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0 Introduction

Consider the example:

(1) There is an engine in the car.

Hornstein, Rosen and Uriagereka (1994) (Henceforth HR&U) point out that (1) is ambiguous. (1) can be paraphrased as in (2a) or (2b):

(2) a. The car has an engine.
   b. In the car is an engine.

(2a) expresses the integral relationship between the car and an engine, i.e., an engine is an integral part of the car. (2b) expresses the spatial relation where an engine is located. For example, the engine is sitting in the back seat of the car. I will call sentences like (2a) and (1) with the reading of (2a) Integrals, and (2b) and (1) with the reading of (2b) Spatials.

Japanese exhibits the same ambiguity as English:

(3) Kuruma ni enzin ga aru.
    car in engine NOM BE
    'There is an engine in the car.'

(3) has the interpretations of (2a) and (2b). In Japanese there is no way to express the difference by using different verbs such as have and be, as in English. However, Topicalization of the subject disambiguates the meaning of the sentence, allowing the Integral reading only:

(4) Kuruma wa enzin ga aru.
    car TOP engine NOM BE.
    'The car has an engine.'

* I would like to thank Norbert Hornstein, Dave Lebeaux and Ian Roberts for helpful discussions and suggestions. I am especially indebted to Juan Uriagereka for invaluable comments and for his patience and encouragement. All errors are my own.
Also, when the word order is changed, the ambiguity disappears, showing the Spatial reading only:

(5) Enzin ga kuruma ni aru
    engine NOM car in BE
    'An engine is in the car.'

HR&U ascribe the difference between Integrals and Spatials to syntax, namely to the difference in their underlying small clauses, which have different predication structures. The purpose of my paper is to argue that the ambiguity seen in (3) is also structural, involving two types of predication structures, and to demonstrate the different syntactic behavior of the two structures.

1 Integrals
1.1 Two Types of Small Clauses: Integrals and Spatials

HR&U claim that (6a) underlies Integrals, and (6b) underlies Spatials:

(6)  
a. Integrals [SC the car [an engine]]
b. Spatials [SC an engine [in the car]]

(6b) has a standard predication structure: the locational PP is predicated of the small clause subject. (6a) is the underlying small clause of the constructions involving inalienable possession and part/whole relations, among others.

For deriving Integrals, HR&U adopt the analysis of possessive structures by Kayne (1993a), which itself is an extension of Szabolcsi (1983). In Hungarian, the movement of the possessor is visible. The possessive noun phrase which means 'my guest' can take either of the following forms:

(7)  
a. az én-Ø vendég-e-m
    the I-NOM guest-POSS-1SG
    (Szabolcsi 1983: 89)
b. én-nek-em a vendég-e-m
    I-DAT-1.SG the guest-POSS-1.SG
    (Szabolcsi 1983: 91)

In (7a), the possessor én T appears with nominative case following the determiner, while in (7b) the possessor with dative case appears preceding the determiner. Szabolcsi (1983, 1994) argues that the structure of noun phrases parallels that of sentences. The agreement between the possessor and the possessed is visible, and this agreement mirrors that of the subject and the verb of the sentence. The definite article is analogous to the complementizer, providing its specifier position for the
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dative possessor. The possessive structure she proposes is, in Kayne's terms, as follows:

(8) a. \( [\text{DP} [\text{D} \text{az} [\text{ACRP} \text{en-Ø} [\text{ACR} \text{0} [\text{vendég-e-m}]]]] \)
the I-NOM guest-POSS-1.SG 'my guest'

b. \( [\text{DP} \text{en-nek-Øi} [\text{D} \text{a} [\text{ACRP} \text{ti} [\text{ACR} \text{0} [\text{vendég-e-m}]]]] \)
I-DAT-1.SG the guest-POSS-1.SG 'my guest'

Furthermore, the possessor must move out of the DP when the DP is indefinite. The definiteness of the DP is signaled by the presence/absence of the definite article a:

(9) a. Nem olvas-t- ad [Chomsky vers- é- t]
not read-PAST-DEF Chomsky(-NOM) poem-POSS.3.SG-ACC 'You haven't read Chomsky’s poem.'

b. Chomsky-naki nem olvas-t- ad [t' i ti vers- é- t]
Chomsky-DAT not read-PAST-DEF.2.SG poem-POSS.3.SG-ACC 'You haven’t read any poem of Chomsky’s.'

(Szabolcsi 1994: 226)

But only the dative-marked possessor can move out of the DP, which suggests the escape-hatch status of the Spec DP.

Szabolcsi also derives *Have*-sentences by extracting the possessors:

(10) Mari-nak\(\_\) van-nak [\(\text{DP} \text{t'} [\text{D} \text{[ACRP t} [\text{ACR} \text{0 [kalap-ja- i]]]]} \)
DAT be 3.PL hat-POSS.3SG-PL(-NOM) 'Mary has hats.'

(Szabolcsi 1994: 223)

Kayne (1993a), adopting Szabolcsi’s analysis of Hungarian possessive constructions, proposes a possessive structure for English which is essentially parallel to that of Hungarian. The D\(\)\(\) must be phonetically unrealized in English:

(11) a. John's sister
b. \( [\text{DP} [\text{D} \text{[the] [ACRP John [ACR} \text{0 [sister]}}]] \)

---

1 Szabolcsi (1983) represents the structure in terms of the NP, S’ system, and she has a different notation in her recent paper (1994). However, I interpret her data in terms of Kayne’s system throughout my paper.
Kayne (1993a) extends Szabolcsi’s (1983) analysis to derive the following phrase, by moving the possessed *a sister* to the Spec of DP:

(12) a. a sister of John’s
b. \[ \text{DP a sister}_i [\text{DP} \text{ of } [\text{AGR} \text{ John}_i [\text{AGR} \text{ of } \text{John}_i [\text{t}_i ]]]] \]

English Spec DP is also an escape hatch, although, unlike Hungarian, this position is not a Case-licensed position, and thus the possessor has to move out of the position, yielding:

(13) John has a sister.

Kayne (1993a) asserts that by incorporating D/Pe to BE, the Spec of the DP is altered to an A-position. Also, D/Pe + BE will be spelled out as HAVE (Freeze 1992).

(14) \[ \text{John}_i \text{ has } [\text{DP} \text{ [e]} D/\text{P}^0 [\text{[e]} [\text{AGR} \text{ a sister}]]] \]

HR&U further extend Kayne’s (1993a) analysis and postulate the Integral small clause under the AGR projection in the possessive structure. The Integral small clause expresses inalienable possession, part/whole relations, and mass term predications, among others. Under their analysis, the possessive structure is as follows:

(15) a. \[ \text{DP} [\text{DP} \text{ (the) } [\text{AGR} \text{ John}_i [\text{AGR} \text{ of } \text{John}_i [\text{t}_i ] \text{ sister}]]] \]
b. \[ \text{DP a sister}_i [\text{DP} \text{ of } [\text{AGR} \text{ John}_i [\text{AGR} \text{ of } \text{John}_i [\text{t}_i ] \text{ sister}]]] \]

The derivation of (1) with the integral meaning is (16):

(16) There is [DP an engine] [DP 0 in [AGR the car] [AGR 0 [SC t_i t_j]]]}

### 1.2 Integrals in Japanese

In Japanese, the possessive phrase meaning ‘Jiro’s child’ is expressed as the following:

(17) Jiro no kodomo
    GEN child
    ‘Jiro’s child.’

Unlike Hungarian, dative case in Japanese is not possible within noun phrases, but it can be observed at the sentential level:

(18) a. ‘Jiro ni kodomo
    DAT child
    ‘Jiro’s child’
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b. Jiro ni kodomo ga aru.
   DAT child NOM BE
   'Jiro has a child'

Parallel to Hungarian and English, I would like to propose the following underlying structure for the Japanese possessive construction: 2

(19) \[DP \ [\theta (\text{the}) \ [\text{AGR} Jiro-no; \ [\text{AGR}^0 \ [\text{SC} \ ; k o d o m o ]]]]\]

I will assume that Japanese has DPs even though it lacks overt determiners such as English the. This definite D0 is always phonetically unrealized, like its English counterpart.

In the Introduction we saw that a sentence like (3) (repeated here as (20)) is ambiguous in that it has two interpretations, Integral and Spatial:

(20) Kuruma ni enzin ga aru. (=3)
   car in engine NOM BE
   'There is an engine in the car.'

I would now like to propose the following two small clauses for the two interpretations:

(21) a. Integrals \[\text{SC} \ kuruma [enzin]]
   car engine

b. Spatials \[\text{SC} \ enzin [kuruma ni]]
   engine car in

This parallels exactly the analysis for English by HR&U. In (21a), kuruma 'car' is the small clause subject and enzin 'engine' is the predicate. In (21b), enzin 'engine' is the small clause subject and kuruma ni 'in the car' is the postpositional locative predicate.

2 Integrals and Spatials in Japanese
2.1 Two Types of Small Clauses: Two Types of Predication Structures

Now, consider what it means to (20) to have two different sources. (20) can be analyzed as follows according to the two small clauses just proposed:

---

2 Japanese Subject honorifics may be analogous to the visible agreement between the possessor and the possessed in Hungarian.
(22) a. Kuruma ni enzin ga aru.
   Subject          Predicate  BE
car    DAT   engine   NOM
'The car has an engine.'

b. Kuruma ni enzin ga aru.
   PP         Subject  BE
car    in   engine   NOM
'In the car is an engine.'

(22a) is an Integral, which parallels the English counterpart 'The car has an engine.'
As in the small clause, kuruma 'car' is the subject and enzin 'engine' is the
predicate. On the other hand, (22b) is Spatial. As in the small clause, enzin 'engine'
is the subject and kuruma ni 'in car' is the postpositional locative predicate. The
ambiguity is due to the surface identity between dative-marker ni and postposition
ni, and is due to the fact that the incorporation of D0 does not alter the form of the
verb in Japanese, always spelled as 'aru'. In the following sections, I will present
several lines of evidence for the existence of the two types of small clauses.

2.2 Two Types of Ni-Phrases: Dative vs. Postposition

First I will compare the ni-phrases seen in both types. Ni in Spatial and
Integrals seem to behave differently. I claim that ni in Integrals is dative, while ni
in Spatial is a postposition. I will give three types of evidence to support my claim
for the difference in the ni-phrases. To make the discussion clearer, I will use the
following examples:

(23) a. Helicopter ni propeller ga aru.
    helicopter    DAT propeller NOM BE
'The helicopter has a propeller.'

b. Reizooko ni ringo ga aru.
    fridge       in apple NOM BE
'In the fridge is an apple.'

In the remainder of my discussion, I will treat sentence (23a) as Integral only,
and sentence (23b) as Spatial only.

2.2.1 TOPICALIZATION

Japanese topicalization is carried out by attaching the topic-marker wa to the
element to be thematized. When the element is case-marked, the case-marker is
entirely replaced by the topic-marker. On the other hand, when the element is
accompanied by a postposition, the topic-marker is attached to the postpositional
phrase, i.e., the postposition remains along with the topic-marker. Compare (24)
and (25):
(24) a. Kodomo ga kooen de asondeiru
   children NOM park at playing
   'Children are playing at the park.'

   b. Kodomo wa kooen de asondeiru.
   children TOP park at playing
   'Speaking of the children, they are playing at the park.'

   from letter NOM came
   'A letter came from Tokyo.'

   b. *Tokyo wa tegami ga kita.
      TOP letter NOM came
      'From Tokyo, a letter came.'

In (24), the subject kodomo can be topicalized by replacing the nominative-marker ga by the topic-marker wa, and if the nominative-marker remains along with the topic-marker, an ungrammatical sentence results. In (25), on the other hand, the topic-marker must be attached to the postposition. This suggests that noun phrases within the postpositional phrase cannot be topicalized, but that the entire postpositional phrase must be topicalized.

If we apply this test to (23a) and (23b), we can find out whether ni-phrases are postpositional or not:

(26) a. Helicopter wa propeller ga aru.
    helicopter TOP Propeller NOM BE
    'Speaking of the helicopter, it has a propeller.'

    b. Reizooko ni wa ringo ga aru.
       fridge in TOP apple NOM BE
       'In the fridge is an apple.'

In (26a), ni was replaced by the topic-marker wa, and in (26b) ni remained with the topic-marker wa. This proves that the ni-phrase in (26a) is a subject, not a postpositional phrase, and that the ni-phrase in (26b) is a postpositional phrase. This fact proves the existence of two kinds of ni-phrases: one being dative, the other postpositional.

3 It is pointed out in HR&U that it is possible for both Integrals and Spatialss to have paraphrases with the verb have and a preposition:

   ia) The car has an engine in it.
   ib) The fridge has an apple in it.
The same conclusion is obtained in English. HR&U have an interesting observation:

(27) You believe that there is a big trunk on this elephant. (HR&U 1994)

The there-sentence in (27) is ambiguous between the Integral reading and the Spatial reading. In the former reading a big trunk is the elephant’s nasal appendage. In the latter reading a big trunk means a big piece of luggage which is located on the elephant. What HR&U show is that pied piping disambiguates these two readings.

(28) On which elephant do you believe that there is a big trunk? (HR&U 1994)

(28) has only the Spatial reading, with on which elephant forming a constituent. For them the on in the Integral Existential is a D0. Thus, according to HR&U, in the ambiguous sentence in (1), in the car in the Spatial Existential forms a PP constituent, but when it occurs in the Integral Existential it does not.

2.2.2 Two Different Types of Questions

When making wh-questions to ask about ni-phrases, the type of question which is formed depends on whether the sentence is Integral or Spatial. When asking about the location, doko ni ‘where in’ is used, while when asking about the possessor, nani ni ‘what DAT’ is used:

Thus, (ia) is ambiguous between Spatial and Integral, the obligatory prepositional phrase in the former, and optional in the latter.

When a preposition different from the Spatial one is chosen, the Integral reading disappears; (iia,b) are unambiguously Spatial:

iia) The car has an engine inside it.
ib) There is an engine inside the car.

Japanese has similar examples. When topicalizing ni-phrases, the Integrals have two options: one is to replace ni by wa, as discussed in the text, and the other is to attach wa to ni:

iiia) Helicopter wa propeller ga aru.
TOP NOM BE
‘The helicopter has a propeller.’

iiib) Helicopter ni wa propeller ga aru.
TOP NOM BE
‘The helicopter has a propeller.’

The analysis of (iiib) is not clear at this point.
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(29) a. Propeller wa nani ni aru no?
   TOP what DAT BE Q
   'To what is a propeller?'

   b. Ringo wa doko ni aru no?
   apple TOP where in BE Q
   'Where is an apple?'

   If doko ni 'where in' is used in (29a) instead of nani ni 'what DAT', it is actually asking where the propeller is located:

(30) Propeller wa doko ni aru no?
   TOP where in BE Q
   'Where is a propeller?'

These facts indicate the existence of two types of ni-phrases: one is dative, and questioned by what; the other is postpositional and questioned by where.

2.2.3 Subjectivization

As another piece of evidence for my claim that there are two kinds of ni-phrases, I will demonstrate a difference in the possibility of subjectivization. More precisely, I will claim that among the ni-phrases, only the one in Integrals can undergo the process of subjectivization.

The effect of Subjectivization is to make the noun phrase into the focus by replacing the case-marker with ga. Kuno (1973) asserts that among ni-phrases, only sentence-initial noun phrases with ni can be subjectivized, and claims that "the locative for existential sentences is a sentence-initial constituent and the locative for nonexistential sentences is not a sentence-initial constituent." (Kuno 1973: 369). Thus, according to his analysis, all ni-phrases in existential sentences can be subjectivized because they are sentence-initial constituents. However, this prediction is not born out. Consider the following examples:

(31) Helicopter ga propeller ga aru.
    helicopter NOM propeller NOM BE
    'It is the helicopter that has a propeller.'

(32) *Reizooko ga ringo ga aru.
   fridge NOM apple NOM BE
   'It is in the fridge that an apple is.'

(31) is grammatical, but (32) is not. Kuno fails to explain that not all sentence-initial ni-phrases can be subjectivized. Our system can explain the phenomenon better: only the ni-phrase in Integrals can be subjectivized. In other words, the locative PP cannot be subjectivized but the dative subject can be.
2.3 Two Types of Predicates

In this section I would like to compare the nature of the predicates in the small clauses under discussion. I will provide support for HR&U's proposal by showing that the predicate in an Integral small clause is an Individual-level (IL) predicate, while the predicate in a Spatial small clause is a State-level (SL) predicate.

In Japanese, the small clauses under consideration are as follows:

(33) a. ....[sc helicopter [propeller]]
    b. ....[sc ringo [reizooko ni]]

apple fridge in

Note that we are now comparing *propeller* 'propeller' in (33a) and *reizooko ni* 'in the fridge' in (33b).

2.3.1 Individual-Level and Stage-Level Predicate

In Japanese, the subject of IL predicates and SL predicates are marked differently morphologically. The SL predicate selects its subject marked with the nominative-marker *ga*. On the other hand, the IL predicate with the subject marked with *ga* is ungrammatical.4

(34) a. 'Helicopter ga propeller ga aru.
   NOM NOM BE
   'The helicopter has a propeller.'

b. Ringo ga reizooko ni aru.
   apple NOM fridge in BE
   'An apple is in the fridge.'

(34a) is ungrammatical because the predicate of the integral small clause chooses *ga* as its subject marker. This indicates that the Integral predicate is an IL predicate. (34b) is fine because the predicate of the Spatial small clause chooses *ga* as its subject marker. This indicates that the Spatial predicate is a SL predicate. 5

---

4 The IL predicate with the subject which is marked with the nominative *ga* gets a focus reading on the subject. I will ignore this issue here, since it is not relevant to our discussion.

5 In Basque, the verb BE has two forms: *izan* for IL predication and *egon* for SL predication. For Spatials, *egon* is used. For Integrals, the verb which corresponds to English 'have' must be used.
2.3.2 Scoping Out

We have not discussed the second puzzle, namely why in (5) ambiguity disappears. It is well-known that the word order in Japanese is relatively free. For example, (35a) and (35b) have the same cognitive meaning; as do (36a) and (36b):

(35)  a. Jiro ga hon o yondeiru.  
      NOM book ACC is-reading  
      'Jiro is reading a book.'

   b. Hon o Jiro ga yondeiru.  
      book ACC NOM is-reading  
      'Jiro is reading a book.'

(36)  a. Mari wa Tokyo ni sundeiru.  
      TOP in is-living  
      'Mari lives in Tokyo.'

   b. Tokyo ni Mari wa sundeiru.  
      in TOP is-living  
      'Mari lives in Tokyo.'

If changing the word order does not alter the cognitive meaning, why is there a difference in meaning between (3) and (5)? In other words, why isn't (5) ambiguous?

I claim this is because an IL-predicate inside the small clause cannot be scoped out.6 Enzin 'engine' in (3) with the Integral interpretation is the predicate of the Integral small clause which must stay in situ. (5) is the Spatial Existential sentence derived from the Spatial small clause by scoping the subject out.

Let us look at concrete instances by using our contrasted sentences (23a) and (23b). I would like to compare the possibility of the word order change between the two. I will compare the topicalized sentences:7

(37)  a. Helicopter wa propeller ga aru. (=26a)  
      TOP NOM BE  
      'Speaking of the helicopter, it has a propeller.'

6 In this paper, I use the expression 'scope out' as a descriptive term.

7 As you can see in (36b), fronting of the phrase past the topic phrase does not yield ungrammaticality. Thus, ungrammaticality of (37b) is not because propeller is fronted beyond the topic helicopter.
b. "Propeller ga helicopter wa aru.
   NOM TOP BE

(38) a. Reizooko ni wa ringo ga aru. (=26b)
   fridge in TOP apple NOM BE
   'In the fridge is an apple.'

b. Ringo ga reizooko ni wa aru.
   apple NOM fridge in TOP BE

In (37b), propeller 'propeller' cannot be scoped out to the front because it is a predicate inside the integral small clause. In contrast, both (38a) and (38b) are fine.

Let us come back to (3) and (5):

(39) a. Kuruma ni enzin ga aru. (=3, Integral)
   car DAT engine NOM BE
   'The car has an engine.'

b. *Enzin ga kuruma ni aru. (=5, Integral)
   engine NOM car DAT BE

(40) a. Kuruma ni enzin ga aru. (=3, Spatial)
   car in engine NOM BE
   'In the car is an engine.'

b. Enzin ga kuruma ni aru. (=5, Spatial)
   engine NOM car in BE
   'The engine is in the car.'

In (39b) the fronting of the Integral predicate is impossible. On the other hand, (40b) is grammatical. This sentence is derived by scoping out the subject of the Spatial small clause. Sentence (40b) is unambiguously Spatial because it is possible to derive the sentence only from the Spatial small cause.8

8 A similar phenomenon is observed in Estonian according to Lehiste (1969):

ia) Laual on raamat.
   table.ADESSIVE be.3.SG book.NOM.SG
   'On the table is (a) book.'

ib) Raamat on laual.
    book.NOM.SG be.3.SG table.ADESSIVE
    'The book is on the table.'

iia) Laual on neli jalga.
This difference can be ascribed to the fact that the predicates in Integral and Spatial small clauses have a different nature: Individual-Level, and Stage-Level. Raposo and Uriagereka (1990) show that only SL small clauses as opposed to IL small clauses can be pseudo-clefted, right-node raised, focus fronted, and be dependents of what...but... constructions. Since the predicate in the Spatial small clause is Stage-Level, it can scope out. In contrast, since the predicate in the Integral small clause is Individual-Level, it cannot be scoped out. The predicate in the Integral small clause is frozen. However it is still unclear why.

2.4 Two Types of Definiteness Effects

HR&U have an interesting observation: there exist two types of definiteness effects (DEs) in the there-construction. One type is ascribed to the predicative status of the NP, whereas the other is ascribed to a different reason.

Consider the following:

(41) There is an apple in the fridge.
(42) a. There is a propeller on the helicopter.
b. The helicopter has a propeller.

In our system, (ia,b) are clearly Spatial. (iia) is Integral. Thus scoping the predicate (neli jalga 'four legs' here) out of the Integral small clause is banned. Accordingly, (iib) does not have the Integral reading. Rather, (iib) is derived by scoping the subject out from the Spatial small clause.

9 See Raposo and Uriagereka (1993) for the examples in Spanish. They point out that the same point can be made in Celtic and other Romance languages.

10 However, it is possible to topicalize the predicate of the Integral small clause:

   Enzin wa kuruma ni aru.
   engine TOP car DAT BE
   'Speaking of the engine, it is what the car has.'

11 This was suggested to me by Juan Uriagereka (p.c.).
HR&U claim that in both (41) and (42a), the associates have DEs. And they claim that since *have*-sentences such as (42b) also show the DE, the DE in (42a, b) should be treated in the same way, the associate being the predicate of the integral small clause. In contrast, the associate in (41) is the subject of the spatial small clause.

2.4.1 The DE in Integrals in Japanese

The Japanese language lacks a visible determiner system. But, the definiteness can be shown by placing the demonstrative *sono* 'that' in front of noun phrases. In the following Integral sentence, when the predicate is definite as in (43b), the sentence is ungrammatical:

(43) a. Helicopter ni propeller ga aru. 
   DAT propeller NOM BE.
   'The helicopter has an propeller.'

b. *Helicopter ni sono propeller ga aru.
   DAT that propeller NOM BE.
   'The helicopter has that propeller.'

However, the definiteness of "the associate" in the Spatials does not seem to matter:

(44) a. Reizooko ni ringo ga aru.
   fridge in apple NOM BE
   'There is an apple in the fridge.'

b. Reizooko ni sono ringo ga aru.
   fridge in that apple NOM BE
   'There is that apple in the fridge.'

I claim that the lack of the DE in Spatials in Japanese is due to the fact that the language lacks expletive *there*, and thus, Spatials in Japanese are manifested only as the predicative locative construction. Milsark (1977) accounts for the DE as double quantification on the NP: existential quantification from the expression *there be*, and universal quantification from the strong determiner. In other words, an operator *there be* must bind some variable, but strong quantified NPs do not provide free variables to be bound. On the other hand, the weak NPs provide free variables be bound by an operator *there be*. If Japanese lacks the expletive *there*, double quantifications will never occur.

But, then, why do Japanese Integrals exhibit DE at all? We can no longer account for it as double quantification. If we adopt HR&U's claim, the existence of the DE in Japanese integrals is straightforward: it is due to the predicative nature of the NP. In (43) *propeller* 'propeller' is the predicate, and it exhibits the DE. On the other hand, *ringo* 'apple' in (44), which does not show the DE, is the subject of the small clause.
3 Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued for the existence of two types of existential sentences in Japanese: One expresses an integral relationship and the other expresses a locative relation. The differences between Integrals and Spatialials were examined from three perspectives: Ni-phrases, predicates, and nominative-marked NPs of each type were compared. First, I have argued that ni-phrases which were traditionally thought to be postpositional are in fact, of two types: Dative case marked in Integrals and postpositional in Spatialials. Accordingly, the two types of ni-phrases showed different syntactic behavior in Topicalization, wh-question, and Subjectivization. Second, the predicates in each instance showed the different nature. We have seen that the predicate in Integrals is Individual-Level, while the predicate in Spatialials is Stage-Level. The frozen nature of IL predicates is also suggested. Third, nominative-marked NPs were compared. It has been shown that only the nominative NPs in Integrals exhibit a Definiteness Effect, which I ascribed to the predicative nature of the NP.
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