1. Introduction

Since Harada (1971) first noted and analyzed, using a generative grammar framework, one of the most prominent case alternations in Japanese is Nominative/Genitive alternation (henceforth NGA), which is also known as Ga/No Conversion. In this case of alternation, the nominative particle ga is variably substituted for the genitive particle no in certain embedded clauses (1), but not in main clauses (2).

(1) Ken-ga/no kayotta gakkoo
    Ken-nom/gen went school
    ‘the school where Ken went’

(2) Ken-ga/*no hon-o kaita.
    Ken-nom/gen book-acc wrote
    ‘Ken wrote the book.’

Using a quantitative perspective, this study elucidates structural properties of NGA and its information status. The quantitative data suggest that we need to revisit the two competing analyses: D-licensing hypothesis (Miyagawa, 1993, 2008, to appear; Ochi, 2001) and C-licensing hypothesis (Watanabe, 1996; Hiraiwa, 2005). Furthermore, I provide new insight into NGA: the information status of an NP with ga/no. The information status is a crucial factor in further investigating the phenomenon of NGA, as related to the compatibility between the variation and focus particles (Horie and Saito, 1996).

To examine NGA, section 2 explicates previous syntactic accounts of NGA and
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also the relationship between NGA and focus particles. Section 3 presents the data that I used in this study. The results of the quantitative analysis and discussion are provided in section 4, which is followed by section 5, the conclusions from this analysis.

2. Theoretical Background
2.1 Syntactic Analyses

Syntactic aspect of NGA has been examined in almost every grammatical paradigm proposed to date (Shibatani, 1975; Harada, 1976; Inoue, 1976; Nakai, 1980; Miyagawa, 1993, to appear; Ura, 1993; Watanabe, 1996; Nishioka, 1998; Ochi, 2001; Kikuta, 2002; Hiraiwa, 2005; Maki and Uchibori, 2008). As is well known, not every embedded clause allows the genitive no as NGA; and therefore the issue at stake in the literature is to identify conditions where the variation can appear (i.e., where the genitive no is acceptable). This is relevant to a question of how the syntactic structures should be assigned to NGA. The previous syntactic analyses are categorized into two major groups (Miyagawa, to appear): D-licensing hypothesis (e.g., Ochi, 2001; Miyagawa, to appear) and C-licensing hypothesis (e.g., Watanabe, 1996; Hiraiwa, 2005). The major distinction between the D-/C-licensing hypotheses is that the former presumes a structural distinction for a nominative-/genitive-marked NP, while the latter considers their structures identical. The D-licensing hypothesis is based on an observation that the genitive subject occurs in subordinate clauses with a nominal head such as soba ‘noodles’ in (3a), but not in the clauses without a nominal head as shown in (3b).

(3) a. [kino
          Naomi-
          ga/no
        ]
         soba
         yesterday Naomi-nom/gen ate
         noodle
         ‘the noodle that Naomi ate’

       b. [Kinoo
            Naomi-
            ga/*no
          kite-kara], Ken-wa soba-o
           tabeta.
           yesterday Naomi-nom/gen came-after Ken-top
           noodle-acc
           ate
           ‘After Naomi came yesterday, Ken ate noodle.’

The main principle of the D-licensing hypothesis stipulates that the genitive subject must occur with a nominal head with D to be licensed. There are, however, examples of the genitive subject occurring without a nominal head, such as made or yori clauses as in (4).

(4) a. John-wa [Mary-ga/no
               yonda
             yori]
                takusan-no
               hon-o
               yonda.
                John-top
                Mary-nom/gen
                read
                than
                many-gen
                book-acc
                read
                ‘John read more books than Mary did.’

               (Watanabe, 1996)

       b. John-wa [ame-ga/no
                     yamu
                     made]
                        ofisu-ni
                        ita.
                        John-top
                        rain-nom/gen
                        stop
                        until
                        office-at
                        was
                        ‘John was at his office until the rain stopped.’

                        (Hiraiwa, 2005)

Miyagawa (to appear), who advocates for the D-licensing hypothesis, argues that made
and yori clauses have a phonetically null head, and that, in fact, the phonetically null head
can be replaced with a lexical item as in (5).
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(5)  
a. Ken-wa [Naomi-ga/no      yonda-teido/Ø yori] takusan-no hon-o  
Ken-top Naomi-nom/gen read-degree than many-gen book-acc  
yonda.  
‘Ken read more books than Naomi did.’
b. Ken-wa [ame-ga/no      yamu toki/Ø made] ofisu-ni ita.  
Ken-top rain-nom/gen stop time until office-at was  
‘Ken was at his office until the rain stopped.’
(Miyagawa, to appear)

In (5), teido and toki are nominal heads for the clauses that contain NGA. This fact implies that the clauses in (4) contain a DP level, although covertly, and that the genitive subject always occurs within the DP. Miyagawa (to appear) proposes following structures for the nominative and genitive in NGA.

(6)  
D-licensing hypothesis (Miyagawa, to appear)  
a. Nominative Subject Structure  
b. Genitive Subject Structure

The syntactic trees in (6) show that the nominative structure contains a CP level, which contrasts with the genitive structure. In the nominative structure, the subject NP moves from SpecvP to the SpecTP due to EPP and it is assigned Nominative. The D head cannot assign Genitive to the subject because the CP is a phase that blocks the Case licensing. In the genitive structure, on the other hand, the subject does not move to SpecTP. Miyagawa (to appear) argues that when the T lacks any formal grammatical features as a result of not being selected by C, T does not trigger movement. Hence there is no EPP on T in (6b). Therefore, the subject at SpecvP has no motivation for movement to SpecTP; it stays at SpecvP and is assigned Genitive from the D head without having a phase to block the Case licensing. The C-licensing hypothesis, on the other hand, assigns the same structure, which contains a CP level, to both the nominative and genitive structures. Further, the C-licensing adds a categorial feature [+N] in C for the genitive subject to be licensed. Thus, from a perspective of the C-licensing hypothesis, NGA is a case of featural variation. In contrast, the D-licensing hypothesis postulates that NGA has as structural variation.
Based on findings from a quantitative analysis, I will consider whether the alternation involves two distinct structures or it is featural variation.

2.2 Information Status

Reflecting different semantic/pragmatic functions of the nominative/genitive case markers, the quantitative data in this paper will show a correlation between the use of the case markers and information status of the NP with ga/no, such as new and given (cf., Prince, 1988; Lambrecht, 1994). The syntactic issue of NGA described in the last section discussed whether or not NGA is possible in a structural condition which is in question. The effect of information status, on the other hand, does not relate to any syntactic restrictions in the relevant structure. Rather, it associates with functions of the case markers, cutting through the issue of a choice of the variants different from a syntactic perspective. Therefore, this discussion contributes to an argument about the functions of the case markers, which is relevant to focus. Horie and Saito (1996) indicate that the genitive no is not compatible with focus particles as in (7).

   Yamada-hon-only-nom/gen ordered dish-top escargot-dish was  
   ‘The dish that only Yamada ordered was an escargot dish.’

   Japanese-only-nom/gen be.blamed thing-at-top consent-nom go-neg  
   ‘I cannot accept that only the Japanese are blamed.’

   it-top prime.minister-only-nom/gen have authority is  
   ‘It is authority that only the prime minister has.’

d. [Osyoku-ni Tanaka-butyoo-made-ga/*?no kakawatteita] zizitu-wa  
   corruption-to Tanaka-chief.director-even-nom/gen was.involved fact-top  
   syokku datta. shocking was  
   ‘I was shocked at the fact that even Chief Tanaka was involved in the corruption.’

(Horie and Saito, 1996)

Based on this observation, Horie and Saito (1996) conclude that the nominative ga is a focus marker. However, I argue against their claim and posit that ga is not a focus marker (e.g., Heycock, 1994). As evidenced below, case markers other than ga can also occur with focus particles.

(8) a. [mizu-o/ga/no nom-eru] zikan  
   water-acc/nom/gen drink-potential period  
   ‘the period when (we) can drink water’

b. [mizu-dake-o/ga/*no nom-eru] zikan  
   water-only-acc/nom/gen drink-potential period  
   ‘the period when (we) can drink only water’
This example shows that the accusative case marker 0 can occur with the focus particle dake ‘only’ in the environment for NGA. Therefore, I claim that the compatibility between the nominative ga and focus particles does not imply that ga is a focus marker. Rather, the examples in (7) and (8) only demonstrate that the genitive no as NGA is not compatible with focus particles. The quantitative data in this article will show that the choice of NGA is affected by information status of an NP such as given and new information.

3. Data

3.1 Corpus

This article uses the data from the MJD corpus and the CSJ corpus, following Nambu (2007, to appear). The MJD corpus stores records of Diet members’ speeches from every meeting in the Diet (Congress) close to verbatim, and the data are publicly available (http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/) (cf., Matsuda, 2004, 2008). The CSJ contains 661 hours of spontaneous speech collected from 1999 to 2003, which corresponds to about 7 million words (cf., Maekawa, 2003).

3.2 Subjects and speech data

There has been argued that inter-speaker variation in grammaticality judgments of NGA with respect to conditions such as adjacency and apposition clauses (cf., Kikuta, 2002). Since the inter-speaker variation might be able to be attributed to a dialectal variation, this paper investigated NGA in Tokyo Japanese to avoid the mixture of dialects. The MJD and CSJ corpora provide speakers’ hometown so that we can extract the data from speech by Tokyo Japanese speakers. The variants ga and no of NGA are extracted from speech by all Diet members in the MJD, who are native speakers of Tokyo Japanese (76 speakers, 100 tokens from each speaker). For the CSJ data, the uses of ga and no are extracted from speech by all native speakers of Tokyo Japanese in the corpus (80 speakers) to obtain all tokens of the variants available from the speakers. The distributions of ga and no in each corpus are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MJD</th>
<th>CSJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga</td>
<td>87.7% (6,662/7,600)</td>
<td>91.8% (4,540/4,945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>12.3% (938/7,600)</td>
<td>8.2% (405/4,945)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table1: Distributions of ga and no in the two corpora

3.3 Envelope of variation

I counted the frequencies of the nominative ga and the genitive no in relevant
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1 As Grammar Atlas in Japanese Dialect (1989) and Fujiwara (2000) indicate, the Kyushu dialect allows NGA in a main clause as below.

(i) Udon-no hoshikatai.
    wheat.noodle-gen want
    ‘(I) want a wheat noodle.’
environments. Following Nambu (2007) and Nambu and Matsuda (2007), I delineated the environments where the variation is possible. The canonical environment for NGA, adnominal clauses, is shown below.

(9) Adnominal Clauses
   [Ken-wa musuko-ga/no yonda] hon-o katazuketa.
   Ken-top son-nom/gen read book-acc cleaned up
   ‘Ken cleaned up the books which his son read.’

There has been an argument that NGA can be observed in clauses other than adnominal clauses (Hiraiwa, 2001; Yoshimura and Nishina, 2008; Miyagawa, to appear). I included environments that have been raised in the literature to observe these potential variations. One environment is subordinate clauses headed by made ‘until’ and yori ‘than’. Watanabe (1996), Hiraiwa (2001, 2005), and Kikuta (2002) pointed out that NGA can occur in these clauses. Another environment is apposition clauses headed by to yuu/to no, discussed in Inoue (1976) and Ura (1993). The examples are as follows, showing uses of the nominative ga for variation.

(10) Made or yori subordinate clauses
   a. [Basu-ga kuru] made suwatte iyooka.
       bus-nom come until sit be
       ‘Let’s sit until the bus comes.’
   b. [kyaku-ga kuru] yori hayaku nimotsu-ga tsuita.
       customers-nom come than early luggage-nom arrived
       ‘The luggage arrived before the customer came.’
       (Kikuta, 2002)

(11) To yuu and to no apposition clauses
   [karera-ga buzi-datta] to yuu/to no sirase
   they-nom safe-were C news
   ‘the news that they were safe’
   (Inoue, 1976)

4. Analysis and Discussion

In this section, I would like to consider theoretical implications of a quantitative analysis in terms of two aspects of NGA: the syntactic analysis with respect to the D-/C-licensing hypotheses, and a relationship between information status and the nominative/genitive case marker. For the syntactic analysis of NGA, I will examine two conditions, which have been discussed in Nambu (2007, to appear); that is, adjacency and the to yuu apposition clause. The quantitative analysis of the conditions provides evidence to consider whether the D-licensing hypothesis or the C-licensing hypothesis is a plausible analysis of NGA. Furthermore, I will investigate the effect of information status on NGA using NP type with the nominative/genitive case marker.

4.1. Syntactic theories
4.1.1. Adjacency

Harada (1971) states that the existence of intervening elements between the subject NP and its predicate affects the acceptability of NGA as in (12). To consider the effect of adjacency, I categorize NGA into two environments: adjacent and non-adjacent.

(12) [kodomotati-ga/*no minna-de ikioiyoku kakenobotta] kaidan
children-nom/gen together vigorously run.up stairway
‘the stairway that the children ran up together vigorously’

(Harada, 1971)

Table 3 provides frequencies of the nominative ga and the genitive no in the MJD data. The result of Pearson’s chi-square test shows that there is a statistically significant difference ($X^2=363.87$, d.f.=1, $p < 0.001$) in adjacency. Table 4 shows the result in the CSJ data, which also shows a statistically significant difference ($X^2=152$, d.f.=1, $p < 0.001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjacent</th>
<th>Non-Adjacent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ga</strong></td>
<td>82.9% (4,371/5,274)</td>
<td>98.5% (2,291/2,326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td>17.1% (903/5,274)</td>
<td>1.5% (35/2,326)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Adjacency in the CSJ data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjacent</th>
<th>Non-Adjacent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ga</strong></td>
<td>88.9% (3,222/3,624)</td>
<td>99.8% (1,318/1,321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td>11.1% (402/3,624)</td>
<td>0.2% (3/1,321)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that the use of the genitive no in the adjacent environment is higher than the non-adjacent environment, which supports Harada’s (1971) claim. In fact, the adjacency effect is relevant to the syntactic structure of NGA. Following the D-licensing hypothesis, Miyagawa (to appear) argues that the genitive subject cannot be used if an intervening element is an adverb that is attached higher than vP, such as a TP adverb (cf., Cinque, 1999), whereas the genitive subject can be used with a VP adverb as in (13).

(13) a. [Taro-ga/*no osoraku_{TPverb erabareta} iinkai
Taro-nom/gen probably was.chosen committee
‘the committee to which Taro was probably chosen’

b. [Koji-ga/no mattaku_{VPverb sir-anai} kakudo
Koji-nom/gen at.all know-Neg angle
‘an angle that Koji doesn’t know at all’

(slightly modified, Miyagawa, to appear)

Miyagawa (to appear) argues that the genitive subject violates economy principle when there is an intervener that occurs above SpecvP; the genitive subject does not have any motivation for further movement due to lack of EPP at T. The corpus study of this paper
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supports his assumption. All of the intervening elements with the genitive no in the data (N=38 in the MJD and CSJ) are VP adverbs or PP, which are located lower than the genitive subject at SpecvP. Thus, his analysis is consistent with the quantitative data in this paper.  

4.1.2. Apposition Clauses

One of the differences in theoretical assumptions between the D-licensing hypothesis and the C-licensing hypothesis is whether a CP level exists in the genitive structure. Here, I would like to consider the existence of CP from a quantitative point of view, investigating to yuu/to no apposition clauses. As discussed earlier, Inoue (1976) indicates that NGA cannot occur in to yuu and to no apposition clauses. If the Miyagawa’s (to appear) assumption is correct, the genitive subject should not occur with to yuu/to no, since they have been treated as complementizers in the syntactic literature (e.g., Ura, 1993). However, Tables 5 and 6 show that the genitive subject with to yuu is possible, as in the following example from the CSJ corpus.

Table 5: To yuu/to no clauses in the MJD data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to yuu clause</th>
<th>to no clause</th>
<th>other clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga</td>
<td>98.9% (1,308/1,322)</td>
<td>100% (8/8)</td>
<td>85.3% (5,346/6,270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1.1% (14/1,322)</td>
<td>0% (0/8)</td>
<td>14.7% (924/6,270)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: To yuu/to no clauses in the CSJ data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to yuu clause</th>
<th>other clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga</td>
<td>99.9% (713/714)</td>
<td>90.5% (3,827/4,231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0.1% (1/714)</td>
<td>9.5% (404/4,231)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14) [jikkan-no wak-anai]-tteiu kanji desita.
actual.sensation-gen come.up-neg-C feeling was
‘It was unrealistic to me.’

In this example, the genitive subject occurs with the colloquial form -tteiu for to yuu. Thus, even though the low frequency of the genitive subject can be interpreted as a reflection of the degradation of acceptability, if to yuu are actually complementizers, then

---

2 There still exists one point to be accounted for. Under Miyagawa’s assumption, the intervening elements in (12) should not affect the acceptability of the genitive subject, since they are VP adverbs. As Harada (1971) argues, the number of the intervening elements affect the acceptability of the genitive subject. The quantitative data in this paper support this observation; there is no use of the genitive subject in the non-adjacent environments when there are more than two intervening elements. Thus, we need to consider whether or not the adjacency effect of intervening elements can be attributed to the type of adverbs and also why the number of intervening elements affects acceptability. Both of the effects are validated from the corpus data in this paper, but further research is requisite to scrutinize the effect of adverbs in terms of higher and lower adverbs (Cinque, 1999).

3 The frequency of to no clauses itself is very low in both corpora (0 frequency in the CSJ), but we can assume that the frequency of the genitive no would be similar to to yuu which is in the same syntactic category.
Miyagawa’s (to appear) analysis of NGA needs to be revised. In the D-licensing hypothesis, the absence of CP is crucial for D in the genitive structure to assign Genitive to the subject. If a CP level exists in the genitive structure, the C-licensing hypothesis may be more appropriate in that it assumes a CP level in the genitive structure. In addition, the advocates of the C-licensing hypothesis offer examples of the genitive no without a nominal head. Hiraiwa (2005) demonstrates the lack of a D head with the genitive subject, using Cleft Construction and Head-internal Relative Clause (HIRC), as shown below.

(15)  a. [John-**ga/no sikarareta no]-wa Mary-ni da.  
      John-nom/gen scolded C-top Mary-dat is 
      ‘It is by Mary that John was scolded.’  
   b. John-ga [sara-no ue-ni ringo-**ga/no oiteatta no]-o katteni 
      John-nom plate-gen on-dat apple-nom/gen put C-acc without.permission 
      ate  
      ‘Without asking, John ate an apple which was on the plate.’  
      (Hiraiwa, 2005)

As shown in these examples, no is categorized as C in the cleft construction and HIRC. Thus, both the nominative and genitive structures should contain a CP level. In addition, the examples in (15) have no space for an NP to assume the existence of a phonetically null head for D as we saw in (5). Therefore, the quantitative data shown in this section uphold one of the aspects of the C-licensing hypothesis: the assumption of the existence of a CP level for both the nominative and genitive structures. However, not every lexical item for C is allowed with the genitive structure. As Harada (1971) and many others have pointed out, the genitive no cannot occur in to complementizer clauses (16).

(16) Taro-wa [kinoo Jiro-**ga/no kita]-to omotta.  
      Taro-top yesterday Jiro-nom/gen came-C thought  
      ‘Taro thought that Jiro came yesterday.’  

This example represents that not all complementizers can occur with the genitive subject. Hiraiwa (2005) proposes “Complementizer Blocking Effects” to block an overt C such as

---

4 Although the low acceptability can be considered a speech error, this study treats it as the use derived from grammar. Here, I provide one example to support this perspective: a transitivity restriction. Watanabe (1996) proposes a transitivity restriction, where if a direct object exists as an argument of the predicate in the embedded clause, the genitive no cannot appear in the same embedded clause as a subject marker as follows.

(i) [Ken-**ga/no hon-o katta] mise  
    Ken-nom/gen book-acc buy store  
    ‘the store where Ken bought a book’

In the both corpora, there is zero use of the genitive no with a direct object, which supports Watanabe (1996)’s claim. This suggests that the locus of explanatory factor for the restriction is in syntax; the incompatibility between the genitive subject and the direct object within the embedded clause is derived from syntax. See Miyagawa (to appear) and Hiraiwa (2005) for syntactic analyses of the transitivity restriction.
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to with the genitive subject, but this constraint should not exclude the genitive use with the C head -no as in (15). Thus, further research is needed to investigate when the over C heads allow the genitive use, but the data in this section provide evidence that both of the nominative and genitive structures must contain a CP level.

4.2. NP Type and Information Status

As seen earlier, Horie and Saito (1996) indicate compatibility between the nominative ga as NGA and focus particles. To explore this compatibility, this section pursues the relationship between NGA and information status of NP, which is realized as various NP types. Notice that this is independent from the question of whether the D-/C-licensing hypothesis is correct; rather, the question here is that what is a crucial factor when we have a choice of the variants that do not violate any structural restrictions.

The categories for the NP type that I used are wh-word, lexical word, pronoun, and nominal clause. Table 7 shows that the frequency of the genitive no is, from highest to lowest: pronouns > lexical words > nominal clauses > wh-phrases in the MJD data. The frequency from the CSJ data given in Table 8 represents the same order.

Table 7: NP type and NGA in the MJD corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wh-phrases</th>
<th>lexical words</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>nominal clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga</td>
<td>100% (28/28)</td>
<td>87.1% (4,974/5,710)</td>
<td>77.8% (487/626)</td>
<td>94.9% (1,173/1,236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0% (0/28)</td>
<td>12.9% (736/5,710)</td>
<td>22.2% (139/626)</td>
<td>5.1% (63/1,236)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: NP type and NGA in the CSJ corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>wh-phrases</th>
<th>lexical words</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>nominal clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ga</td>
<td>100% (40/40)</td>
<td>90.1% (3,052/3,386)</td>
<td>87.3% (425/487)</td>
<td>99.1% (1,023/1,032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>0% (0/40)</td>
<td>9.9% (334/3,386)</td>
<td>12.7% (62/487)</td>
<td>0.9% (9/1,032)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate the effect of information that the NP carries. The NP types differ in information status, which also plays an important role with respect to focus. The quantitative results show that when the NP is informationally non-given, it tends to take the nominative ga. Pronouns are given, that is, pragmatically activated from the discourse. Lexical words and clauses are not guaranteed as given and most often carry new information. Wh-phrases are focused, which is indicated by their phonological prominence (cf., Deguchi and Kitagawa 2002). Tables 7 and 8 show that wh-phrases always take ga. In addition, the use of pronouns with ga can be explained by focus, based on the fact that informationally given NPs can also be focused (Kratzer and Selkirk, 2010). Thus, I posit that the relationship between the NP type and NGA is determined by

---

5 This categorization follows Matsuda (1995) that analyzed the variable accusative case markers (o/zero) in Tokyo Japanese.
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the information status of the NP. As discussed earlier, this is consistent with the compatibility of focus particles with ga of NGA but not with no (Horie and Saito, 1996). This argument seems to provide evidence that ga is a focus marker, which follows the discussion by Fry and Kaufmann (1998). However, as I mentioned earlier, ga is not a focus marker. As shown in (8) in section 2.2, not only the nominative ga but also the accusative o can occur with focus particles under the same condition. The quantitative data here represent that there is a correlation between information status and NGA, but it is irrelevant to the argument as to whether or not ga is a focus marker. Thus, what the quantitative data here show is that the genitive no of NGA is incompatible with a focused element.

5. Conclusion

From a quantitative perspective, this paper investigated the following two points: structural properties of NGA and its information status. The quantitative data addressed the controversy in syntax, where there exist two competing analyses: the D-licensing hypothesis and the C-licensing hypothesis. The results of the corpus-based analysis suggest that NGA contains two distinct syntactic structures with respect to the position of the nominative/genitive subject, supporting Miyagawa’s (to appear) claim (D-licensing). However, the data also suggest that the genitive subject can exist within a CP domain, contrary to the D-licensing hypothesis. Thus, the data here call for a syntactic theory that distinguishes the nominative/genitive constructions but requires a CP level for both of the structures. Furthermore, the data provide evidence that information status of NP affects NGA, showing that the genitive no is not compatible with a focused element. In addition, although there is a correlation between focus and the case markers, I argued that the quantitative data do not support the idea that ga is a focus marker, against the claim by Horie and Saito (1996).
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