

論文の英文要旨

論文題目

On So-Called GA Case Marking

氏名

吉田 一彦

A descriptive study of a function word should first seek the functional property attributed to the target word, which works as the same function in any contexts, at any points in syntactic structure, or with co-occurrence with any words. This approach should be taken, unless that is obviously irrational in comparison with describing the word as polysemous or part of larger constructions. This dissertation is aimed at describing such unique functional property of so-called Japanese nominative case marker GA.

As far as this research target is concerned, we can hardly find successful description of unique functional property for it. Instead, it is often described as a pair of homonyms, namely subject and object markers, or the markers of the concept *shutai* (i.e. main participant in an event referred by a sentence) and the other one *taishoo* (i.e. object concerned with a situation referred by a sentence), although it is recognized as one lexical item introspectively by native speakers. Or it is often described as the partner of so-called Japanese topic marker WA in the alternation at syntactic subject positions, without any plausible analysis about the relations with the usages of WA at many different syntactic positions. Few scholars have attempted to present generalized explanation, but their descriptions of unique function have not really been persuasive, as their explanatory concepts have been overly extended to deal with all the usages.

The problem in explanations for the linguistic phenomenon, which is the gravest and which had never been seriously examined so far, is the one related to the fact that GA does not appear at all in many ordinary sentences used in everyday communication. Since GA was regarded by many grammarians as the marker of *shutai* which is essential for an event, the thought that the GA-marked noun phrase is one of the indispensable elements of sentences in general has been taking part in most of grammatical theories in Japanese linguistics. In consequence, to deal with such sentences without GA-marked noun phrase the grammatical theories have found it necessary to employ principles such as ellipsis, empty category, zero particle and substitute, which can not prove to be as phenomena by usual auditory or visual means. Based on Saussurian theory of *signe*, and criticizing Jakobson's theory of *signe zéro*, this research points out that the use of these

principles causes inevitably logical failures in any explanations for linguistic phenomena and that therefore they should be excluded from description. And it argues that according to the observations of the linguistic forms as they are we should conclude that GA does not function as clue informing communication participants of the entities to be identified as *shutai* nor *taishoo*.

Also, this research points out the following grammatical facts about GA that have not been fully discussed so far in previous literature:

1) Required feature for a linguistic form to be placed before GA:

It is widely believed that to be a noun phrase (or to be a nominal) is incontestably the necessary condition for that. However, this research exemplifies that in reality other kinds of words than noun are sometimes placed at that syntactic position, and argues that the generalization should be done by the informational value borne by the form rather than by the part of speech to which it belongs and that GA is by definition not a case marker. This research presents the generalization that the form must have potential of conveying sufficient information to have the referent identified as the entity that the speaker has intended to mention.

2) Criterion to distinguish it from the homonymic conjunction particle:

This conjunction is known as a derived but distinct lexical item from the so-called case marker. And it is believed that the same criterion for the point 1 above is applicable for this distinction also. Showing several pairs of examples that contain identical forms but that should be interpreted as of the two different particles from each other, this research proves that the formal criterion is not applicable, and argues that the generalization for the point 1 above is useful for this distinction also. This research does not deny the possibility of describing the two particles as continuum.

3) Usages in which GA co-occurs with the form not referring to *shutai* nor to *taishoo*:

This type of usages has been considered to be exceptional and to be limited to the case of multiple GA construction. This study exemplifies that the usages appear more generally in other construction also.

Thus considering that the form-to-function approaches taken by preceding studies have not succeeded in the generalization of the phenomena, this research has chosen the opposite approach. Examining critically Y. Yamada's and D. Matsushita's mental models of sentences, it appreciates Yamada's idea of "shutai" (i.e. entity recognized as target of predication) in his theory of "tookaku sayoo", which is, apperception in the terminology of psychology.

And this research employs that concept and names it TARGET, and the corresponding idea conveyed by predication CONTENT. These two concepts are not grammatical categories, but informational values in communication participants' mind in the mental model that this research presents. The key is that these concepts do not have necessarily the counterpart in linguistic forms. The thesis illustrates its mental model by comparing and contrasting in detail with the topic-comment relations discussed in previous literature. The emphasis is put on the differences between TARGET and *shudai* (i.e. topic or theme) that is really polysemous in chaotic terminology in today's language researches.

This research finally presents the generalization as follows on the function of GA at the

grammatical and pragmatic levels of analysis that are distinct from each other:

Functional property attributed to the form GA:

Marking the linguistic form placed before it as the form referring to the entity that is recognized as TARGET and relating it to the contextually closest predicate as referring to the corresponding CONTENT

Pragmatic motivations of using GA:

1. Giving priority to an entity as TARGET in a context where other competing entities exist to be selected, entities to which communication participants have already paid attention or which have been selected as TARGET in preceding context
2. Expressing verbally that a linguistic form is used for the purpose of referring to a TARGET and not of simply setting a domain of discourse

The thesis presents an alternate explanation also about how *shutai* and *taishoo* can be identified without any help from the marker GA.