was 1, indicating that there was much variation in the participants’ judgments.

However, the addition of superpolite elements such as the copula de-gozaimasu seems to have had an effect somewhat more in line with our expectations: -0.27 for suki, -0.57 for kirai and +0.24 for hoshii. It would seem, then, that if there indeed is an effect of the inclusion of formal elements on the acceptability of sentences with NOM-ACC case-marking, it is relatively small and only detectable when extreme instances of these elements are present.
7.3 Summary

Despite some unexpected numbers, I would argue that the results point in favor of a moderate optimism in regard to the validity of the hypothesis that there is a connection between similarity to the transitive prototype and the acceptability of sukil/kirail/hoshii-sentences with the NOM-ACC-pattern. The observations which support this are that, compared to the β-sentences:

1. Very non-object-like N₂s elicited lower acceptability scores
2. More event-like test-items yielded significantly higher acceptability scores
3. Sentences with semi-reflexive N₂s yielded lower acceptability scores
4. More dynamic (temporally bounded) test-items produced higher acceptability scores
5. More affected ‘objects’ (N₂s) yielded significantly higher acceptability scores.

As for the evidence that goes against the hypothesis, we see that, compared to the β-sentences:

1. Sentences with reflexive N₂s yielded similar or higher acceptability-judgments
2. Subject-likeness produced mixed results
3. Test-items with volition-decreasing elements yielded higher scores for 2/3 predicates.

While it would seem that there are only two more reasons for the hypothesis than against it, I would argue that the arguments in favor of the hypothesis are stronger (in that the effect is larger) and more consistent (in that there is less variation between predicates). Additionally, it seems that the transitivity-hypothesis holds more explanatory value than ‘syntactic’ theories about the alternation relating to factors such as distance, as evidenced by the relative size of the effect of the transitivity-related factors in comparison with the non-transitivity-related factors. While much of the increased acceptability might be accounted for by ‘syntactic’ changes, such as the addition of the naru-verb, this does not necessarily imply that the increase is strictly based on formal criteria. This is because it is undoubtedly true that the inclusion of such elements leads to a more transitive interpretation, and this semantic and conceptual change cannot be separated from its structure.

I would like to point out, however, that, due to both variation and lack of testability, the conclusion does not hold equally true for all predicates. Due to constraints of meaning, the hoshii-predicate was not examined with regard to all the same factors as the two other predicates, most notably concerning Participant number, Object-likeness, Discreteness and Object-affectedness. Additionally, there was a great deal of variation among the predicates with reference to some of the different factors, particularly when it comes to Participant
number and Subject-likeness. Admittedly, some of this variation might be due to certain test-items containing unrelated elements which could have impacted the interpretation of the sentences.
8 Conclusion

8.1 The goal of the thesis

The goal of this thesis was to uncover the cause for the NOM-ACC-alternation observed with the three predicates suki ‘like’, kirai ‘dislike’, and hoshii ‘want’. During my preliminary research, I realized that a completely exhaustive examination of causes (including conceptual, syntactic, phonological, and social) would likely lead to a thesis which greatly exceeded the prescribed page-count, and that an attempt to orient myself in all of these fields over the span of merely a year would likely hurt the quality of the analysis. For these reasons, I decided to focus on one branch of linguistics – namely Cognitive Linguistics – and to conduct the research from this viewpoint. In examining the previous literature, I found that the (to my eyes) most reasonable explanation of the alternation was related to the notion of transitivity. From there, an idea began to take form, eventually resulting in the hypothesis presented in the introduction, and re-rendered below:

\[ H_1: \text{The choice of case-marker is related to the perceived transitivity of the clause in which it occurs, with a higher degree of transitivity coinciding with a stronger preference for accusative marking.} \]

In order to provide testable features, “transitivity” was operationalized in terms of the following factors and sub-factors, following Langacker (1991b):

1. Participant number
2. Participant role
   a. Subject-likeness
   b. Object-likeness
3. Event-likeness
4. Dynamicity
   a. Energeticness
   b. Temporal boundedness\footnote{“Temporal boundedness” was assessed together with “Event-likeness” in the in-depth corpus study.}
5. Participant-discreteness
6. Pre-existence of participants
7. Asymmetry
8. Volition
9. Energy-direction
10. Object affectedness
Which of these factors were tested for varied between the corpus and questionnaire-studies, due to methodological (and semantic) limitations. In the corpus studies, the distribution of sentences in the NOM-NOM and NOM-ACC patterns was examined in regard to the presence/absence of these factors, and in the questionnaire, these factors were intentionally included/excluded, in order to see the effect this had on the sentences’ acceptability. Due to the nature of conceptual transitivity (see chapter 2) it was not necessarily expected that all factors would correlate positively with accusative marking, and it was neither assumed that they should all ‘matter’ equally much.

8.2 Previous research

The hypothesis received ample support in the examination of previous research in Chapter 5. Despite the scholars whose work was discussed making use of radically different frameworks, their theories and findings regarding the reason for the case-alternation (or the reason for the choice of case-marker, anyway) all conform well to the notion that transitivity plays a role. In addition to obvious appeals to concepts related to transitivity (e.g. Makino (5.3.1), Jarkey (5.3.2) and Mano (5.3.3)), those working within more syntax-focused linguistics (i.e. Tokieda (5.2.1), Kuno (5.2.2) and Shibatani (5.2.3)) also made observations which – directly or indirectly – support the transitivity-hypothesis. From the analysis of the previous research, the most important factors facilitating the case-alternation seemed to be:

1. An increased event-likeness (and non-state-likeness) of the clause
2. The presence of volition in the clause

These are both factors strongly associated with transitivity, providing support for the hypothesis.

8.3 The corpus-studies

The statistical corpus-analysis revealed that two of the predicates (suki and kirai) were preferentially associated with accusative marking when they occurred together with the inchoative verb naru (to become). This co-occurrence renders the situation more event-like. The suki-predicate also preferred accusative marking when appearing together with adverbs which trigger a more volitional interpretation. Additionally, it revealed that for suki and kirai,
accusative marking is often avoided when the N₂ takes the form of a nominalized verb, which arguably lowers the transitivity of the sentences due to a decreased object-likeness. The data also hints at other types of very non-object-like N₂s (such as those anteceded by hou ga ‘side (of comparison)’ being less common with accusative marking, but due to the relative lack of data, this claim is not as strong.

The in-depth sentence analysis conducted on the two corpora also provided support for the hypothesis. The “transitivity-aggregate”-score, created by combining scores for all transitivity-related factors, turned out to – on average – be higher for instantiations of the predicate where the N₂ was accusatively marked for all predicates. While some transitivity-related factors showed no significant difference (in particular “Participant discreteness”, “Object affectedness”, “Subject-likeness” and “Dynamicity (energeticness)”), others did show significant distinctions between nominatively and accusatively marked instantiations. Notably, sentences which contained elements of volition accounted for a larger portion the suki and kirai predicates with accusative marking, compared to their counterparts with nominative marking. Additionally, more “event-like” (and temporally bounded) sentences also accounted for a larger portion of the sentences with the NOM-ACC pattern for all predicates, compared to those in the NOM-NOM pattern. Lastly, the occurrence of accusative marking negatively correlated with the presence of very non-object-like N₂s (for suki and kirai).

8.4 The questionnaire

The acceptability-judgment questionnaire of Chapter 7 also produced results which reinforce the hypothesis. Notably, the acceptability of the test-items was positively affected when the sentences: 1. had more event-like interpretations; 2. were more dynamic (temporally bounded), and 3. had more affected ‘objects’ (N₂s) (for suki and kirai). Additionally, acceptability of suki and kirai was negatively influenced by non-object-like nominalized verbal N₂s. Contrary to the hypothesis, however, the questionnaire did reveal that test-items with non-discrete (reflexive) NPs, in addition to kirai and hoshii-test-items with decreased volition, were deemed more acceptable than their neutral base-sentences. Additionally, the “subject-likeness” test items produced mixed results. I will point out, however, that the findings supporting the hypothesis are significantly stronger than those which go against it.
8.5 Common elements

Looking back at the results, we see that the most common factor across the studies seems to be that of “Event-likeness”. In all examinations, event-likeness was preferentially associated with accusative marking. The presence/absence of volitional elements – which was hypothesized by previous scholars to be a significant factor in the NOM-ACC alternation – does not, however, seem to be as pivotal as previously assumed. While the corpus-studies showed a positive correlation between the presence of volitional elements and accusative marking for suki and kirai (and a negative correlation between their absence and accusative marking for suki), the acceptability-judgment questionnaire produced somewhat different results. While it is true that sentences containing volitional elements were given higher scores than the NOM-ACC control-sentences, they did not compare as favorably to the control-sentences with the naru-predicate (which the volitional sentences also contained). Additionally, the questionnaire-results seem to indicate that a presence of volition-decreasing elements does not decrease overall acceptability of sentences with accusative marking for kirai and hoshii. On the hypothesis-positive side, however, we also see that the NOM-ACC pattern was negatively associated with very non-object-like N₂s, indicating that these types of N₂s to some extent preclude accusative marking. Furthermore, the questionnaire suggests that the two factors of “object-affectedness” (for suki and kirai) and “temporal boundedness” (for all predicates) influence the acceptability of sentences with accusative marking.

8.6 State of the hypothesis

Seen as a whole, I would argue that the results make the case for a moderate optimism in regards to the validity of the transitivity-hypothesis. By this, I mean that they seem to indicate a relatively strong correlation between the occurrence of the NOM-ACC pattern, and certain factors related to conceptual transitivity. While not all factors seem to have the same significance, some – such as event-likeness, object-affectedness, object-likeness and (to a certain extent) volition – arguably seem to influence choice and acceptability of accusative marking. Some other factors, such as dynamicity (temporal boundedness) also showed a correlation in the studies where it was assessed.
8.7 Other findings

Over the course of the thesis, I have also touched on various other potential factors facilitating the choice of accusative marking with these predicates. One of these is that a greater distance between the N₂ and the predicate seems to result in a greater acceptability of accusative marking on said N₂. This is likely in part motivated by parsing-constraints, as hypothesized in Shibatani (1978). Do note, however, that this effect seems to be significantly weaker than the effects of many of the ‘transitivity-related’ factors discussed above. Furthermore, there appears to be a link between the prevalence of the predicates’ verbal counterparts, and their productivity in regard to appearing in new constructions (6.2.5). In particular, the suki predicate – whose verbal counterpart suku is the rarest of all the verbal predicates – appears to be significantly more productive than the other two predicates. Lastly, the results of the in-depth corpus study suggest that there is some validity in Caluianu’s (2009) claim that the predicates suki and kirai are subject to a sort of semantic split, in which the NOM-ACC pattern is preferentially associated with (romantic) feelings, while the NOM-NOM pattern is preferentially associated with preferences. While this observation might seem to be separate from the transitivity-hypothesis, it is quite possible that the (romantic) feelings sense of the predicates are more closely associated with the transitive prototype due to conceptual metaphors such as LOVE IS A PHYSICAL FORCE and EMOTIONAL EFFECT IS PHYSICAL CONTACT (see section 2.5). If this is indeed the case, this serves to strengthen the validity of the transitivity-hypothesis.

8.8 Closing remarks

Seeing as most of the previous research conducted on this topic has either been mainly introspective (e.g. Makino (1996); Jarkey (1999) and Mano (2004)), or been unsuccessful in finding a ‘unique factor’ responsible for the phenomenon (e.g. Caluianu (2009)), I believe that the transitivity-hypothesis is the most plausible and empirically sound theory of the cause of the case-alternation. Coupled with the semantic split-factor put forth by Caluianu (2009) (which might even be related to the transitivity-hypothesis), and the parsing-constraints suggested by Shibatani (1978), I believe that we have come a long way in regard to accounting for the phenomenon.
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10 Appendices

10.1 Appendix 1 – Glossary

10.1.1 What is the glossary?

This glossary has been appended to the thesis for two purposes:

1. To provide readers not privy to linguistic jargon with short easy-to-understand explanations of the linguistic terminology made use of in the thesis.
2. To serve as a quick way to look up abbreviations and terms made use of in the thesis.

The structure of the glossary is split into two major sections. 10.1.2 contains a list of all abbreviations made use of in the thesis, together with explanations for the abbreviated terms when applicable. 10.1.3 is a list of non-abbreviated linguistic (or thesis-specific) terminology, along with short explanations of the terms. Do note that the explanations for linguistic terminology are far from exhaustive, as such an endeavor would likely result in a glossary far exceeding the page-number of the actual thesis. The definitions are rather intended to be sufficiently detailed as to allow the reader to understand how they are used in the context of the thesis.

10.1.2 Abbreviations

? Slightly unacceptable: Indicates that the following sentence is slightly unacceptable.

?? Considerably unacceptable: Indicates that the following sentence is considerably unacceptable.

* Unacceptable: Indicates that the following sentence is very/completely unacceptable.

3P.EXP Third-person experiential: Auxiliary used to describe feelings and internal states of a third party.

ACC Accusative case: A grammatical case typically used to mark the direct object of a transitive verb, and also the N₂ of the predicates discussed in the thesis. Takes the form of o in Japanese.

A: Adjective: See the discussion in Chapter 4.

ADZ Adverbializer: An affix which transforms other parts of speech into adverbs. The affix ‘-ly’ in English can be interpreted as an adverbializer (e.g. beautiful (A) ➔ beautifully (Adv)).
<p>| BCCWJ | Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese: the written-language corpus which forms the base for most of the analysis in the chapter. |
| CL | Cognitive Linguistics: A branch of linguistics which views language-comprehension and language-production as a part of general cognition. For more details, see chapter 2. |
| COM | Comitative case: A grammatical case that indicates accompaniment (e.g. together with). Takes the form of to in Japanese. |
| COMP | Complementizer: A word (or morpheme) which marks an embedded clause. An example of a complementizer in English is the that in ‘He said that she likes cake’. Takes the form of to in Japanese. |
| COND | Conditional mood: A grammatical mood used to express a proposition that is dependent on a certain condition. Commonly realized by the word ‘if’ in English. |
| COP | Copula: An auxiliary used with parts of speech which cannot stand alone. The copula used in English is be, while the Japanese copula is da. Like the English copula, the Japanese copula has several inflections, such as de and ja. In attributive adjectival clauses, the copulate takes the form na. |
| CSJ | Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese: A spoken-language corpus used to supplement the analysis in the chapter. |
| DAT | Dative case: A grammatical case typically used to mark indirect objects. Takes the form of ni in Japanese. |
| DER | Derogatory: Signifies an expression which displays a critical or disrespectful attitude. |
| DESID | Desiderative mood: A grammatical mood with the rough meaning of “wanting to do X”. Japanese has two main desiderative forms, -tai and -tagaru, both of which attach to verb stems. |
| EModE | Early Modern English: The historical variety of English spoken from the late 15th century to the mid-to-late 17th century. |
| EMPH | Emphasis: Used to stress the importance or value of a given statement. |
| FORM | Formal: Indicates that the expression belongs to a style of writing/speaking characterized by more technical and conservative vocabulary. |
| GEN | Genitive case: grammatical case typically used to mark possession. Takes the form of no in Japanese. |
| GG | Generative Grammar: A branch of linguistics which views grammar as a system of rules which generate all grammatical sentences (and no ungrammatical ones) in a given language. For more information, see chapter 2. |
| HUMB | Humble: Expressing a low or modest estimate of the social position of the speaker, in reference to the listener. |
| INCH | Inchoative: A verb-aspect which refers to the beginning of a state. An example of an inchoative suffix in English is the ‘-en’ in verbs such as “darken”. |
| INST | Instrumental: A grammatical case typically used to indicate an instrument by use of which the subject accomplishes an action. Takes the form of de in Japanese. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative case: A grammatical case which indicates a location at which something takes place. Takes the form of de in Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Lexical Profiling System: A system which enables the user to retrieve a list of occurrences of a given word or phrase, regardless of orthographic form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₁</td>
<td>First nominal: The first nominal (noun, pronoun, or nominalized phrase) to appear in a sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>Second nominal: The second nominal (noun, pronoun, or nominalized phrase) to appear in a sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Nominal adjective: See the discussion in Chapter 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative: Indicates that a verb or copula is negatively inflected (e.g. don’t run in comparison with run). Negative inflection is typically marked by the presence of -(a)nai directly after the predicate or the copula of a copular predicate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMZ</td>
<td>Nominalizer: A word or morpheme used to create nouns out of phrases or other parts of speech. Similar to the English suffix -ing, as in ‘run’ ➔ ‘running’. Takes the form of either no, n, or koto in Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative case: A grammatical case that is typically used to mark the subject of a verb or the predicate of a noun. Takes the form of ga in Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase: A word or group of words containing a noun, and functioning as a subject, object, or as the object of a preposition. Two examples in English are “cat” and “the man over there”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>Old English: The earliest historical form of the English language. Spoken in England and some areas of Scotland during the early Middle Ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Passive voice: A form of a verb in which the subject undergoes the action described by the verb. An example of passive voice in English is the sentence “He was punched”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Polite: Used to indicate respect and/or consideration for the listener.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoS</td>
<td>Part of speech: Categories in which words are assigned based on their syntactic functions. Examples of parts of speech are nouns, verbs, prepositions, conjunction, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>Potential form: A verb-conjugation expressing the ability to do something (e.g. run ➔ be able to run). Typically created by adding -(ra)reru or -eru to the end of verbs, or dekiru to the end of Sino-Japanese compounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>Predicate: The main verb or adjective of a sentence. The predicate generally describes something about the subject. Two examples of predicates used in this chapter are suki (da) ‘like’, and naru ‘become’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>Present tense: Indicates that a verb or copula is inflected in the present tense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSU</td>
<td>Presumption: Indicates that the clause involves an assumption of the state of a given situation or outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>Past tense: Indicates that a verb or copula is inflected in the past tense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCL</td>
<td>Particle: (particularly sentence-final particles) Indicates a particle whose meaning is not straightforwardly interpretable. Particles can, for instance, indicate assertion or emphasis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q  Question marker: Indicates that a given sentence is a question. Takes the form of ka in Japanese.

SUPERPOL  Superpolite: Used to indicate a great degree of respect and/or consideration for the listener.

TOP  Topic marker: A grammatical particle used to mark the topic of a sentence (e.g. what the sentence is about). Often confused with NOM, but can be used for a wider array of words or phrases.

V  Verb: A word used to describe an action, event, or state. Unlike, for example, nouns, conceptualizing a verb usually requires the inclusion of other elements, such as a subject. Verbs are associated with certain inflectional paradigms, and their plain form usually ends in -u in Japanese.

Ø  Omission: Indicates that an element has been omitted from a given sentence.

+VOL  Volitional form: A verb conjugation expressing the intention to do the action described by the verb (e.g. run → let’s run). Typically created by adding -yō or -rō to the verb-stem.

+VOLITION  Positive volition: Indicates overt presence of intentionality in a given word.

-VOLITION  Negative volition: Indicates the overt absence of intentionality in a given word.

10.1.3 Linguistic terminology

Acceptability  A measure of whether or not a sentence is permissible by native speakers of the language it is expressed in. Can also be defined as the degree of “naturalness” exhibited by the clause. Not to be confused with “Grammaticality”, as clauses can be acceptable without being grammatical, and vice versa.

Accusative  See ‘ACC’

Affix  An affix is a morpheme (see Morphology) that attaches to a word-stem to form a new word or word-form. They generally do not appear on their own, but rather only in conjunction with other words. Examples of affixes in English are the plural -s and -ness, which derives nouns from adjectives (e.g. rude → rude-ness).

Agent  The entity in a clause which functions as the initiator or cause of the event taking place. The agent is determined semantically, by means of examining the relation between the various entities and the predicate. In the sentence “Mike kicked the ball”, “Mike” functions as the initiator of the kicking-action, and is thus the agent.

Animacy  Animacy is a semantic feature denoting an entity’s sentience, as well as whether or not it is alive. Humans are more animate than animals (because we are more sentient), while animals are in turn more animate than physical objects (because they are more alive, and able to move around freely).

Aspect  A grammatical category that describes the temporal constituency of a given situation (e.g. how an event takes place) (Comrie 1976, 5). In contrast to tense, which describes the temporal location of an event in respect to another situation (e.g. the moment of speaking), aspect pertains to how the event takes place over time. The difference
between the sentences “John read the book” and “John was reading the book” is one of aspect, where the former sentence simply implies that a certain action took place, while the latter places us into the middle of the “reading-situation”.

**Attributive use** When an adjective is used pre-nominally. English example: ‘A beautiful girl’.

**Auxiliary** An auxiliary (also called auxiliary verb) is a verb which combines with other verbs, and serves to express aspect, mood, tense, etc. Examples of auxiliaries in English are *do* in “do you want tea?” and *has* in “he has lost everything”. An example of an auxiliary in Japanese is -(te)iru (-ing) in “kare wa waratteiru ‘he is laughing’”.

**Canonical** (of a linguistic construction): Being able to be described by a given linguistic framework. Constructions can be deemed “non-canonical” by virtue of being ungrammatical, or simply because the framework is unable to analyze them properly. Adjectives appearing with accusative marking is an example of a non-canonical construction, because such a construction is not expected in the grammar.

**Case-marking** A term for the linguistic assignment of roles to nouns within a clause. By looking at the case-markers, one can often discern what role a given NP plays in the clause. In Japanese, the nominative case-marker *ga* typically assigns an agent/subject-role to the NP to which it attaches, while the case-marker *o* typically assigns a patient/object-role to the NP to which it is attached. Different languages mark case in different ways (see 3.1).

**Closed class** A grammatical class of words which limited membership. Closed-class categories do not readily accept new words as members. Examples of closed classes in English are prepositions, conjunctions and auxiliary verbs. For the opposite, see “Open class”

**Cohortative** A grammatical verb-mood which expresses mutual encouragement. An example is the Japanese *hanas-ō*, which roughly translates to “let’s talk”.

**Concordancer** A computer program which constructs a concordance – a list of all the instances of a given word or phrase, together with its immediate context.

**Conjunctive** A form of a verb or copula which allows it to be connected to other predicates or clauses. The conjunctive is typically created by adding a variation of the morpheme -*te* to the verb, or by leaving the verb in its stem-form. The conjunctive form of the copula *da* is *de*.

**Construal** A term for our ability to portray and conceive of situations in various different ways. The two widely-known expressions “the glass is half-full” and “the glass is half-empty” are examples of the same situation being construed in different ways. For a discussion, see section 2.3.3.

**Definiteness** A characteristic of clausal participants pertaining to whether or not it refers to a specific object, and whether not the speaker/hearer are successful in establishing mental contact with the participant. The NP “the man” is more definite than the NP “men”, both in terms of referring to a specific man, as well as the implication that both speaker and hearer are familiar with and successful in establishing mental contact with it.

**Dependent clause** A clause which provides a sentence with additional information, but which cannot stand on its own. In the sentence “I don’t like Mike, because he is mean”, the clause
“because he is mean” is a dependent clause, adding the information of a ‘reason’ to the main clause “I don’t like Mike”. While “I don’t like Mike” can stand as a sentence on its own, “because he is mean” cannot.

**Derivation**
The process of forming a new word from an existing word, most often by the addition of an affix. An example is the derivation of the noun *coolness* from the adjective *cool* by means of the -ness affix.

**Desiderative**
See ‘DESID’

**Direct object**
A noun phrase denoting an entity which is the recipient of the action described by a transitive verb. In the sentence “John kicked the ball”, the NP “the ball” is the direct object which receives the “kick”-action.

**Discreteness**
A characteristic of clausal participants involving both degree of ‘Definiteness’ and ‘Individuation’.

**Ellipsis**
The omission of one or more words from a clause. In Japanese, the subject is often omitted when referring to the speaker.

**Experiencer**
A thematic relation describing an entity which undergoes some sort of situation or sensation, which often has no conceivable agent. In the sentence “He was scared of the dog”, “he” can be said to be an experiencer.

**Figure-ground organization**
A type of conceptual grouping used to distinguish focused objects from their background. For a discussion, see section 2.5.1.

**Genitive**
See ‘GEN’

**Grammaticality**
A measure of whether or not a given clause conforms to prescriptive grammar norms. Not to be confused with “Acceptability”, as clauses can be grammatical without being acceptable, and vice versa.

**Honorable**
A term for the encoding of certain social relations into linguistic expression. Honorification is used to elevate the status of the entity to which it applies. Some English examples are *Mr.* and *Your Honor*. The honorifics-system in Japanese is significantly richer than that of English.

**Inchoative**
See INCH

**Individuation**
A characteristic of clausal participants which both pertains to their distinctness from each other (e.g. of agent and patient), as well as the participant’s distinctness from its own background.

**Intransitive**
A feature of clauses or predicates pertaining to the relationship between the clause’s/predicate’s participants. Typically, intransitive clauses only have one participant.

**Image schema**
Schematized patterns of activity, which are abstracted from everyday interaction with the world. These abstract schemas are then used to conceptualize more complex activities. An example is that the concept enter can be expressed as a combination of the images schemas *object, source-path-goal, and container-content*. For a more in-depth look, see Langacker (2008, 31-36).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>A grammatical mood expressing a command or request. The English “Be quiet!” is an example of an imperative. In Japanese, verbs have an imperative conjugation-form constructed by adding -yo, -ro or -e to the verb-stem.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>See ‘LOC’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>The value separating the lower half of a data sample from the higher half. Often described as the “middle number” in a data set, the median is less sensitive than the average in regards to the presence of very small or very large values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>A phenomenon in which one entity is used as a stand-in for another, associated, entity. In the expression “England decided to leave the EU”, the entity “England” represents the people who live in England, and not the geographical entity itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>The value that appears most often in a set of data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>The study of words, including how words are formed and how they relate to other words in the same language. Morphology is the linguistic discipline most concerned with topics such as word-roots and affixes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>See ‘NOM’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-canonical marking</td>
<td>Case-marking of NPs which is not straightforwardly explainable by appealing to current linguistic frameworks. In Japanese, dative/nominative marking on objects is an example of non-canonical marking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open class</td>
<td>A grammatical class of words which readily accepts new members. The word-classes nouns and verbs often accept new members, particularly in response to new technology, as evident by neologisms such as “hashtag” and “to google”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>The entity in a clause which functions as the receiver/target/undergoer of the event taking place. The patient is determined semantically, by means of examining the relation between the various entities and the predicate. In the sentence “Mike kicked the ball”, “the ball” functions as the target/receiver of the kicking-action, and is thus the patient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
<td>The study of how context contributes to linguistic meaning. Includes such topics as ‘implicature’ and ‘speech act theory’. Some linguists, such as Ronald Langacker, reject a clear-cut pragmatics/semantics-divide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>See ‘PRED’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive</td>
<td>A pronoun that refers back to a preceding NP in the clause. In the sentence “Mike blamed himself”, the reflexive pronoun “himself” refers back to the NP “Mike”. The most common reflexive pronoun in Japanese is jibun ‘oneself’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>The study of meaning in language. Semantics can be further split into logical semantics, which deals with the relationship between linguistic expressions and real/imagined worlds, and lexical semantics, concerned with the analysis of word-meanings and the relationship between words. Some linguists, such as Ronald Langacker, reject a clear-cut semantics/pragmatics-divide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate clause</td>
<td>See “Dependent Clause”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subordinate subject</strong></td>
<td>A subject within a subordinate (dependent) clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suffix</strong></td>
<td>An affix that attaches to the end of a word. An English example is the -en which attaches to adjectives such as soft and hard to form the verbs soften and harden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
<td>The study of the rules, principles and processes that govern sentences’ structure in a given language. Word-order is an example of a basic syntactic feature. In Generative Grammar, syntax is often thought to be an autonomous system, while Cognitive Linguists usually argue that syntax is greatly affected by, for instance, semantics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tense</strong></td>
<td>A category which expresses the time of the situation expressed by the clause, in reference to the moment of speaking. Usually expressed through conjugation, the tense of a verb/adjective usually expresses whether the event ‘has taken place’, ‘will take place’, ‘is taking place’, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitive</strong></td>
<td>A feature of clauses or predicates pertaining to the relationship between the clause’s/predicate’s participants. Typically, transitive clauses contain two or more participants. For a further discussion, see 2.4.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 Appendix 2 – The corpus study

10.2.1 Calculation of total amount of suki, kirai, and hoshii instantiations

**Numbers yielded in primary search:**

NOM suki – 6923

NOM kirai – 910

NOM hoshii – 2704

ACC suki – 1104

ACC kirai – 289

ACC hoshii – 215

**Removed instances by reason-for-removal:**

Case-marker on N₁

NOM suki – 97

NOM kirai – 9

NOM hoshii – 37

Compounds (sukikatte, sukihōdai, sukikirai)

NOM suki – 29

ACC suki – 14

Case-marker referring to different verb (suki ni suru, suki na dake V, suki na you ni V, suki ni sase, hoshii mama ni)

NOM suki – 26

ACC suki – 70

ACC hoshii – 100

Predicate in verbal form
10.2.2 Incidence rate ratios for searches and statistical analysis

Incidence rate ratios provide us with a way to compare the number of occurrences of the various PRED+PoS/verb combinations, while accounting for the large difference between the amounts of sentences with NOM/ACC marked Ns. The ratios are given as

\[
IRR: \left( \frac{[\text{PRED(ACC)+PoS/verb occurrences}]}{[\text{PRED(ACC) occurences}]} \right) \div \left( \frac{[\text{PRED(NOM)+PoS/verb occurrences}]}{[\text{PRED(NOM) occurences}]} \right)
\]

The numbers thus give us an indication of the relative occurrence of these combinations between ACC- and NOM-marked predicates. A number such as 10 indicates that PRED(ACC)+PoS-X occurrences account for 10 times more of the total PRED(ACC) occurrences than PRED(NOM)+PoS-X occurrences do for the total PRED(NOM) occurrences.

Table 6-2A  PRED+nar- & PRED+nare- (Incidence Risk Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>Nar- ‘become’</th>
<th>Nar-‘POT’ ‘can become’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>16,50</td>
<td>11,40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>4,90</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3A  PRED+nar- inflection  (Incidence Risk Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>+POT</th>
<th>+POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
<th>-POT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nar (naru)</td>
<td>(naranai)</td>
<td>(naru)</td>
<td>(narenai)</td>
<td>(narō)</td>
<td>(naritai/naritagaru/ naritakunai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>29,64</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>14,49</td>
<td>7,78</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>11,57</td>
<td>8,23</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>0,60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-∞</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6-4A  PRED+PoS\_VOLITION & PRED+PoS\_VOLITION (Incidence Risk Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>+VOLITION</th>
<th>-VOLITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doryoku</td>
<td>doushitemo - naru</td>
<td>ganbatte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6-5A  The nature of the N\_2 (Incidence Risk Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PoS</th>
<th>PRED</th>
<th>Verbal N_2</th>
<th>NOUN+hou ga</th>
<th>VERB+hou ga</th>
<th>hou ga (total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(VERB no ga PRED)</td>
<td>‘NOUN side of comparison’</td>
<td>‘NMZ side of comparison’</td>
<td>‘side of comparison’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-suki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-kirai</td>
<td>-∞</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-∞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-hoshii</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>-∞</td>
<td>-∞</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.2.3 Sentences used in in-depth analysis (BCCWJ)\(^7\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>前文脈</th>
<th>検索文 字列</th>
<th>後文脈</th>
<th>NUM</th>
<th>SUB</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>EVE</th>
<th>DIS</th>
<th>VOL</th>
<th>AFF</th>
<th>ROM</th>
<th>執筆者</th>
<th>生年代</th>
<th>性別</th>
<th>タイトル</th>
<th>出版年</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>く聴く）声優を教えてください。 nouvellesクロ、お よでぃ。 05 3、声優以外で、あなた</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>またもコンビニ寄った時にこのパンを探していたら</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>とANA、乗り心地が違うと感じた事大好きですか</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>帰住強い人はよく眺めてますよ、いやらしい気持 ちは全然ないです。ただ、美しいもの</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>パッションを真剣に持つます。 (体重は100キロ 以上あります)私は特別しっかりの服</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イチロー左腕のおこイチロー自分に厳しいのかやチ ロー、カーティ良いのがイチロー挑戦</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ところにしか、行かなくなっちゃった訳です。もし かすると、私がガムサパン、ハワが好きなのは、それが原因かも。コンビニが無い場 かんて、考えられません。ただ、カニ</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>みの日は家族ちゃんと3食べますハムとチーズの オムレツ、やっぱりハマちゃんは玉子</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>また、「目が見え」をいうことを理解できるので でしょうか？ヘレン・ケラーは、赤い服</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あなたのこと好きですよ。」という態度をとってく れたらすごくうれしいし、私もその人</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>＊☆どんなメイクが好きですか？肌は黒い方がいい の？それともしろ？ナチュラルメイク</td>
<td>が好き</td>
<td>執筆者</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yahoo!ブログ</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^7\) Abbreviations: NUM = Participant number, SUB = Subject animacy, OBJ = Object animacy, EVE = Event likeness/temporal boundedness, DIS = Participant discreteness, VOL = Volitional element, AFF: Object affectedness, ROM = Romantic love nuance
ならの本がある話ですか？私は、「20世紀少年」「デスノート」「カジ」こんな系統の本が好きなんですが、オススメがあったら教えてください。

頭脳戦が好きですか？「マスターキング」が好きですか？

うちの王子は「かぼちゃ」が好きです。<ちなみにパパは嫌いみたい(殿方カボチャ嫌いな人多いね)、スムヨメは大好物。

家庭でも可能でしょうか？私はおでんの白滝、こんにゃく、笹竹(北海道だけかしら?)が好きで、毎日でも食べたいんですけどもし煮返して使えるのならいちいち、おでんを作ること

家族でも可能でしょうか？私はおさんのはじきや、こんにゃく、筍、鰤(北海道だけかしら？)

オープンテニスで放送したりとか情報お待ちしてます・ああ、懐かしい。オープニングの歌が好きだったなぁ。レンタルビデオはあったような記憶がある。ケーブルではやってないと思う。

会にも現れているみたいで、まあ、自分はというと、昔から、そう、スポーツ系の車が好きです。たとえばちょっと趣味からは分らせてしまう傾向だからというのもあってか3年近くはオートがとても良かったと所感をいったし李敏求会員は"ガールフレンドがキム・ジュヒョクが好きで、応募したがトウモロコシを投資したやりがいがあった"という所感を明らかにした。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>あると思うけど、女1え、どういうことですか、渡辺女だって、地位とお金を持った男</th>
<th>が好き</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>女が気に入っていた一個だったのか、並木が入っているからではなく、彼女は自分の気分</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>で、どうしようもなきにしもあらず。娘は彼女が、操枝の住居に一色大笑の名があるのが</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>手に入れる夢」と言葉の前に声を掛けた。そこは</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>さんの趣味に合わない作家があっても、仕方ない</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>にかかわらず、カトラーはよほど彼さしい</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大智さんは物語や自分のその日の経験談を話すの</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>た。こうした人たちやその家族の家に立ち寄って、</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>て当てるゲームなんです。趣味はカラオケ。と</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>て授業に参加するかを表すもっとも分かりやすい指</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>担ぎを表す。子供たちに「授業</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>て授業の参加を求めるの</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人間の位とか、そんなことを</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>」と言ってもらえるような授業にするというのは、先生たちにとっても分かりやすい目標</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ルル市庁所属研に勤めています。趣味はカラオケ、特にリンチ・ジョーンズの曲を歌うこと</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ことではなくて、どの女性さんが一番多く集めるの</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>こちらで授業するかを表すもっとも分かりやすい指</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>た、こうした人たちやその家族の家に立ち寄って、</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>って人間の心を理解できるような授業にするというのは、先生たちにとっても分かりやすい目標</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大智さんは…男によくも、真雲にも…みんなにや</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人気の野口英世</td>
<td>が好き</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
のよね」 「かっこいいんじゃないか」 そ
う？」 「赤いからなあちゃんは丸ノ内線が好きなんだよ。とってもなくなって
りょう」 彼女は歯みがいて寝るのよ 1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0 1990 男 廣田隆二 著 2005
は、子どもが好きであれば、保育者にな
れないのでしょうか。皆さんたは子どもを
好きなんだろうか？ 彼女たは子どもを
好きなんだろうか？ ただ、小泉首相もエルビスのファンらしいが、週末
には、トキの職場の同僚とよく釣り
が好きなんだよ。とってもとっても好きなんだよ、赤いか
ら」 お金を浴びせられたような気がし
いる。 六月になるとアガパンサの花茎が急に伸
び、尖端に青い花が開く。「この花が好き
です」と、言った久乃木のことは、千澄は決して
忘れることはなかった。
た。彼らは、天井からワサワサ降りてきて、カメを囲んだ。
カメは、あまりカメが好きではなかった。特に足の多いやつは苦手で、ムカデ
などは絵で見ただけで鳥はだがたつ。
レックのコメントは、父ホリオンを前にして少し面白かった。
「僕はヒクソンの闘い方が好きなんだ。グレッシブに上のポジションを求めて攻
め込んでいく…そんな闘いのできるフ
したことだから、恋人が選んだことだから、と諦め
れるのは、自分がそんなに恋人のこと
を好きではないってことですか？ いろいろ頑張ってみるけど、結局は「なるようにしかならない
Yahoo! 知恵袋 女 2005
| リス。こんな自分がいやなので、それでもま
た寂しさと喪失感を埋めるために誰か
を好きになる。こんな自分がいやなので、それでもま
た寂しさと喪失感を埋めるために誰か
を好きになる。恋していなくても平気な人に
っていうのはある意味の奇跡でしょう？ 一目ぼれ
同士なら奇跡でしょうが、好きになった
について、あなたが彼女のこと
を好きになることはそうそう何度もあることではありま
せん。他の誰かずっと好きでいるあなたは今、きっと素敵な恋をしているの
と思いません。そんな限りある貴重な
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| トシク。相手との出会いから、好きになるま
での期間は？ 一目ぼれ | 34 | 相手との出会いから、好きになるま
での期間は？ 一目ぼれ
| Yahoo!ブログ | 2008 |
| ではいけるのっていう不倫否定派の人いますが、
その人の妻または夫その人以外の人
を好きになる。恋していなくても平気な人に
っていうのはある意味の奇跡でしょう？ 一目ぼれ
同士なら奇跡でしょうが、好きになった
について、あなたが彼女のこと
を好きになることはそうそう何度もあることではありま
せん。他の誰かずっと好きでいるあなたは今、きっと素敵な恋をしているの
と思いません。そんな限りある貴重な
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| 女性の方に質問。好きだった人とメールや電話で
話しているうちにまたその人
を好きになる。恋していなくても平気な人に
っていうのはある意味の奇跡でしょう？ 一目ぼれ
同士なら奇跡でしょうが、好きになった
について、あなたが彼女のこと
を好きになることはそうそう何度もあることではありま
せん。他の誰かずっと好きでいるあなたは今、きっと素敵な恋をしているの
と思いません。そんな限りある貴重な
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| 人は独身です。子供が3人いて、旦那と別居中の40歳の人
を好きになりました。彼女、旦那との離婚を考えているよ
うです。（ちなみに、彼女とは、学生
を好きになるのはいいですし、お付き合いするのも流れか
と思いますが恋愛と仕事は分けて考え
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| あたって毎回喧嘩して、言い合いで、どことなく気
まずい雰囲気になっています。彼
を好きだけど、前ほど価値観も共通点も会話も心の満たさ
れも少なくなってしまいました。
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| レジントを買ったら、どう感じますか？ 素直になっ
たらいいですよ。あなたが彼女のこと
を好きになるのにはいいですよ。お酒の勢
いもあったけど、あげたかったから買
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| との恋愛がうまくいかなくなったあなたは仕事も
失うことになるワケですから。彼の事
を好きになるのはいいですよ。お酒の勢
いもあったけど、あげたかったから買
| Yahoo!知恵袋 | 2005 |
| 『を言わない、言えないということではない。 情
けないことである。自由自在に
自分で好きな人が相手も自分
を好きになるのはいいですよ。若者の特権ですよ。
| Yahoo!ブログ | 2008 |

| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 1 | 2005 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 1 | 2008 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2005 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 1 | 2005 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2005 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 0,5 | 0 | 2005 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2005 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2005 |
| 1 | 1 | 0,25 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2005 |
| 0 | 1 | 0,25 | 0 | 1 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 1 | 2005 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2005 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0,5 | 1 | 2005 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2005 |
| みたいのです。あと、友達に勝手に同級生の女子が好きって決め付けられて、僕がその女子を好きだと知ったら、「泣く」とか「怒る」といってました。恋愛感情はないのですが。 | を好き | だと想像したら、「惹く」とか「癒す」と考えています。恋愛感情はないのですが。 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| やむを押さえてる人ってなかなかいないんですか？僕は結構スゴいと思ったのですが。 | を好き | になるのにジャンルは関係ない。って考え方じゃないですか？私もジャンルや言葉関係なし。 | 0 | 1 | 0,75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| 香、樺く好きな人いたけど、実らなかった。。。良いい思いを胸にしまい、今の旦那さんを好きになわりました。 | を好き | になり、結婚しました。 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| これは、相手に迷惑がかかりることなんですか？以前質問して、フラれたのにそれでも相手を好きでいることはあまりよくないという回答が多かったです。私は彼が一番好きだし、友人と | を好き | になる人が少ないかと思います。理想も低いと良くないという答えは多いです。 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| きっかけを押さえてる人ってなかなかいないんですか？僕は結構スゴいと思ったのですが。 | を好き | になる人は少ないかと思います。理想も低いと良くないという回答が多かったです。私は彼が一番好きだし、友人と | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| せんせいの顔に生まれたかった;;自分に自信を持つことですね!後ろ向きな人を好きになる人は少ないかと思いますよ…。理想も低いと言わず…あなたが好きになった人でし | を好き | ないと思っていた。しかし、気付いたときには、もう好きになっていた。セランの何処を好きになったのか、自分でも分からない。 | 1 | 1 | 0,25 | 0 | 1 | -0,5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2008 | Yahoo!ブログ
| ねえ、強い気持ちを追いつき続けるかね〜！でも、それだったら、今好きな人 | を好き | になったのか、自分でも分からない。誰の頭上にも等しく降り注ぐ。陽光のような | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -0,5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| れているようで嫌です。皆さんはどう思われますか？女子と親しみを意識する前に、同性 | を好き | になっても良いです。女子高であつしかありません。友達はまだその状態ではないか… | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| 彼がいるのに仔犬の子のこと | を好き | になっても良いでした。そう思ってからは彼とHするのが気持ち悪くなってしまいました | 0 | 1 | 0,25 | 0 | 1 | -0,5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2005 | Yahoo!知恵袋
| いささか多い。最初は日本文化にとまどい反発していた。時間が経つにつれて、だんだん日本 | を好き | になっていく。だがその日本びいきを度が過ぎると、社員が迷惑することがある。K氏が | 0 | 1 | 0,75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 0 | 大宮 知信(著) | 1940 | 男 | 日本の社長は外国語
| おまえが大好きだよ。女。「あたしなんか、男から見たらただの売春婦よ」と男。「売春婦 | を好き | になったらいけないって法律でもあるのか？」「そっか、自由だときの雑音。何か | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0,5 | 1 | T・ジェファーソーン・バーカー(著)/渡谷比佐子(訳) | 1950/1940 | 男/女 | レッド・ライ特
| 冷静な目で見つめ直してみると…。「あれ？どうしてこんなくちっとと失礼ですかが」 | を好き | になったらいったらう？」「なんで考えてのこと、ありまませんか？この原因には二つあり | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | -0,5 | 1 | 1 | ゆうき ゆう(著) | 1970 | 男 | 「ひと言」で相手の心をつかむ恋愛術
| すぐに「惚れにくく」育ってしまっています。なので「誰かに好かれる」のも「誰か | を好き | になるのでも、決して自然に起こることはではないのです。この不必要にほど高貴な文 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 1 | ゆうき ゆう(著) | 1970 | 男 | 「ひと言」で相手の心をつかむ恋愛術
人を好きになる方法。人

好きになる方法。ここでのテーマは、人を好きになる方法。よく、恋人がいなかったり、

ルに教科書やノートを広げた。「今どのへんやっているのか。ああ、微分積分数、微分。

よういくつかほほ笑みの歌、特めのうちは、さままなことが起きます。そして自分

彼を怒らせることになっても、断った方がいいと私のすべての直感が告げていた。

作家が好きだったので議論もしたが、いまはそのとき話題になった作家の名や、なぜ彼ら

た。友好きは男の欠点じゃない、もしも友好きじゃない男の人だったら、女だって彼

素敵な作品だったと思います。第1回から放送を見た彼が本当にウルトラクイズ

しても、だからといって先生が危険な犯罪者ということにはなりませんよ。ひとの奥さん

も持っていそうで(もしくはハードMか)ちょっと警戒したくなる。ばっさり一言江角

持っていそで(もしくはハードMか)ちょっと警戒したくなる。ばっさり一言江角

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>作品</th>
<th>作者</th>
<th>出版年</th>
<th>警戒事項</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ドナ・ジョー・ナポリ</td>
<td>ボビー・アギラール</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ジョン・カルシオ</td>
<td>ジョン・カルシオ</td>
<td>1920/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>クレイジー・ジャック</td>
<td>クレイジー・ジャック</td>
<td>1940/1950</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>作品</th>
<th>作者</th>
<th>出版年</th>
<th>警戒事項</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ドナ・ジョー・ナポリ</td>
<td>ボビー・アギラール</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ジョン・カルシオ</td>
<td>ジョン・カルシオ</td>
<td>1920/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>クレイジー・ジャック</td>
<td>クレイジー・ジャック</td>
<td>1940/1950</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>作品</th>
<th>作者</th>
<th>出版年</th>
<th>警戒事項</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ドナ・ジョー・ナポリ</td>
<td>ボビー・アギラール</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ジョン・カルシオ</td>
<td>ジョン・カルシオ</td>
<td>1920/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>クレイジー・ジャック</td>
<td>クレイジー・ジャック</td>
<td>1940/1950</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>ハーバ・ハネイ</td>
<td>1940/1950/1960</td>
<td>レコードはまっすぐに</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

しもを持っていそで(もしくはハードMか)ちょっと警戒したくなる。ぽろり一言."江角

なんてすっかり忘れていても

彼を怒らせることになっても、断った方がいいと私のすべての直感が告げていた。

「ひと言」で相手の心をつかむ恋愛術

2005
もともと言えない、どうしていいかわからない気持ちに駆られてしまう。こんなにも誰かを好きになったことがなかったから、恥ずかしい気持ちが先に立ち、喜怒哀楽の普通の感情のよ

ケダモノは甘く招く

でも」わたし「パブロが好きだったのな」おばあちゃん「パブロがあたしを好きだったのよ!」わたし「で、おばあちゃんはふたりめのだんなさんが好きだった?」お

役にも立たない。この男性についてもっと知りたいという気持ちはあるが、私はやはり彼を好きになれない。ラヴデでもトーストを食べてしまったほう

大阪!」との事ホント、この国って恐ろしい...当然ですが、オーラはパチモン

「「 moetenが嫌いなので何も購入してませんがだってこそお話しに重いといいたくなければ買ってい

は長靴でないと歩けないという辺り、同じ市でも文化の違いを感じます。(長靴の閉塞感が嫌いである。冬でも草履で出歩くためしよけになーる。)この晴れ間、大事にしなくては。

男性で ポテトサラダ フランスパンが嫌い 人にあったことがないのですが、理由を教えてく

男性で ポテトサラダ フランスパンが嫌い に違いないと思うのですが、理由を教えてく

「大丈夫!」との事 ヘント、この国って恐ろしい...当然ですが、オーラはパチモン
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では、将来はペットショップで働きたいです。高校にはあまり行きたくないです。勉強が嫌いだから・・・。ペットショップで働くには、どんな学校へ行くのですか？専門学校とか0.75

が嫌い だから・・・ペットショップで働くには、どんな学校へ行くのですか？専門学校とかあ0.75

が嫌い と言う人って仲良さそうな、仲良つきやすい人だと思える。本当に優しいですよ。その0.75

が嫌い です。Yahoo!知恵袋 2005

が嫌い じゃなさでも美味しいと思うかも。クリームソーダは普段が分かれるようです。私はそ0.75

が嫌い なのにどうして？最近やせてきた気がする。ダイエットしてるんじゃない？Yahoo!知恵袋 2005

が嫌い ？これかなの立場で言い合ったの？ワロタビァでどんな髪型の人が好き？え0.75

が嫌い なので気分が悪いです。Yahoo!ブログ 2008

が嫌い なのはありません。安い酒でも高い酒でも美味しいように飲める人はうらやましい。Yahoo!ブログ 2008

が嫌い なので格好しながらにかこうか。・・・なぜ素人人がやるのでお風呂に入れて乾かすと0.75

が嫌い なんてこと一線です。美味しそうにお酒を飲む人はうらやましいほどである。けっして酒飲み全てが嫌いなのではありません。安い酒でも高い酒でも美味しそうに飲める人はうらやましい。Yahoo!ブログ 2008

が嫌い なのは母（実の）が人の面倒を見るのが嫌いな人で、一切お産の時は何も手伝ってくれなかったんです。そういう母だと思ってました。（笑）「トラウマがあって近づかれるのは苦手なんだ」とか適当に。相手が嫌いなの訳ではなく、自分に問題があるんですというのをアピールすると角が立たないです。もYahoo!知恵袋 2005

が嫌い って思うこと生挙げり・9月で18歳。このままどんな歳をとって死んで行くのYahoo!知恵袋 2005

が嫌い だと言う人がいるみたいですよ。例えば、D級だと似合わないブーツともあります。洋Yahoo!知恵袋 2005

が嫌い だと限らないが何故ですか？ブリックスなんて世界の最先端の技術でいいと思うけどYahoo!知恵袋 2005
この件に関して、皆様のご意見を賜りたく存じます。似てますよねぇ！旦那は山川恵里佳

ウスケらしい、困った男に捕まったね。歳は私とあまりわからない４１歳だと、彼女は

れてもらえそうですなんて、そのとき素心に出たの。考えてみればそれから、物を持つの

彼女のかかわらなくて皆彼のことだけ思い出す、仕事が立ち込んでいる時間にはならばるの

私は知恵袋で回答するのが嫌いです。何故かと言うと、せっかくいろいろ考えて書いても、回答すると削除されているとき

は「すいません」なんだろうで、どちらが正しいのですか？私「すいません」という言葉が嫌いでした。すまないと思うなら「すみません」と言っ

私、「すいません」ってもらえないっても、そのとき薬味になったのかもしれない。この手で葬ってしまうのなら最初から持たないほうがなどと考

昼なのか分からなくて食べたことが思い出す。仕事が立ち込めている時間には、ナッシルはしなくなる。あれ、とてもクールするという話か？別に魅力ない。ある人々

私は知恵袋で回答するのが嫌いです。何故かと言うと、せっかくいろいろ考えて書いても、回答すると削除されているとき

なしにです。これでは文章力がつくはずがありません。むしろ、子どもは文章を書くのが嫌いになるばかりです。「書く力」と「読む力」は表

早く終わったようだ。羽田を離陸したのは、それから三十分後だった。鈴谷は、飛行機が嫌いだ。鉄の塊が空中を飛ぶということが、どうしても非現実的に思えない。加えて、

でも、日曜日は行くのだ。どんなことしろ、一度決ったことを、健太郎は変更するの

たほうが楽、ということになり、夫婦対立の原因と

ならなかった。しか、料理が嫌いなほうが、ともかくも半分は夕食の準備をするだけでも、相手にとっては時間の余裕がで

人のほとんどはそんなことは知らなかったろう。見に行きたかったけど、ぼくは人ごみ

いつまでも花菜を抱きしめていたい
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たほうが楽、ということになり、夫婦対立の原因と
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人のほとんどはそんなことは知らなかったろう。見に行きたかったけど、ぼくは人ごみ

いつまでも花菜を抱きしめていたい

でも、日曜日は行くのだ。どんなことしろ、一度決ったことを、健太郎は変更するの

たほうが楽、ということになり、夫婦対立の原因と

ならなかった。しか、料理が嫌いなほうが、ともかくも半分は夕食の準備をするだけでも、相手にとっては時間の余裕がで

人のほとんどはそんなことは知らなかったろう。見に行きたかったけど、ぼくは人ごみ

いつまでも花菜を抱きしめていたい

でも、日曜日は行くのだ。どんなことしろ、一度決ったことを、健太郎は変更するの

たほうが楽、ということになり、夫婦対立の原因と
できるということは忘れてください。私はあの子をいつも厄介に思っていましたし、あの子も私が嫌いだった。私にとっても、あの子が死んでくれてよかったのかもしれない」彼女は顔をゆるませた。

「このおじさんこそ、僕のことが嫌いなんだ。僕よりもこの家の方が大事なんだ」（やれやれ…）昴は拗ねだし、俺は内心苦笑した。

ノートを閉じて袋にしまい、木立のなかを歩きはじめた。雨の気配がする。ハンターは雨が嫌いだった。雨が降るといやな記憶がよみがえる。

「カルテルはポーチに駆けこんだ。脇腹が差し込まれた。」

文化はいいなあとか、アメリカに対する憧れをもっている。中東のムスリムもアメリカが嫌いなことになっていますが、実際によく聞いてみると、アメリカの文化は大好きで、コーラが大好きだ。相手が嫌いだ、というような雑念が入っていると、これは見えてきません。あなたも自然体ではない。

「そうだ」中沢は、膝をついて言った。「もう一度見第三次。」

「各々の調子が悪くて断ったとしましょう。」安奈が言った。「えっ、今日はダメなの?」「どうして?」「オレが嫌いになったのか?」必ず理由をチェックされます。女性はいちいち説明するのが苦痛になるようだ。
| 行き、そこでユニテっと会った、待っている間、
| ユニテとは、ヒトラーはムッソリーニ
| つながる法則
| が嫌い | だが、近く予定されているムッソリーニのドイツ訪問については、他国に独立株価を示す | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1940年/1950年 | 女/女 | 1940年 | 男 | 高橋みどり(著) | 1950年 | 女 | みちのくフィード家の人たち | 2005年 |
| 住むなら目をつけて、むしろ好きだった町
| が嫌い | なぜ、ほとんどのディーバード（できない）のもので、私たちはどうしよう | 1 | 1 | 0.75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 羽田小瀬太(著) | 1940年 | 男 | 大城光子(訳) | 2005年 | 女 | 高橋みどり(著) | 1950年 | 女 | ふさ払いの引越し | 2005年 |
| いるのだわ...春菜は内気な子を笑んだ、彼の客関
| が嫌い | で、ない、ウェイトレスになりたてのころは、たま
| | ならく新しぅかった客の視線と客層が、今
| | でないなら、誘われた場所に住むと、前から行き
| | たかったお店とか美味しいお店とか連
| | おおとり | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 羽田小瀬太(著) | 1940年 | 男 | 高橋みどり(著) | 1950年 | 女 | みちのくフィード家の人たち | 2005年 |
| 女性は男性（嫌いではない）から遊びに訪れたす
| | で、ないなら、誘われた場所に住むと、前から行き
| | たかったお店とか美味しいお店とか連
| | おおとり | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 羽田小瀬太(著) | 1940年 | 男 | 高橋みどり(著) | 1950年 | 女 | みちのくフィード家の人たち | 2005年 |
| こんなに人
| が嫌い | と、られることができるんだねえ、本当、君大嫌い★
| | 笑 rainingが気づかないかなー。まあいい
| | あたしは今、35才の男ですが、モー娘
| | が好きってあんたはなんかぶっ殺したいんですよね。同じ質問者でも、あなたの場合、
| | たは、何でも多数派の意見が優先される今の社会に
| | 反発しているあなたは、少数グループに属しているよ
| | う。他人と共有・共感を図ろう
| | みのもんたさん
| が嫌い | だが感じたあなたは、少数グループに属しているよ
| | う。他人と共有・共感を図ろう
| | みのもんたさん
| が嫌い | みたい、運命だなんて、思い込んで一緒になっ
| | て、後悔することになるなんて、思っ
| | みのもんたさん
| が嫌い | みたい、運命だなんて、思い込んで一緒になっ
| | て、後悔することになるなんて、思っ
| | みのもんたさん
| が嫌い | ないじゃない自分に気づきましょうね、あなたそうな
| | んじゃないでしょうか？
| | みのもんたさん
| が嫌い | ないじゃない自分に気づきましょうね、あなたそうな
| | んじゃないでしょうか？
私は数時間で復活ですよ！1回ちょっと時間に遅れてくらやいので、そんな簡単に好きな人を嫌いになれるわけになりません！あとはちゃんと明日素直に「ごめん」って言うことと思います。

彼女より、仕事は当然ですが、時には趣味を優先される事に耐えられますか。決して女性を嫌いでは無いし、いやむしろ好きなんですよ。何よりもって気持ちにはならないんですよ。

ぽよよん」としている女性を好きになりました。それでも、仕事が出来る女性を嫌いになった訳ではないです。今まで興味が湧かなかったタスキの女性にも心が動くようになって、念願かなえる事が出来た自分を誇りに思って下さい。

どれだけ深かったろうか。だけど、あのときは自分を止められなかった。あの時は自分を好きになる事なく、今すぐに不倫を解消し、それが出来た自分を誇りに思って下さい。

定したくなるものですか？なんだと否定されても気分悪いし受け入れたくない程、私はを嫌いなのです。いい人だなって思ってた自分を嫌いにだけはならないようにしてください。

ナナを食べさせては？と回答がありましたが勿論食べさせてみた。でも拒否、パンナを嫌い。なぜならめずらしいのですよね。嫌な小麦（あと卵と大豆もです）アレルギーのためです。

アメリカ人はカナダ人を嫌い。っていうような聞いた覚えがあります。もし言葉がは？では何か？嫌い

いて家に帰れば忙しいし、そんなことで気分を離れるより眠りたいと思っています。主人の事はではありませんが、家の事を手伝ってくれなくて、私は少し寂しいなと思います。大きな声で言う。

どんなのの詩が好きのです。」「アレクサンドロ・プーシキンの詩です。」「私も大好きです。」プーシキンの詩は二人の間でしばら

イチビタクナ…スパイクを履くのも嫌っ！タクルを嫌い。いつも彼女の言葉が好きで、陸上競技を続けられなかった理由は無くなりました。もう少しの努力です。
今までは、自分が嫌いな人を嫌いと考え opiniónで自分を向き合っていたけど、一晩じっかな てその人をしっかりと見つめて自分は改

続くかわからないけど、物事は akoしい思いさせて教えるのは...とかヘルメットをかぶる彼

まさか、一度結婚したら一生、別れられなくなってしまったのです。 もし結婚した男性

はんとうということもないに言えた。「どういう意味？」私の顔は沈んだ。「ほら、女性

の調査と比べると、日本に好感を持っている人は一 じ。六ポイントも落ち込む一方、日本

の言動に翻弄されっぱなしかった。

の調査と比べると、日本の英語を教えても、英語とは意味がないんじゃないだろうか、と結論づけよ

頭の片隅では、彼女と別れてしまうかもしれないな

訂正しよう。たくさんある。

がする。しかし、答えるのが面倒だと、首を傾げて

の言葉に向けてはバヴァった。「どう考えても、差し出ない口、何とも言えないのだから、なんとか

彼の片隅では、彼女と別れてしまうかもしれないねと感じています。真由美さんのこと

 Hamm(著) 1970/ 1970 女/ 女 プッサと結婚

のが人、ドイツ人、ロシア人に比べ、中

なことが二

なんということなしに言った。「私のこと、忘

に変わっていないのか。もし、彼があなたのこと

「ひと言」で相手の心をつかむ恋愛術

「環境」、そして「方法」について、それぞれを、彼女を言う。と同時に、私たちの考え方を教える。

マネルム・シンドロームとは、自分の命を守っ

指導者の彼女が読んだ読み物に、「読むようになった のだから、自分で読みたいって、本

好きになった男に本当のことを言わなかったこ と。もし真実を言うなら彼女のことが

1 1 0 0 1 0 -0.5 Yahoo!ブログ 2008

1 1 0 0 1 0 0.5 奥井 聡(著) 1970/ 1970 女/ 女 プッサと結婚

1 1 1 0 1 0 0 宮本 隆(著) 1950 男 1900 男 目中はなぜわかり 合ええないのか

1 0 0.25 0 1 0 0 60 男 ひまわり

1 1 1 0 1 0 0 七宮 輝(著)/ 金森 藤加(著) / 1960 女/ 女 正しい古いのすす め

1 0 0.25 0 1 0 0.5 江藤 あおい(著) 1940 女 できる女の女

1 0 0 0 1 0 0.5 西田 浩(著) 1930 男 2005 女 AD/HD・LDの発達と保育・教育

1 1 1 0 1 0 0 日原 広一(著) 1950 男 臨床的見解開発力

1 0 1 1 0 1 0 1 日原 広一(著) 1940 男 早期教育と脳

かなじんしゃないだろうか、と結論づけよ うとしていたところだ。 でも彼

これは、そうか、いうや、それは嫌だ。

の言葉に向かってはバヴァった。「転任どう責任取ってはし ろの？」 「ど、どうって...」 「言

こと、忘

さえ思いもしない。彼女に何かしてほしいすこと があるわけではない。今回と何を話し

1 0 1 0 1 0 0.5 谷村 真理子(著) 1940 女 アメリカ女性剣術 クロニクルズ

1 1 0.25 1 1 0 0.5
われた場合の耐性も非常に弱く、全人格を否定されたいのかために受け止め、批判する相手を嫌いになったりすることさえあります。前述したイギリス人のクラスメートたちは、幼少の

大好き状態の恋が成就した時、より相手が本気でこちらを向いてくれた途端に、相手を嫌いになったり終わりたりしたケースがよくありました。相手に「食事でも行きませんか、

、さすがにライオン先生のお眼鏡になかったんだね。おおらかさからして、苦悩の出来ることはないものだ、だれが言っただろうか。

た、電話の向こうでジーンは言った、「「ローマの休日」を書いてきたわよ。あなたのこと

を嫌いになったりしたのだけれども、正直に言うと、私ではみんなに手にはできなかったと思う

、ねだりに思っているが、その奥さんのことに関しては、だれが言っただろうか。

で一番の宝物なんだだから　そう言っているにしろと雨が降った日

を嫌い、忘れてしまわぬこと。普通、あなたが招待を断り

を嫌い、だらかではない、その姿自体に気がありがとう、あるいはタイミング、場所その他の要

思っていい年齢を知っているが、男が言ったものだ、それが耳に入った途端に、あや

二人はおなじような大野鮮をしていた（朝がう

を嫌い、になった原因のひとつと、四老爺は言ったものだ、が、それが耳に入った途端に、あや

ならとそうだそうした。ぼくが知らずにハリーを怒らせたのか、それともハリーがぼくの顔

を嫌い、だったのか、わからないけど、ぼくたちはほとんど中が悪く、一度ハリーにプレハブに引

れる気じゃないの？　「彼のように、お前、俺たち　まだ三日下でー」　「長さ、あたし

を嫌い、？」　「いきなりそんなことを言われて」　「じゃあ、あの晩、あたしを好きで抱い

にそれがみんなを幸せにするのか、私は幸せになれるのか、今大きく悩んでいます。日本

を嫌い、になりたくない、人生に取りたくはない。ジョン

と静かに生きていくことも大事、私も

にそのまんまをさせにするのか、私は幸せになれるのか、大きく悩んでいます。日本

を嫌い、になりたくない。人生に取りたくはない。ジョン

と静かに生きていくことも大事、でも

分のやることが大事を持っているということを感じ

にながら、だからといってその奥さん

を嫌い、になるわけでもない。この夫婦は例外的にものすごくくしゃみさせた夫婦だと思います、パル

が欲し、なんて欲は言いません。ただ、姿が近くでみれた

Yahoo!ブログ
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「いな物」が欲しいということですか？ノーズクリップといえば猫耳のお姉さん（女の子、お兄さん、男の子）ならどちらが欲しいですか？ドラえもんがいいんだけど、大山のぶ代の声がイヤだ。

レバレッジ系の本を読んで勉強し、自分が変わった気になっただけでは全くダメ。お金が欲しいならお金に関する行動を始めよう。掃除をはじめたら、玄関をキレイにして、自転車に切った。

それでも安めの、六万円ぐらいの（σ・Д・σ）！！そのまえにお金が欲しい！！笑

混ざっていると解釈してきましたが、どうなのでしょうか？付け加えますが、「ミックスが欲しい」「雑種が欲しい」などという質問に回答するための知識としての質問です。まずは結論

一人っ子の方に質問です。歳が10歳以上離れていても弟か妹が欲しいですか？私には9歳になる子がいますが、二人目がなかなか出来ません。歳が離れた兄弟は

なんて解釈されますか？話を聞いてもらいたいだけ、ということはありうるのですか？私は意見

今ドコモの携帯を使用してます。新しい携帯が欲しいと思ってお店に行ったのですが、何がいいのかが分かりず諦めて帰ってきました。

「エラプラント」を行うことに・・・簡単な方は土台となるチタン！！（僕はチタコが欲しいぞ）を骨に挿入、難しい方は・・・土台を作るため骨を移植してからという結構な手術

なるほど、ポスト＆ビームでゲレンジを作ること。そして「子供が成長して自分の部屋

つとめてきたのは、ユーザーが「こういうものが欲しい」と言っていたときに、できるだけ対応できないのかと思うわけです。せーり・オー

浦元さんは言う。「最初に考えたのは、ユーザーが「こういうもの

恋愛運、人間関係運 中旬以降交際運が好調。元気で明るい人がモテるので、出会
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浦元さんは言う。「最初に考えたのは、ユーザーが「こういうもの

満月運、人間関係運、恋愛運　中旬以降交際運が好調。元気で明るい人がモテるので、出会
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ね。「節約」している人が変わり者みたいに見られていたときでした。でも、私は「家が欲しかった」夢を持ったから、「節約」が楽しかった。だって、「節約」すればお金が貯まるから！丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

「節約」していた人が変わり者みたいに見られていたときでした。でも、私は「家が欲しかった」夢を持ったから、「節約」が楽しかった。丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

「節約」だったんです丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

山さんの本を読んで、なるほど、ぼくはまだ甘いなと痛感させられた次第です。丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005

丸山晴美（著）/横田濱夫（著） 1970/1950 女/男 明るい節約生活入門 2005
「もしかば、私はたぶんその確証

と、三日花咲日常になた。三園の友どうすせて、友情の友か

に相談を呑ませて受ける。「誰だる木もしかいですか？」とアドバイスしたのが、男

の面白方がみやぎでさ。「わからってよ、襲

とは、何かのためにケーキをするかね。

れ、「どこに持つける？」「実家の近くに適当

家庭があるんだよ」「今日、これ

間は初めて言及した。「わかった」のいのである。

（まだ無けて考えたのは、い・発」

理せずできるか、という感じです。 22歳の

ときはフリーターをやっていた、「家

が欲しい」いう夢に出会ってしまったんです。家を買う頭金を貯めるには貯金をしなければなら

いけないんだ。新しいのは見つからない、何を見ても"欲しい"と感じない。

いうと、その日の夕方に私を見知らぬ友人

れと、好きな男が思わず手を伸ばしたく

加納 知恵袋(著) 1940/1940 女/女 かけがえのない、

にいかがわしき感じるかだろうか。金運というの

が欲しかった、他の人より少しでも大きいお金

が欲しかった、という気持を自分が持っているのに、そういう自分

によって考えたのは、一発

岡は彼の古巣の瞳に力がみなぎってきた。

の相談を呑ませて受ける。「誰だる木もしかいですか？」とアドバイスしたのが、男

same page...
～安心』なのか？！よく分からないですけど・・・（苦笑）、でももし彼が、私の下着を欲しいって言ったら、あげないかもしれませんね、でも〜嬉しいです。21才♀

産は80億を動かないという金持ちです。その彼が身寄りが無いために老後を考え養女を欲しと考えていたのでした。俵は彼女が働く高級サウナに相庭を連れてきて合わせます。

最初は相当のもので、3日間寝込みました。痛み止めも2本も入れました。そろそろ二人目を欲しと思うようになりましたが、あの痛みにまた耐える自信がなくて、自然分娩で産んでみました。

急募だった求人を見て、登録面接をしましたら、翌日中に就業可能かお返事を欲しと言われました。条件的にはとても良いと思います。ただ、年齢的に(30歳)今、無理ではないと思いますが、何か良い方法があったら教えてください。

落札者から領収書を欲しとメールもらいました。個人出品なのですが、どうすればよいか領収書買った

彼女さんがバパイを欲しいって要求されたら、買ってあげます。喜んでプレゼトします。お礼は下さい。「マック買いました」

働き始めても最初は1人暮らしがやっていけるほどお金をもらえません。親にはもうお金を欲しとは言いたくないのですが、援助してもらえるならして欲しい気持ちはあります。自分で

願望(探求と実現)−−−上手に期待することを学びましょう。自分が何を欲しいるかを完全に知ることが出発点です。よく掘り下げて考えてみる必要があります、自分に正

減うの子はなんでも欲しいる。ニンテンドーD Sを買ったばかりなのに、P S Pを欲しいる

心すると6人組男性グループ神話のメンバーになった。音楽をしていると単独レーベルを欲しいという計画を立てて、その夢をかなえた。そして今は彼氏養成という巨大な目標をたて

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>や行</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>〜安心』なのか？！よく分からないですけど・・・（苦笑）、でももし彼が、私の下着を欲しいって言ったら、あげないかもしれませんね、でも〜嬉しいです。21才♀</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>産は80億を動かないという金持ちです。その彼が身寄りが無いために老後を考え養女を欲しと考えていたのでした。俵は彼女が働く高級サウナに相庭を連れてきて合わせます。</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>最初は相当のもので、3日間寝込みました。痛み止めも2本も入れました。そろそろ二人目を欲しと思うようになりましたが、あの痛みにまた耐える自信がなくて、自然分娩で産んでみました。</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1 0 0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>急募だった求人を見て、登録面接をしましたら、翌日中に就業可能かお返事を欲しと言われました。条件的にはとても良いと思います。ただ、年齢的に(30歳)今、無理ではないと思いますが、何か良い方法があったら教えてください。</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>落札者から領収書を欲しとメールもらいました。個人出品なのですが、どうすればよいか領収書買った</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼女さんがバパイを欲しいって要求されたら、買ってあげます。喜んでプレゼトします。お礼は下さい。「マック買いました」</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>慣き初めて最初は1人暮らしがやっていけるほどお金をもらえません。親にはもうお金を欲しとは言いたくないのですが、援助してもらえるならして欲しい気持ちはあります。自分で</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●願望（探求と実現）　−−上手に期待することを学びましょう。自分が何を欲しいるかを完全に知ることが出発点です。よく掘り下げて考えてみる必要があります、自分に正</td>
<td>1 1 -0,5 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>輪戦がこの先一生セックスなしで自慰行為だけで生きていけるものなのでしょうか？子供を欲し迫ってみてはどうでしょうか？デブな娘が嫌だとは言ってもどうでしょうから・・・</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>うちの子はなんでも欲しいる。ニンテンドーD Sを買ったばかりなのに、P S Pを欲しいる</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高河ゆんさんの「ガーシャン」の結末はどうなったのですか？昔はまっていたので完結版を欲しいるのですが、ずいぶん昔の作品なので迷っています。ネタばれお願いします!完結版揃える</td>
<td>0 1 1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>心すると6人組男性グループ神話のメンバーになった。音楽をしていると単独レーベルを欲しいという計画を立てて、その夢をかなえた。そして今は彼氏養成という巨大な目標をたて</td>
<td>0 1 -0,75 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
父が麻雀ソフトをほしいみたいです。あまり値段が高くなくておすすめなソフトがあったらおしえてください。

で国会が大騒ぎ（衆議院の決議）だと言っていました。私は、1万2千円プラス8千円をほしいです。と、言っておきます。欲しくなくて、ほかに使ってくれという方が多いそうですが

でですか保険証を使用しての治療になるのでしょう？派遣元の責任者に何度も連絡をほしいと頼んでいるにも関わらず連絡がなく困っています。今回の怪我の為に休んだ分というのも

で枠を作ったお手製マフラーゆかしレンズに付けて写真を楽しむ親を見ていた。

で戸を作ったお手製フィルターレンズに付けて写真を楽しむ親を見ていた。私が望遠鏡を欲しで、新聞紙を丸めて中を黒く塗り、凸レンズと凹レンズを組み合わせ、望遠鏡を

でできるという点だ。インターネットでの通信販売は、製品情報を見た顧客がその製品

でホールデンは、激しく動揺した。その瞬間まで、ホールデンは自分がルシンダを欲しいかえて、お客を連れて来ない時の、父の晩酌相手をさせてもらった。

でめっとなチョコレートの箱を指差して、八箱をギフト用にラッピングし、それぞれに手提げ袋を欲しに伝えたいようだ。店員は注文の品は分かったのだが、そこから先の手話にまごってい

で、私の気持ちは分からない」私は寂しさを抱えて、夜の街に佇んだ。

では、私の気持ちが分かりかねない。私は寂しさを抱えて、夜の街に佇んだ。「オヤジが愛人を欲しかったかなあ……」ただただセックスの相手が欲しい

で、個々の社長が、是非、この写真を欲しって言ってるんだよ。とにかく、見てくれ……」そう言って、津村社長は、例の二枚の写真を

で、お客を連れて来ない時の、父の晩酌相手をさせてもらった。見がボクサーの仔犬を欲しに、と言って、賞めてきみたち、成犬のように大きくて、誰も近づくことができずに返しに

で、個々の社長が、是非、この写真を欲しって言ってるんだよ。とにかく、見てくれ……」それについて、津村社長は、例の二枚の写

で、個々の社長が、是非、この写真を欲しって言ってるんだよ。とにかく、見てくれ……」それについて、津村社長は、例の二枚の写
強くなり、長持ちするようになります。私の研究室でも、研究のために解剖したカラスを欲しといいう農家に提供することがありますが、いずれも防腐処置（後述）をしているので、長持ちするようになります。

すると、カラスを欲しという農家に提供することができる。これは防腐処置をするためで、長持ちするようになります。

あることがあれば、こういったことをすべてソーシャル・スキルという。あるいは、返信を欲しさに言う的同时に、返信用の切手も封筒も入れない人がいる。そういうのはソーシャル・スキルに該当する。

これで納得!契約の基本は商品をなんとかつくりあげても、それを欲している人がどこにいるのか、どれほどの量を欲しいるのか、また、どの程度の値段であれば買ってくれるのか。Gという元手でWという商品をカウンセラーをされたとは、証言したりしない？

しません。いまは理恵のほうが先生を欲しいるんだもん。…理恵が、先生を欲しくなっているの」ソフソの背凭れに背を深く預け、かかわる。

あることがあれば、こういったことをすべてソーシャル・スキルという。あるいは、返信を欲しさに言う的同时に、返信用の切手も封筒も入れない人がいる。そういうのはソーシャル・スキルに該当する。

これで納得!契約の基本は商品をなんとかつくりあげても、それを欲している人がどこにいるのか、どれほどの量を欲しいるのか、また、どの程度の値段であれば買ってくれるのか。Gという元手でWという商品をカウンセラーをされたとは、証言したりしない？

しません。いまは理恵のほうが先生を欲しいるんだもん。…理恵が、先生を欲しくなっているの」ソフソの背凭れに背を深く預け、かかわる。

あることがあれば、こういったことをすべてソーシャル・スキルという。あるいは、返信を欲しさに言う的同时に、返信用の切手も封筒も入れない人がいる。そういうのはソーシャル・スキルに該当する。

これで納得!契約の基本は商品をなんとかつくりあげても、それを欲している人がどこにいるのか、どれほどの量を欲しいるのか、また、どの程度の値段であれば買ってくれるのか。Gという元手でWという商品をカウンセラーをされたとは、証言したりしない？

しません。いまは理恵のほうが先生を欲しいるんだもん。…理恵が、先生を欲しくなっているの']
MOSF1403

何とか速楽し、ちゃうと、と思う。でも、それは、一話、教科書の学校を卒業しまして、あのお一位の、こちに、みんな。

か、五、男の子だ。だから、自分も、声の子だけに、思いてしまいます。か、四、と、かしいものと、かしいの。

好き|

で、あの教科書、の、免許、取りに戻され、か、か。さん、ち、それに、した。あの、職業と、えて、があの。

で、む、今のお、かし、ある、と、か、言うと。かし、かし、いくか。

0 1 0.75 0 1 -1 0 0 0 女 65-69歳

MOSF1000

どう、いえ、は、ちょっと、へえ、へえ、する、そうなん。ですね。

え、どんな、あ、あの、だ、え、え、ええ、だ、え、え。

1 0 0.75 1 0 0 0 0 男 30-34歳

SOSF805

あ、ある、ある、あ、ある、だ、え、ええ、だ、え、え。

0 1 -1 0 1 0 0 0 男 55-59歳

SOSF5135

え、ないっていうの、ある、だから、私は、もう、アレ、して、そうだ、と、いった、ものの、の、が、好きは、し、本物と、同じ。

す、色、を、「ちょっと」と、少し、色、が、来ない、から。

1 1 0 0.5 0 0 25-29歳

SOSF1200

あ、あの、映画、が、好き、として、いう、理由、も、ある、た、だ、と、作り手が、ここ、何、伝えたい、の、と、話す、の、か。

1 0 -1 0 0 0 20-24歳

SOSF5041

え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え。

1 1 0.75 0 0 0 男 25-29歳

SOSF5051

え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え。

1 0 1 1 0 0 35-39歳

SOSF5000

え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え。

1 1 0 1 0 0 40-44歳

SOSF5055

え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え。

0 1 0 1 0 0 30-34歳

SOSF5094

え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え、え。

0 1 0.25 0 1 1 1 女 25-29歳
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>社</th>
<th>女</th>
<th>男</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S04F0871 な人だと言うようになる。塚を兼ねてなければ子供は自信を持ちようにある。絵を描くには近い子どもたちに描かせる。子供は子供のいたましい学びに習う。何を学ぼうとするかは子供が自由に考えてはいかがでしょうか。

S05F1611 何と考えたので、安徽を含む前に実は私の家に来るまで、駅に会って来るようになって、顔が頼っていた。それと聞く子供の顔は本当に私のことを。

S06F1218 11 うちの子も、おりも長い。もしも年を重ねたから、色や風景を読んで、子供が思う。でも、駿に乗りたいくらいの子が駿乗っているのです。

S08M153 6 うちの娘や、りょうやりょうの作り方、楽しい。散歩のどこに散歩に行くか、この場所は。駿に乗る子、人生の旅を。

S08M168 7 なっていう風に思います　また、明日までに、自分のための、言いますか、おんなず、原宿で、田舎の旅に。駿に乗ること。駿に乗る風に。

S09A033 6 なっていった気がするのに、もう汚れないです。何て、索引を抜き、に、友達、会って、あっ、騎乗のための、きっかけがありません。

S10F1409 に自分を大切にしている。と試みよう、に思う。自分ができる、ことは、大切にしている。大切なことは、自己のことを。

S10F1550 たのしいものです、何て。これから、この人、あの子、私達に、あっ、ない。そのことを。駿に乗ること。駿に乗る風に。

S10M131 5 ただ、自分が変わると、と思われますので、顔の色、違うです。心をつける。 Funding of 168

S11F0357 ずれ、そういった、あることはない。だから、それを作るための、自分のことを。

S11F1381 もん、ない。だから、それを作るための、自分のことを。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>いん でしょ と呼ばれるのを</th>
<th>たい</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>女の子</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>男</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>女の子</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

※詳細な解釈は、テキスト内での文脈を参考にすること。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>内容</th>
<th>件数</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>女</th>
<th>20-24歳</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A06F004 4</td>
<td>の理論についてよく箇条に説明を行えない。なぜか私達</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>女</td>
<td>20-24歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10M067 6</td>
<td>できる。まずは「ベース」としての構造を変えることにより、もの</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>男</td>
<td>20-24歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D0IF033 0-R</td>
<td>そう思うよ。あなたが也會った。信頼。</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>女</td>
<td>30-34歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0IF152 4</td>
<td>テーマの解釈である。因子に付ける。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>女</td>
<td>30-34歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02F012 2</td>
<td>できる。電話をふるむと、また、電話の相手は多いです。もしかしたら電話の</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>男</td>
<td>20-24歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02M0B7 4</td>
<td>の相手が多くて、あまり多いと、それほど、その相手との</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>男</td>
<td>25-29歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04AM032 6</td>
<td>なるし、魚がいる。</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>男</td>
<td>40-44歳</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07F070 4</td>
<td>木を用いて、思うので、名作を作る。</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>女</td>
<td>50-54歳</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

注: 表中の数字はスコアや評価を示すもので、具体的な意味は不明です。
10.3 Appendix 3 – The questionnaire

10.3.1 Base-, control-, and test-items used in the questionnaire

Note: The parts of sentences coloured grey are there to provide context without influencing the transitivity of the sentence. They are there to 1) make all of the sentences have roughly the same level of imagery, 2) provide variation to avoid participant fatigue and saturation, and 3) draw the participants’ attention away from the purpose of the questionnaire. The parts in **bold**, on the other hand, signify the inclusion of elements which heighten or lower the degree of the various transitivity factors present in the sentence.

**Base (scale-orientation) sentences**

僕は毎日牛乳を飲みます。
Boku wa mainichi gyūnyū o nomimasu.
‘I drink milk every day.’ [A]

僕は時々牛乳へ飲みます。
Boku wa tokidoki gyūnyū e nomimasu.
‘I sometimes drink to milk.’ [B]

**Control sentences**

1) 僕はみさきが好きだ。
   Boku wa Misaki ga suki da.
   ‘I like Misaki.’

2) 確かに格好いいけど、私は太郎が嫌いだ。
   Tashika-ni kakko-i kedo, watashi wa Tarō ga kirai da.
   ‘He’s certainly handsome, but I dislike Tarō.’

3) 私は新しいセーターがほしい。
   Watashi wa atarashi-i seetaa ga hoshi-i.
   ‘I want a new sweater.’

4) 僕はみさきを好きだ。
   Boku wa Misaki o suki da.
   ‘I like Misaki.’
5) 確かに格好いいけど、私は太郎を嫌いだ。
Tashika-ni kakkoi-i kedo, watashi wa Tarō o kirai da.
‘He’s certainly handsome, but I dislike Tarō.’

6) 私は新しいセーターをほしい。
Watashi wa atarashi-i seetaa o hoshi-i.
‘I want a new sweater.’

7) 私はよく人を好きになる。
Watashi wa yoku hito o suki ni nar-u.
‘I often grow to like people.’

8) 私は人を嫌いになることが多い。
Watashi wa hito o kirai ni nar-u koto ga ō-i.
‘I often grow to dislike people.’

9) 僕は電子機器のCMを見ると、いつもその商品をほしくなる。
Boku wa denshi-kiki no CM o mi-ru to, itsumo sono shōhin o hoshi-ku-naru.
‘Whenever I see commercials for electronics, I always end up wanting the products.’

Transitivity-related factors

Participant number (1/2 – full reflexive)

10) まわりに色々怒られるけど、私は自分を好きだ。
Mawari ni iroiro okor-are-ru kedo, watashi wa jibun o suki da.
‘I often get scolded by people around me, but I like myself.’

11) 友達に聞いた話だけど、春樹は自分を嫌いらしい。
Tomodachi ni kii-ta hanashi da kedo, Haruki wa jibun o kirai rashi-i.
‘I heard this from my friend, but it seems like Haruki dislikes himself.’
Participant number (2/2 – overt)

12) いつも優しくしてくれるから、春樹を好きだ。
Itsumo yasashi-ku-shite-kure-ru kara Haruki o suki da.
always nice-ADZ-do-give-PRS because Haruki ACC like COP
‘I like Haruki because he is always nice to me.’

13) いつも勉強している時に邪魔をするから、弟を嫌いだ。
Itsumo benkyō-shite-iru toki ni jama o sur-u kara, o-tōto o
always study-do-PROG time DAT bother ACC do-PRS because younger-brother ACC
kirai da.
dislike COP
‘I dislike my brother, because he always bothers me while I’m studying.’

14) 春樹は全くデートに連れていかないから、新しい彼氏をほしい。
Haruki wa mattaku deeto ni tsure-te-itte-na-i kara, atarashi-i kareshi
Haruki TOP at.all date DAT bring-go-give-NEG-PRS because new-PRS boyfriend
o hoshi-i.
ACC want-PRS
‘Haruki never takes me on dates, so I want a new boyfriend.’

Participant role (1/2 – subject animacy)

15) 私は基本的に動物に嫌われるタイプだけど、将太の犬は私を好きだ。
Watashi wa kihonteki-ni dōbutsu ni kiraw-are-ru taipu da kedo,
I TOP fundamentally animals DAT dislike-PASS-PRS type.of.person COP but
Shōta no inu wa watashi o suki da.
Shōta GEN dog TOP I ACC like COP
‘I’m the type of person who is usually disliked by animals, but Shōta’s dog likes me.’

16) 猿は色々な動物と仲が悪いが、特に犬を嫌いだ。
Saru wa iroiro na doubutsu to naka ga waru-i ga,
monkey TOP various COP animals COMP relation NOM bad-PRS but
toku-ni inu o kirai da.
especially dogs ACC dislike COP
‘Monkeys are on bad terms with many animals, but they especially dislike dogs.’

17) 犬は何よりも餌をほしいから、食べ物さえ与えれば簡単に仲良くなれる。
Inu wa nani-yori-mo esa o hoshi-i kara, tabemono sae
dogs TOP above.all.else (animal.)food ACC want-PRS because food only
ataer-eba kantai-ni nakayoku nar-er-u
give-COND easily friendly become-POT-PRS
‘Dogs want food above all else, so as long as you give them food, you can easily befriend
them.’
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Participant role (2/2 – object animacy)

18) わたしはファンタジーの本を読むのを好きだ。
Watashi wa fantajii no hon o yom-u no o suki da.
I TOP fantasy GEN book ACC read-PRS NMZ ACC like COP
‘I like reading fantasy-books.’

19) 僕は二日酔いがひどいから、お酒を飲むのを嫌いだ。
Boku wa futsukayoi ga hido-i kara, osake o nom-u no o kirai
day-drinker NOM bad-PRS because alcohol ACC drink-PRS NMZ ACC dislike
COP
‘I dislike drinking alcohol, because I get really bad hangovers.’

Event-likeness

20) みさきの着物姿を見た途端、春樹は彼女を好きになった。
Misaki no kimono-sugata o mi-ta totan, Haruki wa kanojo o suki
Misaki GEN dressed.in.kimono ACC see-PST instant Haruki TOP her ACC like
DAT become-PST
‘When he saw Misaki dressed in a kimono, Haruki fell for her.’

21) 好きな歌手がセクハラで逮捕されたと聞いたとき、みさきは彼を嫌いになった。
Suki na kashu ga sekuhara de taiho-sare-ta to kii-ta
like COP singer NOM sexual.harassment INST arrest-do.PASS-PST COMP hear-PST
toki, Misaki wa kare o kirai ni nat-ta.
time Misaki TOP him ACC dislike DAT become-PST
‘When Misaki heard that the singer she liked was arrested for sexual harassment, she begun to dislike him.’

22) 新型の携帯にはフロントカメラが２つ付いているのを知り、僕はそれをほしくなった。
Shingata no keitai ni wa furonto-kamera ga futatsu tsuite-iru no
new.model GEN cellphone DAT TOP front-camera NOM two attach-PROG NMZ
o shiri, boku wa sore o hoshi-ku-nat-ta.
ACC learn I TOP that ACC want-ADZ-become-PST
‘When I learned that the new cellphone has two front-cameras, I began to want it.’
Dynamics (temporal boundedness)

23) 今はつまらない人だと思うが、1年生の時、私は彼を好きだった。

Ima wa tsumarana-i hito da to omo-u ga, ichinensei no toki, watashi wa kare o suki dat-ta.
‘Now I think he is a boring person, but I liked him when I was a freshman.’

24) 子供の時は野菜を嫌いだったが、今は毎日たくさん食べている。

Kodomo no toki wa yasai o kirai dat-ta ga, ima wa mainichi takusan tabete-iru.
‘When I was a child I disliked vegetables, but now I eat a lot of them every day.’

25) 高校時代はグッチのかばんをほしかったけど、今はそんなのなんてどうでもいいと思ってきた。

Kōkō-jidai wa gucchi no kaban o hoshi-katta kedo, ima wa sonna no nante doudemo-ni to omotte-ki-ta.
‘In my high school days I wanted Gucci-bags, but now I couldn’t care less about those kinds of things.’

Participant discreteness

26) どんなところが自慢かという質問に対して、そのモデルは「私は特に自分の足を好きだ」と語った。

DONNA tokoro ga jiman ka to i-u shitsumon ni taishite, what kind spot NOM pride Q COMP say-PRS question DAT in.regard.to sono moderu wa watashi wa toku-ni jibun no ashi o suki da to that model TOP I TOP especially oneself GEN legs ACC like COP COMP katat-ta.
tell-PST
‘In response to a question about what body-part she was most happy with, the model answered “I’m particularly fond of my legs”.’

27) いつもみんなに「美しい」と言われるけど、私は自分の容姿を嫌いだ。

Itsumo minna ni “utsukushi-i” to iwar-er-u kedo, watashi wa jibun no yōshi o kirai da.
‘Everyone always tells me that I’m beautiful, but I dislike my own appearance.’
Volition (1/2 –positive volition)

28) 私は頑張って、やっと昔嫌いだった野菜を好きになった。
Watashi wa ganbatte, yatto mukashi kirai dat-ta yasai o suki ni nar-e-ta.
DAT become-PST
‘I made an effort, and finally began to like the vegetables I had previously hated.’

29) どんなひどいことをされても、僕はあの子を嫌いになれない。
Donna hido-i koto o sarete-mo, boku wa ano ko o kirai ni nar-e-nai.
become-POT-NEG-PRS
‘No matter what cruel things I am subjected to (by her), I can’t seem to hate that girl.’

30) 大家族がいいという妻の気持ちを理解しようと頑張ってみたが、僕はなかなか子供をほしくない。
Daikazoku ga i-i to i-u tsuma no kimochi o rikai-shi-yō to ganbatte-wa-mi-ta ga, boku wa nakanaka kodomo o hoshikai-shi
understand-do-VOL.COMP perservere-EMPH-try-PST but I TOP not.readily children ACC want-ADZ-become-POT-NEG-PRS
‘I’ve tried my best to understand the feelings of my wife who wants a large family, but I can’t really seem to start wanting children.’

Volition (2/2 – negative volition)

31) 別に好きになりたかったわけじゃないけれど、私は彼を好きだ。
Betsu-ni suki ni nari-ta-katta wake ja-nai keredo, watashi wa kare o suki da.
ACC like COP
‘It’s not like I particularly wanted to like him, but I do.’

32) いつも優しくしてくれるけれど、なぜかあのひとを嫌いだ。
Itsumo yasashi-ku-shite-kure-ru keredo, watashi wa nazeka ano hito o always nice-ADZ-do-give-PRS but I TOP for.some.reason that person ACC dislike COP
‘He is always nice to me, but for some reason I dislike that person.’

33) 私はこの物欲社会がいやだけれど、なぜか新型の携帯をほしい。
Watashi wa kono butsuyokushakai ga iya da keredo, nazeka shingata no keitai o hoshi-i.
I TOP this materialistic.society NOM detestable COP but for.some.reason new.model GEN mobile.phone ACC want-PRS
‘Even though I detest this materialistic society, I for some reason find myself wanting a new phone.’
Object affectedness

34) 太郎が私を好きだなんて、気持ち悪いよ。
   Tarō ga watashi o suki da nante, kimochi-waru-i yo.
   ‘Tarō liking me makes me sick.’

35) みさきが僕を嫌いやだと聞いたとき、すごくショックを受けた。
   Misaki ga boku o kirai da to kii-ta toki, sugoku shokku o uke-ta.
   ‘I was shocked when I heard that Misaki dislikes me.’

Non-transitivity related factors

Ambiguity reduction

36) 僕はみさきをこの世のどの女の子よりも好きだ。
   Boku wa Misaki o kono yo no dono onna-no-ko yori-mo suki da.
   ‘I like Misaki more than any other girl in the world.’

37) 私は太郎を、2年前に振られて以来、ずっと嫌いだ。
   Watashi wa Tarō o, ninenmae ni fur-arete irai, zutto kirai da.
   ‘I’ve disliked Tarō ever since he dumped me two years ago.’

38) 僕はまず貪沢したいが、彼女は子供を、大きな家よりも、高い車よりも、ほしいらしい。
   Boku wa mazu zeitaku-shi-ta-i ga, kanojo wa kodomo o, ōki na ie yori-mo, taka-i kuruma yori-mo, hoshi-i rashi-i COP house rather-than expensive-PRS car rather-than want-PRS seem-PRS.
   ‘I firstly want to live in luxury, but my girlfriend seems to want children more than a large house or an expensive car.’

Politeness (1/2 – polite)

39) 春樹は花子を好きです。
   Haruki wa Hanako o suki desu.
   ‘Haruki likes Hanako.’
40) 友達の話によると、春樹は太郎を嫌いです。

Tomodachi no hanashi ni yoru to, Haruki wa Tarō o kirai desu.

‘According to my friend, Haruki dislikes Tarō.’

41) 私は新しいセーターをほしいです。

Watashi wa atarashi-i seetaa o hoshi-i desu

‘I want a new sweater.’

Politeness (2/2 – superpolite)

42) 私はあの方を好きでございます。

Watashi wa ano kata o suki de-gozaimasu.

‘I like that person.’

43) いつも悪いことばかりしているので、私はあの人の性を嫌いでございます。

Itsumo waru-i koto bakari shite-iru node, watashi wa ano hito o kirai de-gozaimasu。

‘I dislike him/her, because he/she only does bad things.’

44) 大家族に憧れておりますので、私はたくさんの子供をほしゅうございます。

Daikazoku ni akogarete-ori-masu node, watashi wa takusan no kodomo o hoshū-gozaimasu.

‘I want many children because I look up to large families.’
10.3.2 Answer-distribution for questionnaire

Figure 10-1 Bar-charts for acceptability judgments

1) 僕はみさきが好きだ。

2) 確かに格好いいけど、私は太郎が嫌いだ。
3) 私は新しいセーターがほしい。

4) 僕はみさきを好きだ。

5) 確かに格好いいけど、私は太郎を嫌いだ。
6) 私は新しいセーターをほしい。

7) 私はよく人を好きになる。

8) 私は人を嫌いになることが多い。
9) 僕は電子機器のCMを見ると、いつもその商品をほしくなる。

10) まわりに色々怒られるけど、私は自分を好きだ。

11) 友達に聞いた話だけど、春樹は自分を嫌いらしい。
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12)いつも優しくしてくれるから、春樹を好きだ。

13)いつも勉強している時に邪魔をするから、弟を嫌いだ。

14)春樹は全くデートに連れていかないので、新しい彼氏をほしい。
15) 私は基本的に動物に嫌われるタイプだけど、将太の犬は私を好きだ。

16) 猿は色々な動物と仲が悪いが、特に犬を嫌いだ。

17) 犬は何よりも餌をほしいから、食べ物さえ与えれば簡単に仲良くなれる。
18) わたしはファンタジーの本を読むのを好きだ。

19) 僕は二日酔いがひどいから、お酒を飲むのを嫌いだ。

20) みさきの着物姿を見た途端、春樹は彼女を好きになった。
21) 好きな歌手がセクハラで逮捕されたと聞いたとき、みさきは彼を嫌いになった。

22) 新型の携帯にはフロントカメラが2つ付いているのを知り、僕はそれをほしいくなった。

23) 今はつまらない人だと思うが、1年生の時、私は彼を好きだった。
24) 子供の時は野菜を嫌いだったが、今は毎日たくさん食べている。  

25) 高校時代はグッチのかばんをほしかったけど、今はそんなのなんてどうでもいいと思ってきた。  

26) どんなところが自慢かという質問に対して、そのモデルは「私は特に自分の足を好きだ」と語った。
27)いつもみんなに「美しい」と言われるけど、私は自分の容姿を嫌いだ。

28)私は頑張って、やっと昔嫌いだった野菜を好きになった。

29)どんなひどいことをされても、僕はあの子を嫌いになれない。
30) 大家族がいいという妻の気持ちを理解しようと頑張ってはみたが、僕はなかなか子供をほしくならない。

31) 別に好きになりたかったわけじゃないけれど、私は彼を好きだ。

32) いつも優しくしてくれるけれど、私はなぜかあの人の人を嫌いだ。
33) 私はこの物欲社会がいやだけれど、なぜか新型の携帯をほしい。

34) 太郎が私を好きだなんて、気持ち悪いよ。

35) みさきが僕を嫌いだと聞いたとき、すごくショックを受けた。
僕はみさきをこの世のどの女の子よりも好きだ。

私は太郎を、2年前に振られて以来、ずっと嫌いだ。

僕はまず贅沢したいが、彼女は子供を、大きな家よりも、高い車よりも、ほしいらしい。

僕はまず贅沢したいが、彼女は子供を、大きな家よりも、高い車よりも、ほしいらしい。
39) 春樹は花子を好きです。

40) 友達の話によると、春樹は太郎を嫌いです。

41) 私は新しいセーターをほしいです。
42) 私はあの方を好きでございます。

43) いつも悪いことばかりしているので、私はあのを嫌いでございます。

44) 大家族に憧れておりますので、私はたくさんの子供をほしゅうございます。