TWO TYPES OF EXISTENTIALS IN JAPANESE*

Keiko Muromatsu

University of Maryland at College Park

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.'

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 *é n* 'I' 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

dative possessor. The possessive structure she proposes is, in Kayne's terms, as
follows:[1]

(8)   a.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{D^0}$ az [$_{AGRP}$ én-Ø [$_{AGR^0}$ [vendég-e-m]]]]]
                              the   I-NOM   guest-POSS-1.SG
          'my guest'

      b.   [$_{DP}$ én-nek-Ø$_i$ [$_{D^0}$ a [$_{AGRP}$ t$_i$ [$_{AGR^0}$ [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-nak$_i$ nem olvas-t- ad   [t'$_i$ t$_i$ 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$_i$ van-nak [$_{DP}$ t'$_i$ [$_{D^0}$ [$_{AGRP}$ t$_i$ [$_{AGR^0}$ [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^0 must be phonetically unrealized in English:

(11)   a.   John's sister
      b.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{D^0}$ (the) [$_{AGRP}$ John [$_{AGR^0}$'s [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.   [$_{DP}$ a sister$_i$ [$_{D^0}$ of [$_{AGRP}$ John [$_{AGR^0}$ ['s [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/P$_e$ 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)   John$_i$ has [$_{DP}$ [e$_i$]D/P^0 [[e$_i$] [AGR^0 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.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{D^0}$ (the) [$_{AGRP}$ John$_j$ [$_{AGR^0}$'s [$_{SC}$ t$_j$ sister]]]]]
       b.   [$_{DP}$ a sister$_i$ [$_{D^0}$ of   [$_{AGRP}$ John$_j$ [$_{AGR^0}$'s [$_{SC}$ t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]]]

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

(16)   There is [$_{DP}$ an engine$_j$ [$_{D^0}$ in [$_{AGRP}$ the car$_i$ [$_{AGR^0}$ [$_{SC}$ 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'

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)   [$_{DP}$ [$_{D^0}$ (the) [$_{AGRP}$ Jiro-no$_i$ [$_{AGR^0}$ [$_{SC}$ t$_i$ kodomo]]]]]

I will assume that Japanese has DPs even though it lacks overt determiners such as
English *the*. This definite D^0 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   [$_{SC}$ kuruma [enzin]]
                           car   engine

      b.   Spatials   [$_{SC}$ 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 Predcation 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. <u>Kuruma ni</u>   <u>enzin   ga</u>   aru.
         Subject   Predicate   BE
         car   DAT engine   NOM
         'The car has an engine.'

     b. <u>Kuruma ni</u>   <u>enzin   ga</u>   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 postpostional 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 D^0 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 Spatials and Integrals seem to behave differently. I claim that *ni* in Integrals is dative, while *ni* in Spatials 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 Topicalizaton

Japanese topicalizaton 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.   <u>Kodomo ga</u>   kooen de asondeiru
              children NOM park   at playing
              'Children are playing at the park.'

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

(25) a.   <u>Tokyo kara</u> tegami ga   kita.
                     from letter NOM came
              'A letter came from Tokyo.'

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

In (24), the subject *k o d o m o* can be topicalized by replacing the nominative-marker
g a by the topic-marker *w a*, 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 *n i*-phrases are
postpositional or not:

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

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

In (26a), *n i* was replaced by the topic-marker *w a*, and in (26b) *ni* remained with the
topic-marker *w a* . This proves that the *n i*-phrase in (26a) is a subject, not a
postpositional phrase, and that the *n i*-phrase in (26b) is a postpositional phrase.
This fact proves the existence of two kinds of *n i*-phrases: one being dative, the other
postpositional. [3]

_____

[3]   It is pointed out in HR&U that it is possible for both Integrals and Spatials to
have paraphrases with the verb *h a v e* 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 *o n* in the Integral Existential is a D^0. 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 *n i*-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.
iib)   There is an engine inside the car.

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

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.

(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 *n i*-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 *n i*-
phrases, I will demonstrate a difference in the possibility of subjectivization. More
precisely, I will claim that among the *n i*-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 *n i*-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 *n i*-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 <u>ga</u>   propeller   ga   aru.
              helicopter   NOM propeller   NOM BE
              'It is the helicopter that has a propeller.'

(32)   *Reizooko <u>ga</u>   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
n i-phrases can be subjectivized. Our system can explain the phenomenon better:
only the *n i*-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 ungrammticality. 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.[9] 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.[10] The predicate in the Integral small clause is frozen.[11] 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.

| | table.ADESSIVE | be.3.SG | four.NOM | leg.PART.SG |
| | 'The table has four legs.' | | | |

iib)	Neli	jalga	on	laual.
	four.NOM	leg.PART.SG	be.3.SG	table.ADESSIVE
	'Four legs are on the table.'			

In our system, (ia,b) are clearly Spatials. (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 Spatials 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 Spatials. 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 Spatials 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.

REFERENCES

Chomsky, Noam. 1992. A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1.
Freeze, Ray. 1992. Existentials and Other Locatives. Language 68.553-95.
Hornstein, Norbert, Sara Rosen and Juan Uriagereka. 1994. Integrals. UMD Working Papers in Linguistics 2
Kayne, Richard. 1993a. Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection.' Studia Linguistica 47.
Kayne, Richard. 1993b. The Antisymmetry of Syntax. ms., CUNY.
Kuno, Susumu. 1973. The Structure of the Japanese Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Lehiste, Ilse. 1969. 'Being' and 'Having' in Estonian. Foundations of Language 5.324-41.
Milsark, Gary. 1977. Toward an Explanation of Certain Peculiarities of the Existential Construction in English. Linguistic Analysis 3.1-29.
Muromatsu, Keiko. 1994. Integrals and Spatials in Japanese and the Internal Structure of Possessives. Generals paper, University of Maryland.
Raposo, Eduardo, and Juan Uriagereka. 1990. Long-Distance Case Assignment. Linguistic Inquiry 21.505-37.
Raposo, Eduardo, and Juan Uriagereka. 1993. Two Types of Small Clauses. Small Clauses, ed. by A. Cardinaletti and M. Guasti. Academic Press.
Szabolcsi, Anna. 1983. The Possessor that Ran Away from Home. The Linguistic Review 3.89-102.
Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The Noun Phrase. The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian: Syntax and Semantics, Vol.27. San Diego: Academic Press.