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This thesis is an interdisciplinary investigation into a linguistic phenomenon commonly found in Japanese discourse, what we call zero arguments (or ZEROS). The present study, therefore, can be characterized by two central themes: (i) an extensive examination of ZEROS, and (ii) an interdisciplinary approach to this phenomenon.

ZEROs are one linguistic realization of “unsaidness,” a quality that is often used to characterize the Japanese language. In this thesis, we define ZEROs as “invisible” arguments of verbs or nouns, which are triggered by their syntactic or semantic requirements and are recoverable from linguistic or non-linguistic contexts.

As is apparent from the subtitle, the underlying theme of this thesis is “making the invisible visible.” Our sub-goals are: (i) to explore the nature of the invisible ZEROs and “theoretically and empirically” explain why we want to make them visible, with a focus on the coherence that the invisible creates and the inference it demands, (ii) to present how the invisible can “technologically” be made visible, and finally (iii) to discuss where this making visible can be of “pedagogical” benefit. Therefore, we place, in the core of this attempt, an automatic linguistic analysis system that we developed and named Zero Detector, which is the outcome of theory-motivated, corpus-verified, and pedagogy-oriented technology.

The organization of the thesis is two-fold. In Part I, we examine the definition and typology of ZEROs and their distribution in texts, and demonstrate how significantly ZEROs contribute to coherence creation. We also show, using the centering framework, that the amount of inference needed to perceive coherence of ZERO-involving discourse segments varies from segment to segment. We first introduce some relevant key concepts, and propose the definition and the typology of ZEROs, and the centering-based inference cost scheme. We then provide ample empirical data from the corpus study that we conducted on naturally-occurring Japanese data.

In Part II, we attempt to put these findings into practice. The implications from Part I motivate the computerization of ZERO recognition as a virtual model of the human ZERO visualization process, and then inform the discussion of the pedagogical profit to be gained by such a computerization within relevant language teaching principles. More specifically, we discuss two sets of linguistically-sound heuristics that we employ for the recognition of the two types of ZEROs in the development of Zero Detector, and provide the results of evaluation of its performance. We also discuss two possible areas for the pedagogical contribution of Zero Detector to the Japanese as a second language context, that is, (i) teachers’ effective instruction of ZEROs in discourse and (ii) learners’ recognition of ZEROs and better understanding of ZERO-containing discourses.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Thesis statement

This thesis is an interdisciplinary investigation into a linguistic phenomenon commonly found in Japanese discourse, what we call zero arguments (or ZEROS). The present study, therefore, can be characterized by two central themes: (1) an extensive examination of the invisible ZEROS, and (2) an interdisciplinary approach to this phenomenon.

1.1.1 Background

The linguistic phenomenon that this thesis centers on is so-called zero arguments. Zero arguments are one linguistic realization of “unsaidness,” a quality that is often used to characterize the Japanese language. This unsaidness is something agreed upon by tacit consent among participants in Japanese discourse. Speakers/writers unconsciously or consciously avoid unnecessary and intrusive repetition or overtness, and leave unsaid what they believe is obvious from a given context or situation. In other words, hearers/readers are supposed to make best-possible guesses, which are normally “required” to understand the speaker/writer’s intended meaning for the purpose of communication. It also “allows” for an arbitrary interpretation by the hearer/reader, in a special context like this:

このはしを わたるな

There was a sign in front of a bridge, which said "Don't cross this bridge." Ikkyu
saw it; he crossed the middle of the bridge without any hesitation. He was arrested for breaking the rule on the sign, but he calmly explained that he did not cross the edge but the middle.

This is a well-known story of a humorous young Zen priest, Ikkyu, who solves with his wits any problems or unreasonable demands that he is challenged by. The sign says in Japanese:

(1.1)  この  はしを  わたるな

\[ \text{kono hasi-o wataru-na} \]

this bridge-ACC cross-NEG

‘Do not cross this bridge.’

This is a “natural” one-utterance discourse, given the situation in which the sign is in front of the bridge. His witty solution stems from his lexical knowledge of pun on a word *hasi* which has two meanings in Japanese, ‘bridge’ and ‘edge’.\(^1\) It is also driven by his recognition of a zero argument before the word *hasi* in its second meaning. His mental representation of this utterance, when he read the sign, was as in (1.2).

(1.2)  この  Ø  はしを  わたるな

\[ \text{kono (Ø-no) hasi-o wataru-na} \]

this (Ø 'bridge'-GEN) edge-ACC cross-NEG

‘Do not cross the edge (of this bridge).’

This is also a “natural” (although a little odd) and possible utterance in this situation. This zero argument is, however, not one that the sign writer intended and left unsaid, but one that the reader voluntarily evokes by switching the sense of the word. Not everyone would make this interpretation and recognize the ZERO. This linguistic sensibility is what makes Ikkyu a quick-witted problem solver.

This is a special case, and we will not deal with this kind of humorous aspect of language use. What we wish to indicate in this Ikkyu anecdote is that recognizing ZEROS (or “making the invisible visible” in one’s mind) could be of crucial importance in communication in the same way that it saved his life!

In more common communicative situations, making guesses about what is unstated is a “required” process in the comprehension of, in particular, Japanese discourse. Conversely, linguistic options for making guesses easy (or at least possible) are

---

\(^1\) The word actually has a third sense ‘chopsticks,’ but this sense does not work for a solution here.
normally “required” in production, unless you intend to mystify the hearer/reader. Our theoretical interest is in how zero arguments behave to fulfill these requirements, by controlling the demand that “guesses” be make and maintaining “naturalness” in discourse at the same time. In more technical terms, our primary concern is in the interaction of “inference” and “coherence” in particular relation to the use of ZEROS.

Many questions about language itself and language use, including this concern, are explicated in an academic field called linguistics. Linguistics is the study of human language as a system of human communication. Within this broad definition, language has been studied from different perspectives, with different approaches, and for different purposes, in a variety of disciplines or branches, under the name of linguistics.

Theoretical linguistics, for example, aims to establish universal principles for the study of languages, and to determine the characteristics of human language as a phenomenon. Corpus linguists are interested in the systematic study or use of corpora, i.e., large collections of real world data, such as text or speech, for the purpose of formulating and empirically testing hypotheses about language. Applied linguistics, on the other hand, attempts to use theoretical principles, methods, and findings in elucidating and solving practical problems. The best-developed practical application is to the teaching and learning of foreign languages, referred to as Second Language Acquisition (SLA). The growing field of information technology also includes language in the area of Artificial Intelligence (AI). This has led to a relatively new discipline called Computational Linguistics, and also a closely related discipline equipped with a more engineering flavor, termed Natural Language Processing (NLP). In addition, psycholinguists explore the effects of psychological constraints on the use of language and study the mental processes underlying the planning, production, perception and comprehension of discourse. Cognitive linguists aim to provide accounts of language with reference to the understanding of the human mind.

These linguistic sub-disciplines are highly interdependent: successful ideas from one discipline are likely to influence work in another; insights from one are incorporated into another, and results in one may be supported theoretically or empirically by studies in another. However, researchers in each community have tended to pursue their goals quite separately from one another. ZEROS are not an exception; they have been actively researched in each community for its own goals. Our major challenge, and ultimate goal, in this research, therefore, is to integrate several different sub-disciplinary approaches to or views of one linguistic phenomenon, in a harmonizing fashion, within a single thesis written by a single author.

---

2 In early years of corpus linguistics, corpus-restricted linguistic description was the subject of criticism, especially by generative grammarians, who pointed to the limitations of corpora. The wider availability of computerized corpora and analysis tools has encouraged the recent advancement of corpus linguistics.
1.1.2 Goals

As is apparent from the title, the underlying theme of this thesis is “making the invisible visible.” Our sub-goals are: (i) to explore the nature of the invisible and “theoretically and empirically” explain why we want to make the invisible visible, with a focus on the coherence that the invisible creates and the inference it demands, (ii) to present how the invisible can “technologically” be made visible, and finally (iii) to discuss where this making visible can be of “pedagogical” benefit.

We place, in the core of this attempt, an automatic linguistic analysis system that we developed, named Zero Detector, which we deem is the outcome of theory-motivated, corpus-verified, and pedagogy-oriented technology. This is schematically described in Figure 1.1

![Figure 1.1: Schematic view of the thesis](image-url)
Chapter 1 Introduction

The linguistic construct that we deal with in this study is a language-particular discourse level phenomenon in Japanese that presents a clear contrast to English. Therefore, we add the flavor of contrastive analysis between the two languages to relevant discussions throughout the thesis. This is also because our pedagogical interest is in the teaching of Japanese to native English-speaking learners.  

1.2 Overview of the thesis

The major goal of this thesis, and therefore, its organization, is two-fold, as is shown in Figure 1.1 above. Part I of the thesis aims to theoretically and empirically illustrate the nature and behavior of ZEROS. More specifically, the goals of Part I are: (i) to examine the frequency and typology of ZEROS and their distribution from text to text; and (ii) to demonstrate how significantly ZEROS contribute to coherence creation, and that the amount of inference needed to perceive coherence of ZERO-involving discourse segments varies from segment to segment. Part II, then, aims to put these findings into practice. The implications from Part I motivate the computerization of ZERO recognition as a virtual model of the human ZERO visualization process, and then inform the discussion of the pedagogical profit to be gained by such a computerization within a relevant language teaching principle. A chapter-by-chapter overview of the thesis is as follows:

Part I is devoted to discussion of “theory” that motivates and supports Part II, and comprises Chapters 2 through 4.

Chapter 2 introduces the definition and typology of ZEROS after discussing some key concepts related to the nature of ZEROS. Here and in subsequent chapters, special emphasis is given to a less-studied type of ZEROS, namely zero nominal arguments. It also describes the status of ZEROS as cohesion markers in Japanese, and presents some empirical evidence, from a classroom, for problems that Japanese language learners encounter in their interpretation and production of ZEROS.

Chapter 3 first discusses some fundamental concepts in understanding discourse coherence and overviews approaches to coherence proposed in the literature. It then introduces Centering Theory, a model that we chose as an explanatory tool for the relationship between ZEROS and coherence/inference in Japanese discourse.

Chapter 4 describes our corpus study. It is the main component of the thesis, both in

---

3 This study has greatly been benefited from practical and experimental collaboration with teachers of Japanese language courses in a university in the U.S.
volume and in its position as a link between theory and practice, with ample empirical evidence. Following the methodological introduction of our study, two major sets of results are presented. The first set offers some basic facts about the corpus concerning the distribution of various zero types, as well as a preliminary centering analysis. The second set provides findings concerning the interrelationship between the distribution of zeros and the degree of coherence of discourse that contain them that is predicted by centering rules, as formulated in Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein (1995), which in fact is a primary objective of this corpus study. In addition, the centering predictions on zero use, drawn from the analysis results, are compared to human intuition about the appropriate use of zeros. Finally, we discuss the pedagogical implications of the results in reference to the contribution of zeros to discourse coherence and the potential resources for inference, besides centering, required to interpret zeros.

Part II focuses on “practical” considerations that are the outgrowth of the corpus-based theoretical assumptions discussed in Part I, and comprises Chapters 5 though 7.

Chapter 5 reviews educational technology and in particular, natural language processing techniques and applications. More specifically, we discuss the pros and cons of the use of nlp in language teaching and learning. We also present some previous work on nlp-enhanced language teaching/learning aids, also known as icall (intelligent computer-assisted language learning) systems.

Chapter 6 describes zero detector, an automatic zero recognition program that we developed on the ground that the recognition of zeros would play a part in the human perception of coherence. We first discuss two sets of linguistically-sound heuristics that we employ for the recognition of the two types of zeros, then present the system architecture, and finally provide the results of evaluation of its performance.

Chapter 7 discusses possible pedagogical contributions of zero detector to the japanese as a second language context. The two possible areas for such contribution presented are: (i) (teacher’s) instruction and (ii) (learner’s) acquisition of zeros and zero-containing discourse, with focus on their enhancement. Relevant language teaching/learning principles, with insights from cognitive research, are also presented.

Finally, in Chapter 8, we conclude with a summary of the contributions of the thesis and future directions.
1.3 Notational conventions

1.3.1 Japanese language examples

As stated earlier, the corpus study plays a crucial part in this thesis. Hence, at many points, we present examples of Japanese discourses, utterances, phrases and words. Most of our Japanese examples are taken from the main corpus that is described in Chapter 4, of which sources are provided in Appendix A. Some other examples are drawn from the email corpus that is used for our earlier works: Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) and Yamura-Takei and Fais (ms.). References are noted in the text, as “our corpus” and “email corpus” respectively. Also, some constructed examples are used for the sake of simplicity in presentation and no reference is given in such cases. In addition, some writing samples of Japanese learners that we collected are presented in related to relevant discussion.

Examples are numbered and presented in the standard linguistic format with four layers, as shown in (1.3).

(1.3)  Ø 牛乳を 飲みました。  
(Ø –ga)  gyuunyuu-o nomi-masi-ta.  
(Ø –NOM)  milk-ACC drink-POL-PAST

‘(She) drank milk.’

[Hiroko 1]

The utterance is rendered first in Japanese characters (with a mixture of Kanji and Kana); in the next line, it is transliterated in italics in the Kunrei style romanization system. The third line presents English glosses. Here, delivering a word-by-word gloss is made difficult by the fact that many Japanese morphemes do not correspond to individual English words. One typical case involves particles, such as the morphemes ga and o in example (1.3). To those elements, we simply supply abbreviations of their

---

4 This section is intended mainly for the audience in the community of Information Sciences, for which degree this thesis is submitted. Those in the Linguistics community may be already familiar with what is presented here.

5 In our constructed examples, a set of human entities will uniformly be used: Taro for a male entity and Hanako for a female entity in Japanese examples, and John/Jane for male/female entities in English.

6 A more recent style of romanization, called the Hepburn style, is often used in the literature as well. Here, we follow the tradition in Japanese linguistics for our choice. In Kunrei style, long vowels are usually notated with a circumflex as in â, ê, i, o, and ū, but we conventionally use aa, ee, ii, oo, and uu, instead.
grammatical or discourse functions, using the notation listed in Table 1.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
<td>-wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUO</td>
<td>quotative</td>
<td>-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>-ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Notations for particle morphemes

Other particles that exhibit semantic contents, such as *de, kara, yori*, for instance, are notated with corresponding English prepositions, such as ‘in,’ ‘from,’ ‘than’ respectively (see 2.2.3 for further discussion of particles).

Another case where the Japanese morpheme to English word mapping is impossible is inflectional suffixes included in verb conjugations, such as -masi and -ta in example (1.2). The list of these morphemes is given in Table 1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>polite form</td>
<td>-masu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>-nai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
<td>-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>-sase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>-rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>ability</td>
<td>-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>empathy</td>
<td>-kureru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMI</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
<td>-koto, -no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complimentizer</td>
<td>-to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2: Notations for verb conjugation morphemes

Finally in the fourth line, an English translation is given within single quotation marks. At the end of a quoted example, when it is from our main corpus, the source textbook (from the list in Appendix A) is provided, along the right margin, in square brackets.
A zero argument is indicated as Ø in each line. In transliteration and gloss, it is accompanied by a canonical case (marker) to make explicit its grammatical role in an utterance. In English translation, Ø is replaced by a corresponding pronoun and/or by its antecedent noun.

1.3.2 Terminology

A number of linguistic conventions are used throughout the thesis. Those conventions are notated in several different ways mainly for emphasis. First, SMALL CAPS are used for important terms widely used in the literature on discourse and in particular, in the centering framework. Italics are reserved solely for Japanese examples, with a few exceptions of names, such as Zero Detector; ‘single quotations’ are for English glosses and translation. Therefore, emphasis is indicated in bold or with “double quotations.”

The term “discourse” is used to refer to both written and spoken modes of communication. The term “text” is used when we wish to limit our discussion solely to the written mode that this thesis centers on. “Discourse participants” are generally referred to as “addressers/addressees.” “Speaker/writer” and “hearer/reader” distinctions are made when relevant.
In this part, we will demonstrate why the development of Zero Detector is important, from both theoretical and empirical points of view. Theoretical discussion on the phenomenon of ZEROS and their behaviors in Japanese discourse will be given in Chapters 2 and 3, which will be followed by comprehensive empirical validation in the corpus study in Chapter 4.
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Chapter 2
Zero Arguments

2.1 Introduction

The Japanese language is often described as an “elliptic” language (e.g., Obana, 2000). “Ellipsis” is the omission of elements, normally required by “the grammar,” that speakers/writers assume are obvious from a given linguistic context or from relevant non-linguistic knowledge. Here, we mean by “the grammar” a set of rules governing the use of a language, which covers the levels of morphology, syntax and semantics. Ellipsis as a concept is probably a universal feature of languages. People avoid unnecessary and intrusive repetition, and leave “unsaid” what they believe is recoverable or inferable in the context or in the situation.

However, the linguistic options that realize ellipsis vary markedly. Huang (1984), for instance, classifies languages, according to the permissibility of so-called “empty categories” that are defined, in the Government and Binding (GB) framework, as referentially dependent elements that are phonetically empty, but syntactically present (e.g., Haegeman, 1994). Japanese, along with Chinese and Korean, allows for empty categories in all the following sentence forms (where e indicates an empty category) in (2.1), and is labeled a “cool” language.

(2.1) a. e came.
b. John saw e.
c. e saw e.
d. John said that e saw Bill.
e. John said that Bill saw e.
f. John tried e to come.

In “hot” languages, including English, all but (f) are ungrammatical, and in “medium-hot” languages, such as Italian and Spanish, the sentence forms of (a), (d) and
(f) are well-formed, but (b), (c) and (e) are ill-formed. In this account, Japanese and English are placed at the extreme ends of this scale.

Kameyama (1985) presents a typology of languages in terms of “zero anaphora permissibility” and “syntactic overtness requirement” which are “two sides of a coin” (page 7). In her typology, English is categorized as Type I; it syntactically requires overt subjects for any finite verbs and objects for any transitive verbs. Japanese is placed at the other end as Type III; it allows zero-subjects/objects extensively in any person, with no obligatory grammatical encoding of its reference.

This thesis focuses on a typical realization of the “unsaidness” in Japanese, what we conventionally call ZEROS, which are triggered by syntactic/semantic gap, but are distinct in their mechanisms and behaviors from ellipsis found in another class of languages (i.e., Huang’s “medium” or Kameyama’s “Type II/IV”) that normally exhibit a rich morphological system of subject-verb agreement. The ellipsis of our concern is pragmatic in nature rather than morphological (as realized by inflection) or grammatical (as realized by switch-reference systems). Hence, we consider ZEROS as a discourse phenomenon that involves structural, cognitive, and pragmatic factors in their distribution.

2.2 Key concepts

Although ZEROS are pragmatic in their distribution and behavior, they are syntactic and semantic in definition. In this subsection, we will give an overview of four key linguistic (largely syntactic and semantic) concepts: argument structure, case, headness, and definiteness, all of which are closely related to the definition and typology of ZEROS that we present in Sections 2.3 and 2.4. Here, we will initially base our discussion on the study of English, since it is a best-researched language in linguistics in general, and then attempt to apply the concepts to Japanese.

2.2.1 Argument structure

“Predicates” and “arguments” are the terms often used to characterize the units of syntactic structures. Haegeman (1994) metaphorically describes “predicates” as the script of a play and “arguments” as central roles defined by the script (and “adjuncts” as supporting parts in the play). Therefore, every predicate has its own argument structure, just as every script requires its own roles. The argument structure of a verb (as a prototypical example of predicate) determines which elements of the sentence are

---

1 Huang, Yang (2000) proposed, as a working hypothesis, a novel typology of languages in terms of “pragmaticness” versus “syntacticness.” His typology classifies Japanese as a pragmatic language, along with Chinese.
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obligatory and is often defined as the “subcategorization frame” in the GB framework.\footnote{There is an important distinction between argument structure and subcategorization frame. Subcategorization frames only specify the complements of the verb, i.e., the elements that are obligatory inside the VP. The subject NP need not be mentioned in the subcategorization frame because all verbs supposedly have subjects. The argument structure, on the other hand, lists all the arguments, including the subject argument.}

Also, argument structure is used as the common technical term for one idiosyncratic property of a word. Many works have used this notion to explain lexical properties. According to Grimshaw (1990), the term refers to “the lexical representation of grammatical information about a predicate” (page 1). Hence, argument structure explains “the syntactic behavior of a lexical item” (ibid, page 1).

The lexical item that specifies the argument structure is called the predicate. A prototypical example of a predicate is a verb, which usually takes a set of arguments (and also adjuncts). The verb ‘draw,’ for example, is a two-place predicate, as illustrated in (2.2). It requires two arguments: the one who does the act of drawing and the thing that is being drawn (underlined), with possible additional information, “on what” categorized as an adjunct (in parentheses).

\begin{equation}
(2.2) \quad \textbf{John drew a picture} \text{ (on the wall).}
\end{equation}

The application of argument structure is not limited to verbals. Other syntactic categories than verbs, such as adjectives, as well, have their argument structure, as in (2.3).

\begin{equation}
(2.3) \quad \text{a. Jane is \textbf{familiar} with the Japanese language.}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
(2.3) \quad \text{b. Jane is \textbf{afraid} that she may fail in the exam.}
\end{equation}

Predicative adjectives often take one syntactic argument, in addition to a subject (often called an external argument), whose surface realization includes prepositional phrases, as in (2.3a) and clauses, as in (2.3b).

The notion can be further extended to nominals. A prototypical instance of nominals that are claimed to bear argument structure is verbal nouns (e.g., Grimshaw, 1990; Haegeman, 1994; Partee and Borschev, 2003).\footnote{Grimshaw (1990) limits the scope of nouns that can project arguments to a subclass that she refers to as process or event nominals. Haegeman (1994) uses the noun ‘analysis’ which is semantically and morphologically related to the verb ‘analyse’ which share the same argument structures as its noun counterpart.} Look at an example below.

---

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example.png}
\caption{Example of a verbal noun project argument structure.}
\end{figure}
The arguments of the noun ‘transfer’ are syntactically realized either by pre-nominal possessive NPs, as in (2.4a), or post-nominal prepositional phrases, as in (2.4b).

Let us turn now to the case of Japanese. Japanese exhibits the corresponding argument structures for a verb as in (2.5), an adjective in (2.6) and a noun in (2.7).

(2.5) 太郎が 壁に 絵を描いた。
Taro-ga (kabe-ni) e-o kai-ta.
Taro-NOM wall-on picture-ACC draw-PAST

‘Taro drew a picture on the wall.’

The verb kaku ‘draw,’ in this example, requires a nominative argument and an accusative argument, and also accompanies a locative adjunct.

(2.6) a. 花子が 英語に 詳しい。
Hanako-ga eigo-ni kuwasii.
Hanako-NOM English-with familiar

‘Hanako is familiar with English.’

b. 花子は 試験に落ちるのが 恐い。
Hanako-wa siken-ni otiru-no-ga kowai.
Hanako-TOP exam-in fail-NOMI-NOM afraid

‘Hanako is afraid that she may fail in the exam.’

In (2.6), adjectives, kuwasii ‘familiar’ and kowai ‘afraid’ take a ni-marked argument and a ga-marked nominalizer respectively, in addition to subject arguments.

(2.7) a. 太郎の 転勤
Taro-no tenkin
Taro-GEN transfer

‘Taro’s transfer’
b. 太郎のニューヨークへの転勤

Taro-no (nyuuyoku-e-no) tenkin
Taro-GEN New-York-to-GEN transfer

‘the transfer of Taro to New York’

A nominalized verbal *tenkin* ‘transfer’ has the same argument structure as its derived verb *tenkin-suru* ‘to transfer’ that requires the argument of who performs the act of being transferred, and the information about where the person is transferred is probably supplemental.

As we have seen, the distinction of argument (underlined) and adjunct (in parentheses) is often intuitively perceivable as we tentatively mark them differently, but it is not always easy to make this distinction in a principled way. Also note here that the argument structure of nouns in Japanese is normally realized by adnominal phrases that involve a genitive particle *no*, unlike English which has the options of pre-nominal possessives and post-nominal prepositional phrases, which makes clarifying the distinction even harder. We will return to this issue later in Chapter 6.

### 2.2.2 Case

Case is a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads (Blake, 2001). Traditionally, the term refers to inflectional marking, i.e., variation in morphological endings, as is found in Latin (nominative *homo*, accusative *hominem*, genitive *hominis*, etc.). In languages that lack morphological variations of this kind, the term “case” as traditionally used, does not apply. In English, for example, case is generally expressed by means of prepositions (as in ‘to Jane,’ ‘with Jane’) and word order (as in ‘Jane likes John’ versus ‘John likes Jane’); the only morphologically marked case found in English is the genitive (as in ‘John’s’).

In Japanese, which lacks inflectional endings on nouns and permits relatively free word order, postpositions (in bold below) perform the function of case marking, as illustrated in (2.8).

(2.8) 太郎が庭で花子の犬と遊んでいる。

Taro-ga niwa-de Hanako-no inu-to asonde-iru.
Taro-NOM garden-in Hanako-GEN dog-with be-playing

‘Taro is playing with Hanako’s dog in the garden.’

---

4 Pronouns realize case by means of morphological variations, as in ‘he’, ‘him’, and ‘his.’
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These postpositions, often called case marking particles or case markers, can be typologically classified into several groups. The first typology classifies them into two major types according to their function, whether they relate (i) a noun to a verb at the clause level, i.e., “adverbial case,” or (ii) a noun to another noun at the phrasal level, i.e., “adnominal case.”

Also, case markers are typically grouped either as “grammatical case” or as “semantic case.” The grammatical case markers represent the grammatical relations, such as subjects or objects, while the semantic case markers bear a variety of spatial, temporal or other inherent meanings. The typologies for Japanese case can be summarized as in Table 2.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical case marker</th>
<th>Semantic case marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOMINATIVE</td>
<td>LOCATIVE/ALLATIVE, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCUSATIVE</td>
<td>ALLATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATIVE</td>
<td>LOCATIVE/INSTRUMENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATIVE/ALLATIVE, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALLATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOCATIVE/INSTRUMENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-kara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COMMITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ELATIVE/COMPARATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-yori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adnominal</td>
<td>GENITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Typology of case markers in Japanese

Arguments marked by the (adverbial) grammatical case markers, ga, o, and ni, correspond roughly to subject, object and indirect object, respectively. Note, however, that the mapping from grammatical case to grammatical function is not straightforward (e.g., Ono, 1994; Tsujimura, 1996; Obana, 2000). Subjects can be marked by non-NOMINATIVE cases, as in the phenomena termed “Ga/No Conversion” and “Ga/Ni Conversion.” Similarly, a NOMINATIVE case is sometimes involved in the

---

5 Tsujimura (1996) calls the former category “case particles” and the latter “postpositions.” She argues that they share some common features; they cannot stand by themselves, and thus are always attached to NPs. They are distinct in whether or not they bear specific semantic content. Also, case particles can often be absent in casual speech, while postpositions need to be present to retain their meanings.

6 Examples of Ga/No Conversion and Ga/Ni Conversion from Tsujimura (1996) are presented in (a) and (b) respectively (in next page).
so-called “Double nominative construction,” in which ga marks object.\(^7\)

Note also that one lexical case marker is not necessarily mapped to a single specific case role (e.g., Obana, 2000). The case marker -ni, for example, is notorious for its multi-functionality; it needs to be disambiguated from among DATIVE, LOCATIVE, ALLATIVE, and other functions, in the context in which it occurs.

Ono (1994) summarized this mapping issue, and Obana (2000) adopted his summary, as an annular model of the distribution of the case markers (or a circular system in Ono’s terminology). The diagram is reproduced, with some modification, in Figure 2.1.

![Figure 2.1: An annular model of case-to-role mapping](image)

This model is driven by the fuzziness that lies in the mapping between grammatical

\(^7\) An example of double nominative construction also from Tsujimura (1996) is (a), in which the verb dekiru “be competent” marks its direct object with the nominative case particle.

(a) \(\text{Taroo-ga \{Hanako-ga/no kaita\} e-o hometa.} \)
    Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM/GEN painted painting-ACC praised
    ‘Taro praised that painting that Hanako drew.’

(b) \(\text{Dare-ga /ni sonna koto-ga dekiru no?} \)
    who-NOM/DAT that sort of thing-NOM be able to do Q
    ‘Who can do such a thing?’

Another verb wakaru “understand,” among others, may take this construction.
function and surface case. It suggests that they are not in a simple one-to-one relation, but rather form a non-discrete distribution in a circular fashion.

Another issue to be noted here is that grammatical case markers and semantic case markers are given distinct syntactic treatments in the generative framework. Semantic case markers (i.e., postpositions) are treated as a lexical category that constitutes an independent node in a phrase structure tree. Grammatical case markers, in contrast, are analyzed as part of NPs; case assignment is done by an external source, such as verbs, and case particles are attached to NPs. Some researchers, such as Hosokawa (1991) and Fukuda (1993), however, follow the notion of “functional category” discussed in Fukui (1986) and Abney (1987) and regard case particles as an independent node that constitutes Kase Phrase (KP).

In this study, we will treat both grammatical and semantic case markers uniformly as a lexical category (head) that constitutes what we call Particle Phrase (PP) primarily because they both have overt lexical realization and determine the relation of the argument phrases to their predicates.

2.2.3 Headness

The notion of “head” plays an important role in many syntactic theories that configure, for example, “argument structure” that consists of a head and its arguments (e.g., Jackendoff, 1977), “phrase structure” that is made up of a head and its modifiers (e.g., Haegeman, 1994) and “dependency structure” that comprises a head and its dependents (e.g., Hudson, 1984). A linguistic unit at various structural levels, like a sentence, a clause, or a phrase, usually consists of a core element, referred to as “head,” and its peripheral elements.

The notion of a syntactic head is used in generative syntax (e.g., GB), for determining a parametric typology in terms of the order of the head in relation to its modifiers. This so-called head parameter classifies Japanese as a head-final language, in contrast to a head-initial language like English. Japanese generally places the head at the end of its whole unit as illustrated in (2.9) below.

(2.9)  
a. \textit{Taro-no}  
Taro-GEN  
NP (argument) + particle (head) = [particle phrase: PP]

b. \textit{Taro-no ani}  
Taro-GEN brother  
PP (argument) + NP (head) = [noun phrase: NP]

c. \textit{Taro-no ani-ga}
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Taro-GEN brother-NOM
NP (argument) + particle (head) = [particle phrase: PP]

d. Taro-no ani-ga kita
Taro-GEN brother-NOM come-PAST
PP (argument) + V (head) = [clause]

Particles are always placed after nouns within PPs, as in (a) and (c); nominal modifiers,\(^8\) including adnominal PPs, precede nouns, as in (b), and verbs appear at the end of the clauses, as in (d).

### 2.2.4 Definiteness

The notion of definiteness is also an important property of noun phrases, which allows a contrast between an entity that is specific and identifiable (i.e., definite) and one that is not (i.e., indefinite).\(^9\) This contrast is generally conveyed through the use of particular language-specific descriptions.

Definite descriptions in English include noun phrases with the definite article ‘the,’ such as ‘the car,’ or with other definite determiners, such as ‘this car,’ and genitive constructions, such as ‘John’s car,’ and (personal and possessive) pronouns, such as ‘it’ and ‘his (car).’

(In)definiteness is prototypically marked by the use of definite/indefinite articles in English (and other languages that have a binary article system, such as French, Norwegian, Hungarian, and Hebrew), as contrasted in ‘the car’ and ‘a car.’\(^10\) Definite NPs in English have been extensively researched by linguists (e.g., Clark, 1977; Hawkins, 1978; Lyons, 1999) and by computational linguists (e.g., Bean and Riloff, 1999; Vieira and Poesio, 2000a, b, c), and various classifications of their use have been proposed (see Vieira, 1998 for a comprehensive summary). Let us present here the classification made by Vieira and Poesio (2000b), as an example. The four major groups they proposed are given below with a brief definition (from pages 191-192).

(i) **Anaphoric same head**: the description refers to an entity explicitly given in the text and by means of a same head noun.

---

\(^8\) Other types of modifiers, such as adjectives and relative clauses, always precede nouns, as well.

\(^9\) Prince (1992) claims that definiteness is also seen as “a conceptual property of entities in a discourse model” (page 299), suggesting that the definite/indefinite distinction is “an approximate marking of Hearer-status (Hearer-old or Hearer-new)” (page 304).

\(^10\) Some languages have only a definite article (e.g., Greek, Arabic) or just an indefinite article (e.g., Chamorro). A large group of languages lack both definite and indefinite articles (e.g., Japanese, Korean, Chinese, most Slavic languages) (Zlatic, 1997).
(ii) **Associative**: the description refers to an associated entity (trigger) that is explicitly given in the text.\(^{11}\)

(iii) **Larger situation**: the description refers to an entity or event whose existence is of common knowledge.

**Unfamiliar**: the interpretation of the description is based on additional information attached to the definite NP.

(iv) **Idiom**: part of idiomatic expressions.

Given these definitions and the examples in English they provide, we attempt to examine the Japanese counterparts to English definite NPs, summarized in Table 2.2 below (next page).

---

\(^{11}\) The description may refer to the same entity as the antecedent or to an associated one. The antecedent may be a noun phrase (NP) as well as an even represented by a verb phrase, a sentence or even a larger sequence of text.
## Classification of Definite Descriptions in Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Japanese Examples</th>
<th>Linguistic options in Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(i) anaphoric</strong> (same head)</td>
<td><em>hon – sono hon</em> (book – the book)</td>
<td>demonstrative adjective + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>associtative</strong> (different head / same entity)</td>
<td><em>haadokabba – sono-hon</em> (hardcover – the book)</td>
<td>demonstrative adjective + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>associtative</strong> (different entity)</td>
<td><em>hon – sono hyosi</em> (book – the cover)</td>
<td>demonstrative adjective + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>larger situation</strong></td>
<td><em>kookyo</em> (Imperial Palace)</td>
<td>bare NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unfamiliar</strong></td>
<td><em>toosann-no uwasa</em> (rumor about bankruptcy)</td>
<td>pre-nominal phrase/clause + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>idiom</strong></td>
<td><em>hono-ō oru</em> (lit. break bone, take pains)</td>
<td>bare NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There seem to be three linguistic options in Japanese for marking definiteness. The most common lexical device for definiteness in Japanese (and in many other “article-less” languages) is the use of demonstratives that have both anaphoric and deictic functions. As is apparent, the prototypical definite descriptions in Japanese seem to be bare NPs, in addition to a total ellipsis, i.e., ZEROS. Sakahara (2000) points out that there is a strong resemblance between definite NPs in English and bare NPs in Japanese in their behaviors, especially in their referential properties.

Turning now to other more explicit types of definite descriptions, demonstrative adjectives *kono* and *ano* are approximately equivalent to definite adjectives ‘this’ and
‘that’ in English. Personal pronouns, such as kare and kanzyo, are quite constrained in their usage, and ZEROS are normally used in their place; the same is true of possessive pronouns. A demonstrative pronoun sore is used only for non-human (either individual or event) entity.

In sum, with the exceptions of some explicit definiteness markers such as demonstrative adjectives/pronouns and pre-nominal genitive phrases, the two major marker-less constructs, i.e., ZEROS and bare NPs, linguistically realize Japanese definite descriptions. Tricky is the fact that bare NPs are also used as “indefinite” descriptions. Therefore, determining definiteness (with non-lexical means) of Japanese noun phrases is an important task in Japanese discourse processing in general (e.g., Heine, 1998; Bond, Ogura, and Kawaoka, 1995; Bond, 2001; Murata and Nagao, 1993), as well as in our computerized system, ZD. We will return to this issue later (in 2.4.1.2 and Chapter 6).

2.3 Definition of ZEROS

As we mentioned earlier in section 2.1, ellipsis is defined as unexpressed elements that are required by the grammar. Many types of ellipsis are possible across languages, such as VP-ellipsis in English (Kehler, 2002) and particle ellipsis in spoken Japanese (Maruyama, Hashimoto and Kuwahata, 1996; Fry, 2002). This paper, however, limits its scope to the omission of “arguments” in a “head-argument” construction (see 2.2.1 and 2.2.3). This includes: (i) omitted argument(s) to the head verb within a clause, and (ii) omitted argument(s) to the head noun within a noun phrase construction. In both cases, the arguments are realized as Particle Phrases (PPs). In other words, we limit the scope of arguments to obligatory elements in the form of a particle phrase (PP), excluding particle-less arguments, such as adverbial phrases and pre-copula NPs. Further, we limit the range of particles in PPs to grammatical case markers (see 2.2.2). The omission of heads, realized as VP-ellipsis and particle drop, is also beyond the scope of this thesis.

We will use, throughout the thesis, “zero arguments” or “ZEROS” for short, as a general term that refers to ellipsis of the two argument types that we define, and use the

12 The distinction among three demonstrative adjectives, kono, ano, sono, in terms of their functions and distributions is an active area of linguistic research, but we will not go into further details here.

13 Their interests are in machine translation of Japanese into languages that require definite/indefinite determiners for nouns.

14 Pre-copula NPs are never elided in discourse anyway.
separate terms, “zero verbal arguments” and “zero nominal arguments,” when the distinction is necessary. Detailed descriptions of each type will be presented in 2.4.1.

Zero arguments represent “invisible” entities that discourse participants expect to be present for a clause or a noun phrase to make sense in a given context. Therefore, they are “definite” in nature (see 2.2.4). Native speakers find no difficulty in interpreting those ZEROS, or in comprehending a whole discourse that contains ZEROS, although they may encounter some ambiguous cases where they need to request clarification in conversation or to read again for reconfirmation in reading.

Ellipsis as in this definition has been termed in various ways in the literature: simply “ellipsis” by Clancy (1980), “argument ellipsis” by Nariyama (2000), “null anaphora” by Tsujimura (1996), “empty pronoun” by Huang (1984), and “zero pronoun” by Walker, Iida and Cote (1994) among others, to name just a few. All these terms refer to virtually the same phenomenon that this thesis is concerned with, though these researchers seem to attend mostly to zero verbal arguments only. Our emphasis, however, will rather be on a less-acknowledged type, zero nominal arguments, for the rest of the thesis, particularly because this type of zero argument has not been as fully explicated as the other type in previous research, and nor has it been treated sufficiently in the centering framework, despite its significant role.

2.4 Typology of ZEROS

2.4.1 Argument types

Given our definition of ZEROS, this section provides some typological classifications of ZEROS. First, in this section, we will present the classification of ZEROS, based on their argument types. Arguments, as we discussed earlier in 2.2.1, are elements that their head predicates require. Thus, the following distinction is made according to their predicate types: verbs or nouns.

2.4.1.1 Zero verbal argument

The first type of ZERO is defined as “zero verbal arguments.” As the term implies, these ZEROS are defined as unexpressed arguments that their head verbs are required to take. They are, in other words, elements predictable from the argument structure of

---

15 In Yamura-Takei (2003), we call this type “zero adnominal” but it is rephrased in this thesis as “zero nominal argument” to make it parallel to “zero verbal argument.”

16 Request for clarification, such as “dare-ga (who does?)” or “nan-no (of what?),” is quite common in casual conversation among native speakers.
the verbs with which they occur. This is exemplified in (2.10) and (2.10’).

(2.10)  きのう  カレーライスを  食べた。
        kinoo  kareeraisu-o  tabe-ta.
yesterday  curry-and-rice-ACC  eat-PAST

The syntactic argument structure of the verb *taberu* ‘eat’ requires a nominative argument as well as an accusative argument. This implies the presence of a ZERO “Ø-(ga)” in the sentence (2.10), as indicated in (2.10’). We call this ZERO type the “zero verbal argument.”

(2.10’)  きのう  Ø-(ga)  かれいりすお  たべた。
        kinoo  Ø-NOM  curry-and-rice-ACC  eat-PAST

‘Yesterday, Ø ate curry and rice.’

Zero verbal arguments can be further subdivided, according to their case roles, into several types: zero nominative, zero accusative, and zero dative. Zero nominative, for instance, is indicated as Ø-NOM in examples.

2.4.1.2 Zero nominal argument

The second type of ZERO is the “zero nominal argument,” i.e., ellipted arguments to their head nouns. Recall our earlier discussion on definiteness in 2.2.4. We stated that one class of definite descriptions in Japanese is linguistically realized by ZEROS. These ZEROS correspond to our first type of ZEROS, i.e., zero verbal arguments.

Recall also that Japanese does not exhibit an article system and, consequently, there appears to be a strong resemblance between definite NPs in English and bare NPs in Japanese in terms of their behaviors, especially in their anaphoric functions. Associative anaphora, in addition to same-head anaphora, is realized by a definite NP in English and a bare NP in Japanese, as contrasted in (2.11).

(2.11) a.  いえ  は  ある。  屋根  は  赤い。
           ie-ga  aru.  yane-wa  akai.

The relationship between the two entities, *ie* ‘house’ and *yane* ‘roof’ can be explained by lexical association. This is a prototypical approach to this phenomenon in the literature, which has been variously described as, inter alia, “bridging” (Clark and Haviland, 1977), “associative anaphora” (Hawkins, 1978), “inferables” (Prince, 1981), “accommodation” (Heim, 1982), “indirect anaphora” (Erkü and Gundel, 1987),
“semantic cohesion” (Fais, 2004) and “textual ellipsis” (Hahn, Strube, and Markert, 1996).

This phenomenon, on the other hand, can also be interpreted as a missing link that connects the entity yane to its antecedent ie. In other words, the entity yane has an implicit argument that is directly linked to an entity in the previous utterance. Notice that the second utterance, (2.11b), alone is grammatically appropriate, but semantically incomplete. The noun yane ‘roof’ calls readers’ attention to “of-what” information and readers recover that information in the flow of text. That missing information can usually be supplied in Japanese by an NP (i.e., ‘house,’ in this example) followed by a genitive (adnominal) particle no, as in (2.11’).

\[(2.11') \quad \text{Ø-(no) yane-wa akai.} \\
\quad \text{Ø-(GEN) roof-TOP is-red} \]

‘(The house’s) roof is red.’

The second entity has an unexpressed argument that in fact makes a direct reference to the entity in the previous utterance. We will take this “zero genitive” approach to treat what is elsewhere called “bridging” or the many other terms listed above.

There are several reasons for this decision. This treatment is chosen primarily because we attend to the notion of argument structure that both verbs and nouns inherently bear; the verbal and nominal arguments are realized in the form of PPs in Japanese. We have also based our decision on insights from Löbner’s (1985, 1998) discussion on functional concepts of nouns. He argues that some nouns are defined as “semantic definite” if they “represent a functional concept, independently of the particular situation referred to” (1985, page 299) and they take obligatory arguments, which are often left implicit, as in (2.12) (underlining is ours).

\[(2.12) \quad \text{Fred discussed a book in his class yesterday. He knows the author.} \]

This is an example of “associative anaphoric use” of Hawkins (1978) and also of Vieira and Poesio (2000). We have also been inspired by Löbner’s view of this phenomenon as an “implicit argument” which is virtually equivalent to zero argument.

Secondly, the recognition of this type of ZEROS leads to a more accurate characterization of coherence in the centering framework, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4. Since Hahn, Markert and Strube (1996) argued that what they call “textual ellipsis” had only been given insufficient attention, as opposed to the clearer notion of direct realization, several attempts have been made to incorporate indirect anaphors into the centering framework. In order to make this attempt successful in centering work in Japanese, we assume that our “zero nominal argument” approach
works better than so-called “associative” approach for this characterization - at least for a ZERO-prone language like Japanese. In addition, zero nominal arguments have been rather neglected in the past ZERO research in general.

Lastly and most importantly, we prefer this treatment because we need to present referential links (that constitute discourse coherence) as clearly as possible for the pedagogical purposes that will later be discussed fully in Chapter 7. We assume that placing ZEROS will be more recognizable than indicating lexical associations between the two entities involved, in order to help establish coherent relations.

Actually for Japanese, some computational work has already been done on so-called indirect anaphora. Murata, Isahara and Nagao (1999) and Murata and Nagao (2000), for example, present their attempt to construct a noun case frame dictionary by using A no B examples, for the purpose of analyzing indirect anaphora. In a similar spirit, Kawahara, Sasano and Kurohashi (2004) view indirect anaphors as “zero anaphors of nouns” and exploit nominal case frames for the resolution of such anaphoric relations.

In addition to unexpressed nominal arguments, we include in the coverage of “zero nominal arguments” the Japanese counterparts of possessive pronouns in English, which are frequently realized by ZEROS, partly due to the constrained nature of lexical pronouns in Japanese. Look at the following discourse (2.13)-(2.14).

(2.13) 花子はいつもおしゃれだ。
Hanako-wa itumo osyare-da.
Hanako-TOP always fashionable-COP

‘Hanako is always fashionable.’

(2.14) a. Ø服はブランドものばかりだ。
(Ø-no) huku-wa burando-mono-bakari-da.
(Ø-GEN) clothes-TOP brand-name-item-only-COP.

‘(Ø ‘her’) clothes are all brand-name items.’

b. 彼女の服はブランドものばかりだ。
kanojyo-no huku-wa burando-mono-bakari-da.
her clothes-TOP brand-name-item-only-COP.

‘Her clothes are all brand-name items.’

Kameyama (1985) states that overt pronouns are used for contrast, emphasis, or focus (page 30).
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c. 花子の服はブランドものばかりだ。

*Hanako-no huku-wa burando-mono-bakari-da.*

Hanako-GEN clothes-TOP brand-name-item-only-COP.

‘Hanako’s clothes are all brand-name items.’

All three variants in (2.14) that could follow the utterance (2.13) are grammatical, but are not equally natural as part of the discourse. The most natural sounding is the (2.13)-(2.14a) sequence; (b) is possible, but domain-specific and not as natural as (a), and (c) sounds rather awkward because of the redundant repetition of names. The type of ZERO represented in (a) is also included in our definition of zero nominal arguments.

In sum, we regard an unexpressed ‘NP no’ phrase in the NP no NP (a.k.a., A no B) construction as our second type of ZERO. Our definition of zero nominal arguments covers the two phenomena often treated distinctively in the study of English (and some European languages): possessives and (subset of) associative definite descriptions.

The relationship established by a genitive (adnominal) particle *no* that links the A noun and B noun is not limited to possession, but exhibits a wide variety of relations, as we will see later in the next section. Note, though, that however wide the variety of relations may be, this construction does not cover all the phenomena that are categorized in the literature as “associative.” We limit the coverage of zero nominal arguments to what is possible in the A no B construction when they are made “visible.” An antecedent-head noun pair, ‘Titanic’-‘passengers’ is one example, because Titanic-no passengers are semantically possible. Examples of associative relations between the two entities that are exempt from our definition of zero nominal arguments include: (i) different head-same entity association, such as ‘Titanic - passenger boat,’ (ii) knowledge-driven association, such as ‘Titanic - iceberg,’ and (iii) lexical relatedness, such as ‘boat - harbor.’

### 2.4.1.3 Nominal argument

This subsection presents some characteristics of nominal arguments in Japanese, in terms of both the surface (syntactic) realization and the semantic relations they bear. We will use some data both from our earlier corpus study (Yamura-Takei and Fais, ms.), which closely examined the A no B construction, i.e., NPs with “explicit” nominal arguments, found in a corpus of Japanese email18 and from examples found in our corpus (see Chapter 4 for a detailed description of the corpus).

---

18 This is the corpus whose portions were used in Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) in which a description of the nature of the corpus can be found.
**Syntax of the nominal argument**

In contrast to English that exhibits several types of surface realization for nominal arguments, Japanese allows only a single construction, i.e. adnominal phrases, NPs followed by an adnominal particle *no*, as illustrated in (2.15).

(2.15)  
ジョンの車  
*John-no kuruma*  
John-GEN car

‘John’s car’

Although they are basically instances of one single construction, there are two cases in which A *no* B phrases are not as simplex as the example (2.15).

One case involves the inclusion of other particles attached to an adnominal particle. This type of A *no* B phrase can arise in two ways. In example (2.16), the particle (underlined) simply adds semantic information to the phrase in a fairly transparent way.

(2.16)  
市原での ジェフ VS アントラーズ  
*itihara-de-no jehu vs antoraazu*  
Ichihara-in-GEN JEF vs. Antlers

‘JEF vs. Antlers match in Ichihara’

The information provided by such a particle can also be helpful in avoiding semantic ambiguity; (2.17) is an example in which *kara* ‘from’ helps identify Mr. Y as the source and not the possessor of the mail.

(2.17)  
Y-部長からの メール  
*Y-butyo-kara-no meeru*  
Y-manager-from-GEN mail

‘mail from Mr. Y, the manager’

These examples comprise only a small portion, about 4% of the total number of A *no* B phrases (21 in number) in the email corpus, and involve six different particles. Our corpus contains only seven such examples (0.8%).

A second more complex example of this construction concerns multiple constituent examples (A *no* B *no* C…). There are cases in which more than two nominals are joined by *no’s*, as in (2.18).
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(2.18)  
\begin{align*}
\text{プレーヤーの} & \quad \text{容姿の} & \quad \text{問題} \\
n\text{player-GEN} & \quad n\text{appearance-GEN} & \quad n\text{problem}
\end{align*}

‘a problem of the player’s appearance’

b.  
\begin{align*}
\text{夕べの} & \quad \text{テニスの} & \quad \text{試合} \\
n\text{last night-GEN} & \quad n\text{tennis-GEN} & \quad n\text{match}
\end{align*}

‘last night’s tennis match’

These phrases can be bracketed until they are reduced to combinations of phrases containing only two elements (cf. Barker and Szpakowicz, 1998), as illustrated in (2.19).

(2.19)  
\begin{align*}
\text{プレーヤーの} & \quad \text{容姿} & \quad \text{問題} \\
\text{player\-no appearance} & \quad n\text{no problem)}
\end{align*}

‘((the player’s appearance) problem)’

b.  
\begin{align*}
\text{夕べの} & \quad \text{テニスの} & \quad \text{試合} \\
\text{last night no (tennis no match))}
\end{align*}

‘(last night’s tennis match)’

Note that these two examples of multiple constituents differ from each other in terms of the semantic dependency relations among the constituents of the phrases. Each of these subphrases is assigned an appropriate semantic labeling (see next part).

Further, these types of phrases could contain up to as many constituents as logically possible. Table 2.3 below (next page) gives the frequencies of the types of multiple constituent examples in the email corpus and in our corpus.

The simplest construction comprises the majority in both corpora, but its potential multiplicity has also proven empirically valid.
### Multiplicity type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiplicity type</th>
<th># (%)</th>
<th>Email corpus</th>
<th>Our corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A no B</td>
<td>497 (86.74%)</td>
<td>675 (88.75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A no B no C</td>
<td>68 (11.87%)</td>
<td>86 (11.15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A no B no C no D</td>
<td>5 (0.87%)</td>
<td>10 (1.30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A no B no C no D no E</td>
<td>3 (0.52%)</td>
<td>0 (0.00%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>573 (100%)</td>
<td>771 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Frequencies of multiple constituent A no B phrases in the two corpora

**Semantics of the nominal argument**

We have seen that virtually all nominal arguments in Japanese are realized by a single linguistic construct (with the two minor syntactic variations mentioned above), unlike those in English and some other European languages. When it comes to semantic relations, on the other hand, the relationship established by a genitive (adnominal) particle *no* that links the A noun and the B noun is not limited to possession, but exhibits a wide variety of relations. In order to examine the variety of relationships holding between the zero nominal argument noun and its head noun, i.e., (A no) B, we use an existing A no B classification scheme. We adopted, from among many approaches to the categorizations of A no B phrases, a classification proposed by Shimazu, Naito and Nomura (1985, 1986a, 1986b, and 1987, henceforth SNN) who made an extensive analysis of the possible relationships holding between the two entities, A and B. SNN extracted 3,810 A no B phrases from a corpus of ten articles from a journal, *Science*, averaging about 200 sentences and 24,750 characters per article. They classified these examples into five main groups according to the semantic dependency relations between the elements of the phrases.

It is important to note that our labeling differs from that of SNN in one significant way. The categories figuring in the labeling of SNN rely largely on semantic definitions of relationships. We opted to make our labeling syntactic as far as possible instead of strictly following SNN in this regard.

Table 2.4 (next page) describes the five main groups that we used to categorize (A no) B phrases, modeled on SNN, and the examples listed from SNN research give an indication of the wide variety of relations that are possible.

---

19 This is the scheme also adopted in the email corpus study in Yamura-Takei and Fais (ms.). We will present some comparative data concerning semantic relations from this corpus later in Chapter 6.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples from Shimazu et al. (1986)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I     | A: argument  
       | B: nominalized verbal element     | kotoba no rikai  
       |                                 | ‘word-no-understanding’ |
| II    | A: noun denoting an entity  
       | B: abstract relational noun       | biru no mae  
       |                                 | ‘building-no-front’ |
| III   | A: noun denoting an entity  
       | B: abstract attribute noun        | hasi no nagasa  
       |                                 | ‘bridge-no-length’ |
| IV    | A: nominalized verbal element  
       | B: argument                        | sanpo no hutari  
       |                                 | ‘strolling-no-two people’ |
| V     | A: noun denoting an entity  
       | B: noun expressing attribute      | ningen no atama  
       |                                 | ‘human-no-head’ |

Table 2.4: (A no) B classification scheme

In the examples in Group I, B is the nominal form of a verb and A fills some argument role (obligatory or optional) with relation to B. The reverse is true for Group IV, in which A is a nominalized verbal and B fills an argument position. When the argument is the subject, for example, then, the meaning of these expressions may be preserved in the paraphrasing “A does B” (Group I) or “B does A” (Group IV). Where the argument is the object, they may be paraphrased as “(someone/something) Bs A” (Group I) or “someone/something As B” (Group IV), and so on for other possible argument roles.

Group II and III were not possible to define strictly syntactically. While A in both Groups denotes an entity, the B nouns fall into two particular semantic categories. In Group II, B is a member of a particular class of nouns that specify relational properties. Group II B nouns are examples of what are called in the literature *keisiki-meisi* ‘formal nouns,’ *sootai-meisi* ‘relative nouns’ or *kankei meisi* ‘relational nouns’ (e.g., Inoue, 1976). In Group 3, on the other hand, B is an attribute noun, and Group III examples can be paraphrased as “A has (some quality) B.”

In both Groups, the B nouns are nouns that are generally not used alone; Group II B nouns, in fact, include some nouns that never occur alone (*ken* ‘matter,’ and *hoo* ‘direction’). While some other B nouns in both Groups II and III are morphologically independent, they are semantically insufficient by themselves, requiring arguments to complete their meaning. Thus, *omosa* ‘weight,’ or *kaori* ‘smell’ (Group III B nouns) require an argument to specify “weight of what?” or “smell of what?” These nouns are similar to relational or bivalent nouns in English such as ‘mother,’ which require the specification of an argument denoting the entity of which ‘mother’ is the mother.
In Group V, both A and B are generally concrete nouns and they can be thought of as being related by a “hidden” predicate (Torisawa, 2001a). Subdivisions made by SNN refer to particular semantic relationships holding between the two nouns. Examples comprise relationships involving humans and organizations such as “possession” and “belong-to;” they may be thought of in terms such as “A is the possessor of B,” “B is a member of A,” and so on. Other examples may be paraphrased as “B is A,” and “B is in/at/from …A.”

This characterization of each Group plays a crucial role in the recognition of zero nominal arguments; we will discuss how we apply this to the recognition algorithm in Chapter 6.

### 2.4.2 Referent types

ZEROS can also be subdivided into groups according to the types of their referents, and several sets of taxonomy have been proposed. The most basic classification may be the one made by Halliday and Hasan (1976, page 33), who divide referents into two main types: “exophora” that has no mention of its referent in the text, and “endophora” that has an overt referent in the text. Endophora is further divided into two subtypes in terms of the location of the referent: “anaphora” whose referent appears in the preceding text and “cataphora” whose referent is found in the following context.

Here, we adopted the taxonomy used in Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) which examined a Japanese email corpus. The classification used there, consisting of eight subtypes (highlighted), can be schematically incorporated into Halliday and Hasan’s hierarchy, as in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: Taxonomy of ZERO referent types](image-url)
In what follows, we will give a brief description of each type, along with some discussion of relevant typological work in the literature. Examples for each reference type will be presented later in Chapter 4.

2.4.2.1 Local reference

“Local reference” indicates ZEROS whose referents can be found locally, i.e., in the immediately preceding utterance. This is the most straightforward case of reference. A number of studies indicate that the referents of ZEROS (or pronouns) tend to be found in the immediately adjacent utterance (e.g., Hobbs, 1978). When there are some competing candidates for the referent within the utterance, semantic information, such as semantic properties of the arguments and the valency requirements of the verb, usually come into play in order to allow a felicitous interpretation.

2.4.2.2 Global reference

“Global reference” is the case in which the ZERO needs to “reach” for its appropriate referent beyond the previous utterance. That is, none of the entities supplied in the immediately preceding utterance are correct referents, and a global search for a correct one is required. Hitzeman and Poesio (1998) reported that “long distance pronominalization” is not rare (8.4% of the total) in descriptive oral texts. Quite a few studies have also discussed this phenomenon observed for Japanese ZEROS (e.g., Takada and Doi, 1994; Okumura and Tamura, 1996; Iida, 1998; Yamura-Takei, Takata, and Aizawa, 2000).

There is no limit to how long the reach is, as long as the referent is in the text. According to the result in Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003), the distance varies from two to eleven utterances, with an average of 3.35; the majority of “global” references are to antecedents that are two or three clauses away.

2.4.2.3 Cataphorical reference

“Local” and “global” types refer to entities in the previous context. There are also references to entities in the subsequent discourse. This type of reference is called

---

20 We combine in this category what Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) define as ZEROS that can be resolved by “centering mechanisms” and those by “centering mechanisms supplemented with semantic information.” The referents in both types are locally available (a detailed discussion of centering is given in Chapter 3).

21 Hobbs (1978) found that 98% of pronoun antecedents in the English corpus examined were either in the same sentence as the one in which the pronoun is located or in the previous one.

“cataphorical.” Cataphora, also called backward anaphora, as a phenomenon, is observed in English, as exemplified in the utterances in (2.20) that show the cataphoric function of ‘this’ and ‘here’ respectively.

(2.20)  

a. **This** is my suggestion.  First, we should …

b. **Here** is the 7 o’clock news.  Prime Minister Koizumi …

Pronouns can also function as cataphorical referring expressions, as in (2.21).

(2.21) When **she** entered the room, Jane looked ill.

Cataphora is not rare in Japanese, as well. Certain classes of demonstratives are used as cataphoric expressions, as in (2.22).

(2.22)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>日文</th>
<th>汉译</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ここな方法がある。まず、…</td>
<td>There is a method like this. First, …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘There is a method like this. First, …’

As the example (2.22) is roughly equivalent to (2.20), there is also a construction corresponding to (2.21) found in Japanese, as in (2.23).

(2.23)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>日文</th>
<th>汉译</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>部屋に入ると、太郎は踊りはじめた。</td>
<td>When (he) entered the room, Taro began dancing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘When (he) entered the room, Taro began dancing.’

Here, a zero argument in the preceding clause makes a forward reference to a first-mentioned name in the second clause. Compare this with (2.24), in which a lexical pronoun is used instead of a ZERO.

(2.24)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>日文</th>
<th>汉译</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>彼が部屋に入ると、太郎は踊りはじめた。</td>
<td>When he entered the room, Taro began dancing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘When he entered the room, Taro began dancing.’

Normally and intuitively, the overt pronoun *kare* in the first clause and the named entity
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*Taro* cannot be interpreted as co-referential in Japanese; *kare* is likely to refer to another entity previously appearing in the context, unlike the English example in (2.21).

This subordinate-main clause construction is the prototypical environment in which cataphoric use of ZEROS appear.

### 2.4.2.4 Intra-clausal reference

There are ZEROS that refer to entities within the same utterance.

(2.25) 花子が 成績を 心配している。

Hanako-ga (Ø-no) seiseki-o sinpai-site-iru.

‘Hanako is worried about (her) grades.’

In this example, what Hanako is worried about is naturally interpreted as her own grades, which is realized by a zero genitive co-referring intra-clausally with the subject Hanako. This type of reference has typically been studied in the literature as “reflexives” or “reflexive pronouns.” A ZERO in (2.25) can be replaced by a reflexive pronoun *zibun* ‘self.’

### 2.4.2.5 Event reference

Pronouns in English may refer to propositions or events, and so may demonstratives, as shown in example (2.26) taken from Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (2002).

(2.26) John insulted the ambassador. It/that happened at noon.

They can make reference to non-NP constituents, such as VPs, clauses, strings of clauses, and sometimes a whole paragraph. This also applies to ZEROS or demonstrative pronouns (such as *kore*) in Japanese, as in (2.27). We call this type “event reference.”

---

23 Unlike in English, however, the referent of *zibun* is restricted to animate entities.

24 This phenomenon has been studied extensively under the name of “discourse deixis” (Webber, 1991), “deictic anaphora” (Eckert and Strube, 1999), and “reference to higher order entities” (Gundel, Borthe, and Fretheim, 1999), among others.
2.4.2.6 Situational reference

Up to this point, we have been concerned with reference for “textually evoked entities” (Prince, 1981), i.e., the referents do exist in the text. However, there is also a case in which the appropriate reference is not to an entity represented in the text, but to an entity existing in the situation surrounding the discourse, the social context, or the world knowledge of the participants. Such entities are called “inferables” or “situationally-evoked” entities in the terminology of Prince (1981). The act of referring to these entities instantiates them in this set of local discourse entities (Webber, 1991). It requires an articulated model of world knowledge and of the situation of discourse to interpret them fully. We call this type of reference “situational” reference; (2.28) contains a typical example.

(2.28) a. 太郎は タクシーから 降りるとき、
taro-wa takusii-kara oriru-toki,
Taro-TOP taxi-out of get-out-when

‘When Taro got out of the taxi,’

b. Ø Ø チップを 渡しわすれた。
(Ø-ga) (Ø-ga) tippu-o watasi-wasure-ta.
(Ø-NOM) (Ø-DAT) tip-ACC give-forget-PAST

‘(He) forgot to give (the driver) tip.’
Here, a zero nominative in (b) makes a “local” reference to an entity Taro in (a). A zero dative in (b), on the other hand, is not likely to be co-referential with any locally found entity itself (i.e., taxi), but rather, ‘the taxi driver’ in (b) is inferred from the world knowledge. More precisely put, it is inferred from the knowledge of the relevant script, namely “a taxi script” triggered by the mention of a certain entity, i.e., taxi. We call this type “situational reference.”

**2.4.2.7 Indeterminate reference**

Example (2.29) contains typical instances of ZEROS that are labeled “indeterminate reference.”

(2.29) a. 昔は Ø よく 餅つきを したが、

\[
\text{mukasi-wa (Ø-ga) yoku motituki-o si-ta-ga,}
\]

\[
\text{olden times-TOP (Ø-NOM) often rice-cake-making-ACC do-PAST-but}
\]

‘In olden times, (they) often used to make rice cakes, but’

b. 最近は Ø めったに Ø みかけない。

\[
\text{saikin-wa (Ø-ga) mettani (Ø-o) mikake-nai.}
\]

\[
\text{nowadays-TOP (Ø-NOM) seldom (Ø-ACC) see-NEG}
\]

‘these days, (you) seldom witness (it).’

Both (a) and (b) contain a zero nominative of this type; the referent for this type of ZEROS is some generalized agent, i.e., it is not a particular, previously occurring NP. The cultural knowledge about the custom of rice cake making, in the case of (a), may help narrow down the scope of agents from people in general to Japanese people (or people of a country that has the custom), but it is far from specific. This type of reference is typically translated as ‘you’ or ‘they’ in English. Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (2002) call this type “vague inferables,” which are “loosely referential” and refer to people in general.

These examples are similar to those cases in which the antecedent is supplied by the contextual situation (see 2.4.2.6). However, in the latter case, there is enough information to supply a particular referent, whereas in the case of indeterminate reference, the antecedent can only be identified as some general class of entities, rather than as one entity in particular.

In spite of this definitional distinction between “situational” and “indeterminate,”

---

25 Nissim (2001) describes this type of pronouns as “roles” (page 69).
however, there seems to be a continuum from clearly referential inferables to non-referential inferables, or more precisely, from a person who can be inferred from a given situation to people in general (Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski, 2002). Hence, it is sometimes difficult to label these two types of reference, especially when instances seem to fall in the middle of the continuum.

Note, however, that “indeterminate” reference is generally made to human entities, mostly agents, while “situational” reference is not limited to those.

2.4.2.8 Time/weather

Time and weather statements, for example, ‘It is 3:00’ or ‘It is hot,’ require a dummy or expletive ‘it’ in their subject positions in English. This non-anaphoric pronoun is often termed “pleonastic.” Its Japanese counterparts are often classified as subject-less sentences in the literature (e.g., Obana, 2000), and are differentiated from zero-subject constructions. This type of ZEROS, although they are non-referring, has been included for the sake of completeness.

(2.30) a. Ø 春休みに になったら、
   (Ø-ga) haruyasumi-ni  nat-ta-ra,
   (Ø-NOM) spring break-ALL become-PAST-when

   ‘When (it) gets to be the spring break,’

b. 太郎は おばあさんのうちへ 行く。
   Taro-wa  obaasan-no uti-e iku.
   Taro-TOP grandmother-GEN home-to go

   ‘Taro will visit his grandmother.’

No one may not wonder “what gets to be the spring break” when s/he hears the utterance (2.30a), but syntactically the verb *naru* ‘become’ requires two arguments: what becomes what.26

Another instance discussed in the literature is “zero-argument predicate” such as *samui* ‘cold’ and *atui* ‘hot’ that expresses ambient conditions (Shibatani, 1990, page 361).

26 According to Ishiwata (1983) and *Goi-Taikei*, the valency for the verb *naru* is defined as [N-ga N-ni/-to]. As for adjectives such as *atui* ‘hot’ and *samui* ‘cold,’ Shibatani (1990) classifies them as “zero-argument predicates” (page 361), although *Goi-Taikei* defines their valency as [N-ga].
2.4.3 Summary

We have seen two kinds of typological classifications of ZEROS, depending on their argument (case) types and referent types, which are summarized in Table 2.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument (case) type</th>
<th>Referent type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero verbal argument</td>
<td>Local, Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-clausal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cataphorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cataphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exophora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero nominal argument</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time/weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Anaphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Endophora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Typological classification of ZEROS

For instance, one ZERO could be in the “nominative case” of a “verbal argument type” which makes a “situational” reference, while another is a “zero nominal argument” whose referent is “locally” found. Typologically, 32 combinations (out of 4 case types and 8 referent types) are possible, but some combinations are extremely rare or non-existent, as we will see in the corpus analysis presented in Chapter 4.

2.5 ZEROS as cohesion markers

2.5.1 Cohesion types

Cohesion is a linguistically realized device that creates textual unity, i.e., coherence. Coherence represents the natural, reasonable connections among sentences that make for easy understanding. Therefore, good readers take advantage of cohesive devices that writers employ for the text to be coherent. Deficiencies in cohesion recognition/interpretation may cause readers to miss/misinterpret important cohesive links and, consequently, to have difficulties in their comprehension process.

Halliday and Hasan (1987) classified five types of cohesive relations, based on English data: (i) reference, (ii) substitution, (iii) ellipsis, (iv) conjunction, and (v) lexical relation. These grammatical and lexical devices create cohesion between clauses or sentences.
2.5.2 Cohesion in Japanese

Halliday and Hasan’s typology is a useful guideline, but it cannot be directly applied to Japanese. Iijima (1983) examined cohesion types and their frequency, based on Halliday and Hasan’s classification, in his Japanese data (from a JSL textbook) and found difficulties in labeling cohesion types in Japanese on a one-to-one basis.

In Japanese, reference is made by means of names (e.g., Tanaka-san, ‘Mr. Tanaka’), repeated nouns (e.g., inu ‘dog’), demonstrative nouns (e.g., sono otoko, ‘the man’), demonstrative adjectives (e.g., kore, ‘this’), quantifiers (e.g., hutari, ‘the two people’), lexical pronouns (e.g., kanozyo, ‘she’), and ZEROS. ZEROS are a major realization of “reference” in Japanese that takes the form of “ellipsis.” Clancy (1980) reports in her comparative analysis of English and Japanese narratives that 73.2% of the reference found in the Japanese data that she examined is made by ellipsis (i.e., ZEROS) and 26.8% by noun phrases. This is contrasted with the English counterparts: 15.7% noun phrases, 63.8% pronouns, and 20.5% ellipsis. This suggests that in Japanese ZEROS play a distributionally similar role to overt pronouns in English. For this reason, ZEROS are often called, in the literature, “zero pronouns.”

Our focus will be on the cohesion made by “reference” in the form of “ellipsis.”

2.6 ZEROS for Japanese language learners

As we mentioned earlier (in 2.2.2), English and Japanese clearly contrast in “definiteness” marking. In general, English requires explicitness in its elements; the sentence becomes ungrammatical otherwise. Japanese, in contrast, allows a high degree of implicitness, of which ZEROS are a prime example.

This striking contrast poses a major challenge not only for Japanese-English Machine Translation (MT) developers (e.g., Nakaiwa and Ikehara, 1992) but also for JSL learners who have English or another explicit-argument language as their first language. Very few JSL textbooks, however, have a section addressing formal instruction and/or include intensive exercises on this ellipsis mechanism. Yet, ZEROS do exist in very beginning level materials, as shown later in Chapter 4, not to mention in real-world authentic texts. As a result, many JSL teachers rely heavily on their

---

27 The use of (3rd person) lexical pronouns is very constrained and domain-specific. See Hinds (1978) for further discussion of overt pronouns in Japanese.

28 Clancy observes that ellipsis in English is limited to preserved subject position, as in “the boy picks up the rock and (he) throws it out of the road.”

29 Nakahama (2003) examines how “language distance” plays a role in the L2 learning processes, with a focus on referential topic management.
intuition about naturalness, rather than depending upon systematic knowledge, when they explain ZEROS. Intuition is a conventional tool in teaching one’s native language, but from a students’ perspective, well-developed, systematic, theory-based instruction can be more convincing and more helpful. This pedagogical discrepancy is the motive for analyzing the behaviors of ZEROS within a well-developed theoretical framework (in Chapter 4), and further, for building a system that is designed for enhancing instruction and acquisition of ZEROS, from which both teachers and students can benefit (in Chapter 6). In what follows, we will present some empirical data from a JSL classroom to verify the claim that ZEROS are one of the critical issues that students face when learning Japanese.

### 2.6.1 Interpreting ZEROS

Both teachers and learners claim that interpreting ellipsis is not an easy task. In order to verify this claim, we assessed ten upper-intermediate JSL students’ understanding of ZEROS in a text. The text contained eight ZEROS. The students, who are all native speakers of English, were requested to translate the text into English, specifying what each pronoun indicates. This was done after all the lexical information was provided. Part of the passage used for this experiment is presented below in (2.31).

(2.31) 

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(a) } 4\text{-gatu-wa nyuusya-no tuki dearu.} \\
&\text{April-TOP joining-companies-GEN month be.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘April is the month for joining companies.’

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(b) } (\emptyset-ga)\text{ takusan-no sinnyusyain-ga umareru toki dearu.} \\
&\text{(Ø-NOM) many-GEN new employees-NOM come-into-being time is.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘April is a time when there are many new employees.’

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{(c) } kono-hitotati-ga yoi syain-ni naru yooni,} \\
&\text{these-people-NOM good employees-DAT become in-order-that}
\end{align*}
\]

‘In order that these people become good employees,’

---

30 Nariyama (2000) presents a similar view (page 3).
d. 会社は教育をはじめる。
   kaisya-wa kyooiku-o hazimeru.
   company-TOP training-ACC start

   ‘companies start training.’

e. 教育の方法はいろいろである。
   kyooiku-no hoohoo-wa iroiro dearu.
   training-GEN method-TOP various COP

   ‘Training methods are various.’

f. 会社によってちがう。
   (Ø-ga) kaisya-ni yotte tigau.
   (Ø-NOM) company-according-to different

   ‘(They ‘methods’) are different according to company.’

g. 有名な人に講演をたのむ。
   (Ø-ga) yuumeina hito-ni kooen-o tanomu.
   (Ø-NOM) famous person-DAT lecture-ACC request

   ‘Companies request a lecture from a famous person.’

h. ことばづかいを教える。
   (Ø-ga) (Ø-ni) kodobazukai-o ostieru.
   (Ø-NOM) (Ø-DAT) use-of-polite-language-OBJ teach

   ‘Companies teach use of polite-language.’

i. 団体生活になれるため、
   (Ø-ga) dantai-seikatu-ni nareru tame,
   (Ø-NOM) working-in-a-group-OBJ adjust in-order-that

   ‘In order that employees adjust to working in a group,’

j. 合宿をする。
   (Ø-ga) gassyuku-o suru.
   (Ø-NOM) camp-ACC do
‘(They ‘employees) go to a camp.’

The deleted subjects in the utterances (f) through (j) switch from one entity to another (‘methods,’ ‘companies’ and ‘employee’). This seems to make the students more puzzled than in the straightforward case of the ZERO in utterance (b).

The results of this experiment had some interesting implications. Firstly, out of a total of 80 ZERO interpretations, only 46% of them turned out to be correct. Some ZEROS were easier to resolve than others; success rates ranged from 10% to 90%. The ZERO in (g) is the hardest, while the one in (b) seems quite easy. Also, some students performed better than others; scores varied from 0% to 80%. Interestingly, the students’ scores roughly agree with their overall proficiency in Japanese.

Overall, the result, despite these variants, was poor enough to demonstrate the validity of the claim that ZEROS are hard to process for human L2 learners. Also, it implied that there is variation among types of ZEROS and among learners in terms of difficulty of interpretation.

### 2.6.2 Producing ZEROS

For those whose first language does not permit sentence parts to be omitted, it would be a perplexing task to identify what contexts allow omission and which elements can be safely omitted. We might naturally assume that learners tend to underuse ZEROS rather than overuse them, by using the strategy of avoidance. This often results in unnaturalness caused by the redundant use of full noun phrases (NPs). In order to examine this assumption, let us present an intermediate student’s writing sample in (2.32).

(2.32) a. 農民がいつもとうぞくに米やお金を盗まれて

nomin-ga itumo tozoku-ni kome-ya okane-o nusum-are-te
farmer-NOM often thief-by rice-and-money-ACC rob-PASS-and

‘The farmers were often robbed of rice and money by thieves, and’

---

31 Incorrect interpretations include the cases in which zeros are not clearly specified, or students probably avoided (consciously or subconsciously) stipulating them, by using passives or generic pronouns, even though they were asked not to do so. Interestingly, these are the strategies employed by many MT systems.

32 Polio (1995) shows, as a result of her analysis of anaphor choice in Chinese, that second language learners do not use zero pronouns as frequently as native speakers and that their use increases as proficiency rises.
b. 農民が とうぞくを たおすために
nomin-ga toozoku-o taosu tame ni
farmer-NOM thief-ACC beat in-order-that

‘in order that the farmers beat the thieves,’

c. Ø 七人の侍を やといました。
(Ø-ga) 7-nin-no samurai-o yatoi-masi-ta.
(Ø-NOM) 7 samurai-ACC hire-POL-PAST

(They ‘farmers’) hired 7 samurais”

Japanese language teachers would recommend deleting the subject in the second utterance (nomin ‘the farmers’) for more natural Japanese discourse. As instantiated by this example (as well as other examples found in our data), such omissions are often advised in order to avoid unnaturalness caused by redundancy.

Japanese is known as an elliptic language. Learners understand that Japanese quite freely permits sentence parts to be omitted, but what triggers such ellipsis is not as easily understood. This potentially creates overuse of ZEROS. Let us look at the next sample written by a lower-intermediate student in (2.33).

(2.33) a. むかしむかし ある村に ある子どもが いた。
mukasi-mukasi aru mura-ni aru kodomo-ga i-ta.
once-upon-a-time a village-in a child-SUB be-PAST

‘Once upon a time, there was a child in a village.’

b. Ø おおかみが来たと さけんだ。
(Ø-ga) ookami-ga ki-ta-to saken-da
(Ø-NOM) wolf-NOM come-PAST-COMP shout-PAST

‘(He ‘child’) shouted that a wolf came.’

c. 村人が 来たが、
murabito-ga ki-ta ga,
villager-NOM came but

‘The villagers came, but...’
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The three ZEROS in (e) and (g) are very ambiguous. It is not clear who repeated what many times, and who did not come any more. In this example, teachers would advise not to use ZEROS in order to avoid potential ambiguity.33

The use of ZEROS is a double-edged sword precariously balanced on a thin line. Underuse of ZEROS causes redundancy while overuse of ZEROS causes ambiguity. However fine the line may be, there needs to be some theoretical guidelines about where to draw it. We conjecture that Centering Theory (that we overview in Chapter 3) will provide such a base.

---

33 In this particular example, lack of other strategic skills (e.g., viewpoint fixation) to enables ZERO use more safely appears to affect the naturalness of this discourse.
2.7 Summary

In this chapter, we first introduced the definition and typology of ZEROS after discussing some key concepts related to the nature of ZEROS. We presented two argument types and eight referent types of ZEROS. We also described the status of ZEROS as cohesion markers in Japanese and presented some empirical evidence, from a classroom, for problems that JSL learners encounter in their interpretation and production of ZEROS.

Discussion in this chapter will serve as a base of the subsequent chapters. Diverse nature of ZEROS will be empirically verified in the corpus analysis presented in Chapter 4. The role of ZEROS as cohesion markers will be more fully explicated in the centering framework, in Chapter 3, and then given evidence from the corpus in Chapter 4. Solutions to potential problems with ZEROS for JSL learners will be technologically proposed in Chapter 6 and pedagogically discussed in Chapter 7.
Chapter 3

ZEROS and Coherence in Japanese Discourse

3.1 Discourse coherence

3.1.1 Key concepts

In order to discuss discourse coherence as dealt with in this section, let us begin with defining some key concepts. A discourse refers to a set of language forms that are produced and interpreted as people communicate with each other. As such, it cannot be independent of the purposes or functions that those forms are designed to serve in human activities. A discourse may be written or spoken, and usually consists of two or more sets of utterances that are coherently linked and situated in context.

The term utterance, likewise, is defined to be an expression uttered or written by a particular speaker or writer at a particular time and at a particular location for a particular purpose. Utterances thus contrast with possible linguistic constructs, such as sentences or clauses, which do not reside in any specific time and space. That is, there is no utterance possible without a context.

A discourse is considered to be segmented. Factors that determine the boundaries of discourse segments (DSs) have been of great interest to many discourse analysts (e.g., Brown and Yule, 1983; Polanyi, 2001); a variety of segmentation algorithms, each focusing usually on a single factor, have been proposed by computational linguists (e.g., Morris and Hirst, 1991; Kozima, 1993; Nomoto and Nitta, 1994; Hearst, 1997; Passonneau and Litman, 1997). The determination of segment boundaries is so complex that researchers have reached little agreement about it. For a written discourse, paragraphing is sometimes employed as a conventional indicator of a

---

1 A piece of discourse in context can also comprise as little as one or two words, as in ‘Stop’ or ‘No Smoking’ (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000, page 4).
A *discourse model* is an internal representation held by a discourse participant that links linguistic forms (referring expressions) to some referents, e.g., particular individuals, objects or events in some real world. When an addresser uses a referring expression, he or she is specifying, for example, a specific individual in his or her discourse model, with the intention of having the individual introduced or identified in the addressee’s discourse model.

A discourse model contains a set of *discourse entities* that are elicited in the discourse, along with their properties and their relations with other entities. Discourse entities are the real, abstract, or imaginary objects introduced by the discourse, and contrast with referring expressions that are linguistic mentions of the discourse entities throughout the text. One may have in mind a particular person, and may refer to this person in one context as ‘John,’ in another as ‘the man who won the race,’ in yet another as ‘he’ or whatever is linguistically possible (Chafe, 1976). Discourse entities may be evoked by the discourse via explicit (or implicit) linguistic mention; otherwise, entities can be inferred within the discourse model due to generic or specific knowledge of entities and relations holding among them. Entities may also be situationally evoked (Prince, 1981).

Several taxonomies for discourse entities have been proposed in the literature. The given (or old)-new distinction proposed by Chafe (1976) is one of the first classifications that consider psychological or cognitive status of entities. He defines “given” as what the speaker believes is in the hearer’s consciousness, and “new” as what the speaker believes is not. Prince (1981) elaborates on this distinction and, by adapting a discourse (rather than hearer) centric view, defines entities, when first introduced in discourse, as “discourse-new,” including “brand-new” when the hearer must create a new entity in his/her discourse model, and “unused” when the hearer already knows of this entity. Evoked entities that are already in the discourse are considered to be “discourse-old,” and are further classified into “textually evoked” and “situationally evoked.” In a similar vein, Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (1993) claim, attending to the cognitive status of discourse entities, that their accessibility is reflected by linguistic forms.

A discourse is not a mere sequence of utterances. For a set of utterances to be a discourse, it must exhibit **coherence**. Coherence, however, is a cognitive state; it is not in the language itself, but is rather perceived by the language users, who unite utterances into a coherent representation of discourse. These utterances may contain linguistic devices that help the perceiver (including the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader) in establishing coherence. Speakers/writers utilize such linguistic devices, called **cohesion**, and hearers/readers recognize them, to establish coherence in discourse, often

---

2 “Discourse entity” is a term first introduced by Webber (1979); this term is equivalent to “discourse referent” as used by Karttunen (1976).
supplemented with their knowledge of the world and so on.

The recognition of cohesion in the linguistic input leads to a better perception of coherence or a more coherent mental representation of the discourse, and hence to better comprehension. However, this alone is not sufficient. Comprehension is a complex cognitive process that also involves extensive inferential processes drawn on knowledge of the world as well as on memory for the preceding discourse. Inferencing that takes place in the comprehension process is a second major mechanism in creating coherence, after cohesion. Inference can be defined as any piece of information that is not explicitly stated in a discourse, but is required to establish a coherent mental representation of the discourse. Not all inferences, therefore, are of the same sort. Researchers in psycholinguistics and discourse processing have proposed several typologies of inferences (e.g., Clark, 1977). The amount of inference required or the processing cost has also been of considerable interest in comprehension research (e.g., Shiro, 1994).

We have reviewed some important concepts for the present study of discourse coherence, which we assume are important in discussing ZEROS, i.e., invisible discourse entities, as well. Our major concerns are: (i) how much of a contribution ZEROS as a unique linguistic device make to discourse coherence, and (ii) how much inference cost they require in comprehending a certain discourse segment or a certain sequence of utterances that contain ZEROS.

All the terminology reviewed here (in bold above) is applicable to both written and spoken discourse. Our focus is, however, on written Japanese monologues, which we call “text” in this thesis. Spoken forms of discourse, such as dialog or conversation, will be excluded from our discussion for the remainder of the thesis.

3.1.2 Approaches to coherence

Discourse coherence concerns the way in which utterances are related to each other in a reasonably meaningful fashion, and many researchers have attempted to describe coherence in terms of the relations among utterances within a discourse.

Such attempts have been made, in the literature, from two major distinct views of coherence. One prominent approach is to characterize the possible ways in which successive utterances can be connected to form a coherent discourse representation, and to enumerate such characterizations in a list of “coherence relations” (e.g., Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Hobbs, 1979; Mann and Thompson, 1987; Kehler, 1995, 2002). Kehler (1995, 2002), for instance, presents a list that includes three major classes, “resemblance,” “contiguity,” and “cause or effect,” and the subclasses therein. This approach concerns the “relational coherence” of discourse.

The other approach, in contrast to relation-based theories of coherence, views coherence in regard to repeated reference to the same entity or event in a discourse.
One of the earliest studies in this approach was made by Kintsch and van Dijk (1978), who proposed that propositional information, abstracted from the incoming text, is connected to previous propositional information via “argument overlap.” In a similar vein, Givón (1983) argues for “topic continuity” as one aspect of the complex process of continuity in discourse. This type of approach focuses on “referential coherence” in a discourse, or “entity coherence” as it is called by Poesio, Stevenson, Cheng, Di Eugenio, and Hitzeman (2002), Poesio, Stevenson, Di Eugenio, and Hitzeman (2004), and Karamanis (2003). One important work in this strand presents Centering Theory (Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein, 1995).

These two approaches are not exclusive of, but rather complementary to each other, as Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) have stated. It is probably a matter of priority or focus of discussion whether one takes the former approach or the latter. In this study, we take the latter approach and adopt the centering model as an explanatory tool that measures coherence of discourse, in relation to a specific referring expression, i.e., ZEROS. This approach makes sense because ZEROS that we are concerned with are “entities” in discourse.

3.2 Centering theory

We have overviewed some major concepts surrounding discourse coherence and approaches to coherence. We adopted, from among different approaches to discourse coherence, Centering Theory, which was officially formulated in Grosz, Joshi and Weinstein (1995; hereafter GJW95) and two previous works (Grosz, Joshi, and Weinstein, 1983, 1986; hereafter GJW83, 86).

The development of Centering Theory has been based mainly on two different strands of background work. Firstly, Grosz and Sidner (Grosz, 1977; Sidner, 1979; Grosz and Sidner, 1986) acknowledged the “attentional state” as a basic local-level component of discourse structure, and proposed that it consisted of two levels of focusing: global and local. In Grosz and Sidner’s account, centering delivered a model for monitoring utterance-by-utterance changes in the local focus of attention. Secondly, Joshi, Kuhn and Weinstein (Joshi and Kuhn, 1979; Joshi and Weinstein, 1981) proposed centering as a model of the complexity of inferencing required in discourse comprehension. They attempted to explicate how each utterance is integrated into the preceding discourse and is linked to the succeeding discourse, in relation to the inferential complexity involved.

The successful merger of these two lines of work resulted in the original version of the centering model, which accounts for the attentional state factors that are responsible

---

3 Poesio et al. (2004) suggested, from their corpus analysis results, “a hybrid view of coherence” that integrates an entity-based account of coherence with rhetorical and temporal coherence, and other factors.
for the differences in perceived degrees of coherence of discourses that convey the same information. One such discourse pair taken from GJW95 is provided in (3.1) and (3.2) below.

(3.1)  
- a. John went to his favorite music store to buy a piano.  
- b. He had frequented the store for many years.  
- c. He was excited that he could finally buy a piano.  
- d. He arrived just as the store was closing for the day.

(3.2)  
- a. John went to this favorite music store to buy a piano.  
- b. It was a store John had frequented for many years.  
- c. He was excited that he could finally buy a piano.  
- d. It was closing just as John arrived.

Discourse (3.1) is perceived as noticeably more coherent than discourse (3.2). Centering explains this difference as the outcome emerging from different degrees of continuity in what the discourse is about. Discourse (3.1) centers around a single individual (John), and hence, is clearly about ‘John.’ Discourse (3.2), in contrast, seems to focus in and out on two different entities (John, store, John, store). Centering is intended to capture these variations in (dis)continuity in focus.

### 3.2.1 Main claims

Centering theory is an entity-oriented theory of discourse coherence (see 3.1.2 above). It intends to model the local mechanisms that create local coherence by operating on the discourse entities in each utterance within a discourse segment. The fundamental assumption of centering is that humans continuously update the local attentional state or local focus as they incrementally process a discourse.

The local focus contains a set of FORWARD-LOOKING CENTERS (CFs), along with the information about the relative salience or RANKING of these CFs. The local focus gets renewed after every UTTERANCE within a DISCOURSE SEGMENT. In this renewal, the current CFs are updated into new ones. The set of CFs introduced in the local focus by utterance $U_i$ is presented as $\text{CF} (U_i)$. The members of CF ($U_i$) are defined as discourse entities that are REALIZED in $U_i$. One unique entity of the CF ($U_i$) is called the BACKWARD-LOOKING CENTER or CB ($U_i$). The CB ($U_i$) links the current utterance to the previous discourse. The intuition that some discourses are perceived to be more coherent than others, as illustrated in (3.1) and (3.2) above, is stipulated such that one way of updating this CB is preferred over another. Different ways of updating are formulated as the TRANSITION types that each utterance is labeled with.

The primary claims of the centering theory in GJW are given in two proposed
centering rules: **Rule 1** establishes constraints on the realization of entities mentioned in an utterance; and **Rule 2** claims a difference in inference load for different centering TRANSITION states between utterances.

The precise definitions of these theory-unique terms (indicated in SMALL CAPS above) are largely left unspecified, allowing for “a large number of possible instantiations of the theory” (Poesio et al., 2004, page 310). Before we give the definition of centering terms that we employ for this study (in 3.2.3 below), we will briefly overview in the next section previous areas of the application of centering and present our objectives, which affect our own definitions.

### 3.2.2 Applications of the theory

Centering Theory is one of the most influential frameworks in the study of discourse. Since the early development of the theory (GJW83, 86), it has been adopted as the basis for numerous works mainly in computational linguistics. The claims about pronominalization made in Rule 1 have been applied to develop algorithms for both anaphora resolution (e.g., Brennan, Friedman, and Pollard, 1987) and anaphora generation (e.g., Dale, 1992; Henschel, Cheng, and Poesio, 2000; Yüksel and Bozsahin, 2002). Ideas deriving from Rule 2 about preference order for TRANSITIONS have been increasingly found useful in text structuring/planning (e.g., Karamanis, 2003; Kibble and Power, 2004). Some predictions of the theory have also been tested with (and verified by) psychological experiments (e.g., Gordon, Grosz, and Gillion, 1993; Hudson-D’Zmura and Tannenhous, 1998).

One promising but rather inactive application area of centering is to language learning/teaching. One near-track application is found in work by Suri and McCoy (1993a) in which they utilize Sidner’s (1983) local focusing in their algorithm for identifying illegal NP omissions and inappropriate pronominalization in the CALL system designed for native signers of American Sign Language learning English as a second language. In a similar vein, our earlier work attempts to assist learners of Japanese in their interpretation and production of ZEROS with centering-based algorithms (Yamura-Takei, Fujiwara, and Aizawa, 2001a, 2001b; Fujiwara and Yamura-Takei, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c).

One significant work in an attempt to use centering for practical application in an educational context is (Milsakaki and Kukich, 2000a, 2000b, and 2004), in which ROUGH-SHIFT TRANSITION was used as an indicator of incoherence in students’ essays. More recently, Tanimura (2004) employs Centering Theory as an explanatory tool to show the contrast between native speakers and learners of English with regard to coherence establishment and choice of referring expressions. This work is one of only a few that utilize centering in second language acquisition research.

Our present study also aims at an educational application of the theory, but in a
slightly different way from our earlier work. Kameyama (1985) views centering mechanisms as part of “linguistic competence” operational in human discourse production and comprehension (page 91), and also describes the mechanisms as a “hypothetical cognitive process involved in discourse processing of any human language” (page 94). We subscribe to this view and utilize a centering analysis as a measure in our attempt to explicate human perception of coherence and demand on inference in processing ZERO-containing discourses, in the belief that the findings provide significant pedagogical implications.

3.2.3 Concepts and definitions

Centering Theory is a conceptual framework for theorizing about local coherence; some notions and definitions are left unspecified, and rules are provided as preferences, rather than as hard rules. This has motivated much subsequent work that attempts to make further specifications, reformulations and extensions of the theory (inter alia, Walker, Iida, and Cote, 1994; Strube and Hahn, 1999; Kibble, 2001). Many such attempts have been made to develop efficient algorithms for anaphora resolution and generation, and to attempt cross-linguistic applications of the theory.4

As Poesio et al. (2004) describes Centering as a “parametric theory;” it allows for language-by-language “parameter” setting (cf. Walker, Iida, and Cote, 1994). That being the case, it should even allow for analysis-by-analysis setting so that it can best suit the objectives of particular applications of the theory.

In this study, as well, we set parameters so that they may best fit the purpose of our analysis, by either choosing from among a variety of previous parameter settings reviewed comprehensively by Poesio et al. (2002, 2004), or making necessary revision and further elaboration.

3.2.3.1 Utterance and discourse segment

The definition of utterance, as a basic CENTER update unit, is a crucial one. There has been a debate concerning how and the previous utterance should be regarded (inter alia, Suri and McCoy, 1993b; Kameyama, 1998; Miltsakaki, 2003). We will follow the suggestions of Kameyama (1998) and consider the basic utterance unit of centering to be the tensed clause. Using this approach, we analyze the CFS and CBs of each clause in a linear manner such that the centering output of one clause is the input to the analysis of the next adjacent clause.

Centering is meant to capture within-segment coherence. Therefore, segment boundaries are as important a concept as utterance boundaries. As we mentioned earlier in 3.1.1, however, reliably identifying segment boundaries is extremely difficult. Therefore, some heuristics have been employed in the centering literature. One is to treat a whole text as one discourse segment, ignoring any other possible segmentation. Some researchers use surface linguistic structure, such as paragraphing (Miltsakaki, 2003) and subsection (Poesio et al., 2004), as a conventional indicator of segments. We regard, in this study, a paragraph as a discourse segment, mainly because it is clearly indicated (by indenting and/or line spacing) in our corpus.

3.2.3.2 CENTERS and realization

The term CENTERS is used to represent “semantic objects, not words, phrases, or syntactic forms” (GJW95, page 208). CENTERS are entities constructed in a discourse in which they occur, thus a sentence in isolation does not have CENTERS. GJW used the notion REALIZE to define the relation between utterance (U) and CENTERS (c), and to relate CENTERS to linguistic expressions, as given in (3.3).

\[(3.3) \quad U \text{ directly realizes } c\]
\[\text{if } U \text{ is an utterance of some phrase for which } c \text{ is the semantic interpretation.}\]

Two linguistic options for English that GJW provide for an “NP that directly realizes c” are a definite description and a pronoun. GJW also discuss another possibility for the realization relation: c is “realized but not directly realized” (GJW95, page 217) in case of utterances containing NPs that express functional relations (e.g., ‘the door’) whose arguments have been directly realized in previous utterances (e.g., ‘a house’).

In sum, GJW95 consider two possible ways in which a discourse entity may be “realized” in an utterance: DIRECT realization and INDIRECT realization (cf. Poesio et al., 2004, page 9).

As for Japanese, Kameyama (1985) proposed that “pronouns” in English, as a direct realization of c, correspond to “zero pronominals [in her terminology]” in Japanese with respect to the interactions with centering. Walker, Iida and Cote (1990, 1994) followed this proposal, and claimed that “zero pronouns [in their terminology]” are “realized from information specified in the subcategorization frame of the verb” (1994, page 199). We subscribe to this view and treat ZEROS as a type of “direct” realization. We also regard ZEROS as “implicitly” realized entities, in order to make a contrast to linguistically “explicit” realizations, such as NPs and pronouns that are visible.

As for indirectly realized CENTERS that are claimed to play a crucial role in maintaining CENTERS, and hence in creating coherence (e.g., Hahn, Markert and Strube, 1996; Strube and Hahn, 1999), no work in Japanese explicitly includes them in the
centering analysis, to the best of our knowledge. However, Japanese, as well, does exhibit functionally dependent anaphoric relations, as in the example below.

(3.4)  

a. 家がある。  

ie-ga aru.  

house-NOM exist

‘There is a house.’

b. 屋根は赤い。  

yane-wa akai.  

roof-TOP is-red

‘The roof is red.’

Recall our discussion of zero nominal arguments in Chapter 2. We give a different treatment to this kind of indirect realization, in which two entities are indirectly related via functional dependency, or elsewhere called “bridging” and “association.” In most previous work, mainly for English, an entity ‘roof’ in (b) is considered to be an indirect realization from the previously mentioned entity ‘house.’ We see this instead as a direct realization of an entity $ie$ by way of an implicit argument of the entity, $yame$, as illustrated in (3.5).

(3.5)  

Ø 屋根は赤い。  

(Ø-no) yane-wa akai.  

(Ø-GEN) roof-TOP is-red.

‘The roof (of Ø) is red.’

Indirect realization, either explicitly or implicitly, in our definition, can be illustrated in (3.6) and (3.7) respectively.

(3.6)  

a. 太郎がコンビニを探していると、  

Taro-ga konbini-o sagasite-iru-to

Taro-NOM convenience-store-ACC looking-for-when

‘Taro was looking for a convenience store, and’

b. 角にセブンイレブンがあった。
corner-at Seven Eleven-NOM be-PAST

‘Seven Eleven was at the corner.’

In this example, an entity ‘convenience store’ in (a) is realized as “inferable” in (b) in the form of another head noun ‘Seven Eleven’ that naturally evokes the entity in the discourse model updated after the utterance (a) is heard. Thus, ‘Seven Eleven’ is an indirect and explicit realization of a ‘convenience store.’

(3.7) a. 太郎が セブンイレブンに 入ると、
Taro-ga sebunirebun-ni hairu-to
Taro-NOM Seven Eleven-in enter-when

‘When Taro entered Seven Eleven,’

b. Ø いきなり Ø あいさつされた。
(Ø-ga) ikinari (Ø-ni) aisatu-sare-ta
(Ø-NOM) abruptly (Ø-by) greet-CAUS-PAST

‘(he ‘Taro’) was abruptly greeted by (them ‘shop clerks’).’

In (3.7), on the other hand, the entity ‘Seven Eleven’ in (a) evokes an entity ‘sales clerk’ in (b) which is realized as a ZERO. Here, a ZERO that denotes ‘sales clerk’ is an indirect and implicit realization.

Possible linguistic options for CENTER realization in Japanese can be summarized in a two-by-two classification, according to their “directness” and “explicitness,” in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit (non-ZERO)</th>
<th>Implicit (ZERO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A] same head anaphoric</td>
<td>[C-1] zero verbal argument,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C-2] zero nominal argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B-1] same entity/different head associative</td>
<td>[D] zero argument with situational reference (inferable, situationally evoked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[B-2] situationally evoked, inferable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Linguistic options for CENTER realization in Japanese

An example entity pair for each of the six sub-groups is given below, out of which [B-2]
and [D] (highlighted) are excluded from our definition of realization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>豪華客船</th>
<th>客船</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gooka-kyakusen</td>
<td>kyakusen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>luxury passenger boat</td>
<td>passenger boat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>タイタニック</th>
<th>船</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taitanikku</td>
<td>hune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titanic</td>
<td>boat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>客船</th>
<th>港</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kyakusen</td>
<td>minato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passenger boat</td>
<td>harbor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>客船</th>
<th>（客船）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kyakusen</td>
<td>(Ø kyakusen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>passenger boat</td>
<td>(Ø ‘passenger boat’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>タイタニック（タイタニックの）乗客</th>
<th>（タイタニックの）乗客</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taitanikku (Ø taitanikku-no) zyookyaku</td>
<td>(Ø taitanikku-no) zyookyaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titanic</td>
<td>‘passenger (Ø ‘of the Titanic’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>タイタニック（乗客）</th>
<th>（乗客）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taitanikku (Ø zyookyaku)</td>
<td>(Ø ‘passenger’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titanic</td>
<td>(Ø ‘passenger’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[B-1] and [C-2] are normally combined as one type under the name of what is elsewhere called “bridging” and “associative,” the distinction depends on whether or not the relation between the two entities can be expressed in A no B form (see Chapter 2 for detailed discussion on [C-2] type). Inclusion of zero nominal arguments [C-2] in our definition of realization is one novel aspect of the centering analysis that follows.5

---

5 To the best of our knowledge, no work for Japanese has explicitly included zero nominal arguments in a centering analysis and discussion. The inclusion shows that the interaction of zero verbal arguments and zero nominal arguments in the centering mechanism interact in the same way that personal and possessive pronouns (in bold below) interact in the following example discourse in English used in Kameyama (1998, page 104).

1. Her entrance in Scene 2 Act I brought some disconcerting applause
2. even before she had sung a note.
3. Thereafter the audience waxed applause happy
4. but discriminating operagoers reserved judgment
5. as her singing showed signs of strain
6. her musicianship some questionable procedure
Excluded is [D] type, what we define as ZEROS with situational reference (see 2.4.2.6 for the definition and wait for 4.4.1.3 for relevant examples from the corpus). Also excluded is type [B-2], which is totally beyond the scope of our study, but Fais (2004) attempts to include this type in her centering study. She proposes, for a better characterization of coherence, a new TRANSITION state named “cohesive shift” that considers lexical relatedness in determining CBS for TRANSITION states otherwise categorized as “NULL” (see 3.2.3.5 below for the definition of “NULL”).

3.2.3.3 CF ranking

The basic elements of Centering Theory are the discourse entities that appear in each utterance, called FORWARD-LOOKING CENTERS or CFs. Because the notion of salience is crucial to Centering Theory, these entities are ranked in the CF list for each utterance according to language specific ranking principles that reflect the relative salience of the entities.

CF ranking is one of the best-researched parameters of the “parametric” theory. The factors in determining CF ranking have traditionally been grammatical relations. The CF ranking initially proposed by GJW for English is as follows.

(3.8) SUBJECT > OBJECT > OTHERS

A slight modification was made by Brennan, Friedman, and Pollard (1987), who made a further distinction between objects and indirect objects. In addition, some subsequent cross-linguistic studies have augmented the ranking with other language-specific features, while others have proposed alternative potential factors for certain languages: lexical conceptual structures for English (Cote, 1998), thematic roles for Turkish (Turan, 1998), and information structure for German (Strube and Hahn, 1999) among others. While maintaining the grammatical role-based ranking, Kameyama (1985, 1986) proposed and Walker et al. (1990, 1994) agreed that, in addition to the role of grammatical function hierarchy, two special discourse devices in Japanese contribute to the salience of an entity: topics (marked by a topic marking particle, wa) and empathy or IDENT in Kameyama’s terminology (normally indicated by certain empathy-loaded verbs). The ranking in (3.9) has since been the dominant ranking used for the centering study of Japanese.

7. and her acting uncomfortable stylization.
8. As she gained composure during the second act
9. her technical resourcefulness emerged stronger
10. though she had already revealed a trill almost unprecedented in years of performances of Lucia

We will present similar samples in Japanese in Chapter 4 and some data in Chapter 7.
Both TOPIC and EMPATHY are placed higher than the otherwise highest ranked SUBJECT. They allow some entities in syntactically less salient positions to be elevated to higher-ranked positions (than subjects) and, as a consequence, to continue to be CENTERS in subsequent utterances. In another view, these features can be seen as strategies that native speakers subconsciously employ for the purpose of continuing CENTERS and maintaining coherence, and that learners need to consciously or subconsciously acquire. We will look further into these two devices and discuss our position for the ranking used in this study.

**Topic**

One linguistic typology classifies English as a subject-prominent language and Japanese as a topic-prominent language (Li and Thompson, 1976). In the topic-prominent languages, the grammatical units of topic and comment are basic to the sentence structure. Moreover, topics in Japanese are explicitly marked by a so-called topic marker *wa*. Obana (2000) examines the characteristics of topic-prominence from a language learning perspective. She also discusses the discourse function of topic by summarizing the literature including Kuno (1978). Once a topic is introduced in an initial utterance, this *wa*-marked entity may be readily omitted in subsequent utterances until another *wa*-marked NP is introduced to change the topic. It is pedagogically plausible to direct learners’ attention to this topic chain phenomenon and topichood (rather than subjecthood) as a strong indicator of salience in Japanese discourse.

However, this argument is made less persuasive by the fact that in Japanese, topics and subjects often coincide. We examined our corpus (see Chapter 4) for *wa*-marked topic NPs and their grammatical functions in the utterances in which they occur. The result is shown in Table 3.2 below (next page).

---

6 Here, we tentatively limit our definition of topics to *wa*-marked NPs, but our intuition calls for further investigation on other possible topic constructions, such as NP-*to-ieba* ‘speaking of NP.’ This has not been discussed in either theoretical or centering literature.
As is apparent, the vast majority of topicalized NPs are canonically nominative, occupying the subject position of utterances. Topicalized accusative NPs, often defined as a theoretically possible construct, are extremely rare in our corpus, a situation which is also pointed out by Kameyama (1985, page 114, ft.). The cases of topicalized non-obligatory arguments are also very infrequent.

Moreover, Kameyama (1985) limits her definition of topic in the CF ranking to topicalized subjects, objects and possessors, excluding topicalized obliques and adjuncts. In fact, it is questionable whether all topicalized NPs, regardless of their canonical case, are equally salient or are always more salient than subjects. These observations taken together lead us to question the validity of specially ranking TOPIC at the most salient position in the CF.

On a related issue, Walker et al. (1990, 1994) demonstrated that topics sometimes affect the determination of preferred interpretation even when they are not overtly wa-marked (i.e., zero topics) and proposed the Zero Topic Assignment (hereafter ZTA) rule in (3.10).

(3.10) When a zero in $U_{i+1}$ represents an entity that was the CB ($U_i$), and when no other CONTINUE transition is available, that zero may be interpreted as the ZERO TOPIC of $U_{i+1}$.

This rule allows some ZEROS in syntactically less salient positions to continue to be CENTERS. A typical ZTA example is that a zero object (or a zero genitive) is realized as

---

7 This is a compound particle that indicates role or function; it can be translated as ‘as.’

8 She states that adjuncts “appear to be associated with global coherence rather than local coherence” (page 116) and leaves further discussion for future studies.

---

Table 3.2: Frequency of wa-marked NP according to canonical case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Case</th>
<th>Frequency # (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ga</em> (nominative)</td>
<td>616 (83.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>de</em> (locative, instrumental)</td>
<td>51 (6.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ni</em> (dative, locative, etc.)</td>
<td>31 (4.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>o</em> (accusative)</td>
<td>7 (0.94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kara</em> (ablative)</td>
<td>2 (0.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>to</em> (commitative)</td>
<td>2 (0.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>to-site</em></td>
<td>1 (0.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particle-less adjunct</td>
<td>31 (4.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>741 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZERO (in a subject position) in the immediately following utterance. We also disregard this rule in our analysis.

**Empathy**

The notion of empathy was proposed by Kuno and Kaburaki (1997) and Kuno (1978). Empathy expresses the perspective or position that a speaker takes in describing an event. In Japanese, the speaker’s empathy is encoded by using empathy-loaded verbs. These include verbs of giving and receiving. Empathy locus is defined as the argument position whose referent the speaker identifies with. A list of such verbs and their empathy loci are summarized, following Kuno and Kaburaki, Tsujimura (1996) and Obana (2000), in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy Loci</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>yaru, ageru</td>
<td>giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>morau</td>
<td>receiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT</td>
<td>kureru</td>
<td>giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>receiving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Empathy loaded verbs and their empathy loci

These verbs can also be used as auxiliary verbs, attaching to the main verbs in complex predicates in quite a productive way.

Yanagimachi (2000) reports from his observation of spoken narrative discourse that native speakers of Japanese effectively use these empathy-loaded verbs to fix their viewpoint. This results in infrequent topic shifts and continuous use of ZEROS. Learners, on the contrary, tend to switch from one topic to another due to the lack of mastery of this viewpoint fixation technique. This causes frequent topic shifts and requires the use of overt anaphoric forms each time.

Tanaka (2001, 2004) also points out in her study of cross-linguistic influence on the acquisition of viewpoint fixation (encoded by passives and empathy-loaded expressions) that English speaking learners of Japanese tend to show a delay in the early-stage development, compared to other speakers (Korean and Chinese), and to show gradual progress.

The reports of Yanagimachi and Tanaka suggest that empathy is a critical pragmatic device that learners of Japanese need to “learn” for natural discourse creation and interpretation. This further implies that empathy-involving discourse may not be perceived to be equally coherent between native and non-native speakers of Japanese, and among learners with different proficiency levels.

In conclusion, we decided to eliminate “empathy,” in addition to “topic,” from
listing in our CF ranking for the purpose of elucidating perceived degrees of coherence by Japanese language learners. Thus, we leave the ranking as simple and syntactic as possible, as formulated in the original centering account, which is given in (3.11).\(^9\)

(3.11) SUBJECT > OBJECT (S) > OTHERS

We regard other semantic and pragmatic factors, including topicalization and empathy, as potential resources for additional information required in inference processes in interpreting CENTER (dis)continuation.

**Complex NPs**

Standard accounts of centering do not include provision for the ranking of the entities that make up complex nominal phrases. A typical complex nominal construction in Japanese, the A *no* B phrase, is of great interest in this study, as discussed earlier in Chapter 2. Thus, the ranking within the construction is an important issue to discuss. Let us first review how complex nominals have so far been treated in the literature, mainly for English.

Walker and Prince (1996) proposed the Complex NP Assumption as a hypothesis about how to handle the multiple discourse entities evoked in complex phrases in English. This assumption states that such entities are ordered on the CF ranking as they appear from left to right within the complex NP. Other researchers (Gordon and Hendrick, 1997; Gordon, Hendrick, Ledoux, and Yang, 1999; Turan, 1998) reject the notion that surface word order alone can characterize salience (or “prominence”). The work of Gordon and colleagues with the processing of name and pronoun references in complex phrases in English sheds light on the effect that embedding has on the prominence of referential expressions. Based on experiments in which subjects’ reading times for short discourses containing possessive structures with both names and pronouns are measured, Gordon and colleagues concluded that the more deeply embedded element, namely, the possessed element, was more prominent.

Tetreault (2001) evaluated the performance of an algorithm based on Walker and Price’s Complex NP Assumption and an algorithm based on Gordon et al.’s claim that the possessed entity was the more salient. He based his evaluation on how accurately the two algorithms could resolve pronominal reference to elements of possessive phrases. His conclusion was that the Complex NP Assumption yielded slightly better results. Poesio and Nissim (2001) also compared these two approaches. Their results showed that the Complex NP Assumption not only led to fewer violations of major principles of Centering Theory, but also predicted subsequent reference to the possessor better than Gordon et al.’s hypothesis. Di Eugenio (1998) uses as a “working

---

\(^9\) The role of grammar in the control of inferences was the original motivation of the centering model (Joshi and Kuhn, 1979; Joshi and Weinstein, 1981).
hypothesis” that a possessed entity that is animate precedes a possessor entity (whether animate or not); otherwise (i.e., if the possessed entity is inanimate), the possessor precedes the possessed entity on the CF ranking list. Poesio and Nissim revise this account with an amendment that the possessor is more highly ranked if it is pronominalized.

These studies were conducted on the English phenomenon of the possessive construction, which is only approximately analogous to the Japanese A no B construction, so it is not possible to make very specific arguments by comparing the two. However, we can say that there seems to be no single factor, such as word order or animacy, that determines the ranking. This is also true of the Japanese case, as is suggested by the results reported by Yamura-Takei and Fais (ms.) in which the salience ranking of entities in the A no B phrase was examined on the assumption that an entity of the phrase that provides the antecedent for a subsequent anaphor must be the more salient of the two entities. This examination yielded an interesting result, which is far from being as simple as is suggested by the studies for English mentioned earlier. Defining criteria for characterizing salience in this complex nominal construction seem to stem from both syntactic and semantic factors.

Now then, how do we rank entities within complex NPs? As we have stated several times, the purpose of our centering analysis is not to evaluate a centering algorithm for pronoun resolution; efficiency of parameter setting is not an issue. We rather attempt to examine how syntactic constraints affect coherence establishment. So we simply place B nouns, which are syntactic heads, in a higher position in the ranking.

3.2.3.4. Pronominalization: Rule 1

As previously discussed (in 3.2.3.2), we regard ZEROS as equivalent to pronouns in English (and some other languages) that centering is concerned with. Therefore, we directly apply a hypothesis about the relation between centering and pronominalization, which is called Rule 1, to ZEROS. The formulation of Rule 1 defined in GJW is as follows.

\[(3.12) \text{If any element of CF (}U_n\text{) is realized by a pronoun in }U_{n+1}\text{, then the CB (}U_{n+1}\text{) must be realized by a pronoun also.}\]

3.2.3.5 TRANSITION: Rule 2

Adjacent utterance pairs are characterized in terms of TRANSITION types. In GJW, three types of TRANSITION relations are defined according to two criteria: (a) whether or not the CB (}U_{i-1}\text{) is maintained in }U_i\text{, and (b) whether or not CB (}U_i\text{) is also the most
highly ranked entity (CP) of $U_i$. This can be summarized as in (3.13).

(3.13) CENTER continuation (CON): $CB(U_i) = CB(U_{i-1})$, and $CB(U_i) = CP(U_i)$

CENTER retaining (RET): $CB(U_i) = CB(U_{i-1})$, but $CB(U_i) \neq CP(U_i)$

CENTER shifting (SHIFT): $CB(U_i) \neq CB(U_{i-1})$

Later, Brenann et al. (1987) introduced a further distinction between two types of SHIFT according to whether or not $CB(U_i)$ equals $CP(U_i)$, and Walker et al. (1990, 1994) named the two distinct states SMOOTH-SHIFT and ROUGH-SHIFT, respectively. A widely-used classification, as a result, is as in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$CB(U_i) = CB(U_{i-1})$</th>
<th>$CB(U_i) \neq CB(U_{i-1})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>SMOOTH-SHIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIN</td>
<td>ROUGH-SHIFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: TRANSITION definitions

Given these definitions, Rule 2 claims that differences in inference cost in discourse interpretation, and thus in coherence, result from using different sequences of TRANSITIONS. Rule 2 is defined, in GJW, as in (3.14).

(3.14) Sequences of continuation (dubbed CON in this thesis) are preferred over sequences of retaining (RET); and sequences of retaining are to be preferred over sequences of shifting (SHIFT).

Although Rule 2 was originally formulated in terms of sequences of utterances, many applications of this rule to discourse processing algorithms (after the work of Brennan et al., 1987) have restricted the rule to pairs of utterances, as formulated in (3.15).

(3.15) Transition states are ordered. The CONTINUE transition is preferred to the RETAIN transition, which is preferred to the SMOOTH-SHIFT transition, which is preferred to the ROUGH-SHIFT transition.

These uses of Rule 2 fail to capture the intuition that what matters to coherence are centering TRANSITIONS throughout a segment, not only between pairs of utterances. It is, however, easier to evaluate coherence between a pair of utterances than over a whole segment (Grosz and Sidner, 1998, page 48). A somewhat intermediate approach was taken by Di Eugenio (1998) and Turan (1995), who attend to certain pairs of TRANSITIONS (e.g., CON-CON, RET-CON, SHIFT-CON). Strube and Hahn (1999) took a slightly different position. In their formulation, pairs of TRANSITIONS $<U_i, U_j>$,
<U_j, U_k>> that are “cheap,” i.e., CP (U_j) = CB (U_k) are preferred over those that are “expensive,” i.e., CP (U_j) ≠ CB (U_k).

Rule 2 “reflects our intuition that continuation of the CENTER and the use of retentions when possible to produce smooth transitions to a new CENTER provide a basis for local coherence (GWJ95, page 215).” This implies that the CON-RET-SHIFT sequence is a valid way for CENTER movement, or “topic change” to take place. The rule also predicts that certain sequences produce a higher inference load upon the reader than others. The CON-CON sequence is predicted to require a lower inference cost than, for example, the RET-RET or the SHIFT-SHIFT sequence. The CON-SHIFT sequence is hypothesized to be more costly than the CON-RET sequence. We follow these claims as postulated in the original version of centering, and take the TRANSITION-sequence approach to coherence-driven preferences, rather than the single-TRANSITION approach as proposed by Brenann et al. (1987).

In addition to the canonical TRANSITION types (CON, RET, and SHIFT), corpus studies revealed that natural-occurring discourses contain quite a few utterances without a CB, that is, there is no common entity between U_i−1 and U_i (cf. Passonneau, 1998; Poesio et al., 2002, 2004). Such utterances are labeled “NULL” or elsewhere called “No CB” (e.g., Di Eugenio, 1998).

**Single TRANSITION versus TRANSITION sequence**

Let us first clarify what we mean, in this thesis as well as in the previous studies, by a TRANSITION and a TRANSITION sequence. Look at the next sample discourse, which consists of utterances (U_1) through (U_4), in (3.16).

(3.16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(U_1)</th>
<th>よこはまの おばあさんは  りょうりを</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yokohama-no obaasan-wa ryoori-o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama-GEN grandmother-TOP recipe-ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

たくさん 知っています。

takusan sitte-i-masu.  
many know-POL

‘Grandma in Yokohama knows a lot of recipes.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(U_2)</th>
<th>Ø  いいりょうりの本を持っています。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Ø-ga) ii ryoori-no hon-o motte-i-masu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 This sequence may follow another stretch of continuation to talk about a newly established center.

11 Poesio et al. (2002, 2004) distinguished the NULL TRANSITION between utterances neither of which has a CB and the ZERO TRANSITION from an utterance with a CB to one without. We collapse these two TRANSITIONS into the NULL TRANSITION.
‘(She) owns a good recipe book.’

‘Hiroko’s mother sometimes telephones (her ‘Hiroko’s’) grandmother.’

‘And (she ‘mother’) asks (her ‘grandmother’) for various recipes.’

Table 3.5 (next page) schematically represents the relationship between CENTER structure and TRANSITION state of each of these utterances, and between TRANSITION and TRANSITION sequence.
Table 3.5: Schematic view of TRANSITION and TRANSITION sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U</th>
<th>CF/ CB</th>
<th>TRANSITION</th>
<th>TRANSITION sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CF: obaasan, ryoori, CB: none</td>
<td>(U1, U2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CF: obaasan, hon, CB: obaasan</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>(U1, U2, U3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CF: obaasan, okaasan, denwa, CB: obaasan</td>
<td>(U2, U3)</td>
<td>CON-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CF: okaasan, ryoori, CB: okaasan</td>
<td>(U3, U4)</td>
<td>(U2, U3, U4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“TRANSITION” characterizes the relation, in terms of CENTER movement, between the two adjacent utterances (e.g., U2 and U3); it labels the latter utterance (underlined) (e.g., U3). “TRANSITION sequence,” on the other hand, characterizes the relation between the two adjacent TRANSITION states (e.g., CON and RET) that involve three successive utterances (e.g., U1, U2, U3). The label (CON-RET) is assigned to the last utterance in the sequence (e.g., U3 underlined). Thus, when we say the use of ZERO in a certain sequence, it concerns a ZERO in the last utterance in that sequence.

**TRANSITION sequence and inference cost**

There are a total of eleven possible sequence patterns out of combinations of CON, RET, SHIFT, and NULL TRANSITION types.12 We tentatively divide the eleven types into three groups in accordance with the predictions outlined by GJW’s Rule 2: “low-cost” sequence types and “high-cost” sequence types, placing in between “medium-cost” sequences, as presented in Table 3.6. Although Rule 2 explicitly mentions only three sequence types, CON-CON, RET-RET and SHIFT-SHIFT (indicated in bold in the table), we take into account the claims made by GJW concerning the rule (see 3.2.3.5 above) and list all possible sequence types accordingly.

---

12 The NULL-SHIFT sequence is theoretically impossible.
Table 3.6: Inference cost-based classifications of sequence patterns (tentative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“low-cost” sequence types</th>
<th>“medium-cost” sequence types</th>
<th>“high-cost” sequence types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON-CON,</td>
<td>RET-RET,</td>
<td>CON-SHIFT,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON-RET,</td>
<td>SHIFT-SHIFT,</td>
<td>RET-CON,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET-SHIFT,</td>
<td>NULL-CON,</td>
<td>SHIFT-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIFT-CON</td>
<td>NULL-RET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This grouping is made because the distinction is not, of course, binary, but rather is graded, as claimed by GJW95: “to the extent a discourse adheres to centering constraints, its coherence will increase and the inference load placed upon the hearer will decrease (page 210).” We then compromise, for the sake of simplicity, with this three-scale hierarchy.

We use this distinction as a starting point to analyze the effect of ZERO use in each sequence type on perceived degree of coherence in a discourse, and hence inference cost required for interpreting the ZERO(S) contained, and ultimately for understanding the discourse. We also attempt not only to estimate the amount of inference that centering concerns, but also to elucidate the types of information resources required for such inference. This will be done by analyzing both textual and contextual environments that enable the use of ZEROS in “high-cost” sequences. In Chapter 4, particularly in 4.4.3, we will make an empirical assessment of the centering-predicted coherence/inference measure, as depicted in the table above, and make adjustments, if necessary, according to the analysis result. The analysis will be accompanied by statistical data and numerous relevant discourse samples from our corpus.

### 3.3 Summary

In this chapter, we first discussed some fundamental concepts in understanding discourse coherence and overviewed approaches to coherence proposed in the literature. We then introduced Centering Theory, a model that we chose as an explanatory tool for the relationship between ZEROS and coherence/inference in Japanese discourse. We emphasized the original intention of Centering as discussed in GJW, and fully described the “parameter” settings that we adopted for the purpose of characterizing ZERO-involving coherence. We finally proposed a tentative version of inference cost-based classifications of TRANSITION sequence patterns, on which our later corpus analysis is based.
Chapter 4

Corpus Study

4.1 Corpus

Our corpus is a collection of 83 written discourses (texts), either in narrative or expository style, from seven different Japanese as a Second Language (JSL) textbooks published and widely used in JSL teaching contexts in/outside Japan, with levels ranging from “beginning” to “intermediate.” The textbooks are given abbreviated names, in this thesis, for the sake of convention: Hiroko 1, Hiroko 2, Minna 1, Minna 2, Gendai, Nitizyo, and Sokudoku (see Appendix A for the information of these textbooks). Hiroko 1 and Hiroko 2, and Minna 1 and Minna 2, respectively, are two-level volumes of the same textbook series. The texts are presented in each textbook as teaching materials for reading comprehension, often accompanied by vocabulary lists and comprehension questions. From all the reading materials available, dialogues and first-person monologues (such as letters and diaries) are excluded because of the focus of our analysis.1

The compiled corpus includes 314 paragraphs (indicated by line spacing and/or indenting), 1,200 sentences (separated by periods), and 2,007 clauses (manually identified based on our definition of a clause). The corpus contains a total of 1,382 ZEROS (manually located; see Section 4.3 for the locating process), of which further classifications will be presented in 4.4.1. Quantitative information concerning the corpus is summarized in Table 4.1.

---

1 We employed this manipulation because we deal only with third person NPs in our centering analysis of the corpus, following the standard assumption that deictic entities are beyond the purview of centering. Byron and Stent (1998a, b), on the other hand, argue for the inclusion of first and second person pronouns in examining two-party dialogues. Our CF lists exclude a very few cases of first and second person NPs found in the corpus.
Table 4.1: Quantitative information of the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Texts</th>
<th>Paragraphs</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Clauses</th>
<th>ZEROS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendai</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitizyo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokudoku</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>1,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Qualitative information of the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clause/sentence</th>
<th>Clause/ ZERO</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko 1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko 2</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna 1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minna 2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendai</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>expository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitizyo</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokudoku</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We chose this type of corpus for several reasons, which are driven by the specific aims of our analysis and the overall goal of this thesis. Firstly and most fundamentally, the underlying theme of this thesis is concerned with the pedagogical application of the
theory based on sound empirical evidence from the corpus. Thus, the analysis ought to start with data that is as directly related as possible to a pedagogical context.

Secondly, as the first comprehensive corpus analysis regarding ZEROS in Japanese both in its quality and quantity, we believe that our mission is to provide as “standard” data as we could offer, i.e., a baseline from which the subsequent research can gain insights or with which they can compare the analyses of other types of text or speech. By “standard,” we mean free from domain-specific deviation and domain-unique characteristics.

Also, we wish to provide a “standard” centering analysis of Japanese discourse, from which JSL teachers can benefit, gaining a better understanding of mechanisms involving ZEROS and enhancing their instruction. Centering phenomena vary, to some extent, from corpus to corpus, and from genre to genre. The Japanese email corpus that Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) and Fais (2004) examined, for example, exhibits a very particular TRANSITION distribution, which may be partly due to situation-dependent knowledge shared by the discourse participants. Also, spoken dialogues are still left with a number of open issues (see Byron and Stent, 1998).

For these reasons, our analysis, concerning the interrelationship between ZEROS and coherence, requires as maximally coherent discourse samples as possible, such that such excessive inferential costs as those induced by world or shared knowledge are minimized in the comprehension process. We conjecture that JSL reading materials serve as such a representative text sample. In addition, they are naturally occurring data in the sense that they are not constructed solely for the purpose of analyses or experiments, although they are more or less controlled (intentionally by text writers) in terms of their lexical difficulty and syntactic complexity.

4.2 Purposes

The primary goal of the corpus analysis conducted in this section is to provide statistically reliable and generalizable results concerning the behaviors of ZEROS in naturally occurring Japanese discourse. The results are discussed from various perspectives, with a focus on the diverse nature of ZEROS and their significant contribution to discourse coherence.

---

2 The previous corpus studies of ZEROS so far conducted on relatively large sets of naturally occurring Japanese data include Iida (1998) and Nariyama (2000).

3 We thank Shigeko Nariyama (personal communication) for pointing this out.
4.3 Methodology

The data was subjected to the following stages of manual analysis based on the definitions given in Chapter 2. First, sentences (conventionally indicated by periods) were split into clauses that later served as basic syntactic units for identifying verbal argument structure, and hence for the ZERO detecting operation, and also as CENTER-updating units, i.e., utterances, for our centering analysis. Given this unit, the native-Japanese-speaking author identified the presence of ZEROS by utilizing both intuitive judgment and linguistic knowledge about valency requirements of each given predicate (including verbs and adjectives). We basically followed the definition of ZEROS presented in Chapter 2: ZEROS are unexpressed “obligatory” arguments. However, unexpressed “adjuncts” that are strongly evoked in a given context were also marked. The identified ZEROS were labeled according to their types as defined in Chapter 2. For the identification of zero nominal arguments, we mainly utilized intuitive judgment about semantic “incompleteness” of a given noun, which usually calls for “of-what” information (see 2.4.1.2).

These ZERO identification and labeling processes did not pose too much difficulty, but were subjected to several stages of revision and occasional consultation with another native-speaker collaborator who is a trained linguist and JSL teaching expert, when necessary.

This set of ZERO-specified clauses was later used for the centering analysis, which includes identification of CF and CB and computation of TRANSITION type. This process was also straightforward in many cases, but some tricky cases required clear understanding of centering rules and constraints, and introspective judgment on what an utterance is centrally about.

In order to delineate the behaviors of ZEROS, we present numerous figures and tables that provide frequencies and proportions of certain types of ZEROS and other related linguistic constructs that occur in certain environments. Chi-square tests, the most commonly used significant test in corpus analysis, are conducted wherever relevant. We use chi-square values to determine whether the distributional difference is a genuine reflection of variation in order to make generalizations, from the findings in our analysis, in subsequent discussion.

In the next section, we present the analysis results with supporting statistical data and attempt to interpret them in order to discuss their pedagogical implications.
4.4 Results

4.4.1 Basic facts: Types and distribution

This subsection provides some basic facts from the corpus with respect to the distribution of various types of ZEROS, with numerous examples. Several sub-classifications and supra-classifications of ZEROS will also be proposed.

4.4.1.1 Distribution of zero argument and case types

ZEROS, in our definition, are inferred from two different types of argument structure: verbal argument structure and nominal argument structure. As is easily predicted, there are more zero verbal arguments (1,066 occurrences, 77.13% of total) than zero nominal arguments (316 occurrences, 22.87%) found in our data.

Verbal arguments can further be classified into several case types: nominative (NOM), accusative (ACC) and dative (DAT). Nominal arguments are of one case type: genitive (GEN). Figure 4.1 shows the distribution of each case type of ZEROS (indicated in percentage) found in the corpus.

![Figure 4.1: Distribution of zero argument case types](image)

As is evident, zero nominatives are the most dominant type of ZEROS (41.38%, 910 cases) of all ZERO types. An example is given in (4.1).
From the utterance (4.1), a nominative NP is missing, and the information of “who is studying in Japan” is not overtly expressed. The high frequency of zero nominatives conforms to the widely acknowledged fact that Japanese often drops its subjects and is often dubbed a “null subject language.”\(^4\)

Other types of zero verbal arguments are not so prevalent. Zero accusatives comprise 6.01% (83 cases) and zero datives only 3.84% (53 cases). The sample utterances are given in (4.2) and (4.3) respectively.

(4.2) 
六十代、七十代の 人が 
60-dai, 70-dai-no  hito-ga 
60’s, 70’s-GEN  people-NOM 
もっとも たくさん Ø かく。 
mottom  takusan  (Ø-o)  kaku. 
most  numerously  (Ø-ACC)  write 

‘People in their 60’s and 70’s write (them ‘letters’) most frequently.’

(4.3)  Ø 「サッチャン」という 名前が ついている。 
(Ø-ni) “Sattyan”-to-iu  nanae-ga tuite-iru. 
(Ø-DAT) “Sattyan”-COMPL-say  name-NOM  assign-be 

‘The name “Sattyan” is assigned to (it ‘to the robot’).’

In (4.2), the information concerning “what they write” is not explicitly given.

The utterance (4.3) lacks the information concerning “to whom the name is given.”

Here is an interesting finding regarding these latter two ZERO cases. Unlike the examples in (4.2) and (4.3), a large number of zero accusatives and zero datives appear

---

\(^4\) This view is empirically justified by other corpus studies, as well. Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) report that 72% of subjects (of any person) in the email corpus are ellipted.
in utterances that contain multiple ZEROS (75.90% and 60.38% of the time respectively). In other words, when accusative NPs or dative NPs are ellipted, other NP(s), mostly nominatives, are also dropped, as is shown in (4.4).

(4.4)  ØØ半分ぐらい残してしまった。
(Ø-ga) (Ø-o) hanbun-kurai nokosite-simat-ta.
(Ø-NOM) (Ø-ACC) half-about leave-finish-PAST

‘(She ‘Misako’) ended up leaving (it ‘main course dish’) half-finished.’

[Sokudoku]

Both “who left unfinished” and “what is left unfinished” are not explicitly stated in (4.4). One extreme case of multiple ellipses is given in (4.5).

(4.5)  a. この犬のロボットは頭がよくて、
kono-inu-no robotto-wa atama-ga yoku-te,
this-dog-GEN robot-TOP brain-NOM is-good

‘As this robot dog is smart,’

b. ØØØ教えてやると、
(Ø-ga) (Ø-o) (Ø-ni) osiete-yaru-to,
(Ø-NOM) (Ø-ACC) (Ø-DAT) teach-EMP-if,

‘If (Ø ‘its owner’) teaches (Ø ‘the robot dog’) (Ø tricks),’

c. ØØいろいろ覚える。
(Ø-ga) (Ø-o) iroiro oboeru.
(Ø-NOM) (Ø-ACC) variously learn

(Ø ‘the robot dog’) learns various (Ø ‘tricks’).

[Minna 2]

In both (b) and (c), only the predicates (plus an adverb) are visible; all the arguments are covert, but they are either contextually or situationally recoverable. Talking about a pet dog normally involves its owner teaching it some tricks and manners. Adjuncts, such as locatives and destinatives, are basically outside the scope of our definition of ZEROS (as mentioned in Chapter 2), but ellipted adjuncts are also detected when they are highly evoked in contexts in which they occur, as in the example below.
A zero locative in (b) is highly evoked, and also is the only entity that links the two utterances. This case is not very frequent (1.37%, 19 examples), but these ZEROS are worth noting in terms of their role as creator of coherence.

Nominal arguments, on the other hand, are not further classified into subclasses because they all share the same syntactic construct NP no, unlike English that allows both pre-nominal possessive constructions and post-nominal prepositional phrases, as illustrated in (4.7).

For this reason, all the nominal arguments, in our definition, are labeled zero genitives (GEN), as we mentioned above. Thus, the two terms, zero nominal argument and zero
genitive, are basically identical; we use either term, throughout the thesis, depending on the relevant typological level. The example from our corpus is given in (4.8).

(4.8) Ø 放送は 1日に 4時間だけ でした。
(Ø-no) hoosoo-wa 1-niti-ni 4-zikan-dake desi-ta.
(Ø-GEN) broadcast-TOP 1-day-in 4-hour only COP-PAST

‘(Ø ‘TV’) broadcast was only 4 hours long per day.’

The utterance (4.8) alone does not explicitly present any information of “what type of broadcast,” which is supplied by the presence of a zero genitive. Surprisingly, zero genitives are the second most frequent (22.94%, 317 cases) after the dominant type of zero nominatives. This result provides us with a first clear indication of the assumingly significant role of zero nominal arguments in Japanese discourse and coherence.

4.4.1.2 Distribution of ZERO referent types

Next, we labeled ZEROS with their referent types, i.e., local, global, intra-clausal, cataphorical, event, situational, indeterminate, and time/weather (see Chapter 2 for the definitions). The frequencies of each type are summarized in Table 4.3 in the descendent order of frequency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent type</th>
<th>Frequency (# / %)</th>
<th>Our corpus</th>
<th>Email corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>887 (64.17%)</td>
<td>115 (42.91%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global</td>
<td>146 (10.56%)</td>
<td>48 (17.91%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intra-clausal</td>
<td>130 (9.41%)</td>
<td>5 (1.87%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeterminate</td>
<td>104 (7.53%)</td>
<td>8 (2.99%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational</td>
<td>56 (4.05%)</td>
<td>62 (23.13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event</td>
<td>21 (1.52%)</td>
<td>17 (6.34%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cataphorical</td>
<td>20 (1.45%)</td>
<td>2 (0.75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time/weather</td>
<td>18 (1.30%)</td>
<td>11 (4.10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1,382 (100%)</td>
<td>268 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Frequencies of ZERO referent types

As can be seen, local ZEROS are the most prevalent, followed by global and intra-clausal.
These three anaphoric types, with the antecedents located at three different positions, comprise about 84% of all ZEROS. The remaining types each comprise respectable percentages.

For a cross-genre comparison, we also provide in the table, the distribution of the same referent types found in the Japanese email corpus examined by Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003). The distribution is not totally identical, but highlights some characteristics of each genre. Most striking is the high frequency of “situational” ZEROS in the email corpus. This, we assume, may result from a presumably heavy dependence on the common knowledge shared by the discourse participants (who engaged in the email exchange).\(^5\)

We will provide examples of each referent type from our corpus, while discussing how the referent types interact with the two argument types.

### 4.4.1.3 Interaction of argument types and referent types

We then made a cross-typological comparison, by examining the distribution of each referent type in relation to its argument type. Figure 4.2 indicates the frequency (in number of occurrences) of each referent type that is syntactically realized as either ZERO argument type.

![Figure 4.2: Distribution of ZERO referent types according to argument types](image)

The result suggests that the eight referent types can be divided into three groups depending on the tendency as to which argument type they occur as. As is mentioned

\(^5\) This is one domain-specific phenomenon that we attempt to eliminate for the purpose of the coherence analysis (see above for discussion of our motives for the choice of corpus).
earlier, 77.13% of the total of 1382 ZEROS are of the zero verbal argument type. We use this figure as a baseline in order to make the following classification.

The first group includes “local,” “global” and “situational,” all of which are similarly distributed across both argument types, showing a considerable preference for zero verbal arguments. The average ratio of zero verbal arguments in this group is 82.55%. The second group shows a strong tendency to occur as zero nominal arguments; “intra-clausal” belongs here. For this group, the ratio of zero verbal arguments is only 5.38%. The third group, which includes “cataphorical,” “event,” “indeterminate” and “time/weather,” on the other hand, shows a very strong tendency to appear as zero verbal arguments, with an average ratio of 98.16%. In this group, usage as a zero nominal argument is non-existent or extremely rare. The difference in distribution among the three groups proves to be significant ($x^2 = 438.433$, DF=2, $p < .001$). We will take a closer look at members of each group, with relevant examples from our corpus.

**Group 1**

For both argument types, local ZEROS are the most prevalent (742 cases for zero verbal arguments; 145 for zero nominal arguments). Examples are provided in (4.9) and (4.10) respectively.

(4.9)  a. 花火は美しいが

\[ \text{hanabi-wa utukusii-ga} \]
\[ \text{fireworks-TOP beautiful-but} \]

‘Fireworks are beautiful, but’

b. Ø 一瞬できえる。

\[ (\text{Ø-ga}) \text{ issyunde kieru.} \]
\[ (\text{Ø-NOM}) \text{ instantly fade-away} \]

‘(they) instantly fade away.’

[Gendai]

A zero nominative in (b) is locally linked with an entity hanabi ‘fireworks’ in the adjacent utterance (a).
(4.10)  a. 日本では まだ オリンピックは
nihon-de-wa  mada  orinpikkku-wa
Japan-in-TOP  yet  Olympics-TOP

ほとんど 知られていなかった。
hotondo  si-rare-te-i-nakat-ta.
hardly  know-PASS-be-NEG-PAST

‘In Japan, the Olympics were hardly known yet.’

b. Ø 選手を 決めるマラソン大会が
(Ø-no) sensyu-o kimeru marason-taikai-ga
(Ø-GEN) athlete-NOM choose marathon-race-NOM

開かれて、…
hirak-re-te, ...

‘The marathon race that chose the athletes (for the Olympic Games) was held, and’

Likewise, a zero genitive in (b) is also locally bound to an entity ‘Olympics’ mentioned in the immediately preceding utterance (a). The antecedents in both examples are topicalized NPs, but they could appear in other phrase types, too. We will examine a further analysis in 4.4.1.5.

Global reference, another member of the first group, is found in 110 cases of zero verbal arguments, and 36 cases of zero nominal arguments. A verbal argument example is given in (4.11).

(4.11)  a. つぎの朝 Ø おきたとき
tugino-asa  (Ø-ga)  oki-ta-toki
next-morning  (Ø-NOM)  wake-up-PAST-when

‘The next morning when (he) woke up,’

b. 雨は つよく ふっていました。
ame-wa  tuyoku  hutte-i-masi-ta.
rain-TOP  heavily  fall-is-POL-PAST

‘it was raining heavily.’

In this example, a zero nominative in (a) is neither intra-clusally nor cataphorically co-referential, but refers a few utterances back to a main character entity ‘Takesi.’
Next, a nominal argument example is given in (4.12).

\[(4.12)\]

a. \(\emptyset\) 眠かったですから、
\[(\emptyset\text{-}ga)\text{ nemuka-tta-kara,}\]
\[(\emptyset\text{-}NOM)\text{ sleepy-PAST-since,}\]

‘Since (they) were sleepy,’

b. \(\emptyset\) まちがいがたくさんありました。
\[(\emptyset\text{-}no)\text{ matigai-ga talusan ari-masi-ta.}\]
\[(\emptyset\text{-GEN})\text{ mistake-NOM many is-POL-PAST}\]

‘many mistakes (in calculation) were found.’

A zero genitive in (b) refers to an entity ‘calculation’ explicitly mentioned in the utterance before (a). Both cases had their antecedents somewhere in the previous context. Further analysis concerning the distance between a ZERO and its antecedent will be provided in 4.4.1.6.

Situational reference is found in 47 cases of zero verbal arguments and nine cases of zero nominal arguments.

\[(4.13)\]

二人が注文し終わると、…
\[\text{hutari-ga (\emptyset-o) tyuumon-si-owaru-to, …}\]
\[\text{two-people-NOM (\emptyset-ACC) ordering-do-finish-when, …}\]

‘When the two finished ordering (dishes), …’

From utterance (4.13), a zero accusative is missing. Given that this utterance appears in a restaurant scenario, what they order is naturally inferred by world knowledge to be ‘dishes on the menu.’

\[(4.14)\]

一人はすぐ\(\emptyset\)窓をふきはじめました。
\[\text{hitori-wa sugu (\emptyset\text{-}no) mado-o huki-hazime-masi-ta.}\]
\[\text{one-person-TOP soon (\emptyset\text{-GEN}) window-o wipe-begin-POL-PAST}\]

‘One person soon began to wipe the windows (of the car).’
Utterance (4.14), on the other hand, is part of a gas station scenario; thus a zero genitive should most plausibly refer to an automobile. Compared, however, to the case in (4.13), this inference is to some degree culture-based; in Japan, it is quite common for gas station attendants to wipe the windows and empty the ashtrays of cars while they are filling them with gas for the customers.

**Group 2**

Intra-clausal ZEROS are apparently a prototypical type for zero nominal arguments (123 cases, 94.62% of total). Typically, this type of zero nominal arguments co-refers with preceding verbal arguments, often subjects, within the clause, as in (4.15).

(4.15) わかものは むすめを Ø 家の 中に
wakamono-wa musume-o (Ø-no) ie-no naka-ni
young-man-TOP young lady-ACC (Ø-GEN) house-GEN inside-in

入れてあげました。
irete-age-masi-ta.
enter-let-POL-PAST

‘The young man let the young lady come inside (his) house.’

This use of ZEROS is constrained by various syntactic conditions, and can often be replaced with a reflexive, *zibun* ‘self,’ which in itself is an active area of research in Japanese syntax (e.g., Aikawa, 1993; Inoue, 1976).

The case of zero verbal arguments with intra-clausal referents is very rare (only seven cases). The example (4.16) is counted as such a case.

(4.16) Ø 兄や友達が お金を Ø
(Ø-no) ani-ya tomodati-ga okane-o (Ø-ni)
(Ø-GEN) brother-and-friend-NOM money-ACC (Ø-DAT)

集めてくれた。
atumete-kure-ta.
collect-EMP-PAST

‘(His) brother and friends raised (him) money.’
In this case, we count an utterance-initial zero genitive as a local ZERO whose referent is found in the previous utterance, and a zero dative as an intra-clausal ZERO that is co-referential with the preceding zero genitive.

Zero verbal arguments, though not so frequently, also co-refer intra-sententially with entities in embedded phrases or clauses that are left within the whole utterance, as in (4.17).

(4.17)  ジェーンがホームステイをしているホストファミリーのお母さんは

Jane-NOM homestay-ACC do host family-GEN mother-TOP

毎朝 ジェーンが 出かける時に、

every-morning Jane-NOM go-out-when-at,

「今日はどこに行くの？」、「何時ごろ帰って来るの？」と

(Ø-ni) “kyo-wa doko-ni iku-no?,” “nanzi-goro kaette-kuru-no?” to

Ø 聞きます。
Ø-ni kiki-masu.
Ø-DAT ask-POL.

‘The mother of the host family whom Jane stays with, asks (Ø ‘her’), “where are you going today?” or “what time are you coming back?” every morning when Jane goes out.’

[Nitizyo]

In this example, a zero dative is co-referential with an entity (underlined) that appears both in a phrase modifying a topic NP and in an embedded subordinate clause.

**Group 3**

The vast majority of indeterminate reference ZEROs (101 cases) are zero verbal arguments, and only three are zero nominal arguments; examples of both cases are found in (4.18).
Utterances (a) and (b) contain zero nominatives that refer to people in general, while a zero genitive of the same type is found in (c). These ZEROS are usually translated as ‘you’ or ‘your’ in English.

The other three types in this group appear only as zero verbal arguments. There are 20 cases of cataphorical reference. All these ZEROS appear in tensed conjuncts and adjuncts, and the referents are found in their main clauses (i.e., the immediately following utterances, with a few exceptions). A stereotypical example is presented in (4.19).

(4.18)  a. Ø コーヒーを 飲むと
(Ø-ga)  koohii-o nomu-to
(Ø-NOM) coffee-ACC drink-when

‘When (you) drink coffee,’

b. Ø 元気に なります。
(Ø-ga)  genkini nari-masu.
(Ø-NOM) energetic get-POL

‘(you) get energetic.

c. Ø 頭の働きが よく なります。
(Ø-no) atama-no hataraki-ga yoku nari-masu.
(Ø-GEN) brain-GEN function-NOM well become-POL

‘(Your) brain functions better.’

(4.19)  a. Ø 美しいかぐや姫のことを 聞いて、
(Ø-ga)  utukusii kaguyahime-no koto-o kii-te
(Ø-NOM) beautiful Princes Kaguya-GEN thing-ACC hear-and

‘(They) heard about beautiful Princes Kaguya, and’

---

6 Carden (1982) and van Hoek (1997) provide empirical evidence that the majority of cataphorical pronoun instances (in English) are found in fronted subordinate clauses.

7 There are two cases in which another subordinate clause intervenes between the utterance with ZEROS and the utterances containing their referents.
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The utterance (a) is in the discourse segment initial position, and there is no previous mention of okoto-tati ‘men’ in the entire discourse. Eight cataphorical cases (out of 20) are of this kind: “first-mention” cataphora. In the other 18 cases, the referents of what we label “cataphorical” ZEROS can also be found in the immediately preceding utterance, across the segment boundary in the adjacent discourse segment; or even beyond several segment boundaries, within the same discourse. These “non-first-mention” types, as well, are intuitively easier to process as (more proximate) cataphorical reference than as (far-reaching) global reference, and thus are labeled as cataphorical.

Event reference is also rare (21 cases), and all of the cases are zero verbal arguments. One example is given in (4.20).

(4.20) a. 映画やマンガの忍者は水の上を歩いたり、
*eiga-ya manga-no ninzya-wa mizu-no ue-o aruitari,*

空を飛んでいる。
*sora-o tondari-site-iru.*

‘Ninjas in films and comics walk on the water and fly in the sky.’

b. でも、Ø 実際は無理だ。
*demo, (Ø-ga) zissai-wa muri-da.*

‘However, that is in fact impossible.’

The ZERO in (b) refers to the action described in (a), namely, “the act of ninjas walking on the water and flying in the sky.” As in this example, ZEROS with event reference

---

8 Kuno (1972) claims that there is no first-mention cataphora. However, our corpus contains some counter-examples.
appear with adjectival predicates, such as taihen-da ‘be-difficult,’ muda-da ‘be-wasteful,’ zannen-da ‘be-pitiable,’ and tanosii ‘be-fun,’ or with verbs that require propositional arguments for their subjects or objects, such as siraberu ‘investigate.’

Lastly, time/weather examples comprise 18 cases, all of which are found in zero verbal argument positions. One such example is given in (4.21).

(4.21) a. そして、また 3年が過ぎて、

sosite, mata 3-nen-ga sugi-te,

‘And another three years have passed, and’

b. Ø 夏に なりました。

(Ø-ga) natu-ni nari-masi-ta.

(Ø-NOM) summer-DAT become-POL-PAST

‘(it) became summer.’

[Minna 2]

So far, we have seen instances in our corpus of the eight referent types, while examining which argument type they tend to appear as. The interrelationship between argument types and referent types is summarized in Table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Referent type</th>
<th>Percent as zero verbal argument</th>
<th>Percent as zero nominal argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>83.65%</td>
<td>16.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>75.34%</td>
<td>24.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>83.93%</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intra-clausal</td>
<td>5.38%</td>
<td>94.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cataphorical</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>97.12%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time/weather</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>average</td>
<td>77.13%</td>
<td>22.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Interrelationship between argument and referent types

In what follows, we will make some super-classifications of the referent types.
### 4.4.1.4 NP versus non-NP antecedents

Among the referent types listed above, local, global, intra-clausal, and cataphorical are ZEROS that co-refer with explicit NP antecedents, while event, situational, indeterminate, and time/weather are ZEROS that do not have any explicit co-referring NP antecedents.

The latter type of ZEROS (and pronouns in English) has attracted the attention of researchers who, in particular, are interested in the problem these ZEROS pose for reference resolution. Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski (2002), for example, claim that 16.1% of the third person personal pronouns found in their English corpus of spontaneous conversation lack NP antecedents. In our corpus, ZEROS with no explicit co-referring NP antecedents comprise 14.40%, while in the email corpus, they made up 36.57%.

The relatively low frequency (14.40%) in our data (compared to the email data) could be accounted for probably by the difference in corpus types. This is an interesting issue to explore, but we will not make any further elaboration here.

### 4.4.1.5 Referents of local ZEROS

As figure 4.2 above shows, our corpus contains 887 “local” ZEROS, whose antecedents are found in the immediately previous utterance. We examined with which type of entities these ZEROS are co-referential. Figure 4.3 presents the frequency of the antecedent types.
The antecedents of local ZEROS are predominantly zero nominatives (41.38%, 367 instances), which typically occurs as a sequence of utterances with ZERO subjects, as in (c)-(f) in the following example.

(4.22)  

a.  

忍者は 昔のスパイだ。

ninzya-wa mukasi-no supai-da.

Ninja-TOP old-time-GEN spy-COP

‘Ninjas are like spies of olden times.’

b.  

忍者は 厳しい訓練を したから、

ninzya-wa kibisii kunren-o si-ta-kara,

Ninja-TOP hard training-ACC do-PAST-as

‘As ninjas did hard training,’
c. Ø各种各样なことができた。
(Ø-ga)iroirona koto-ga deki-ta.
(Ø-NOM)various-thing-NOM can-do-PAST

‘(they) could do various things.’

d. Øスポーツの選手と同じだ。
(Ø-ga)supootu-no sensyu-to onazi-da.
(Ø-NOM)sports players-as same-COP

(They) were like sports players.

e. Øとても速く歩いたり、走ったりすることができた。
(Ø-ga)totemo hayaku aruitari
(Ø-NOM)very fast walking

hasittari-suru-koto-ga deki-ta.
running-do-NOMI-NOM can-do-PAST

(They) could walk or run very fast.’

The second most frequent antecedent type for local ZEROS is NP topic, i.e., NPs accompanied by the topic marking particle, wa (28.97%, 257 cases), as exemplified in (b)-(c) above. Here, almost all the NP topic antecedents (252 instances) turn out to be topicalized subjects. There are only 5 instances of topicalized non-subjects (two objects and three ni-marked locative adjuncts), including example (4.23).

(4.23)  a. 高層住宅にはエレベーターがあるが、
koosoozyuutaku-ni-wa erebeetaa-ga aru-ga,
high-rise-apartment-in-TOP elevator-NOM is-but,

‘Although there are elevators in high-rise apartments,’

b. それでもØ外へ出るのはめんどうなのだろうか。
soredemo (Ø-no) soto-e deru-no-wa mendoona-no-daroo-ka.
still (Ø-GEN)outside-to go-out-NOMI-TOP troublesome-Q

‘is going out (of the apartments) still troublesome?’
Apparently, it is ‘troublesome’ to ‘go out of the apartment,’ not ‘out of the elevator’; the antecedent of a zero genitive in (b) is not an elevator (nominative NP) but an apartment (topic NP, underlined). On the other hand, in example (4.24) below, the antecedent of a zero in (b), underlined, turns out to be a nominative argument ‘boat’ in (a), setting aside a topicalized locative argument ‘ship.’

(4.24)  a. 船には十分なボートがなかったので、

hune-ni-wa jyuubunna booto-ga naka-ta-node,

ship-on-TOP enough boat-NOM lack-PAST-since

‘As there were not enough boats on the ship,’

b. まず女の人と子どもがØ乗りました。

mazu onnanohito-to kodomo-ga (Ø-ni) nori-masi-ta.

first women-and child-NOM (Ø-in) get-POL-PAST

‘Women and children first got in (them ‘the boats’).’

There seems to be a difference between topicalized subjects and topicalized non-subjects as far as their topicality (or saliency) status. Recall that Kameyama (1985) excluded topicalized adjuncts (e.g., locatives) from entities entitled to be considered highest-ranking TOPICS in her CF lists.

Still, some ZEROS directly follow NP nominatives, i.e., NPs marked with the nominative particle, ga, without initial topicalization (8.13%, 72 cases), as in (4.25).

(4.25)  a. 長くある村にびんぼうなわかものが住んでいました。

mukasi aru mura-ni binboona wakamono-ga

long ago certain village-in poor young-man-NOM

sunde-i-masi-ta.

live-be-POL-PAST

‘Long ago, a poor young man lived in a village.’
b. ある日、Ø道で矢がささったつるを
aru-hi, (Ø-ga) miti-de ya-ga sasatta turu-o
one-day, (Ø-NOM) road-on arrow-NOM stuck crane-ACC

見つけました。
mituke-masi-ta.
find-POL-PAST

‘One day, (he) found a crane stuck with an arrow on the road.’

[Hiroko 2]

Also, referential chains created by a zero-genitive-ZERO (of any type) sequence are not rare; in fact, they are the fourth most frequent (5.98%, 53 cases). This is instantiated in (4.26).

(4.26) a. Ø値段も高すぎましたから、
(Ø-no) nedan-mo taka-sugi-masi-ta-kara,
(Ø-GEN) price-FOC high-too-POL-PAST-since

‘As (its ‘curry’s) price was too expensive,’

b. 普通の人はあまりØ
hutuu-no hito-wa amari (Ø-o)
ordinary-GENpeople-TOP often (Ø-ACC)

食べることができませんでした。
taberu-koto-ga deki-mase-n-desi-ta.
eat-ing-NOM able-POL-NEG-COP-PAST

‘ordinary people could not eat (it ‘curry’) often.’

[Minna 2]

The remaining antecedent types comprise less than 4% each. This data provides suggestive evidence that (overt or covert) subjects, regardless of whether they are topicalized or not, are the most likely antecedent candidates for local ZEROS. Here again, the role of zero genitives may be worth noting; we will return to this topic later.
4.4.1.6 How far is global?

“Global” ZEROS are the second most frequent type after “local” both in our corpus (146 occurrences, 10.56%) and in the email corpus (48 occurrences, 17.91%). Like “local” ZEROS, the referents of global ZEROS do exist somewhere in the previous discourse; unlike “local,” they occur at a long distance. This brings up the question, “how far is global?” That is, how many utterances typically separate a ZERO from its antecedent in these cases? Figure 4.4 shows the results from our corpus.

![Figure 4.4: Distance from antecedent to “global” ZERO measured in # of utterances](image)

Here, the ZEROS whose antecedents are found in the utterances immediately adjacent (i.e., at a distance of one), but beyond the discourse segment boundary, are also counted as “global.” Thus, the distance ranges from one to 13 utterances, averaging 2.51 utterances.\(^9\) In this corpus, the majority of “global” references are to antecedents that are only two or three utterances away from their ZERO references. However, there are 55 cases in which the reach is across one or more discourse segment(s), regardless of the distance.

\(^9\) This average distance is a little shorter than that of the email corpus (3.35 utterances).
4.4.2 Basic facts: CENTERS and TRANSITIONS

In this subsection, we present some basic facts concerning the corpus regarding CENTER realization and TRANSITION distribution, before we go on to detailed TRANSITION sequence-based analyses of ZERO-involving coherence in Section 4.4.3.

4.4.2.1 CENTER realization

Our main concern is the behavior of ZEROS that is explicated by the centering mechanism. For the sake of comparison, we divide the possible CB forms linguistically realized in an utterance into two major types: ZERO and non-ZERO. Here, non-ZERO forms include repeated names (e.g., Tanaka-san, ‘Mr. Tanaka’) and bare nouns (e.g., kaisya, ‘the company’), demonstratives (e.g., kore, ‘this’), demonstrative nouns (e.g., kono kawa, ‘this river’) and lexical pronouns (e.g., kare, ‘he’). ZEROS include, according to what we defined in Chapter 2, both zero verbal arguments and zero nominal arguments. As for ZERO referent types, only “local,” “situational” and “cataphorical” are considered as CB candidates, i.e., entities listed in CF.10

Figure 4.5 shows the distribution of CENTER realization forms.

Out of the total of 2,007 utterances in the corpus, 314 (15.65%) have no CBs because of their discourse segment-initial (DSI) positions, and another 445 (22.17%) utterances in discourse segment medial (DSM) positions have no CBs either, for some

---

10 “Global” ZEROS are naturally excluded by the centering constraint on CENTERS. “Intra-clausal” is outside the scope of centering, and is instead treated by a syntactic constraint, like binding (see Yamura, 1996 for discussion). “Time/weather” corresponds to expletives that are also outside the scope of centering. The remaining two types, “event” and “indeterminate,” are often the subject of debate concerning their validity as CENTERS. We exclude these two from the CB candidates for the present study.
possible reasons that we will investigate and discuss in 4.4.3.5. These utterances with no CBs are labeled NULL (see Chapter 3). The remaining 1,248 utterances do have CBs that are realized by either ZEROS (841 utterances, 41.90%) or non-ZEROS (407 utterances, 20.28%). The occurrence of ZERO CBs is more than double that of non-ZERO CBs. This result shows the significant role of ZEROS in creating entity-based coherence.

According to Iida (1998) who examined Japanese newspaper texts (which consisted of 250 utterances), CBs in 51.11% of utterances are realized by ZEROS, which is roughly comparable to our result.

4.4.2.2 CB types

Next, we further examined what forms and grammatical roles those CBs take. The result is summarized in Figure 4.6.

At the top come zero nominatives (651 cases, 32.44%). This is followed by topic-marked NPs (188 cases, 9.37%), 180 of which are topicalized subjects. These two major CB realization forms suggest the prominent role of subjects in centering, as is
observed in other languages as well (e.g., Turan, 1998).

The next most frequent type is zero nominal arguments (132 cases, 6.58%). This figure is striking, particularly when compared to the other zero verbal argument CBS: zero accusatives (24 cases, 1.20%); zero datives (23 cases, 1.15%); and zero adjuncts (11 cases, 0.55%). Apparently, zero nominal arguments deserve more attention than they have previously received in the centering literature. We will further discuss the role of zero nominal arguments in the centering mechanism in the following sections.

### 4.4.2.3 Sample centering analysis

Before we go on to examine the distribution of TRANSITION types, this subsection presents a sample discourse segment from our corpus (4.27), in order to characterize each TRANSITION type both in intuitive and centering terms. The segment consists of the following eight utterances.

(4.27) a. 江戸時代は藩があった。
   edo-jidai-wa han-ga arimasi-ta.
   Edo-era-TOP feudal clan-NOM exist-POL-PAST

   ‘In the Edo era, there were feudal clans.’

b. Ø 今の県とだいたい同じです。
   (Ø-ga) ima-no ken-to daitai onaji-desu.
   (Ø-NOM) current-GEN prefecture-to roughly equivalent-COP

   ‘They are roughly equivalent to the current prefectures.’

c. 藩に大名がいました。
   han-ni daimyo-ga i-masi-ta.
   clan-in feudal lord-NOM be-POL-PAST

   ‘In each clan, there resided a feudal lord.’

d. 大名は自分の藩と江戸に Øうちがあって。
   daimyo-wa zibun-no han-to edo-ni (Ø-no) uti-ga atte,
   clan-TOP self-GEN clan-and Edo-in (Ø-GEN) home-NOM be,

   ‘Feudal lords had (their) homes both in their clans and in Edo, and’
住まなければなりませんでした。
live-have-to-POL-PAST

'(they) had to live one year in (their) clans and another year in Edo.'

妻と子どもは江戸に住んでいました。
live-be-POL-PAST

'(Their) wives and children lived in Edo.'

江戸まで歩いて行かなければなりませんでしたから、
walk-go-have-to-POL-PAST-because

'(They) had to walk as far as Edo, so'

とても大変でした。
tough-COP-PAST

'it was very tough.'
(4.28) Utterance (a) provides ‘clan’ as a potential topic, 
Utterance (b) continues ‘clan,’ 
Utterance (c) retains ‘clan’ and introduces ‘feudal lord,’ 
Utterance (d) shifts attention to ‘feudal lord,’ 
Utterance (e) continues ‘feudal lord,’ 
Utterance (f) retains ‘feudal lord’ and introduces ‘wife and children,’ 
Utterance (g) continues ‘feudal lord,’ and 
Utterance (h) sums up, without referring to any specific entity.

Finally, a very technical centering account for this segment is provided; the CENTER structure and TRANSITION state are computed for each utterance in the segment in (4.29).

(4.29) 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CF:</th>
<th>TRANSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>clan &gt; Edo era</td>
<td>NULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clan</td>
<td>(clan) &gt; prefecture</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clan</td>
<td>feudal lord &gt; clan</td>
<td>RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>feudal lord &gt; home &gt; clan &gt; Edo</td>
<td>SHIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>(feudal lord) &gt; clan &gt; Edo</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>wife and children &gt; (feudal lord) &gt; Edo</td>
<td>RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>(feudal lord) &gt; Edo</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>NULL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The centering account perfectly matches the intuitively perceived topic (dis)continuity. For instance, the “gradual shift” to a new topic is realized by a RETAIN in (d) followed by a SHIFT in (c). A “short-lived” entity is accounted for by a CONTINUE in (g) followed by a RETAIN in (f), and so on.

We will use this ‘feudal lord’ discourse segment several times later, when we discuss TRANSITION sequences in more detail in 4.4.3.1.

### 4.4.2.4 TRANSITION types

Figure 4.7 shows the distribution of the four TRANSITION types (CONTINUE, RETAIN, \(^{12}\) SMOOTH-SHIFT, and ROUGH-SHIFT), plus DS-initial NULL and DS-medial NULL, assigned to all 2,007 utterances in the corpus.

\(^{12}\) Our CONTINUE and RETAIN include what Kameyama (1985) calls “Center Establishment” (i.e., the TRANSITION between an utterance without a CB and one with a CB). Here, we follow Walker, Iida and Cote (1994) and include, in the definition of CONTINUE and RETAIN, TRANSITION states from utterances without CBs.
As Table 4.4 below shows, the relative proportion of each TRANSITION type is in the order of the single TRANSITION preferences predicted by Brenann et al. (1987), with a considerable number of CONTINUEs, followed by a respectable number of RETAINs, and then SMOOTH-SHIFTS, and a very few ROUGH-SHIFTS. This proportion is roughly equivalent to those examined for other languages.\textsuperscript{13}

![Figure 4.7: Distribution of centering TRANSITIONS](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIN</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOOTH-SHIFT</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGH-SHIFT</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NULL</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Cross-linguistic comparison of TRANSITION distribution

In earlier studies of centering based on constructed examples, the existence of the NULL TRANSITION state (or elsewhere called “No CB” condition) had not been recognized. More recent corpus-based studies, however, reveal an abundance of occurrences of NULL in naturally-occurring data. The proportion of NULL, counting both DS-initial and DS-medial, in our corpus turns out to be 37.82%. In Poesio et al.’s data, the utterances with NULL TRANSITIONS make up 63.98%. The NULL

\textsuperscript{13} Poesio et al. (2004) examined an English corpus and Roh and Lee (2003a, b) analyzed Korean data taken from news, story and descriptive texts. Roh and Lee did not provide the number of NULL utterances, if any, so the percentage presented in the table cannot be compared directly to those in the other two studies.
TRANSITION, however, does not necessarily indicate coherence breakdown in a discourse, nor is a sequence of NULL-labeled utterances always perceived as totally incoherent. This, in a sense, argues that a centering-based account of coherence should be supplemented by a more global view of coherence or by other approaches to coherence, such as a so-called relation-based approach.

4.4.2.5 Distribution of ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs

Figure 4.8 presents the distribution of the TRANSITION types according to ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs realized in each utterance. This result presents a significant difference among the four TRANSITIONS in terms of their preference for ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs ($x^2 = 83.82$, DF=3, $p < .001$).

![Figure 4.8: Distribution of TRANSITIONS in terms of ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs](image)

ROUGH-SHIFT is the only TRANSITION state in which non-ZERO CBSs are preferred over ZERO-CBSs, but the degree of preference (measured simply by the frequency) apparently varies among the other three TRANSITION states; CONTINUE shows the strongest preference for ZERO-CBSs, followed by SMOOTH-SHIFT, and RETAIN shows a weaker preference. This result is roughly compatible with that reported by Tanimura and Yoshida (2003) who examined Japanese narratives based on the Pear Film (Chafe, 1980) produced by native speakers. The frequency of the TRANSITION types with respect to ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs in their data is reproduced in Figure 4.9.
On the other hand, the result in Iida (1998) presents a rather unique distribution, as shown in Figure 4.10 below.

The high frequency of NON-ZERO CBSs in RETAIN and ZERO CBSs in SMOOTH-SHIFT TRANSITIONS are two major characteristics. We suspect that this is partially due to differences in the way these TRANSITIONS are defined.

Let us next examine the distribution of ZERO CBSs in each TRANSITION type. The relative proportion of ZERO CBSs in each TRANSITION type is given in Table 4.6 below.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITION</th>
<th>% (# of ZERO CB / # of utterances)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>77.02% (573/744)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIN</td>
<td>52.13% (147/282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMOOTH-SHIFT</td>
<td>58.86% (93/158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGH-SHIFT</td>
<td>43.75% (28/64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>67.39% (841/1,248)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Proportion of ZERO CBSs in TRANSITIONS

The most striking feature of this table is the outstandingly dominant role of ZERO CBSs in CONTINUE. In our corpus, ZEROS are used 77% of the time. When we compare CONTINUE and all the other TRANSITIONS combined (see Table 4.7 below) in terms of the distribution of ZEROS/non-ZEROS, there is a significant difference ($x^2 = 77.713$, $p < .001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSITION</th>
<th>ZERO CBS</th>
<th>non-ZERO CBS</th>
<th>ratio of ZERO CBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other TRANSITIONS</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7: Comparison of CONTINUE and other TRANSITIONS

This leads to the most well defined hypothesis concerning the interaction between CB forms and TRANSITION types, in (4.30).

(4.30) The CONTINUE hypothesis:

ZEROS, rather than more explicit forms (e.g., full NPs, strong pronouns), are used to CONTINUE the CENTER.

Iida (1998) confirms, based on her analysis of Japanese newspaper texts, the validity of this hypothesis; ZEROS are used more than 90% of the time in CONTINUE, with a significant difference between that and the use of ZEROS in other TRANSITION types ($x^2 = 53.932$, $p < .001$). Di Eugenio (1998) presents a similar tendency in Italian; ZEROS are strongly preferred (80% of the time) in CONTINUE, but not in other TRANSITIONS, with a significant difference between the two groups ($x^2 = 9.204$, $p < .001$), which is a compatible result to our Japanese data (see Table 4.7). She claims that the usage of ZEROS for CONTINUE is seemingly “a robust cross-linguistic phenomenon (page
The tendency expressed in the CONTINUE hypothesis, however, is not clearly observed among the other three TRANSITION types ($\chi^2 = 4.54$, DF=2, $p < .020$); ZEROS and non-ZEROS are roughly equally used to realize the CENTERS. Rather striking is the fact that ZEROS are as frequently used as non-ZEROS in those TRANSITIONS. That is, ZEROS, as well as non-ZEROS, are used to signal a shift (RETAIN) and to make a shift (SMOOTH-SHIFT and ROUGH-SHIFT) in the CENTER. This is compatible with Iida (1998) who concludes that “full NPs are not always used to shift the CENTER, and ZEROS frequently are” (page 163).

Some researchers claim that ROUGH-SHIFT is extremely rare (2% in Hurewitz’s (1998) English corpus) and it is often collapsed into other TRANSITIONS in their analyses. Our corpus, as well, exhibits ROUGH-SHIFT in only 3.34% of the utterances (see Figure 4.8 above), but the two SHIFT states (SMOOTH and ROUGH) are significantly different from each other in terms of the preference for ZERO/non-ZERO CBS ($\chi^2 = 4.19$, DF=1, $p < .005$). So we keep this distinction, when applicable, and abandon it, when irrelevant, in the subsequent discussion.

Although these figures present an interesting characterization concerning certain aspects of centering phenomena, a single-TRANSITION-based analysis will not best characterize the relationship among the perceived degree of coherence of a given discourse, TRANSITIONS and the use of ZEROS, as we discussed earlier. In the next section, we will move on to the TRANSITION-sequence-based analyses of the corpus.
4.4.3 Main Facts: Coherence and ZEROS

We have so far seen some fundamental facts concerning the types and distribution of ZEROS and single-TRANSITION-based centering analysis of the corpus. This section presents some further facts concerning the interrelationship between the use of ZEROS and degrees of discourse coherence that centering principles can account for, which in fact is the main part of our corpus study.

Here, we follow Di Eugenio (1998) among others, and take a TRANSITION-sequence approach to examining the distribution of ZEROS in relation to centering-predicted degrees of coherence. Di Eugenio, in analyzing the CONTINUE TRANSITION in her data, considers the possible TRANSITION states of the utterance $U_{i-1}$ that precedes the utterance $U_i$ in which a CONTINUE occurs, and presents three different TRANSITION sequence patterns: CON-CON, RET-CON and SHIFT-CON. Although she limited her analysis to the CONTINUE sequence group due to the small number of samples of the RETAIN and SHIFT sequences found in her corpus, we extend our analysis to the other sequence groups with fairly rich samples. As a result, we have eleven different sequence patterns: (i) CON-CON, (ii) RET-CON, (iii) SHIFT-CON, (iv) NULL-CON, (v) CON-RET, (vi) RET-RET, (vii) SHIFT-RET, (viii) NULL-RET, (ix) CON-SHIFT, (x) RET-SHIFT, and (xi) SHIFT-SHIFT, all of which we presented earlier in 3.2.3.5. One novel contribution of this corpus study is the comprehensiveness of this analysis.\(^\text{14}\)

Perceived degrees of coherence of certain ZERO-involving discourses or the amount of inferential cost required in processing those discourses is our prime concern, and this cost can be tested through behavioral psychological experiments. Psychological studies, like those previously conducted by Gordon, Grosz, and Gillion (1993) and Brennan (1995), are outside the scope and the interest of this study, and thus, we take an empirical (corpus-based) approach.

Our fundamental assumption is that “invisible” ZERO CBs tend to appear in centering conditions that require less inferential demand, while “visible” non-ZERO CBs are used in centering conditions that require more inference cost, on the ground that texts are generally planned so that they turn out to be unambiguous. We conjecture that the analysis result of “real data” concerning the ZERO/non-ZERO CB distribution will provide an indication of relative degrees of inferential cost that certain environments impose. That is, a certain TRANSITION sequence in which more ZERO CBs appear should be less costly in terms of inference demand in interpreting a discourse containing that TRANSITION sequence.

\(^\text{14}\) Other corpus studies that take TRANSITION-sequence approach include Turan (1995) for Turkish, Prasad (2003) for Hindi, Roh and Lee (2002) for Korean, and Poesio et al. (2002, 2004) for English, none of which explicitly present data concerning all the eleven sequence patterns. Many of these attempts, including ours, were made after (and probably in answer to) Grosz and Sidner (1998) who described the utterance-based approach to Rule 2 as one outcome of “lost intuitions and forgotten intentions” of the original centering.
Based on this assumption, we examined the distribution of ZERO/non-ZERO CBs in each sequence pattern. The result is summarized in Figure 4.1. Recall that a TRANSITION sequence involves three successive utterances, in which the label is assigned in the last utterance. Here, we see whether that last utterance contains a ZERO/non-ZERO CB (see 3.2.3.5 for detailed discussion on TRANSITION sequences).

Figure 4.11: Distribution of ZERO/non-ZERO CBs in TRANSITION sequence patterns

Apparently, there is a difference in CB type distribution within the same TRANSITION sequence groups; compare, for example, RET-CON and SHIFT-CON in the CONTINUE group, and also CON-SHIFT and RET-SHIFT in the SHIFT group.

In the following subsections, we attempt to characterize each sequence pattern, both theoretically, based on centering predictions concerning the amount of inference required to process certain sequences, and empirically, based on relevant samples from our corpus. We also provide statistical evidence from the corpus, in an attempt to support those observations.
4.4.3.1 ZEROS in the CONTINUE sequence type

In Section 4.4.2.4 above, we provided suggestive evidence for the hypothesis that ZEROS are strongly preferred to CONTINUE the CENTER both from our corpus study and from some previous studies. Although the hypothesis appears to be a statistically (and cross-linguistically) valid claim, there still remains room for further investigation; whether every CONTINUE state constitutes a “preferable” environment for ZERO CBS. Here, we pay attention to the TRANSITION state of a preceding utterance, as well.

Figure 4.12 below shows the occurrences of ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs in utterances in the four TRANSITION sequence patterns of the CONTINUE group.

![Figure 4.12: Distribution of ZERO/non-ZERO CBSs in CONTINUE sequences](image)

The figure indicates that there is a significant difference, among the four types of TRANSITION sequence type, in the tendency to realize CBS by either ZERO or non-ZERO ($\chi^2 = 85.60, \text{DF}=3, p < .001$). We will further examine each sequence with a focus on ZERO CBSs.

**CON-CON**

The CON-CON sequence is considered to be the most coherent (GJW95). Here, an utterance in the CON-CON sequence means an utterance labeled CONTINUE that follows an utterance also labeled CONTINUE. Look at a prototypical example of this type from our corpus, in (4.31).

(4.31) a. トム君のお父さんは、日本に来的前に、
    Tom-GEN father-TOP, Japan-to come-before-at,
‘Before Tom’s father came to Japan,’

b. Ø アメリカで 日本語を 勉強しませんでした。
   (Ø-ga) amerika-de nihongo-o benkyoo-si-mase-n-desi-ta.
   (Ø-NOM) America-in Japanese-ACC studying-do-POL-NEG-PAST

‘(he) didn’t study Japanese in America.’

[NULL-CON]

c. Ø 日本に 来て、
   (Ø-ga) nihon-ni ki-te,
   (Ø-NOM) Japan-to come-and,

‘After (he) came to Japan,’

[CON-CON]

d. Ø 日本語を 勉強しました。
   (Ø-ga) nihongo-o benkyoo-si-masi-ta.
   (Ø-NOM) Japanase-ACC studying-do-POL-PAST

‘(he) studied Japanese.’

[CON-CON]

[Hiroko 1]

The use of ZEROS in the CON-CON sequences, as in utterances (c) and (d), is straightforward and far from ambiguous. This sequence is typical in beginning level JSL texts, as an introductory sample discourse that contains ZEROS.

Out of 346 examples of this sequence, 306 cases realize their CENTERS by means of ZEROS (88%). This ratio is convincingly higher than that of ZEROS in the CONTINUE group as a whole (77.02%). From this data, we conjecture that the CON-CON is a more adequate indication than the single CONTINUE TRANSITION of a preferable environment for ZEROS.

NULL-CON, SHIFT-CON and RET-CON

Recall the ‘feudal lord’ discourse segment that we presented in 4.4.2.3, which perfectly fits our purpose of examining these three sequence patterns in the CON sequence group. Let us reproduce the segment below as (4.32).
(4.32) a. 江戸時代は藩がありました。
edo-jidai-wa han-ga ari-masi-ta.
Edo-era-TOP feudal clan-NOM exist-POL-PAST

‘In the Edo era, there were feudal clans.’

b. 今の県とだいたい同じです。
(Ø-ga) ima-no ken-to daitai onaji-desu.
(Ø-NOM) current-GEN prefecture-to roughly equivalent-COP

‘They are roughly equivalent to the current prefectures.’

c. 藩に大名がいました。
han-ni daimyo-ga i-masi-ta.
clan-in feudal lord-NOM be-POL-PAST

‘In each clan, there resided a feudal lord.’

d. 大名は自分の藩と江戸にうちがあったって、
daimyo-wa zibun-no han-to edo-ni (Ø-no) uti-ga atte,
clan-TOP self-GEN clan-and Edo-in (Ø-GEN) home-NOM be,

‘Feudal lords had (their) homes both in their clans and in Edo, and’

e. 藩に1年、江戸に1年
han-ni 1-nen, edo-ni 1-nen

(Ø-NOM)(Ø-GEN) clan-in 1-year, Edo-in 1-year

住まなければなりませんでした。
sum-anakereba-narimasen-desi-ta.
live-have-to-POL-PAST

‘(they) had to live one year in (their) clans and another year in Edo.’

f. 奥さんと子どもは江戸に住んでいました。
okusan-to kodomo-wa edo-ni sunde-i-masi-ta
wife-and children-TOP Edo-in live-be-POL-PAST

‘(Their) wives and children lived in Edo.’
g. Ø 江戸まで 歩いて行かなければなりませんでしたから、  
(O-ga) edo-made aruite-ik-anakereba-narimasen-desi-ta-kara,  
(O-NOM) Edo-as far as walk-go-have-to-POL-PAST-because  

‘(They) had to walk as far as Edo, so’

h. Ø とても 大変でした。  
(O-ga) totemo taihen-desi-ta.  
(O-NOM) very tough-COP-PAST  

‘it was very tough.’

The CENTER structure of each utterance is also presented, this time labeled with a TRANSITION sequence type, in (4.33). The CF elements realized by ZEROS are indicated by parentheses.

(4.33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>Sequence Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>clan &gt; Edo era</td>
<td>NULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clan</td>
<td>(clan) &gt; prefecture</td>
<td>NULL-CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clan</td>
<td>feudal lord &gt; clan</td>
<td>CON-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>feudal lord &gt; home &gt; clan &gt; Edo</td>
<td>RET-SHIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>(feudal lord) &gt; clan &gt; Edo</td>
<td>SHIFT-CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>wife/children &gt; (feudal lord) &gt; Edo</td>
<td>CON-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feudal lord</td>
<td>(feudal lord) &gt; Edo</td>
<td>RET-CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>NULL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three sequence patterns with which we are concerned here are indicated in bold. We will look at how these TRANSITION sequence types interact differently with the distribution of CB types, and attempt to explicate the reasons for that difference.

The segment starts with the NULL-CON sequence, in utterances (a) and (b). The CONTINUE in this sequence is equivalent to Kameyama’s (1986) “Center Establishment.”15 This sequence is the second most frequent (283 cases) after the CON-CON, and also shows preference for ZERO CENTERS (69% of the time), but not as

---

15 Walker, Iida and Cote (1994) proposed that utterances that follow an utterance without a CB should also be classified as center continuations; the idea is that even the first utterance of a segment does have a CB, but this CB is initially underspecified, and is only determined when the second utterance is processed. The idea of Kameyama (1986), on the contrary, is that center continuation and center establishment should be differentiated. Our label NULL-CON, in this sense, stands in the spirit of the latter idea.
strongly as the CON-CON (88%).

Second, the utterances (d) and (e) constitute the SHIFT-CON sequence. The SHIFT TRANSITION is a state that establishes a shift from the previous CENTER (‘clan’ in this example) to a new one (‘feudal lord’). Therefore, shifts will naturally be “followed by a sequence of continuations characterizing another stretch of locally coherence discourse” (GJW95, page 215). Thus, the interpretation of ZEROS in this sequence is predicted not to require a lot of inferential effort. The occurrence of this sequence itself is not very frequent (60 cases), but the preference goes to ZERO CENTERS as frequently as 83% of the time.

Finally, we will turn to the RET-CON sequence that is characterized by utterances (f) and (g). RETAIN, by definition, is a state that signals a subsequent CENTER shift by realizing the CENTER in a less salient position. The reader is warned by this signal (i.e., realization of the CENTER ‘feudal lord’ from the previous utterance in a lower ranked position), and predicts a topic change to a newly introduced entity, ‘wife-and-children’ in this case. This RETAIN-driven signal, however, is followed by a CONTINUE that maintains the old CENTER in this sequence. This contra-prediction sequence may cause some inferential cost in interpreting ZEROS even though the utterance alone is in the presumably most coherent TRANSITION state, i.e., CONTINUE.

In order for the ZERO in this “problematic” sequence to be accurately interpreted, additional information resources, other than centering, are necessary. In this particular case, it is inferencing from “contextual knowledge” concerning who lives in Edo and in the clan. We will later summarize potential resources of inference that supplement centering mechanisms in perceiving ZERO-containing discourse as reasonably coherent, in 4.6.3.

A clear contrast can be observed if the utterance (g) is replaced with (g’) below.

(4.34’) f. Ø 奥さんと子どもは 江戸に 住んでいました。

(Ø-no) okusan-to kodomo-wa edo-ni sunde-i-masi-ta
(Ø-GEN) wife-and children-TOP Edo-in live-be-POL-PAST

‘(Their) wives and children lived in Edo.’

g’. Ø 藩へ 行くことは ゆるされませんでした。

(Ø-ga) han-e iku-koto-wa yuru-sare-masen-desi-ta.
(Ø-NOM) clan-to go-NOMI-TOP allow-CAUS-NEG-POL-PAST

‘(They) were not allowed to go to the clan.’

16 In our configuration of the CF ranking, zero nominal argument entities are ranked lower than their head noun entities.
Unlike the original discourse, attention is shifted to ‘wife and children,’ as predicted, creating a SHIFT in (g’), hence constituting a RET-SHIFT sequence in (f) and (g’). Theoretically, this sequence provides a more natural flow of CENTER management, in the sense that the prediction is fulfilled.\footnote{Hence, this sequence is “theoretically” anticipated to be easier to process for Japanese speakers and probably for Japanese learners, but we need to wait until it is empirically verified (see Chapter 8).} We will return to this RET-SHIFT sequence in 4.4.3.3.

Before we move on to the next sequence, let us provide another example of the RET-CON from our corpus in (4.34).

(4.34) a. しげる君はいたずらが好きな子です。
Sigeru-kun-wa itazura-ga sukina-ko desu.
Sigeru-TOP mischief-NOM like-kid COP
‘Sigeru is a mischievous kid.’

b. 先生がいくら注意してもRET
sensei-ga ikura (Ø-ni) cyuui-site-mo
teacher-NOM how-often Ø-DAT warning-do-though
‘No matter how often teachers may warn (him) not to,’

c. Øいたずらをします。
(Ø-ga) itazura-o si-masu.
(Ø-NOM) mischief-ACC do-POL
‘(he) keeps causing mischief.’

The CENTER ‘Sigeru’ is retained in (b) and a new entity sensei ‘teacher’ is introduced in a subject position, which signals a shift to this new entity. In (c), however, the old CENTER ‘Sigeru’ is realized by a subject ZERO, and hence the CONTINUE. If we apply the Zero Topic Assignment (ZTA) rule proposed by Walker, Iida and Cote (1990, 1994) here, this can be interpreted as a CON-CON sequence, but we assume that applying the rule also requires some, if not a great deal of, intentional or strategic inference. A number of factors, such as “contextual knowledge” from (a), “commonly-held knowledge” about who does warning and who does mischief, and the “conjunctive relation” between (b) and (c), seem to enable the interpretation of ZERO in this contra-prediction condition (see 4.6.3 for a summary).

The frequency of this RET-CON sequence is as low (56 cases and 7.51% of the
CON sequence group) as that of the SHIFT-CON, but there is a significant difference between the two sequence patterns, in the way they realize CENTERS ($x^2 = 25.626, p < .001$). In the RET-CON sequence, ZEROS are less frequently used (37.5% of the time).

**Summary of the CONTINUE group**

The three different sequence patterns in the CONTINUE group have different status in terms of preference for ZERO CENTERS. This is summarized in Table 4.8, where the four sequence patterns are categorized as either “low-cost,” “medium,” or “high-cost”; this grouping was hypothesized earlier in Chapter 3, based on the centering prediction, defined as Rule 2, concerning inferential cost required by a certain sequence of TRANSITIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>centering prediction</th>
<th>sequence</th>
<th># of ZERO CB</th>
<th># of non-ZERO CB</th>
<th>% of ZERO CBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“low-cost”</td>
<td>CON-CON</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>88.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIFT-CON</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“medium”</td>
<td>NULL-CON</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“high-cost”</td>
<td>RET-CON</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: ZERO occurrences in CON sequences

When the three groups (“low-cost,” “medium” and “high-cost”) are compared, they present a significant difference in the distribution of ZERO CBS ($x^2 = 87.509, DF=2, p < .001$). That is, our theory-driven distinction is now supported by statistical evidence. Di Eugenio (1998) presents a similar result for Italian zero pronouns. Turan (1995) also found similar results in the comparison of null and explicit pronouns in Turkish.

**4.4.3.2 ZEROS in the RETAIN sequence type**

Before we examine ZEROS in RETAIN-labeled utterances, let us first clarify the environment defined as RETAIN.

**What is RETAIN?**

Unlike CONTINUE or SHIFT that “literally” continues or shifts CENTERS respectively, RETAIN is a state that is not as straightforward in capturing its precise function. However, the RETAIN TRANSITION plays an important role in CENTER management.

As well as the CONTINUE TRANSITION, RETAIN keeps the same CENTER from the previous utterance, but the realization of the current CENTER in a less salient position in
the utterance suggests the introduction of a potential new CENTER placed in a more salient position in the utterance. This functions as a sort of signal or warning for a subsequent CENTER shift. Therefore, capturing this signal may lead to a smoother shift of attention to another entity.

RETAIN is established by means of two conditions: (i) introduction of a potential new CENTER and (ii) allocation of a previous CENTER to a less salient position. In other words, the RETAIN state of a certain utterance (Uᵢ) involves two entities; one is the previous CENTER, CB (Uᵢ₋₁), that is realized in a lower-ranked position, such as OBJECT or ADNOMINAL, of Uᵢ, and the other is the CP (Uᵢ), which is either a totally new entity, a globally retrieved entity, or a non-CB member of CF (Uᵢ₋₁). The realization of these two entities can be made either explicitly (via non-ZEROS) or implicitly (via ZEROS), which constitutes four possible combinations. Each combination is presented below with relevant examples from our corpus.

(i) non-ZERO CP/ non-ZERO CB

(4.35)  
a. ひろこさんは 2じに えみさんの うちへ いきました。  
hiroko-san-wa 2-zi-ni emi-san-no ie-e iki-masi-ta.  
Hiroko-TOP 2-o'clock-at Emi-GEN house-to go-POL-PAST

‘Hiroko went to Emi’s house at 2 o’clock.’

b. えみさんは ひろこさんの ともだち です。  
emi-san-wa hiroko-san-no tomodati desu.  
Emi-TOP Hiroko-GEN friend COP

‘Emi is Hiroko’s friend.’

In (b), both entities, Hiroko (CB) and Emi (CP), are realized with explicit mention of names.

(ii) non-ZERO CP/ZERO CB

(4.36)  
a. 船には 十分な ボートが なかったので、  
hune-ni-wa zyubunna booto-ga nakat-ta-node.  
ship-on-TOP enough boat-NOM lack-PAST-because

‘As the ship lacked enough boats,’
b. まず 女の人と 子供が Ø 乗りました。

mazu onnanohito-to kodomo-ga (Ø-ni) nori-masi-ta.
first woman-and child-NOM (Ø-on) get-in-POL-PAST

‘women and children rode in the boats first.’

In (b), a new entity ‘woman-and-child’ is explicitly introduced as CP, while CB is realized as a ZERO.

(iii) ZERO CP/non-ZERO CB

(4.37) a. 初めに パンとサラダが たくさん 出てきた。

hazimeni pan-to sarada-ga takusan dete-ki-ta.
first bread-and salad-NOM much come-out-PAST

‘First, a lot of bread and salad were served.’

b. Ø それを 食べながら

(Ø-ga) sore-o tabe-nagara ...
(Ø-NOM) that-ACC at-while

‘While (they) were eating that, …”

[Sokudoku]

In (b), CB is realized explicitly as a demonstrative pronoun, while CP is realized as ZERO whose referent is globally located beyond the utterance (a).

(iv) ZERO CP/ZERO CB

(4.38) a. 犬も くまも ロボットなで,

ini-mo kuma-mo robotto na-node,
dog-FOC bear-FOC robot COP-because

‘Because those dogs and bears are robots,’

b. Ø Ø 食べ物を やったり、… しなくてもよい。

(Ø-ga) (Ø-ni) tabemono-o ya-ttari, … si-nakute-mo-yoi
(Ø-NOM) (Ø-DAT) food-ACC give … do-not-need-to
‘(They ‘the owners’) do not need to give (them ‘robot dogs and bears’) food’

[Minna 2]

In (b), the two entities are realized as ZEROS; the CB is a “locally” referential ZERO, whereas the CP is a situationally evoked ZERO entity.

We have seen examples for the four possible CP/CB combinations for RETAIN. Turning now to the frequency of each combination, we see an interesting tendency. CP is realized via non-ZEROS in the majority of cases (91.13% of the time: 43.62% plus 47.52% in the table), which is intuitively a reasonable choice for a signaling role. The frequency of the four types is summarized in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP (U_i)</th>
<th>CB (U_j)</th>
<th># (%)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>non-ZERO</td>
<td>non-ZERO</td>
<td>123 (43.62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>non-ZERO</td>
<td>13 (4.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>non-ZERO</td>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>134 (47.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>ZERO</td>
<td>12 (4.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>282 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Realization of two entities in RETAIN

CB, on the other hand, does not show any strong preference for either realization type; it is realized by non-ZEROS 48.23% of the time, and by ZEROS 51.77%. This contrasts with the result of Iida (1998) who examined a Japanese newspaper corpus. In her corpus, non-ZEROS are far more frequently used (92.86% of the time, 39 cases) than ZEROS (only 3 cases) for CBs in RETAIN. This is possibly due to the difference in the computation of RETAIN; we consider zero nominal arguments as potential RETAIN CB realizers, but Iida probably did not.

A closer look at the CENTER realization in the RETAIN condition, as presented in Figure 4.13 below, verifies this; RETAIN is created in a number of cases (103 out of 283 cases, 36.40%) by zero nominal arguments (=zero genitive) in our analysis.
As we discussed earlier in Chapter 3, the realization of RETAIN by zero nominal arguments matches our intuition about the perceived degree of coherence, particularly when compared to that created by CONTINUE or SHIFT. The role of zero nominal arguments in coherence establishment has just not been paid much attention to in the centering literature, which is actually an important claim of this thesis.

We have clarified the characteristics and functions of RETAIN. Their relation to ZEROS, however, has not been fully explicated; it is not as clear-cut as the CONTINUE hypothesis. In order to gain more insights concerning this TRANSITION type, we now move on to the TRANSITION-sequence-based analysis. We classify the RETAIN group into the four different sequence patterns labeled CON-RET, RET-RET, SHIFT-RET, and NULL-RET. The distribution of ZERO/non-ZERO CBS in these sequence patterns is given in Figure 4.14 below.
Figure 4.14: Distribution of ZERO/non-ZERO CBs in RETAIN sequences

The difference in distribution of CB forms among the four sequence types proves to be significant ($x^2 = 9.865$, DF=3, $p < .025$), but not as strongly as that in the CONTINUE group ($x^2 = 85.608$, DF=3, $p < .001$). Let us examine each pattern.

**NULL-RET**

In this group, the most frequent sequence turned out to be the NULL-RET (125 cases and 44% of the RET group). This sequence equals the Center Establishment of Kameyama (1986), together with the NULL-CON sequence discussed earlier. The difference between the two lies in the way in which an initially underspecified CB is realized in the current utterance, either as CP or as non-CP, as exemplified in the following sample pairs, (4.39) and (4.40), from our corpus.

\[(4.39) \quad \text{a.} \quad \text{ジョージは、文部省の試験にパスして、} \quad \text{NULL}\]
\[
zyooji-wa, \ monbusyo-no siken-ni pasu-si-te,\]
\[
\text{George-TOP, ministry-of-education-GEN exam-in pass-and,}\]
\[
\text{‘George passed the ME exam, and’}\]

\[
\text{b.} \quad \text{Ø に 日本に 一年 留学することになった。} \quad \text{CON}\]
\[
(Ø-ga) \ nihon-ni 1-nen ryuugaku-suru-koto-ni nat-ta.\]
\[
(Ø-NOM) \text{Japan-in 1-year study-abroad-do-COMPL-to become-PAST}\]
\[
\text{‘(he) was allowed to study one year in Japan.’}\]

[ Sokudoku ]

In this example, CB (a) ‘George’ is realized as ZERO in the CP (b) position, and hence
utterance (b) constitutes a CONTINUE.

\[(4.40)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{ジェイソンが 日本に 着いた 次の日、} \quad \text{NULL} \\
& \quad \text{Jason-ga nihon-ni tui-ta tugi-no hi,} \\
& \quad \text{Jason-NOM Japan-in arrive-PAST next day,}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The next day Jason arrived in Japan,’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{ホストファミリーのお母さんが、} \\
& \quad \text{hosutofamirii-no okaasan-ga,} \\
& \quad \text{host-family-GEN mother-NOM,}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{隣の} & \quad \text{佐藤さんの 家へ} \\
& \quad \text{tonari-no Sato-san-no ie-e} \\
& \quad \text{neighbor-GEN Mr.Sato-GEN home-to}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\emptyset & \quad \text{あいさつに 連れていってくれた。} \\
& \quad (\emptyset-o) \text{ aisatu-ni turete-itte-kure-ta.} \\
& \quad (\emptyset-ACC) \text{ greeting-for take-go-EMP-PAST}
\end{align*}
\]

‘His host mother took him to their neighbor Sato for a greeting.’

[Sokudoku]

Here, CB (a) ‘Jason’ is realized as ZERO in the non-CP (b) object position, and hence utterance (b) constitutes a RETAIN, which is presumed to require a higher inference cost than the (4.39) sequence.\(^\text{18}\)

This difference is reflected in their preference for ZERO/non-ZERO CENTERS. The NULL-RET does not favor ZERO CENTERS (41.6%), while the NULL-CON does (69.26%).

**CON-RET**

The CON-RET sequence comprises 83 occurrences: the second most frequent after NULL-RET in the RETAIN group. RETAIN after CONTINUE implies a warning for a shift from the previously established CENTER to a new one, and this warning is done by realizing CB in a less salient position. Recall again the ‘feudal lord’ discourse segment presented in 4.4.3.1. The segment is partially repeated as (4.41).

\(^{18}\) In this particular example, the recognition of empathy locus or the application of ZTA will help readers perceive the discourse as more coherent, since it changes the TRANSITION state of the discourse to CONTINUE.
a. 江戸時代は藩がありました。

'In the Edo era, there were feudal clans.'

b. 今の県と

'They are roughly equivalent to the current prefectures.'

c. 藩に大名がいました。

'In each clan, there resided a feudal lord.'

d. 大名は自分の藩と江戸に

'Feudal lords had (their) homes both in their clans and in Edo, and'

e. 住まなければなりませんでした。

'(they) had to live one year in (their) clans and another year in Edo.'
This segment contains two examples of this sequence type, in (b)-(c) and in (e)-(f). In the former case, the CENTER is retained by a non-ZERO, a bare noun han ‘clan,’ while the latter realizes the retention of the CENTER with a zero nominal argument. This sequence prefers, though not strongly, ZERO CBS (60.24% of the time).

**SHIFT-RET**

The SHIFT-RET sequence has not been discussed in any centering literature, to the best of our knowledge, probably due to its rareness (only 23 cases in our corpus). A typical example from our corpus is given below.

(4.42) a. Ø  むこうからくる人に
(Ø-ga)  mukoo-kara kuru hito-ni
(Ø-NOM)  opposite-side-from come person-into

ぶつかりそうになると、
butukari-soo-ni-naru-to,
run-be-about-to-when

‘When (it ‘robot’) is going to run into a person coming from the opposite direction,’

b. Ø  「スミマセン、ミチヲアケテクレル？」と
(Ø-ga)  “sumimasen, miti-o akete-kureru?”-to
(Ø-NOM)  “excuse-me, way-ACC clear-EMP?” -QUO

Ø  言う。
(Ø-ni)  iu.
(Ø-DAT)  say

‘(it) says to (her ‘the person’), “Excuse me, but let me go through.”’

---

Chapter 4 Corpus Study

f. Ø  奥さんと子どもは 江戸に 住んでいました。  RET
(Ø-no)  okusan-to kodomo-wa edo-ni sunde-i-masi-ta
(Ø-GEN)  wife-and children-TOP Edo-in live-be-POL-PAST

‘(Their) wives and children lived in Edo.’
This sequence involves two entities, ‘robot’ and ‘person (who is coming toward the robot)’ who are realized in (a). The first entity ‘robot’ continues to be the CENTER in (b), but the second salient entity ‘person’ is shifted rather abruptly to the CENTER in (c), namely the CON-SHIFT sequence. In (d), the shifting of the CENTER back to the previous one ‘robot’ is anticipated by placing ‘person’ in a less salient object position. This signal for “shifting back” (in this example) or for “another shifting” is the nature of the SHIFT-RET sequence.

Describing this sequence in more intuitive terms, the point of view in this segment of discourse is not fixed, but rather is flexible. GJW95 presents a similar discourse and claims that this “flip[ping] back and forth among several different entities” (page 206) makes this sequence less coherent (or more inference-dependent\footnote{At least for native speakers of Japanese, this segment does not sound “incoherent” at all if they utilize contextual knowledge.}) than a discourse that is continuously about the same entity, i.e., the CON-CON sequence. What makes ZEROS in this discourse unproblematic for native speakers is “world knowledge;” when one person does something for another, the latter person usually expresses gratitude.

In this sequence, ZERO CBSs are slightly more frequent (56.52\%) than non-ZERO CBSs.

\textbf{RET-RET}

Lastly, the RET-RET sequence makes up 50 examples in our corpus. This type is defined, in GJW95, as the second most preferred sequence after the CON-CON.
entities keep being introduced while maintaining the same CB. This situation is represented by an example from GJW95, in (4.43). Here, GJW assume that “the door ranks above the house in CF (b)” (page 217).

(4.43)  

a. The house appeared to have been burgled.  
   CB: none  CF: house  

b. The door was ajar.  
   CB: house  CF: door > house  
   RET

c. The furniture was in disarray.  
   CB: house  CF: furniture > house  
   RET

Although this discourse segment keeps introducing new entities, such as ‘door’ and ‘furniture,’ it maintains the same CB ‘house.’20 As a result, the whole segment is perceived to be “about” one entity ‘the house,’ but in a different way from the more coherent CON-CON sequence.

Similar samples are abundant in our corpus. Below is one such example.

(4.44)  

a. ひろこさんは  けん君と  いっしょに
   hiroko-san-wa  ken-kun-to  issyo-ni
   Hiroko-TOP    Ken-with  together

   トム君のうちへ  遊びに  行きました。
   tomu-kun-no uti-e  asobi-ni  iki-masi-ta.
   TOM-GEN house-to  visit-to  go-POL-PAST

   ‘Hiroko went to visit Tom’s house with Ken.’

b. きれいな花が  たくさん
   kireina hana-ga  takusan
   beautiful flower-NOM  many

   Ø 庭に
   Ø-no) niwa-ni
   Ø-GEN) garden-in

   植えてありました。
   uete-ari-masi-ta.

   ‘Many beautiful flowers were planted in the garden.’

---

20 For GJW, the CB ‘house’ is “realized, but not directly realized” (via functional relations) in (b) and (c). For us, in a corresponding Japanese discourse, the CB ie ‘house’ is a zero nominal argument, which is a directly but implicitly realized entity (see discussion in Chapter 3).
c. けん君がトム君にあげた自転車が
ken-kun-ga tomu-kun-ni age-ta zitensya-ga
Ken-NOM Tom-DAT give-PAST bicycle-NOM

Ø ガレージに 置いてありました。
(Ø-no) gareezi-ni oite-ari-masi-ta
(Ø-GEN) garage-in place-be-POL-PAST

‘The bicycle that Ken gave TOM was in the garage.’

d. 大きなふじ山の絵が
ookina huzisan-no e-ga
Large Mt. Fuji-GEN painting-NOM

Ø 居間に かけてありました。
(Ø-no) ima-ni kakete-ari-masi-ta.
(Ø-GEN) living-room-in hang-be-POL-PAST

‘A large painting of Mt. Fuji was hung in the living room.’

In the same way as the “functional dependent” example above, while maintaining the
same CENTER ‘house,’ this sequence keeps mentioning what’s in the house, specifying
its parts such as ‘garden,’ ‘garage’ and ‘living room.’

This sequence type inclines toward ZERO CBS (62.00%). This figure is slightly
higher than that for CON-RET (60.24%).

Summary of the RETAIN group
We have described the characteristics of RETAIN sequences. A summary of statistical
data is given in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>centering prediction</th>
<th>sequence</th>
<th># of ZERO CB</th>
<th># of non-ZERO CB</th>
<th>% of ZERO CBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“low-cost”</td>
<td>CON-RET</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“medium-cost”</td>
<td>RET-RET</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NULL-RET</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“high-cost”</td>
<td>SHIFT-RET</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: ZERO occurrences in RETAIN sequences
The ZERØ/non-ZERØ CB distribution among the three “cost” groups turned out to be not significant. This is probably due to the neutral nature of the RETAIN TRANSITION itself that lies between CENTER continuation and CENTER shifting.

4.4.3.3 ZEROS in the SHIFT sequence type

The SHIFT transition state is created by discontinuing CENTERS; the previous CENTER, CB (U_{i-1}), disappears and a new CENTER, CB (U_i), is promoted from among other entities listed in CF (U_{i-1}). The newly promoted CENTER can be realized, in U_i, either in the highest ranked position, as CP (U_i), or in any lower ranked position. This distinction was first made by Brenann et al. (1987), and was named SMOOTH-SHIFT and ROUGH-SHIFT respectively, by Walker et al. (1994). Although these two SHIFT types, in our corpus, present significantly different preferences for the CB forms, either ZEROS or non-ZEROS ($x^2 = 4.194$, DF=1, $p < .005$), we combine them together here when we examine transition sequences for the sake of simplification of the presentation, and also because the ZERØ use in ROUGH-SHIFT is limited to only 28 cases.

The SHIFT group consists of three sequence patterns: CON-SHIFT, RET-SHIFT and SHIFT-SHIFT. The sequence NULL-SHIFT is theoretically impossible because there is no way to compare with CB (U_i), when CB (U_{i-1}) is underspecified, to form a SHIFT transition. The distribution of ZERØ/non-ZERØ CENTERS in this group is provided in Figure 4.15.

![Figure 4.15: Distribution of ZERØ/non-ZERØ CBs in SHIFT sequences](image)

Again, the CB type distribution among the three patterns is significant ($x^2 = 32.767$, DF=2, $p < .001$).
**RET-SHIFT versus CON-SHIFT**

We discussed above in 4.4.3.1 that the RET-CON sequence is contrary to the RETAIN function of signaling a subsequent shift. On the contrary, the RET-SHIFT sequence fulfills this function by completing a shift and is considered to be a natural way of CENTER management. This typical application of the ranking in Rule 2 is exemplified by a well-cited discourse segment, encoding the CON-RET-SHIFT sequence in (c)-(e), from GJW95.

(4.45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NULL</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>RET</th>
<th>SHIFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>John has been having a lot of trouble arranging his vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>He cannot find anyone to take over his responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>He called up Mike yesterday to work out a plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Mike has annoyed him a lot recently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>He called John at 5 AM on Friday last week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, the CENTER ‘John’ in (c) is retained in (d) in a lower-ranked object position as ‘him’; instead, a member of CF (c) ‘Mike’ is placed in the highest-ranked position. The newly promoted entity ‘Mike’ is realized by a pronoun as a new CENTER in (e), which completes a flowing CENTER shift from ‘John’ to ‘Mike.’

The CON-SHIFT, on the other hand, poses a different story. Imagine the segment that eliminates the utterance (d), resulting in the following (c’)-(e’) sequence, as in (4.46).

(4.46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>SHIFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c’.</td>
<td>He called up Mike yesterday to work out a plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e’.</td>
<td>He called John at 5 AM on Friday last week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an abrupt shift in CENTERS, i.e., without warning, between (c’) and (e’). As a result, the interpretation of a pronoun ‘he’ becomes totally ambiguous, and requires extra inferences (although explicit mention of the other entity ‘John’ is of great help in this case). In this respect, the RET-SHIFT can be considered a “low-cost” sequence, while the CON-SHIFT is a “high-cost” sequence.21

Let us present some samples from our corpus. First, the segment (4.47) provides the RET-SHIFT sequence.

(4.47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NULL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>yokohama-no obaasan-wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ykokohama-GEN</td>
<td>grandmother-TOP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 Strube and Hahn (1999) defined the CON-(SMOOTH-)SHIFT sequence as an “expensive” TRANSITION pair, and the RET-(SMOOTH-)SHIFT sequence as a “cheap” TRANSITION pair.
りょうりを たくさん 知っています。
recipe-ACC many know-POL

‘Grandma in Yokohama knows a lot of recipes.’

b. Ø いいりょうりの本を もっています。 CON
(Ø-ga) ii ryoori-no hon-o motte-i-masu.
(Ø-NOM) good recipe-GEN book-ACC own-POL

‘(She) owns a good recipe book.’

c. ひろこさんのお母さんは ときどき RET
hiroko-san-no okaasan-wa tokidoki
Hiroko-GEN mother-TOP sometimes

Ø おばあさんに 電話を かけます。
(Ø-no) obaasan-ni denwa-o kake-masu.
(Ø-GEN) grandmother-DAT telephone-ACC ring-POL

‘Hiroko’s mother sometimes telephones (her ‘Hiroko’s’) grandmother.’

d. そして Ø Ø SHIFT
sosite (Ø-ga) (Ø-ni)
And (Ø-NOM) (Ø-DAT)

いろいろな りょうりを 聞きます。
Iroirona ryoori-o kiki-masu.
various recipe-ACC ask-POL

‘And (she ‘Hiroko’s mother’) asks (her ‘Hiroko’s grandmother’) for various recipes.’

[Hiroko 1]

A ZERO in (d) realizes the CENTER ‘Hiroko’s mother’ which has already been introduced in a higher ranked position than the previous CENTER from (b) ‘grandmother’ in the utterance (c). This intervening retention creates a natural flow in CENTER shifting. Therefore, this sequence does not require consultation with other information resources even though the two entities involved share the same semantic property [+human].
Next, turn to the CON-SHIFT sequence example in (4.48).

(4.48) a. スーパーで ひろこさんは

\textit{suupaa-de} \textit{hiroko-san-wa}  
\text{supermarket-at} \text{Hiroko-TOP} 

したじきと けしごむを 買いました。

\textit{sitaziki-to} \textit{kesigomu-o} \textit{kai-masi-ta.}  
\text{plastic-sheet-and} \text{eraser-ACC} \text{buy-POL-PAST} 

‘At the supermarket, Hiroko bought a plastic sheet and an eraser.’

b. Ø ぜんぶで 150えんでした。

\textit{(Ø-ga) zenbu-de 150-en desi-ta.}  
\text{in-total} \text{150-eyn} \text{COP-PAST} 

‘(They) were in total 150 yen.’

The \text{CENTER} in (a) is ‘Hiroko’ (continued from the previous utterance). In (b), however, a \text{ZERO} realizes not the previous \text{CENTER} (nor the \text{CP}), but another member of \text{CF} (a) ‘sheet-and-eraser.’ This results in a hasty shift of \text{CENTERS}. However, in this particular example, the “selectional restriction” for a \text{ZERO} in the utterance (b) makes this shift less problematic; ‘Hiroko’ cannot be ‘150yen.’

Likewise, in (4.49), a \text{ZERO} in (b) does not represent the \text{CENTER} in (a), ‘employees,’ but a lower ranked entity in \text{CF} (a), ‘ideas.’

(4.49) a. Ø 新しい製品のアイデアを 考えます。

\textit{(Ø-ga) atarasii seihin-no aidea-o kangae-masu.}  
\text{in-total} \text{new product-GEN idea-ACC} \text{think-POL} 

‘(They ‘employees’) think about ideas for new products.’

b. 社長も 社長室で Ø 考えます。

\textit{syacho-mo syachositu-de (Ø-o) kangae-masu.}  
\text{president-FOC} \text{president-office-in (Ø-ACC)} \text{think-POL} 

‘The president also thinks about (it ‘idea’) in the president’s office.’
These shifts are, in a sense, unexpected from a centering perspective; therefore, some overriding factors that enable these unexpected shifts should exist: “parallel structure” in this case (see 4.6.3 below).

Turning now to the statistical data, the RET-SHIFT and the CON-SHIFT pair has proven to be similar in frequency (84 and 95 cases, respectively), but different in their CB type distribution (ZEROS used 76% and 34% of the time, respectively), and this difference has proven significant ($x^2 = 32.390$, DF=1, $p < .001$). An expected shift (RET-SHIFT), rather than an unexpected one (CON-SHIFT), may impose a higher inferential cost.

**SHIFT-SHIFT**
The SHIFT-SHIFT sequence is the least preferred according to the ranking in Rule 2 (GJW95). Its occurrence is very limited (only 43 cases). This sequence is characterized also as “flip[ping] back and forth among several different entities” (page 206). Let us now look at the sample segment from our corpus in (4.50).

(4.50)  

a. 昔、神様が動物たちに言った。… NULL  
   mukasi, kamisama-ga doobutu-tati-ni it-ta.  
   long-ago, god-NOM animals-DAT say-PAST  

   ‘Long ago, God said to the animals.’ …

b. 猫は神様の話がよく聴こえなかったから、  
   neko-wa kamisama-no hanasi-ga yoku kik-oe-nakat-ta-kara,  
   cat-TOP god-GEN story-NOM well hear-able-NEG-PAST-because  

   ‘Because the cat did not hear well what God said,’

c. (Ø)ネズミに「いつ？」と聞いた。 SHIFT  
   (Ø-ga) nezumi-ni “itu?”-to kii-ta.  
   (Ø-NOM) mouse-DAT “when?”-QUO ask-PAST  

   ‘(it ‘cat’) asked the mouse, “When?”’
Right after the first established entity ‘God’ is retained and a new entity ‘cat’ is introduced in (b), the **center** is shifted again to another entity ‘mouse’ in (d). This example involves a pair of verbs that usually have different entities for their agents: asking and answering (see 4.6.3 below).

Let us examine another example in (4.51).

(4.51) a. ジェイソンがその家に着くと、

zyeison-ga sono-ie-ni tuku-to,

‘When Jason arrived at the house,’

b. まずお母さんが家中を

mazu okaasan-ga ie-zyu-o

‘the host mother showed (him ‘Jason’) around the house, and’

c. 『トイレはここ』と

(Ô-ga) “toire-wa koko” –to

(Ô-NOM) “toilet-TOP here”-QUO

‘(She) showed (him), “the toilet is here.”’
Chapter 4 Corpus Study

4.3.4.3 Additional comparisons

**CON-CON versus RET-RET versus SHIFT-SHIFT**

Let us re-examine here the three sequence types explicitly defined in Rule 2 (GJW95): the CON-CON, the RET-RET and the SHIFT-SHIFT. The zero/non-zero CB frequency and distribution are summarized in Figure 4.16.
As is clear, the frequency seen in Figure 4.16 is that predicted by the centering preference order defined in GJW95 Rule 2. The ratio of ZERO CBS is also in descending order (88.44%, 62.00%, and 58.14%). The difference between the RET-RET and the SHIFT-SHIFT, in terms of their CB type distribution, however, is not significant ($x^2 = 0.143$). This statistical result does not provide us with any evidence regarding the difference in inferential cost between the SHIFT-SHIFT and the RET-RET sequences.

**RET-CON versus RET-RET versus RET-SHIFT**
We have discussed these three sequence patterns separately above. Here, we will present a cross-comparison of these three to re-examine the function of RETAIN and its subsequent TRANSITION state.

The frequency indicates that RETAIN is most preferably followed by SHIFT, as claimed by GJW95: RETAIN should ideally be used to introduce a following SHIFT. Karamanis (2003) argues for the adequacy of the RET-SHIFT sequence as an
entity-coherence metric for his text structuring algorithm. Our data cross-linguistically supports his claim for English.

The ZERO CB/non-ZERO CB distribution in the three sequences also indicates that RET-SHIFT is a more preferable environment for ZEROS (used 76.19% of the time) than the other two (62.00% and 37.50%).

**Nominal argument in RET-SHIFT versus RET-CON**

We have already examined above the RET-SHIFT and the RET-CON sequences. Here, we will pay particular attention to a subclass of these environments, i.e., when the RETAIN-encoded utterance in the sequence involves zero nominal arguments.

Zero nominal arguments constitute the construction “(A no) B” as a whole NP. The semantic relations between the two entities within the NP exhibit a wide variety, as presented in 2.4.1.3. Syntactically, the entity B is defined as the head of the whole NP (see 2.2.2). However, the referential properties of this complex NP are not as simple as this definition might make it seem. That is, in some cases, a head B entity is later referred to; in other cases, an implicit modifier, the (A) entity, is referred to by a subsequent referring expression, such as a ZERO. The former case constitutes a RET-SHIFT sequence, while the later is a RET-CON sequence, according to our CF ranking. Let us look at the examples in (4.52) and (4.53) respectively.

(4.52) a. 山下君は 部屋に 入りました。

Yamasita-kun-wa heya-ni hairi-masi-ta.

Yamasita-TOP room-into enter-POL-PAST

‘Yamashita entered the room.’

b. Ø 自己紹介が 終わって、 RET

(Ø-no) zikosyookai-ga owat-te,

(Ø-GEN) self-introduction-NOM be-finished-and

‘When (his ‘Yamasita’s) self-introduction was finished,’

c. Ø 手紙とプレゼントを 渡すと、 CON

(Ø-ga) tegami-to purezento-o watasu-to,

(Ø-NOM) letter-and present-ACC hand-and

‘(He ‘Yamasita’) handed over the letter and present, and …’

[Sokudoku]
The robot bear sends the data to the hospital, so

when (its ‘robot’s) owner’s condition is very bad,’

‘the doctor will come to see (him ‘owner’).

In the examples above, subsequent reference to either the A or B entity is made by means of ZEROS: a zero nominative in (4.53) and a zero accusative in (4.54). There are also cases in which later reference is made explicitly via non-ZERO expressions. Table 4.12 below summarizes the frequency of the two reference patterns that result in the two TRANSITION sequences, and their reference types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ZERO reference</th>
<th>non-ZERO reference</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RET-SHIFT (reference to B)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET-CON (reference to A)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12: Frequencies of reference to A or B entity

Out of a total of 46 cases of the two sequence types, a syntactic head (B entity) is subsequently referred to, as in (4.54), in only 14 instances (43.75%). In the remaining 32 cases, an implicit modifier (A) entity, i.e., a zero nominal argument, acts as
antecedent for later ZEROS or non-ZEROS. This result contrasts somewhat with that of Yamura-Takei and Fais (ms.) who examined the A no B phrases and their later reference; in 57.14% of the examples that they examined, reference is made to head B entities.\(^{22}\) We will not look further into this distributional difference, but at least from a cursory examination of the two results, it is clear that both A and B can act as antecedents for later reference.

The use of ZEROS in the “controversial” RET-CON sequence (see discussion in 4.4.3.1), i.e., 13 cases including the example (4.55), appears to impose a greater inferential load.

### 4.4.3.5 ZEROS in NULL

As we mentioned earlier, the absence of a centering TRANSITION between adjacent utterances is possible, or rather it is not rare at all in naturally-occurring utterances, no matter how strictly the parameters are set to minimize the number of such cases (Poesio et al., 2004). Those CB-lacking utterances, what we call in this thesis, the NULL utterances, are not exempt from the use of ZEROS in Japanese discourse. ZEROS do appear in the NULL labeled utterances. Iida (1998) reported that her 250-utterance corpus contained 23 such cases.

We will first examine the NULL-encoded utterances in discourse-medial positions (DSM-NULL). Our corpus includes 445 such utterances; 157 of them contain ZEROS, ten utterances of which accommodate multiple ZEROS. A total of 171 ZEROS (143 zero verbal arguments and 28 zero nominal arguments) contained in these utterances are of various referent types, summarized in Figure 4.18 below.

\(^{22}\) Of the 77 A no B phrases that are later referred to by ZEROS, pronouns or NPs, 28 references are to A entities, 44 are to B entities, and there are also 5 unclear cases.
There are 62 instances of global reference, 11 of which are to antecedents beyond the DS boundary; the remaining 51 are co-referential within the same segment, in an average range of 2.76 utterances. The four cases of cataphorical reference are similar to global in that they do not create links with the previous utterance. Literally speaking, intra-clausal (10 instances) do not create any inter-clausal link, either. The remaining four reference types (situational, event, indeterminate, and time/weather), although they are not infrequent (16, 18, 48, and 13 instances, respectively), are exempt from listing in the CF, based on our decision discussed in Chapter 3. Therefore, they cannot establish proper TRANSITIONS.

Now, we turn to ZEROS in discourse-segment initial NULL (DSI-NUL) utterances. Our corpus exhibits 96 such cases.\textsuperscript{23} The referent types of those ZEROS are indicated in Figure 4.19 below.

\textsuperscript{23} Some discourse-segment initial utterances have more than one ZERO.
The “global” category includes those ZEROS that find their referents in any of the previous discourse segments (32 cases). The majority (31 cases) refer to entities in the adjacent segment. Among them, the referents of 18 ZEROS are in the immediately preceding (but across the segment boundary) utterances. Twenty-five cases refer to previous CBs, and the remaining 7 do not.

Also, there are 10 cases of cataphorical ZEROS. This means that half of the cataphorical ZEROS found in the corpus (20 in total) appear in discourse-segment initial positions.

Out of two “event” ZEROS found in the DSI position, one refers to the whole situation described in the previous segment, and the other the action described by the verbal phrases in the preceding segment. A total of 21 “event” ZEROS appear in the corpus.

---

24 There is one case in which a ZERO is in the last discourse segment of the text and its referent is found in the first segment (with five intervening segments in between). The two utterances involved exhibit a parallelizing structure.

25 This raises a fundamental question concerning what a discourse segment is, but we will not further discuss this issue in this thesis.
4.4.4 Summary

4.4.4.1 Basic facts

This corpus analysis has firstly provided us with basic facts concerning the behaviors of ZEROS, including the distribution of various ZERO types that we defined in Chapter 2 and the interrelationship between the types, and the antecedent types and locations. The result constitutes empirical evidence for the diverse nature of ZEROS, which we see as one of the potential complexities and ambiguities that Japanese language poses to the hearer and the language learner.

Secondly, we analyzed the data according to centering metrics: CENTER realization, CB types, and TRANSITION types, in an attempt to empirically validate our assumption concerning the significant role of ZEROS in the creation of local discourse coherence. Our attempt has been successfully fulfilled; ZEROS were more frequently used than non-ZEROS to conceptually link current utterances with adjacent utterances. Also, ZEROS are most commonly used to continue the CENTERS, but they also appear in CENTER-discontinuing (i.e., retaining and shifting) environments.

4.4.4.2 Main facts

In order to further investigate the environments in which ZEROS occur, we employed a TRANSITION-sequence approach to the centering analysis of the data. As a result, a number of insightful findings were drawn from the analysis. Here, we will discuss how we interpret the figures.

The TRANSITION-sequence-based approach to the CB type distribution has revealed that the distribution is not as simple as it might look if characterized by a single-TRANSITION approach. This is clear from the ranking of sequence types, presented in Table 4.13, according to the ratio of ZERO CBs (in descending order).
The table below shows the ranking of different sequence types based on the ratio of ZERO CB (%). The table includes the rank, sequence type, and the ratio of ZERO CB (%). The average ratio is 60.63.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sequence type</th>
<th>Ratio of ZERO CB (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CON-CON</td>
<td>88.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SHIFT-CON</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RET-SHIFT</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NULL-CON</td>
<td>69.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RET-RET</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CON-RET</td>
<td>60.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SHIFT-SHIFT</td>
<td>58.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SHIFT-RET</td>
<td>56.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NULL-RET</td>
<td>41.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>RET-CON</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CON-SHIFT</td>
<td>33.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>60.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 4.13: Ranking of TRANSITION sequence types according to the ZERO CB ratios |

Take the CONTINUE group, for instance; the four types within the group range from first to tenth in the ranking. The same is true of the SHIFT groups, ranging from third to eleventh. The range of the RETAIN group is somewhat squeezed into the middle of the ranking, from fifth to ninth.

Here, we assume that this ranking serves as an approximate indicator that reflects the degree of coherence, and hence the amount of inference cost that each sequence imposes, on the ground that texts are generally planned so that they turn out to be unambiguous. Thus, we incorporated this ranking in the refining of our cost-based classification, a tentative version of which we presented in Chapter 3. The plan for the refinement is given in Table 4.14.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>ZERO CB</th>
<th>non-ZERO CB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-cost</td>
<td>CON-CON</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIFT-CON</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RET-SHIFT</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-cost total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-cost</td>
<td>NULL-CON</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RET-RET</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON-RET (↓)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium-cost total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>277</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-cost</td>
<td>SHIFT-SHIFT (↓)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIFT-RET</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NULL-RET (↓)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RET-CON</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON-SHIFT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High-cost total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: Cost-based classification of TRANSITION sequences

This grouping was made so that the difference in the CB type distribution among the three groups might be the greatest ($x^2 = 174.479$, DF=2, $p < .001$) of any possible groupings. The symbols (↑) and (↓) indicate that that sequence type is classified as less costly or more costly, respectively, than was initially defined in the tentative version. The resulting revised version is presented in Table 4.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“low-cost” sequence types</th>
<th>“medium-cost” sequence types</th>
<th>“high-cost” sequence types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CON-CON, SHIFT-CON, RET-SHIFT</td>
<td>RET-RET, NULL-CON, CON-RET</td>
<td>SHIFT-SHIFT, SHIFT-RET, NULL-RET, RET-CON, CON-SHIFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15: Inference cost-based classifications of sequence patterns (revised)
4.5 Centering predictions and human intuition

We have discussed that preference for CB types, i.e., ZERO or non-ZERO, can be explained by the centering rules for CB realization (Rule 1) and TRANSITION preference (Rule 2). Particularly, we have focused the interaction of ZERO use in a certain utterance and perceived degree of coherence predicted by a TRANSITION sequence type in which that utterance occurs.

This subsection provides some empirical evidence on how such centering predictions match human intuition on the “naturalness” of ZERO use. We use JSL learners’ writing samples that were judged by JSL teachers on their use of ellipsis, in order to present how their judgments are interrelated with the centering-based analysis and discussion in the previous section.

The samples consist of two sets of narrative texts, which describe the story of a movie “Shall We Dance,” written by two upper-intermediate JSL learners (whose first language is English). Some quantitative information concerning this learner corpus is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of texts</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of paragraphs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of sentences</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of clauses</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16: Quantitative information for the JSL corpus

The centering analysis of the corpus is provided in Table 4.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ZERO-CB</th>
<th>non-ZERO CB</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETAIN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIFT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17: Distribution of CB types for single TRANSITIONS in the JSL corpus

The distribution is approximately equivalent to that of our corpus, and both texts are, as a whole, perceived to be reasonably “coherent,” although they exhibit more or less unnatural flow. The distribution of CB types for TRANSITION sequences, on which we base our analysis, is also given below, in Table 4.18.
Table 4.18: Distribution of CB types for TRANSITION sequence types in the JSL corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>centering prediction</th>
<th>sequence type</th>
<th>ZERO CB</th>
<th>non-ZERO CB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low-cost</td>
<td>CON-CON</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RET-SHIFT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHIFT-CON</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium-cost</td>
<td>NULL-CON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON-RET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-cost</td>
<td>SHIFT-SHIFT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NULL-RET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RET-CON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CON-SHIFT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our assumption is that in low-cost sequences, ZERO CBs are a reasonable choice in terms of CENTER management, and a safer option to avoid redundancy; whilst in high-cost sequences, non-ZERO CBs are a less risky choice to eliminate unnecessary ambiguity. In other words, the choice of CB type highlighted in the table is considered to be potentially illegal or unnatural usage that is subject to revision. We will see how this assumption is reflected in human intuitive judgments on the choice of CB types.

Our human judges were ten JSL instructors at tertiary institutions in Japan, Singapore and the U.S., who have extensive JSL teaching experience, but none of them had prior knowledge of centering mechanisms. Given the writing samples with ZEROS specified, the judges were instructed to mark (i) NPs that they would advise students to elide in order to avoid redundancy, and (ii) ZEROS that they would advise students to overtly express in order to avoid ambiguity. They were asked to do the marking based on their intuitive judgment on the naturalness of the discourses. Their marking was interpreted in this way: if at least nine judges, out of ten, agreed on a certain usage (ZERO or non-ZERO), that usage was regarded as “approved,” while if eight or fewer judges agreed, the usage was labeled “disapproved.” In other words, if two or more human judges decided to revise a certain usage, the usage was considered somewhat problematic.

---

26 The data does not include the RET-RET and the SHIFT-RET sequences.
The result is as follows. Three “potential redundancy inducing” cases of non-ZERO CB in “low-cost” sequences were all disapproved by human judges. Look at one such example in (4.54).

\[(4.54) \]

a. 杉山さんは 会社員で、
\[sugiyama-san-wa kaisyain-de,\]
Sugiyama-TOP office worker-COP

‘Mr. Sugiyama is an office worker, and’

b. Ø いつも 仕事のあとで ダンスの看板を
\[(Ø-ga) itumo sigoto-no ato-de dansu-no kanban-o\]
(Ø-NOM) always work-GEN after dance-GEN sign-ACC

見ていました。
\[mite-i-masi-ta.\]
look-be-POL-PAST

‘on his way back from work, (he) always looks at the sign of a dancing school.’

c. 杉山さんは 電車の中で 女のを
\[sugiyama-san-wa densya-no-naka-de onna-no-hito-o\]
Sugiyama-TOP train-GEN-inside-in woman-ACC

窓から 見ていました。
\[mado-kara mite-i-masi-ta.\]
window-from look-be-POL-PAST

‘Mr. Sugiyama looks at a woman from the window of the train.’

The half (five out of ten) of judge teachers claimed that the topic NP CB (underlined) in the CON-CON sequence utterance (c) should be ZERO-pronominalized.

One “risky” case of ZERO CB in “high-cost” sequence was also disapproved. This case is presented in (4.55).

\[27\] There were varying degrees of disapproval: from 20% to 50%. We will not look into the reasons for each case here, but the possible causes seem to be found both in the text (e.g., the linguistic environment) and in the judge (e.g., knowledge, tolerance for ambiguity). Also, some judges commented, after the experiment, that their decision might change depending on the target level.
(4.55)  a. Ø    Ø    Ø    聞くのはこわかった。  
(Ø-ga) (Ø-ni) (Ø-o)  kiku-no-wa kowakat-ta.  
(Ø-NOM) (Ø-DAT) (Ø-ACC) ask-NOMI-TOP afraid-PAST  
‘(His wife) was afraid to ask (him) (about the reason).’

b. Ø    うわきを    しているかもしれない。  
(Ø-ga) uwaki-o   site-iru-kamo-sirenai  
(Ø-NOM) affair-ACC  do-is-may  
‘(He) might be having an affair.’

Half of the judges disfavored the ZERO use for the CB in the subject position of the utterance (b) in the SHIFT-SHIFT environment.28

On the other hand, out of 17 cases of ZERO CB in “low-cost” sequences, 14 were approved; the remaining three involved multiple ZEROS, which we believe affected human judges in their decisions. No cases of non-ZERO CB in “high-cost” sequences were disapproved.

This proves that centering predictions concerning the choice of CB types undoubtedly match human intuition on the naturalness and coherence each type creates in a certain environment.

4.6 Pedagogical implications

In this section, we will discuss what significance the findings from our corpus study have for JSL teachers.

4.6.1 ZERO occurrences and types

Our fundamental assumption about ZEROS is that some ZEROS are easier to process than others. Which ZEROS are easier to process, and for whom, is a crucial empirical question that requires a well thought-out and planned experiment on a considerable number of subjects, which is beyond the scope of this study, but the knowledge of a wide variety of ZERO types and their distribution is helpful. This is what our corpus study first provides us, as we stated earlier in 4.4.4.1.

Let us compare two texts from the same JSL textbook. There are two expository texts, both of which consist of four paragraphs: one 24-clause text exhibits 15 ZEROS

28 The other half probably regard this ZERO as unambiguous enough because of contextual and world knowledge about ‘who is afraid’ and ‘who is having an affair.’
and the other, with 28 clauses, contains 14 ZEROS. The two texts are similar number-wise, but when we look into the referent types of ZEROS contained, they show totally different characteristics. Look at Table 4.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>local</th>
<th>global</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>situational</th>
<th>indeterminate</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19: Frequency of referent types in two different texts

Text 1 contains only the textually retrievable ZEROS, i.e., ZEROS whose referents can be found in the discourse. Text 2, on the other hand, includes many ZEROS (10 out of 14 total) that are not contextually evoked. This difference is something that JSL teachers should be aware of in the instruction of ZERO-containing discourse. We will discuss this issue further in Chapter 7.

### 4.6.2 ZEROS and coherence

The relationship between ZEROS and coherence has been verified in our corpus study. The four important points that we would like to emphasize are as follows.

(i) ZEROS play a significant role in creating coherence;

(ii) the role of less-recognized zero nominal arguments in coherence creation has proven significant;

(iii) ZEROS are used in a variety of environments with differing degrees of inferential cost; and

(iv) the distribution of ZERO types and ZERO-occurring environments varies from text to text, and predicts inference level costs as defined by both a TRANSITION sequence analysis and native speaker intuitions.

Keen awareness of these facts and critical analysis of teaching materials with these points in mind are helpful in predicting potential difficulties that learners may encounter. We will discuss these points further in Chapter 7.
4.6.3 Resources for making inferences

By analyzing ZEROS and their textual/contextual environments in so-called “high-cost” sequence utterances, we attempt to extract potential resources of information required to make inferences in interpreting ZEROS and in comprehending a discourse. Listing these, we believe, would be beneficial for effective instruction of ZEROS and for understanding the coherence created by ZEROS. The list includes:

(i) empathy,
(ii) selectional restrictions,
(iii) pair verbs (e.g., ask-answer),
(iv) parallelism,
(iii) topicalization (grammatical and zero),
(iv) word order (scrambling),
(v) conjunctive relations,
(vi) contextual knowledge, and
(vii) world knowledge.

These factors sometimes (but not always) override centering principles, as exemplified in several discourses presented above, such as (4.33), in which a ZERO in a RET-CON sequence is made acceptable by the “contextual knowledge” involved, and (4.49), in which a ZERO in a CON-SHIFT sequence is perceived as reasonably unambiguous because of the “parallel structure” of the two adjacent utterances. A single factor or a combination of several factors enables the use of ZERO CBS in a high-cost sequence discourse.

We assume that these factors support the strategic and intentional inference skills that native speakers are usually equipped with and that non-native learners need to learn. The mastery levels of these factors will affect perception of coherence and understanding of the discourse. Looking further into each factor is an interesting issue to explore, but we will leave this for future research.\(^{29}\)

4.7 Summary

In this chapter, we conducted an extensive corpus study and two major sets of results were presented. The first set offered some basic facts about the corpus concerning the distribution of various ZERO types, as well as a preliminary centering analysis. The second set provided findings regarding the interrelationship between the distribution of

\(^{29}\) Kameyama (1996) discussed “grammatical parallelism preference” and “commonsense preference” among others, in her account of pronoun interpretation.
ZEROS and the degree of discourse coherence that was predicted by the centering rule. In addition, the centering predictions on ZERO use, drawn from the analysis results on JSL data, were proven to match human intuition about the appropriate use of ZEROS. Finally, we briefly discussed the pedagogical implications of the results.

The significant role and diverse distribution of ZEROS in Japanese discourse proven in this chapter will serve as an impetus for the development of a ZERO-detecting tool that will be presented in Chapter 6 and its pedagogical application that we discuss in Chapter 7.
Part II

Technology and Pedagogy

In Part I, we have given the definition and typology of ZEROS that this thesis is concerned with, and discussed the role of these ZEROS in Japanese discourse in a particular relation to discourse coherence. Our analysis, in the centering framework, has provided theoretical assumptions concerning the significant contribution of ZEROS to coherence establishment, along with introspective and statistical evidence from our corpus. This raises two questions: (i) how much trouble native speakers or learners of Japanese have in recognizing entities evoked by ZEROS in discourse; and (ii) how conscious native speakers or learners of Japanese are of entities evoked by ZEROS when processing discourse that includes them. Answering these questions is beyond the scope of this thesis, but the questions have led us to a “what-if.” What if these invisible ZEROS are made visible? Is it technologically possible? Is it of any help to those who teach a ZERO-prone language or to those who learn it? Chapter 6 is an attempt at answering the first question. The second question will be answered in Chapter 7. Chapter 5, beforehand, discusses some background on the use of technology for educational purposes, especially for language learning.

Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>Educational and language technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6</td>
<td>Technology and Zero Detector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7</td>
<td>Pedagogy and Zero Detector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Educational and Language Technologies

5.1 Educational technology and CALL

Educational technology (henceforth, ET), as the term implies, involves both “education” and “technology,” and aims for their congenial integration. That is, the goal of ET is to use technology to support education, or more precisely, to use technology effectively as a tool to enhance the learning and teaching processes.

The use of ET can be characterized in terms of three defining facets: space, target and technology. The first facet is the space or environment in which technology is put into use and practice. Much of the ET research and practice is currently focusing on “e-learning” or “online education” that considers so-called “cyberspace” or “virtual classrooms” as its educational environment, where course materials are delivered via the Internet and/or learners are collaborating using computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools. In fact, “e-learning” and “distance learning” are the new buzzwords in the community of education in Japan and in many other countries worldwide. Still, ET can also be used in “actual space” or “traditional classrooms.” The availability of document processing software in place of manual writing, and presentation software and a digital screen in place of a traditional blackboard and printed materials has been changing the classroom instruction drastically.

The second facet concerns for whom ET is intended in order in enhancing their learning process. The target age groups vary from K-12 (kindergarten, elementary, middle and high school pupils) to adult (e.g., university students and adults in so-called adult education and job training). The target subject areas also vary: math, science, computer, art, music, social studies, language, and even anger management, to name a few. The subject area that we aim at is language learning, and technology-enhanced language learning has traditionally been called computer-assisted language learning, or CALL for short. Its origin can be traced back to the 1960s when the PLATO project
was first featured.¹

Technologies currently available for educational use also show a wide variety, most of which are useful for any subject area, although some are domain-specific. Such technologies range from basic computer capabilities to multimedia devices, and to web/network technology and speech/language technology. CALL systems are often categorized according to the technologies they deploy. Categories depend, for example, on whether the system does or does not use speech technology, web technology, or NLP technology. We will leave the discussion of the first two types of technology to other work, and focus on the use of NLP in this thesis. In the next section, we will overview NLP with regard to methodology and application.

To sum up, our focus will be on the exploitation of NLP technology for language learning in a real classroom environment. Our primary target group consists of university students, i.e., adults rather than children, who study Japanese as a “foreign” (rather than “second”) language.

5.2 NLP: Methodology and application

NLP, by definition, is the process of computer analysis of input provided in a human language (natural language) and the conversion of this input into a useful form of representation. The general aim of NLP is two-fold; it is primarily concerned with helping us come to a better understanding of human languages as a system of computational representations and processes, and is secondarily concerned with getting computers to perform useful and interesting tasks with human languages, utilizing such representations, as summarized by Webber (2001). She classifies work having to do with the former concern as Computational Linguistics (CL), and the latter as Applied Natural Language Processing (ANLP), Natural Language Engineering (NLE), or Language Technology (LT). Our interest is not only in the NLE or LT aspect of NLP that enables us to embody the development of our intended program, but also in the CL aspect that models the underlying human processes.

In this section, we will overview NLP in terms of methods, processes, and applications. The discussion here is heavily drawn from the two recent “bibles” in Natural Language Processing (Dale, Moisl, and Somers, 2000) and Computational Linguistics (Mitkov, 2003). In so doing, we will clarify our stance toward the use of NLP in CALL.

¹ A comprehensive review of CALL history can be found at http://www.history-of-call.org/.
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5.2.1 Methods

Natural Language Processing (NLP), as a discipline, has its own history and rationale. Dale, Moisl, and Somers (2000) propose three main strands of approaches to NLP according to its historical development: the symbolic approach, the empirical approach, and the artificial neural network approach.

Firstly, linguistic-based approaches have their origins in generative linguistics, which concerns itself with the formal and syntactic description of linguistic phenomena, primarily along the lines proposed by a highly influential generativist, Noam Chomsky and his successors. This symbolic approach is often contrasted with empirical approaches that are based on statistical and other data-driven analyses of raw data in the form of text corpora. The corpus-based approach, instantiated as statistical and machine-learning methods, has gained speed as the availability of computer technology has made the analysis of reasonably large corpora increasingly viable, although it was initially criticized by Chomsky and his followers, who were strongly opposed to empirical methods in linguistics. The most recent approach is the artificial neural network-based approach, which is based on an analogy with the physical structure of biological brains, and hence orients itself toward cognitive modeling and simulation.

More recently, an integrated approach is sometimes taken, mainly in an attempt to supplement limitations of one approach with strengths of another (e.g., Iida, Inui, Takamura, and Matsumoto, 2003).

The approach that we take for this study is purely linguistic-based. It can, however, be considered empirical in the sense that our linguistic-based heuristics are partly drawn from the results of a corpus analysis. Our motives for this choice are closely related to and largely influenced by our intention of applying NLP to language learning. As we stated earlier, the CL aspect of NLP concerns modeling human understanding and generation of language. For this purpose, the linguistic-based approach is the most reasonable choice among the three, as it provides a more transparent (“glass box”) language model in which rules and principles are articulated, and thus provides us with direct implications for language teaching.

5.2.2 Processes

As presented in Mitkov (2003), linguistic levels of processing that NLP is responsible for typically range from word segmentation, which presents a substantial challenge in non-segmented oriental languages (including Japanese), to morphological analysis, which assigns a part-of-speech tag to each morpheme, and to syntactic analysis, which parses a string of words into larger chunks and often presents their phrase structure or dependency relations. In the area of semantics, word-sense disambiguation is an important task, given the fact that many words, such as ‘right’ in English and ‘hasi’ in
Japanese, have multiple meanings. Disambiguation is also required at syntactic and discourse levels, as well. Anaphora resolution, as a process of disambiguation of referential relations, is one crucial aspect of discourse processing that is usually constructed “on top of” morphological, syntactic and semantic analyses.

Our focus will be on the detection of the presence of invisible referential expressions, which requires lexical, syntactic, and semantic interpretations of the input, as well as some pragmatic factors.

### 5.2.3 Applications

Natural Language Processing (NLP) is a fascinating area of research and an emerging technology with a variety of real-world applications. The most familiar applications found in our daily life include the grammar checking, spell checking and spelling correction that many word processing packages are equipped with. Machine translation (MT) is one of the earliest practical applications of NLP techniques, dating back to the 1950’s, and still is an active area of research. Other areas include information retrieval, information extraction, question answering, and text summarization, to name a few from the extensive coverage in Mitkov (2003). Also listed in this volume is computer-assisted language learning (Nerbonne, 2003), in which our interest lies, and which will be discussed in more detail in what follows.

### 5.3 NLP in language teaching/learning

Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is one promising area that NLP techniques can contribute to. The emerging discipline that seeks to apply NLP to the problems of language learning and language learning research is called “intelligent computer-assisted language learning” or simply ICALL. This term is used, on one hand, to refer exclusively to parser-based CALL programs (e.g., Holland, Maisano, Alderks, and Martin, 1993); on the other hand, it is used in a broader sense to cover CALL systems equipped with any AI techniques (such as inferencing, learning from interactions, and updating knowledge), and is also known as intelligent tutoring systems (ITS), a subfield of AI (e.g., Hamburger, Schoelles, and Reeder, 1999). In this thesis, we treat the term in a neutral sense to indicate CALL programs that deploy NLP techniques of various kinds, and use the terms ICALL and NLP-based CALL (or NLP-enhanced CALL and some other varieties) interchangeably.

---

2 The use of MT for language learning has also been discussed in the CALL literature (e.g., Anderson, 1995).
Since the rise of this discipline, there has been a debate concerning the relationship between CALL and NLP and the two communities they belong to, as well as the pros and cons of NLP-based CALL (e.g., Swartz and Yazdani, 1992; Holland, 1995; Hamburger et al., 1999; Tschichold, 2000; Borin, 2002a, b; Nerbonne, 2003). On the “pessimistic” side of those debates, Holland grieves for “the neglect of ICALL.” Borin metaphorically describes the relationship as “oil and water.” Tschichold raises a question whether or not they are “unwilling partners.”

Among the pessimistic views on NLP-based CALL is the observation that many CALL programs have been successful without NLP technology, which has tended to turn the eyes of CALL researchers away from NLP. NLP does not seem to be indispensable to CALL, at least to traditional CALL that emphasizes drill and practice, and to multimedia CALL and web-based CALL that value communicative activities.

Pessimism may also stem from the distance between the two communities, as Borin (2002) pointed out, including different cultures and misunderstanding about the other discipline, namely, humanistic CALL versus engineering NLP.

Despite all this pessimism, the efficacy of NLP-inspired CALL is still promising and worth pursuing, with a “milk and honey” (Borin, 2002) or “bread and butter” view of the collaboration between the two disciplines. Gamper and Knapp (2002) provided a comprehensive review of ICALL systems as a fruitful result of such collaboration.

### 5.4 Previous NLP-in-CALL work

Successful “milk and honey” or “bread and butter” collaboration through a “willing partnership” between CALL and NLP has been realized in numerous research efforts in the form of NLP-enhanced CALL programs. This section reviews those existing programs, which range widely in their linguistic levels of analysis, from lexeme to discourse. The aim of this review is not necessarily to be exhaustive, but rather to present a summary of what has been done in order to enable a comparison to what we are attempting to do. We will first review ICALL programs developed for English and other European languages, and then introduce some Japanese ICALL work.

**ICALL programs for English and other European languages**

Concordancing programs, or simply concordancers, also called KWIC (key word in context) are among most basic language processing programs. Quite a few concordancers are available on the market: MonoConc designed for monolingual corpus

---

3 Earlier NLP-based CALL work was done in the 1980s (e.g., Pulman, 1984; Zock and Alviset, 1986). The 1990s witnessed numerous works in CALL from an NLP perspective. For example, COLING (International Conference on Computational Linguistics) organized a panel on the use of NLP and CL in CALL in 1996.
and ParaConc for parallel corpora (Athelstan), Wordsmith (Oxford University Press), and MicroConcord (Oxford University Press), and so on. There are also a number of concordancers currently available on the web. Edict Virtual Language Centre in Hong Kong, 4 for example, provides an online “resource assisted learning system” that includes a word frequency text profiler, dictionary reference and concordancer in the spirit of “data-driven learning (DDL).” 5 Idiom Concordancer is in a similar vein such that it aims to assist writing by providing idiomatic expressions in authentic contexts; it locates idioms in the research paper corpus (Morishita, Nanba, and Aizawa, 2003).

Morphological processing has reached a reasonably sufficient maturity (Nerbonne, 2003), and it has been applied to a considerable number of programs that aim to support language learners with glossed text. PC-KIMMO, a morphological parser, is used for glossing text (Antworth, 1993). Another example is GLOSSER, which provides assistance for French learners in the form of morphological information for a lemma, dictionary entry for the lemma, and examples from corpora (Nerbonne, Dokter, and Smit, 1998).

Even more ICALL work has been done at the syntactic level, with parsers for syntax checkers. Falling in this category is the ALICE system by Levin, Evans, and Gates (1991) and the LINGER system by Yazdani (1991). Loritz (1995) developed the GPARS system, which utilizes a parsing technology to classify the constructions used by learners and to indicate not only where errors are made, but also what constructions are avoided or overused by learners. Furthermore, Loritz, DeSmedt, Aoki, Yamura-Takei, and Chen (1998) suggest that “competency analysis,” as well as “error analysis,” is what parser-based grammar checkers are capable of, and that such checkers are even good enough to outperform human teachers.

Attempts to go “beyond syntax” can be found in work by Dorr, Hendler, Blanksteens, and Migdaloff (1995), who utilize lexical semantics for free response questions in their MILT system.

ICALL programs for Japanese
A respectable number of CALL programs intended for JSL/JFL have also been implemented and some are freely accessible to the intended users and researchers. These programs are roughly divided into three groups: (i) acquisition support type, (ii) comprehension support type, and (iii) production support type.

Sawaya (2002) developed a Web-Concordancer for Japanese language learners, which is presently incorporated into the Asunaro system (see below). He reported that it had been shown to have a positive effect on learners’ vocabulary acquisition and that it received a high evaluation from teachers for its benefits in the area of material

---

4 http://www.edict.com.hk/

5 DDL will be discussed in detail in Chapter 7.
Yang and Akahori (1997) implemented a CALL program that aims at the acquisition of passive voice in Japanese. It contains morphological and syntactic analyzers, as well as error analysis and feedback generating components.

There are quite a few reading support systems. *JGloss* analyzes Japanese text and appends the readings and meanings of words. Similar reading support can be obtained at *Rikai.com*. *Reading Tutor* is a reading tutorial system to improve the reading skills of English/German-speaking learners of Japanese (e.g., Kawamura, Kitamura and Hobara, 2000), accessible online. It is equipped by morphological processing (by *ChaSen*) with on-demand dictionary look-ups (in *EDR Dictionary* for English and *Woerterbuch-Daten* for German). It also contains vocabulary/kanji level checkers that provide a difficulty level analysis results, in which the levels correspond to the four levels defined in the Japanese Language Proficiency Test (JLPT). *Asunaro* is an integrated reading support program freely accessible online. It utilizes *JUMAN* (morphological analyzer) and *KNP* (syntactic analyzer) and provides, in addition to support on a morphological level, syntactic structures of the input text in four different formats: *KNP* output, tree structure, nesting box structure, and click-on dependency structure.

There are also some programs that aim to support sentence production of learners. *ALICE-chan* also exploits morphological and syntactic analyses, and provides feedback concerning errors detected by those analyses in students’ responses to exercises (Levin and Evans, 1995). Likewise, Kakegawa, Kanda, Fujioka, Itami, and Ito (2000) developed a parser-based system for diagnostic processing that is capable of detecting errors in students’ input sentences to given exercises. *BANZAI* is an intelligent language tutor that is designed to improve learners’ grammatical and sentence production skills (Nagata, 2002a, b). It utilizes morphological/syntactic analyses and provides diagnostic feedback on errors detected.

We have reviewed NLP-based CALL systems both for English (and some other European languages) and for Japanese. As you can see, all these systems aim at the lexical and syntactic level problems that ESL/JSL learners might encounter in their comprehension and/or production. Work that focuses on discourse level phenomena is practically non-existent, to the best of our knowledge. This is probably due to the immaturity of automatic discourse level processing, in contrast to well-developed morphological and syntactic level analyses, and also due to the lower level of interest in or emphasis on discourse (as opposed to sentence grammar) in language teaching in general. It is also worth noting that many of the reading aids reviewed above take

---

6 http://language.tiu.ac.jp/ (maintained at Tokyo International University).

7 http://hinoki.ryu.titech.ac.jp/ (maintained at Tokyo Institute of Technology).

8 One exception that we are aware of is work by Suri and McCoy (1993a), who attempt to detect discourse-level errors concerning the use of definite and indefinite articles.
authentic texts as input, i.e., the users (teachers and learners) can choose such texts from the world as are interesting and informative to them to be analyzed by these tools. This will be an important base for data-driven learning (DDL). We will return to this issue in Chapter 7.

Given the review of previous work, our work will be innovative in that it aims at a discourse-level phenomenon and attempts to enhance instruction and acquisition of the phenomenon, with data-driven or corpus-based learning methodology and principles as its pedagogical backbone.

5.5 Summary

In this chapter, we first reviewed educational technology and in particular, NLP techniques and applications. More specifically, we discussed the pros and cons of the use of NLP in language teaching and learning. We also presented some previous work on NLP enhanced language teaching/learning aids.

A schematic summary of those reviews and discussions is provided in Figure 5.1 below. Our perspective and stance in the development of ZD are indicated by highlighting in the figure.
Our focus is on the use of ET as it contributes to language learning, i.e., NLP technology and its embodiment as NLP-based CALL. We take a purely linguistic (symbolic) approach to explicate a discourse-level phenomenon, fully utilizing lexical, morphological, and syntactic analyses that underlie that phenomenon. Our major goal is to relate technology to pedagogy in a theoretically and empirically feasible way. We will demonstrate how important a role NLP-based CALL plays in what we tentatively call a “new approach” to language teaching later in Chapter 7.

Although not included in the figure, the intended users are teachers and learners in university level JSL courses, excluding K-12. The program is intended for use in a traditional classroom (in the sense of “not virtual” or “not long-distance”, thus including computer-equipped classrooms). The intended mode is teacher-planned rather than total self-study at the present time.
Chapter 6

Technology and Zero Detector

6.1 Impetus for developing ZD

Zero Detector (hereafter ZD) is a linguistic analysis tool that is intended to serve as a basis for pedagogical purposes (which we will discuss later in Chapter 7). The primary function of this program is to make invisible ZEROS visible, by detecting the existence of ZEROS in a given input discourse and explicitly marking them in the output.

Recall the Ikkyu anecdote that we introduced in Chapter 1, in which we assumed that he saved himself from being punished by recognizing the presence of a single ZERO, in the warning sign placed in front of the bridge that he needed to cross. One motivation for the development of this tool derives from our hypothesis that it would save more people if the sign read like this:

(6.1) この ( の) はしを わたるな

kono ( no) hasi-o wataru-na
this ( GEN) edge/bridge-ACC cross-NEG

We conjecture that recognition of ZEROS is harder for “some people” (see below for discussion), especially for those unfamiliar with or unaware of this peculiar linguistic phenomenon in Japanese, which may lead to a failure in the recognition of a unique interpretation like (6.1), or more generally, to misinterpretation, and hence to a failure in a reasonable degree of perception of coherence in a ZERO-containing discourse. By “reasonable” we mean native-like. Establishing native-like perception of coherence created by ZEROS may be enhanced by the visual marking of the invisible; this is our
fundamental motive for the development of ZD.

By “some people” we mean two groups of people: (i) native Japanese speaking teachers of the Japanese language, and (ii) Japanese language learners whose native language (e.g., English) does not exhibit a similar phenomenon to Japanese ZEROS.

Firstly, native speakers of Japanese are supposedly so unconscious of the presence of ZEROS in the discourse they are processing that the interpretation of ZEROS and/or of a discourse that contains them is largely automatic; hence, the recognition of ZEROS may require conscious effort and intensive attention to the language, and also some linguistic expertise concerning the phenomenon.

This supposition was verified by an experiment that we conducted on ten native speakers of Japanese who are more or less language-conscious (as they are a group of people in the NLP community); half of them were more familiar with the phenomenon of ZEROS than the other half. Given a brief definition and some examples of ZEROS in discourse, they were asked to identify the presence of ZEROS in three sets of text consisting of 30, 25 and 23 utterances respectively. Their results were compared to the one provided by one subject whom we regard as an expert on ZEROS.¹ The expert detected a total of 48 ZEROS. ZEROS detected by our ten subjects showed drastic variation in their number, ranging from 16 to 52 (35.4 on average). Interestingly, the number of ZEROS detected by the less-ZERO-familiar group was much smaller (22.6 average) than by the more-ZERO-knowledgeable group (48.2 average). This may first imply that all native speakers of Japanese are not equally conscious of ZEROS, and may secondarily suggest that the recognition of ZEROS largely depends on how much speakers are acquainted with these invisibles as a phenomenon.

This supposition may also be applicable to Japanese language teachers; some teachers are more conscious of ZEROS than others. Teachers do know that Japanese is an “elliptic” language, but they do not necessarily spot every single example of the ellipsis phenomenon that occurs in discourse. Moreover, even though they are conscious and well-enough acquainted with the phenomenon, the detection of ZEROS is a tedious and time-consuming task. Computerization of the manual process would be a great advantage since it would release teachers from having to spend enormous amounts of time on the tedious work of analyzing educational materials that they intend to use in class. It would also have advantages over error-prone and often inconsistent manual analysis.

The same supposition would be true of Japanese language learners. Learners understand that Japanese is elliptic, but knowing precisely “where ellipsis occurs” and “what is elided” is a different story (Obana, 2000). To Japanese language learners, however, the recognition of ZEROS alone does not mean much. It probably does not have a direct impact on their comprehension of ZERO-containing discourses, but the

¹ The subject has an extensive experience on ZERO research from linguistic and pedagogical perspectives.
recognition of ZEROS could lead naturally to the recognition of coherence relations in a discourse, and hence to a better understanding of the discourse. The perceived degree of coherence would vary from learner to learner, depending on how well they recognize ZERO-creating coherence. Accurate interpretation of ZEROS also varies greatly amongst learners, as was indicated by the performance assessed by the experiment that we presented in 2.6.1. All these differences derive from the recognition of ZEROS in the first place; that is our rationale for making invisible ZEROS visible.

We have discussed so far why we want to make ZEROS visible for teachers and learners, and hence why we want to develop ZD. We will discuss later, in Chapter 7, how these two groups of people would educationally benefit from using ZD.

6.2 Methodological principles

Here, we will present our overall stance toward the development of ZD. We aim to re-use existing NLP technologies and resources that are sufficiently mature and “portable” where possible, rather than building a system from scratch.\(^2\) ZD integrates two existing natural language analysis tools and an electronic dictionary, none of which were intended for language teaching/learning purposes, into its architecture, attempting to make the best possible use of their capabilities for our purpose. Morphological analysis is done by ChaSen 2.2.8 (developed at NAIST; e.g., Matsumoto, Kitauchi, Yamashita, Hirano, Matsuda, Takaoka, and Asahara, 2000), and dependency structure analysis by CaboCha 0.21 (also developed at NAIST; e.g., Kudo and Matsumoto, 2000, 2001). Goi-Taikei: A Japanese Lexicon (Ikehara, Miyazaki, Shirai, Yokoo, Nakaiwa, Ogura, Oyama, and Hayashi, 1997) is used as a source of verbal argument structure (or valency pattern) search in the zero verbal argument recognition components and also as a source of nominal syntactic/semantic categorization in the zero nominal argument recognition modules.

The biggest advantage of reusing existing tools and database is to release system developers from making every single component from scratch, which saves a tremendous amount of time and effort. Disadvantages are, on the other hand, that the existing tools and database may not fully suit the new purpose; it is inevitable that the intended goals of the developers and the users do not always match in a perfect manner. We attempt to correct this disadvantage with necessary adjustments.

ZD utilizes syntactic and lexical semantic information from the surface realization of the input text. ZD employs a rule-based approach for its architecture, with theoretically sound heuristics. ZD deals with two types of ZEROS, as we presented in

\(^2\) Several NLP-in-CALL projects follow the same principle, e.g., the ICALL groups at the University of Geneva (Vandeventer, 2000) and at Dublin City University (Greene, Keogh, Koller, Wagner, Ward, and van Genabith, 2004), and the aforementioned programs for Japanese, Reading Tutor and Asunaro.
Chapter 2, zero verbal arguments and zero nominal arguments, which are distinct from each other in their syntactic representation. Hence, the two types naturally need two different sets of heuristics. We will outline the theoretical assumptions from which our heuristics are drawn and present the algorithms for the recognition of these ZEROS, in two separate sections, 6.4 and 6.5 respectively, after a brief discussion of the notions common to both types of ZEROS and a description of the database that we employed in Section 6.3.

6.3 Argument structure versus valency

6.3.1 Definition

Argument structure, as we discussed in 2.2.1, defines the range and nature of syntactic elements usually required by a head verb, noun or other lexical unit (referred to as “predicate”). So does “valency,” a term introduced by the French linguist, Lucien Tesnière, by analogy with the chemistry of atoms. In this thesis, we use the terms “argument structure” and “valency,” and “argument” and “valent” interchangeably.

6.3.2 Lexicon

Central to the task of understanding a natural language text is determining its argument structure or valency, i.e., the “who did what to whom” and/or “of what/whom” information about the text, which is also a key component for the recognition of ZEROS in the system of ZD. Such information is found in a so-called “lexicon,” or “(valency) dictionary,” which usually contains data for each entry (lemma) at various linguistic levels: phonology, morphosyntax, syntax and semantics, as well as possible linking between the entries for various lexical and semantic relations. The availability of electronic lexicons for an increasing number of natural languages has made such dictionaries among the most indispensable language resources for those involved in all aspects of NLP research.

From among several electronic lexicons available for Japanese, we decided to use Goi-Taikei: A Japanese Lexicon. Goi-Taikei is a semantic and valency dictionary; it is commercially available both in an electronic version (CD-ROM) and in a print version comprising five volumes (Ikehara et al., 1997). The major attraction of Goi-Taikei is its size and coverage, containing 300,000 word entries.

Each word entry in Goi-Taikei specifies syntactic information (part-of-speech) and a set of semantic classes. The semantic classes are taken from a hierarchical semantic ontology that is made up of three separate ontological trees: each one containing 2,710 nodes for nouns, 130 nodes for proper nouns, and 36 for predicates (i.e., verbs,
adjectives and nominal adjectives).

For example, for the search for a word はし hasi, Goi-Taikei returns entries as in (6.2).³

(6.2)  a. 橋（はし） [名] 420 橋

hasi (ha-si) [noun] 420 bridge

b. 端（はし） [名] 2658 端 2659 先(場) 2667 ふち …

hasi (ha-si) [noun] 2658 edge 2659 tip (place) 2667 rim

c. 箸,はし,ハシ（はし） [名] 913 箸・さじ

hasi (ha-si) [noun] 913 chopsticks/spoon

The primary entry for the word hasi is syntactically categorized as a “common noun” and is semantically classified as a member of the “bridge” group (#420) which is under the “place” node (#388) in the “concrete” noun group. It is secondarily classified in the same syntactic category, but as a member of the “edge” semantic group (#2658) which is under the “location” node (#2610) in the “abstract” noun group. In the third sense, it belongs to the “tableware” node.

In addition, Goi-Taikei contains valency patterns for 6,000 predicates; a total of 14,000 patterns are listed, with an average of 2.3 patterns for each predicate. These patterns, in fact, correspond to those for English; they are intended to be used for transfer-based machine translation applications. Each predicate sense in the dictionary is associated with one or more argument slots, which are labeled N1, N2, etc. Each argument slot contains information, such as its grammatical function, indicated by case marking particles and selectional restrictions. The search for a verb 渡る wataru returns the basic information as in (6.3).

(6.3) 渡る（わたる）[自動]

wataru (wa-ta-ru) [intransitive]

Also, its valency patterns, along with their corresponding English expressions, are provided with ten different listings. The first two listings are presented in (6.4).

(6.4)  a. 15 natural phenomenon (action; passivization not allowed)

N1-ga N2-o wataru N1 blow across N2
[N1(2373 wind) N2(511 land)]

³ The first three listings, out of the eight entries for ha-si, are presented here.
b. 18 physical movement (action; passivization not allowed)
   N1-ga N2-o wataru   N1 cross N2
   [N1(3 agent 535 animal 986 vehicle) N2(388 place 2610 location)]

Recall the Ikkyu example. According to the Goi-Taikai semantic and valency definitions in the (b) sense, both the Ikkyu interpretation “cross the edge” and the normal interpretation “cross the bridge” are possible.

6.4 Zero Verbal Argument Recognition

6.4.1 Verbal argument structure

6.4.1.1 Related work

Verbal argument structure or valency is significant in its own right. The central role that it plays in analyzing clause units makes it an inevitable lexical resource for many NLP applications. There have been several electronic valency dictionaries developed and made available mainly to the research community. They include the 260,000-word EDR Dictionary (EDR, 1996) and the 2,000-word IPAL Lexicon (IPA, 1987, 1990, 1996), besides the aforementioned Goi-Taikai. More recently, Valence Data on Japanese Verbs (Ogino, Kobayashi, and Isahara, 2003), a successor of EDR, has joined the electronic resource pool.

Even before the age of electronic publishing, verbal valency attracted attention in a variety of theoretical frameworks that share the common idea that verbs are the core of sentence structures. Such theories include dependency grammar (proposed by Tesnière for French in 1959, or by Hays for English), valency grammar (by Helbig and Schenkel, Engel and Schumacher for German), case grammar (by Fillmore), lexical functional grammar or LFG (by Kaplan and Bresnan) and generative grammar (by Chomsky), among others.\(^4\) In generative frameworks, such as Government and Binding (GB), for example, a “subcategorization frame” is defined to specify the range of sister constituents within the verb phrase, namely whether or not the verb permits a following NP object, and “selectional restrictions” specify the inherent semantic features permitted (or required) on the constituents. More traditionally, syntactic patterns for English verbs have been extensively studied by Fries (1952) and Hornby (1954), both of whom are influential in EFL/ESL pedagogy.

Influenced by these studies, work on Japanese valency patterns, as well, has a long history. Though electronically unavailable, there are also a few research efforts on

---

\(^4\) We have benefited a great deal from Ishiwata and Ogino (1983) for this summary.
6.4.1.2 Our approach

Our approach is eclectic and relatively theory-neutral; it does not strictly adhere to any specific grammatical framework reviewed above, but rather simply adopts the general idea that a clause consists of a head predicate and its arguments; a predicate takes (or requires) a set of arguments, and the arguments are syntactically dependent on the head predicate. Thus, “predicate” and “argument” are two key concepts in our approach (see Chapter 2).

**Predicate**

The predicates that constitute clauses in Japanese include verbs, adjectives, nominal adjectives and the copula. Each predicate word does not usually occur by itself, but rather co-occurs with some auxiliary elements, including modal and other supporting verb types that follow the core predicate (in bold), as illustrated in (6.5).

(6.5)  

| a. verb  | nageyoo-to-si-ta       | [core: nageru ‘throw’]  |
| b. adjective | atarasi-katta        | [core: atarasii ‘new’]  |
| c. nominal adjective | sizuka-ni-naru      | [core: sizuka ‘quiet’]  |
| d. copula     | da-tta                | [core: da ‘be’]         |

The whole predicate in (6.5a), for example, is morphologically analyzed into several elements, as in (6.6).

(6.6)  

nageyoo-to-si-ta

throw-COML-do-PAST

This predicate unit contains two verbs nageru ‘throw’ and suru ‘do,’ but the valency should be checked for the core predicate, ‘throw’ in this case. We will discuss this point more concretely later in section 6.4.3.

The verb nageru, for example, usually requires two arguments: the one who does the act of throwing and the one that is thrown. Most adjectives and nominal adjectives are one-place predicates. Two nominal arguments or one nominal and one adjectival argument are obligatory for clauses containing a copula.

We use the term verbal arguments\(^5\) for all four cases in (6.5), simply because verbs

---

\(^5\) In Yamura-Takei and Fujiwara (2004), we used the term “zero predicate-argument,” which is avoided here because of the confusing usage of the term “predicate.”
are the major type of clausal predicate and there is no appropriate (and non-confusing) term to cover all these predicate types. Therefore, when we use the term verbal arguments, we also include the adjectival and copula arguments, for the rest of the thesis.

**Argument PPs**
Arguments normally take the form of PPs, i.e., NPs that are headed by (case-assigning or topic/focus marking) particles, often coded as NP-ga or N-ga. We classify arguments into three groups according to their head particle types: Topic PPs, headed by a topic marking particle *wa*, Focus PPs, headed by focus marking particles *mo*, *koso*, *dake*, *sae*, *sika*, etc., and Case PPs, headed by case marking particles *ga*, *o*, *ni*, *e*, *to*, *yori*, *de*, *kara* and *made*, out of which *ga*, *o*, and *ni* represent the surface realization of grammatical case (see 2.2.3). We regard adjuncts as non-particle-accompanied phrases, such as *sono hi*, ‘that day.’ Look at the next example.

(6.7) 太郎は そのとき かべに 卵を 投げようとした

Taro-wa sono-toki kabe-ni tamago-o nageyoo-to-si-ta
Taro-TOP that-time wall-at egg-ACC throw-to-do-PAST

‘At that moment, Taro tried to throw an egg at the wall.’

This clause contains a core predicate (*nageru* ‘throw’) and one adjunct (*sono toki* ‘then’) and three arguments: one Topic PP (*Taro-wa*) and two Case PPs (*kabe-ni* and *tamago-o*).

We defined ZEROS as the unexpressed “obligatory” arguments of a core predicate. What qualifies as “obligatory” is an open issue, and there is no agreement among linguists on its definition. Somers (1984) proposed, in denying a simply binary distinction (i.e., obligatory/non-obligatory), a six-level scale of valency binding that reflects the degree of closeness of an argument to the predicate. The levels are (i) integral complements, (ii) obligatory complements, (iii) optional complements, (iv) middles, (v) adjuncts, and (vi) extraperipherals.

Ishiwata (1999) suggests that in Japanese, members of group (i) are often treated as parts of idioms and are not omissible; Japanese nominative -*ga* and accusative -*o* fall into the category (ii), while dative -*ni* belongs to (iii). In light of this, we assume that obligatory arguments are phrases accompanied by the nominative-case particle *ga*, and accusative *o*. Dative *ni* in an indirect object position requires special handling. Whilst it is true that it is often optional, there are some cases (e.g., *tutaeru* “tell,” *watasu* “hand”) in which the presence of the dative phrase is obligatory. If the argument is

---

6 In Yamura-Takei et al. (2002), we use the term “Kase Phrase (KP)”, but we replace it with “Case Particle Phrase (Case PP)” in this thesis.
unexpressed in these cases, we identify it as a zero argument as well. In addition, we take ni-marked subject/object and ga-marked object (as discussed in 2.2.3) into consideration.

In sum, we consider argument PPs that are headed by “grammatical” case markers as “obligatory” elements and exclude PPs headed by “semantic” case markers from our ZERO candidates. Therefore, among the three arguments contained in (6.7) above, Hanako-ni is not considered as an “obligatory” argument PP. If the argument is unexpressed in these cases, we identify it as a zero argument.

Look at the sample clause in (6.8).

(6.8) 昨日 カレーライスを 食べた
kino kareerai-su-o tabe-ta.
Yesterday curry-and-rice-ACC eat-PAST

The valency pattern of the predicate taberu ‘eat’ requires a nominative argument as well as an accusative argument. This implies the presence of a ZERO “Ø-(ga)” in the sentence (6.8), as in (6.8’). We call this ZERO type the “zero verbal argument.”

(6.8’) kino (Ø-ga) kareerai-su-o tabe-ta.
Yesterday (Ø-NOM) curry-and-rice-ACC eat-PAST

‘Yesterday, Ø ate curry and rice.’

This definition of ZEROS provides the following three basic valency patterns for verbs and potential ZEROS.

(6.9) a. NOM + V Ø-ga tomaru. ‘Ø stops.’
b. NOM + ACC + V Ø-ga Ø-o tomeru. ‘Ø stops Ø.’
c. NOM + DAT + ACC + V Ø-ga Ø-ni Ø-o osieru. ‘Ø teaches Ø Ø.’

6.4.2 Verbal valency dictionary

As a lexical database that ZD accesses in search of the valency for a given verb, Goi-Takei is employed (see 6.3.2 above for detailed description of Goi-Taikei). The biggest advantage of the Goi-Taikei verbal valency dictionary is its size and coverage; it contains 6,000 predicates.

In addition to Goi-Taikei, we also use a small lexicon that was constructed from the hand-tabulated valency listing provided by Ishiwata and Ogino (1983) and Ishiwata (1999). The list contains valency patterns for 1,154 predicates (including verbs, adjectives, and nominal adjectives), with semantic features for each valent specified.
Valents (coded N) are accompanied by one of nine case particles, *ga, o, ni, to, e, kara, yori, made* and *de*, each of which is assigned one and only semantic feature (labeled in French), from among “abstrait,” “action,” “animal,” “concret,” “divers,” “humain,” “localité,” “number,” “matière,” “temps,” and “s(entence),” as an example in (6.10) shows.

(6.10) *arau* ‘wash’ N [hum] *ga* + N [con] *o* + V

A predicate and its valency pattern, in most cases, correspond on a one-to-one basis. In the case of multiple patterns, the patterns are listed from a fewer-valent pattern to a more-valent pattern.

In constructing our lexicon from this list, we first selected 334 predicates that are listed in the vocabulary for the Japanese-Language Proficiency Test (JLPT) levels 3 and 4 (distributed by the Japan Foundation and Japan Educational Exchange Services, in 1994 and revised in 2002), reexamined the valency patterns, and made some slight modifications when necessary.7 We call this valency dictionary *JLPT3/4*, and use it as a resource for *ZD*, in addition to *Goi-Taikei*.

These two sets of lexicons, distinct from each other in their size, coverage and original intention, are incorporated into two versions of the zero verbal argument component of *ZD*.

### 6.4.3 Algorithm

The recognition of zero verbal arguments is subjected to the following procedures. We will use the following utterance as an example input string to illustrate the ZERO detecting processes.

(6.11) 困った太郎は さっそく 論文を

*komatta taroo-wa sassoku ronbun-o*

troubled Taro-TOP immediately paper-ACC

*sirabe-saseru-koto-ni-si-ta.*

look-in-CAUS-NOMI-to-do-PAST

‘Troubled Taro, immediately tried to have (someone) look in the paper.’

---

7 This is done solely for the purpose of using *ZD* for the instruction of intermediate JSL learners. Modifications were made, according to suggestions from a JSL teaching expert, in order to provide as canonical and basic a valency pattern as is appropriate for those learners.
The input is first analyzed morphologically by ChaSen, and passed on to the next step.

**Clause splitting and labeling**

The identification of clause boundaries is vital for many NLP tasks (Orasen, 2000). It is an initial step that is required for our task, as well, because the basic unit for the zero detecting operation is a clause that consists of one and only head predicate and its arguments. Thus, the input text that is previously morphologically analyzed is next split into a set of clauses.

Clause splitting, in our method, is initiated by searching for an element morphologically defined as a type of predicate (i.e., verb, adjective, or nominal adjective). Here, some complication lies in the fact that some predicates are simplex, as in (6.12a) below, while others are complex, involving multiple predicates, as in (6.12b). The example (b) contains two elements that are morphologically analyzed as verbs (underlined): a core predicate, *taberu* ‘eat’ and a supporting verb, *aru* ‘have.’

(6.12)  

a.  

\[
\text{tabe-ta}  \\
\text{eat-PAST}  \\
\text{‘ate’}
\]

b.  

\[
\text{tabe-ta-koto-ga-aru}  \\
\text{eat-PAST-NOMI-NOM-have}  \\
\text{‘have eaten’}
\]

These complex predicate patterns are predefined as simplex to avoid excessive clause splitting. The predefined rules comprise a total of 15, which are grouped into the following four patterns in (6.13).

(6.13)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. verb + verb</td>
<td>(11 rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. adjective + verb</td>
<td>(1 rule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. verb + adjective</td>
<td>(2 rules)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. verb + nominal predicate</td>
<td>(1 rule)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the rules above is applied to the complex predicate in the sample clause, *sirabe-saseru-koto-ni-si-ta*, which contains two verbs (underlined), and it is consequently analyzed as one predicate.

Then, the clauses are labeled with their clause types: independent (main), dependent (coordinated/subordinated) or embedded (relative/nominal/quoted). A clause serves as the basic unit for the zero detecting operation. In this study, embedded clauses are excluded from this operation and are left within their
superordinate clauses. An example output is given in (6.14).

(6.14) 困った EC(RC)] 太郎は  さっそく 論文を

$komatta\ EC(RC)]\ Taro-wa\ sassoku\ ronbun-o$

調べさせることにした IC]

$sirabe-saseru-koto-ni-si-ta\ IC$]

Here, we use the acronyms: IC for Independent Clause, EC for Embedded Clause and RC for Relative Clause.

**Dependency analysis**

Once the text is split into clauses, each clause is analyzed for its dependency structure and then converted into its clause structure frame. The argument PPs that depend on the verb are extracted, and then classified into phrase types (Topic PP, Focus PP and Case PP) according to their head particles. An example of this frame is given in Figure 6.1.

---

8 This treatment is identical to that of the CENTER-updating unit for our centering analysis (see .3.2.3).
This frame indicates that this utterance, labeled clause #5 in the fourth sentence in the second paragraph in the input text, is a clause of “Independent” type, with a relative clause (RC) embedded in it.

The core predicate is a verb *siraberu* ‘investigate’ whose valency is later checked against a valency dictionary. The verb is accompanied by a causative verb, *saseru*, followed by a past marking auxiliary verb - *ta*. The “voice” slot is, hence, marked as “causative,” which is later referred to at the stage of valency changing operations. The utterance contains two arguments: one Topic PP whose canonical case is restored, at the case restoring operation phase (see below), as nominative (marked N1-*ga*) and one Case PP. It also includes one adjunct, i.e., an adverb.
Valency checking

Given the clause structure frame, a core predicate is checked against Goi-Taikei to search for its valency pattern(s). Goi-Taikei has a semantic valency dictionary, originally designed for transfer-based Japanese-to-English machine translation, so it includes as many valency pattern entries for each predicate as are necessary for effective transfer. The entries are ordered according to the expected frequency of occurrence. We took the naïve approach of selecting the first-ranking entry from the listing for each core predicate. The valency selected for the verb siraberu is shown in (6.15).

(6.15) Valency Selected: N1 ga N2 o

The next step is to apply the definition of “obligatoriness” described in 6.4.1.2. In order to refine the selected valency pattern, the following modification is made; if non-ga, -o, or -ni cases are within the first three slots of the selected valency pattern, they are removed. The resulting valency for (6.15) is given in (6.16).

(6.16) Valency Obligatory: N1 ga N2 o

If a ni-case still remains in the third slot, it is also deleted. These operations leave us two valency patterns: (i) N1-ga N2-o, and (ii) N1-ga N2-ni, in most cases.

Valency changing operation

Then, a valency changing operation is done in the case of causatives or passives. When an auxiliary verb is added to the core predicate in the causative or passive construction, the verb then requires three arguments. In the causative case, there are a ga-marked causer, an o-marked object and a ni-marked causee. The valency changing operation adds the valent, N3 ni, as in (6.17) because the voice slot is marked as causative in Figure 6.1 above.

(6.17) Valency Changed: N1 ga N2 o N3 ni

Case restoring operation

Case-less elements, such as Topic PP and Focus PP, need to have their canonical case markers restored. This is done, in a parallel fashion with the ZERO identification, by assigning the first remaining valent(s) to Topic PP and/or Focus PP. Let us review the rationale for this operation.

In Topic PPs and Focus PPs, topic/focus marking particles replace the nominative case marker -ga or the accusative case marker-o. This replacement of case particles sometimes causes ambiguities, as example (6.18) shows.
This utterance alone is ambiguous because two derivations for the structure (6.18) are theoretically possible, as in (6.19).

(6.18)  ネコは  つかまえた。
\[ \text{neko-wa} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{tukamae-ta}. \]
\( \text{cat-TOP} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{catch-PAST} \)

‘The cat caught (something).’

Empirically, however, (a) is a highly dominant case, as we saw in the evidence provided from our corpus in 3.2.3.3 (see Table 3.2). We examined all the PPs marked by a topic marking particle \( \text{wa} \) and a focus marking particle \( \text{mo} \) in our corpus, and found that the vast majority of topic PPs are canonically of nominative case.

Other case marking particles, such as dative case marker \( \text{ni} \), and other semantic particles, such as \( \text{made} \) and \( \text{kara} \), in contrast, are preserved when PPs are topicalized or focused, and topic/focus marking particles are simply added to them, as illustrated in (6.20).

(6.20)  a.  ネコには  むずかしい。
\[ \text{neko-ni} \quad \emptyset \quad \text{muzukasii}. \]
\( \text{Ø-ga} \quad \text{neko-ni} \quad \text{muzukasii}. \)
\( \text{Ø-NOM} \quad \text{cat-for} \quad \text{difficult} \)

‘Ø is difficult for cats.’

b.  ネコからも  話を  聞いた。
\[ \text{neko-kara-mo} \quad \text{hanasi-o} \quad \text{kii-ta}. \]
\( \text{Ø-ga} \quad \text{neko-kara-mo} \quad \text{hanasi-o} \quad \text{kii-ta}. \)
\( \text{Ø-NOM} \quad \text{cat-from-FOC} \quad \text{story-ACC} \quad \text{hear-PAST} \)
‘Ø heard a story also from the cat.’

These cases are not problematic for the case-restoring operation; canonical cases (underlined) are explicitly maintained.

Returning now to example (6.14), Topic PP, Taro-wa, is assigned ga case and the Topic-case slot is marked with N1-ga, in Figure 6.1. In this way, all the case-less phrases are assigned cases.\(^9\)

**ZERO identification**

Now that the valency pattern for the given predicate is assigned, it is checked against overt arguments listed in the frame. The valent N2 is matched with the overt argument ronbun-o and removed from the ZERO candidate list, as shown in (6.21) where the case slot N1-ga assigned to a Topic PP, Taro-wa is also deleted.

\[(6.21) \text{Valency Changed: } \text{N1} \text{-} \text{ga} \rightarrow \text{N2} \rightarrow \text{N3} \text{ ni}\]

Finally the remaining valent, if any, is assumed to be a ZERO, i.e., N3 ni, in this example.

**ZERO insertion**

Once ZEROS are identified, ZD decides where to insert the identified ZEROS in the original text, by keeping canonical ordering as listed in the valency pattern. An example of the verbal (obligatory) argument structure from Figure 6.1, with the identified ZERO, is presented in 6.22. Here, the predicate-argument structure is arranged horizontally, and the restored case-marking particle, ga in this case, is presented in parentheses.

\[(6.22) * \text{ komatta Taro-wa (ga)} \]
\[* \text{ ronbun-o} \]
\[* [ \text{ ni}] \]
\[* \text{ sirabe-sasyo-o-to-si-ta} \]

Finally, the original series of clauses with ZEROS inserted in the most plausible positions, along with adjuncts, is provided, as in (6.23).

\[(6.23) \text{ (previous utterance)... komatta Taro-wa(ga) sassoku ronbun-o [ ni]} \]

\(^9\) Torisawa (2001b) proposed an unsupervised learning method for what he calls canonicalization of non-case marking particles. This approach utilizes case frames and semantic word classifications, which guarantees a semantic compatibility in a given verb-noun pair that our approach fails to assure. However, it risks the possibility of assigning to a given noun a case that is already used for another noun within a clause, which will not happen in our method.
To sum up, the flow diagram of the zero detecting processes that have been described above (highlighted) is illustrated in Figure 6.2.

![Flow diagram of zero verbal argument detecting processes](image_url)

**Figure 6.2: Flow diagram of zero verbal argument detecting processes**

### 6.4.4 Other methods

There has been little work that focuses on the detection of ZEROS, compared to the interpretation of ZEROS. Among the few researchers dealing with this topic, Nakaiwa (1997) utilizes aligned English and Japanese sentence pairs to identify zero pronouns (and also their antecedents). Seki, Fujii and Ishikawa (2001) take a similar approach to ours, in the zero pronoun identification phase of their probabilistic model for ZERO resolution. Kawahara et al. (2002, 2004) also take a case-frame approach that utilizes the automatically constructed case frames from a tagged corpus. All this work, however, sees ZERO identification as a prerequisite for the subsequent resolution of the antecedents; none provides any evaluation of the performance of the identification

---

10 They use the IPAL Lexicon as a case frame dictionary.
phase alone. Also, many other papers on zero anaphora resolution use manually
ZERO-detected corpora for their experiments or do not explicitly describe their detecting
processes.

This negligible amount of work on detection is an impetus for developing ZD;
detection itself could be an important NLP task, given an appropriate application area,
in the same way that concordancers find any particular lexical unit on the user’s
demand.

6.5 Zero Nominal Argument Recognition

6.5.1 Nominal argument structure

6.5.1.1 Related work

Verbal argument structure or valency has been extensively studied and placed in the
core of a variety of syntactic theories, as we presented in 6.4.1.1. Nominal argument
structure or valency, as well, has been discussed in the literature, mostly on semantic
grounds.

Partee (1987) suggests that NPs can be interpreted either as individual (type e),
predicate (type <e,t>), or as generalized quantifiers (type <<e,t>,t>). Furthermore,
Partee and Borschev (1998, 2000, 2003) argue for “argument-modifier distinction” of
possessive constructions in NP, with regard to sortal nouns (plain one-place predicates)
versus relational nouns (or “transitive” nouns), and type shifting.

The study of “definiteness” of nouns also concerns nominal arguments. Löbner
(1985, 1991) argues that some nouns are “definite” simply because they are
semantically so. He proposes that many definites in discourse are in fact “semantic
definites.” Semantic definites, i.e., nouns with functional concepts, inherently bear
arguments which can be expressed either explicitly or implicitly. Fraurud (1996)
expresses a similar view. She examined a Finnish corpus and found that many of the
so-called first mention definites are actually semantic “functionals” that can be
identified indirectly through their semantic arguments.

Grimshaw (1990) also assumes that not all nouns have an argument structure and
calls those that do so “argument-taking nominals,” which, in her definition, are
“process” and complex event nominals.

nouns” as nouns that are semantically incomplete and require a “parameter” to fill the
gap.

6.5.1.2 Our approach
Our approach to zero nominal arguments largely depends on the idea that underlies the studies presented in the previous section. We conjecture that some nouns inherently do require arguments, or less firmly put, that some nouns are more likely to take arguments than others in certain contexts, and that those arguments can either be overtly expressed or unexpressed at the level of surface realization. We refer to the cases in which arguments required by their head nouns are implicitly realized, as our definition of zero nominal arguments.

Look at example (6.24), assuming that it occurs in a certain discourse context.

(6.24) 身長は 50センチだ。
        sintyo-wa 50 senti da.
        height-TOP 50-centimeters COP

Utterance (6.24) does not contain a “zero verbal argument.” The utterance satisfies the valency requirements of the predicate: the copula verb da appears with a topicalized subject and a pre-copula nominal, both of which are overt. Therefore, utterance (6.24) contains no “zero verbal argument.” However, this utterance alone is semantically incomplete, although it is syntactically well formed. The noun sintyo ‘height’ calls readers’ attention to “of-what/whom” information and readers recover that information in the flow of text. In this sense, this noun is categorized as Löbner’s “semantic definite,” being a noun of functional concept. Then, the missing information can usually be supplied by an NP (‘the robot,’ for example) followed by an adnominal particle no, as in (6.24’).

(6.24’) (Ø-no) sintyo-wa 50 senti da.
       (Ø-GEN) height-TOP 50-centimeters COP

‘(The robot’s) height is 50 centimeters.’

We assume that argument structures of nouns are realized in the form of this adnominal construction and regard this unexpressed ‘NP no’ in the NP no NP (a.k.a., A no B) construction as the other type of ZERO.

It can be said that zero nominal arguments are “semantic ellipsis” triggered by semantic incompleteness, in contrast to zero verbal arguments, which are “syntactic ellipsis” inferred from syntactic requirements. In other words, the search for zero nominal arguments is equivalent to seeking nouns that semantically require arguments in the context in which they appear. We call these nouns “argument-taking nouns (ATNs),” which are roughly equivalent to the aforementioned concepts: Partee and Borschev’s “relational nouns,” Löbner’s “semantic definites,” Grimshaw’s
“argument-taking nominals,” and Nishiyama’s “unsaturated nouns.” Consequently, we take a lexico-semantic approach to zero nominal argument recognition, in contrast to the syntactic approach we employ for the zero verbal argument recognition, and we will explicate it in the following section.

6.5.2 Nominal valency dictionary

6.5.2.1 Alternative: Nominal semantic dictionary

Nominal valency has been studied for English and some other European languages, and several attempts have been made to construct a nominal lexicon. For example, NOMLEX (NOMinalization Lexicon) is a computational lexicon of derived nominals in English (e.g., Macleod, Meyers, Grishman, Barrett, and Reeves, 1997). Another example is the STO project, the on-going computational lexicon project which is an attempt to morphologically, syntactically and semantically encode nouns in Danish (e.g., Olsen, 2002). Both provide information about the syntactic/semantic behaviors of the nominals they concern. In addition, FrameNet provides frame-semantic descriptions of English lexical items, including frame-bearing nouns (e.g., Baker, Fillmore, and Lowe, 1998).

Several broad-coverage resources of this type are available for Japanese verbs, as we listed in 6.4.1.1. For nouns, however, there is no comparably rich resource yet. The Japanese FrameNet project is currently on-going (Ohara, Fujii, Ohori, Suzuki, Saito, and Ishizaki, 2004). Several other attempts have been made to construct a nominal case frame dictionary using A no B phases in corpora (Kurohashi, Murata, Yata and Shimada, 1998; Kawahara, Sasano and Kurohashi, 2004), to construct a tagged corpus that contains information of relations between nouns (Kawahara, Kurohashi and Hasida, 2002), and to automatically construct nominal case frames (Kawahara and Kurohashi, 2004).

The lack of availability of an accessible electronic nominal valency dictionary for Japanese has directed our attention to an alternative, i.e., the use of a semantic dictionary. In what follows, we will discuss how this alternative is made possible and successful.

6.5.2.2 Preliminary corpus analysis

Zero verbal arguments are unexpressed elements that are predictable from the argument structure of the head verb or other predicate. Zero nominal arguments, analogously, are missing elements that can be inferred from some properties specified by their head nouns, i.e., the argument structures of the nouns. We conjecture that certain nouns are more likely to take (zero) nominal arguments than others, and that the head nouns that
take zero nominal arguments, extracted from our corpus, are representative samples of this particular group of nouns. Thus, we carried out a corpus-based analysis of our target construction, i.e. (A no) B, with the following procedures.

**A no B classification**

Our first approach was to use an existing A no B classification scheme. The scheme we adopted is a classification proposed by Shimazu, Naito and Nomura (1985, 1986a, 1986b, and 1987, henceforth SNN). Based on their corpus study, they classified the A no B phrases into five main groups according to the semantic dependency relations between the elements of the phrase. Their classification and a description of each group with some examples were given in Chapter 2.

**Distribution of (A no) B examples**

Given these A no B categories, our next step was to examine our corpus and to locate, based on the native speaker intuitions and the linguistic expertise of the author, a total of 320 zero nominal arguments (unexpressed A nouns) that are associated with B nouns. Locating unexpressed “A no” was not problematic because lexical and contextual information reveal to a native speaker’s introspection that something is missing from the surface, in most cases. Several rounds of annotation and occasional consultation with another native-speaking linguist, we assume, have achieved a reasonably feasible result.

We then classified these located (A no) B examples into groups, modeled on the SNN A no B classification scheme. The distribution of the examples from each group is presented in Table 6.1 (next page); the definitions are repeated from Table 2.4 (in Chapter 2). Also, the examples found in our corpus are listed.
Table 6.1: Distribution of (A no) B types

Group V comprised the vast majority, while approximately the same percentage of examples was included in Groups I, II and III. There were no Group IV examples.

For comparison, we also examined the A no B samples (with explicit nominal arguments) in the same corpus. This is summarized in Table 6.2, along with the data from the SNN corpus (scientific journal articles) and from a Japanese email corpus.\(^\text{11}\)

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Group & Definition & Examples from our corpus & # (%) \\
\hline
I & A: argument & inu-no-sampo & 33 (10.31\%) \\
 & B: nominalized verbal element & ‘dog-no-walk’ & \\
\hline
II & A: noun denoting an entity & kao-no-yoko & 23 (7.19\%) \\
 & B: abstract relational noun & ‘face-no-side’ & \\
\hline
III & A: noun denoting an entity & kodomo-no-kazu & 35 (10.94\%) \\
 & B: abstract attribute noun & ‘children-no-number’ & \\
\hline
IV & A: nominalized verbal element & hitori-gurasi-no-hito & 0 (0.00\%) \\
 & B: argument & ‘living-alone-no-person’ & \\
\hline
V & A: noun expressing attribute & kaisya-no-syokudo & 229 (71.56\%) \\
 & B: noun denoting an entity & ‘company-no-cafeteria’ & \\
\hline
\hline
Total & & & 320 (100\%) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Distribution of (A no) B types}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Group & Our corpus & SNN corpus & Email corpus \\
 & implicit & explicit & explicit \\
\hline
I & 33 (10.31\%) & 76 (8.67\%) & 1247 (20.99\%) & 217 (32.88\%) \\
\hline
II & 23 (7.19\%) & 146 (16.65\%) & 725 (12.20\%) & 147 (22.27\%) \\
\hline
III & 35 (10.94\%) & 71 (8.10\%) & 371 (6.24\%) & 15 (2.27\%) \\
\hline
IV & 0 (0.00\%) & 2 (0.23\%) & 271 (4.56\%) & 27 (4.09\%) \\
\hline
V & 229 (71.56\%) & 582 (66.36\%) & 3328 (56.01\%) & 254 (38.48\%) \\
\hline
\hline
Total & 320 (100\%) & 877 (100\%) & 5942 (100\%) & 639 (100\%) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Comparison of A no B group distribution in three different corpora}
\end{table}

\(^{11}\) This is the corpus used in Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003) in which a discussion of the nature of the corpus can also be found. Yamura-Takei and Fais (ms.) examined the whole corpus for A no B phrases in terms of the relative salience of each element, A and B.
The distributions of the types, as you can see in Figure 6.3, are roughly similar for our corpus and the corpus of SNN; however, the email corpus is relatively unique compared to the other two corpora.

Comparing the (A no) B and the A no B phrases in our corpus, there isn’t any striking contrast, though group II nouns seem to have a tendency to appear with explicit arguments. This is probably because group II nouns have less semantic substance and some of them hardly ever or never appear alone.

**Goi-Taikei: A Japanese Lexicon**

Before we move on to the next stage, let us describe the lexicon that we utilize, as a resource, for the characterization of B nouns. The lexicon that we use is Goi-Taikei (see 6.3.2 above for its general description). Among the ontological semantic trees that the Goi-Taikei provides, we use the common noun ontology that defines approximately 300,000 nouns based on an ontological hierarchy of 2,715 semantic attributes, in a maximum of 12 level-tree structures. The top four levels of the hierarchy are depicted in Figure 6.4 (next page).
Figure 6.4: The top four levels of the semantic hierarchy for nouns
Each node in the tree represents a semantic class, and is numbered. For instance, the lexical entry yane ‘roof’ is categorized as a member of the roof group (#0875) that belongs to the housing part group (#0866), which ascends through the tree by the following chain: building (#0836) < inanimate (#0706) < object (#0533) < concrete (#0002), under the root node of noun.

Goi-Taikei also provides syntactic properties of nouns, using the following nine part-of-speech (POS) codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POS code</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Common noun  名  ie ‘house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nominalized verbal  サ変  ryoori ‘cooking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adjectival noun  名（形動）  yuui ‘dominance’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Derivational noun  Derived from verb  名（転成）  naosi ‘revision’  Derived from adjective  sirosa ‘whiteness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Temporal noun  時詞  gogo ‘afternoon’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Numerical noun  数詞  hyaku ‘hundred’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Formal noun  名（形式）  naka ‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Proper noun  固  tookyoo ‘Tokyo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pronoun  代名  mina ‘everybody’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: POS codes for nouns in Goi-Taikei

Characterization of B nouns

We conjecture that certain nouns are more likely to take zero nominal arguments than others, and that the head nouns that take zero arguments, extracted from our corpus, are representative samples of this particular group of nouns. We call them “argument-taking nouns (ATNs).” ATNs syntactically require arguments and are semantically dependent on their arguments. We use the term ATN only to refer to a particular group of nouns that take implicit arguments (i.e., zero nominal arguments).①

We closely examined the 127 different ATN nouns from among the 320 cases of zero nominal arguments and classified them into the four types that correspond to Groups I, II, and III and V, as presented in Table 6.4 below.

① Recall that we mentioned earlier that some nouns never occur with implicit arguments, such as ken “matter” and hoo “direction,” They are excluded from this category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Syntactic properties</th>
<th>Semantic properties</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Nominalized verbals, de-verbal nouns, common nouns</td>
<td>Human activity</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>zikosyokai ‘self-introduction’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phenomenon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>entyo ‘extension’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Formal nouns, common nouns</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>mae ‘front’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yokuzitu ‘next day’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>De-verbal nouns, De-adjectival nouns suffix nouns, common nouns</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>sintyo ‘height’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>nedan ‘price’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kimotii ‘feeling’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Material phenomenon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nioi ‘smell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>namae ‘name’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>itiban ‘first’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Common nouns</td>
<td>Human (kinship)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>haha ‘mother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animate (body-part)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>atama ‘head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>kaisya ‘company’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing (part)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>doa ‘door’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human (profession)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>sensei ‘teacher’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human (role)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>dokusya ‘reader’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human (relationship)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>dooryoo ‘colleague’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>kutu ‘shoes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>saihu ‘purse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human (biological feature)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>zyosei ‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Man-made</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>kuruma ‘car’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>byoin ‘hospital’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>niwa ‘garden’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing (body)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>gareeji ‘garage’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing (attachment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>doa ‘door’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creative work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sakuhin ‘work’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kuuki ‘air’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nihongo ‘Japanese’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>pasupoo ‘passport’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>tizu ‘map’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>petto ‘pet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? (Unregistered)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>hoomusutei ‘homestay’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Syntactic/semantic properties of B nouns
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The table also lists the syntactic/semantic characterizations of the nouns in each type and the number of examples in the corpus. The syntactic properties are represented by the POS codes for nouns in the Goi-Taikei (see above). The semantic properties are represented by the various (fourth to eighth) level nodes in the semantic feature hierarchy tree. Assigning the syntactic and semantic properties to these nouns was manually done, first by searching Goi-Taikei for the entries, and then by selecting the most appropriate one, when there were multiple candidates, using contextual information. The characteristic properties are indicated in bold, and will be discussed later.

When we examine these four types, we see that they partially overlap with some particular types of nouns studied theoretically in the literature. Teramura (1991) subcategorizes locative relational nouns like mae ‘front,’ naka ‘inside,’ and migi ‘right’ as “incomplete nouns” that require elements to complete their meanings; these are a subset of Type II. Iori (1997) argues that certain nouns are categorized as “one-place nouns,” in contrast to “zero-place nouns,” in which he seems to include Type I and some of Type V nouns. Kojima (1992) examines so-called “low-independence nouns” and categorizes them into three types, according to their syntactic behaviors in Japanese copula expressions. These cover subsets of Type I, II, III and V. In computational work, Bond, Ogura, and Ikehara (1995) extracted 205 “trigger nouns” from a corpus aligned with English. These nouns trigger the use of possessive pronouns when they are machine-translated into English. They seem to correspond mostly to our Type V nouns. Our results appear to offer comprehensive coverage that subsumes all of the types of nouns discussed in these previous accounts.

Next, let us look more closely at the properties expressed by our samples. The most prevalent ATNs (21 in number) are nominalized verbals in the semantic category of human activity. The next most common are kinship nouns (14 in number) and body-part nouns (14), both in the common noun category; location nouns (13), either in the common noun or formal noun category; and nouns that express amount (9) whose syntactic category is either common or de-adjectival. The others include some “human” subcategories, as well as organization (for belong-to), housing (part) for whole-part, clothing (for possession).

The part-of-speech subcategory, “nominalized verbal (sahen-meisi)” is a reasonably accurate indicator of Type I nouns. So is “formal noun (keithiki-meisi)” for Type II, although this does not offer a full coverage of this type. Numeral noun compounds with a counter suffix, such as ‘70%,’ also represent a major subset of Type III.

Semantic properties, on the other hand, seem helpful for extracting certain groups such as location (Type II), amount (Type III), kinship, body-part, organization, and some human subcategories (Type V). But other low-frequency ATN samples are problematic for determining an appropriate level of categorization in Goi-Taikei’s semantic hierarchy tree.
This observation from the results of our corpus analysis will be the base for the zero nominal argument recognition algorithm presented in the next section.

6.5.3 Algorithms

Our goal is to build a system that can identify the presence of zero nominal arguments. As we mentioned earlier, zero nominal argument recognition is equivalent, in our approach, to ATN (Argument-Taking Noun) recognition. The algorithm consists of a set of lexicon-based heuristics, drawn from the observations in 6.2.3, with some additional filtering rules. The algorithm takes morphologically analyzed text as input and provides ATNs as output.

6.5.3.1 Preliminary version

We started with the implementation of a preliminary version of the algorithm initially proposed in Yamura-Takei (2003), which consists of the following three basic processes:

[1] ATN candidate (bare noun) extraction, with idiom filtering,
[2] syntactic category (part-of-speech) checking of the given candidates from [1], and
[3] semantic category checking of the remaining candidates from [2].

**Bare noun extraction**
The observation that zero nominal arguments usually co-occur with “bare nouns” is both theoretically motivated (see Chapter 2) and empirically verified; more than 90% of manually detected zero nominal arguments appear with bare nouns. Bare nouns are often simplex as in (6.25a), and sometimes are compound (e.g., numeral noun + counter suffix noun) as in (6.25b). These are immediately followed by case-marking, topic/focus-marking or other particles (e.g., *ga, o, ni, wa, mo*) to form PPs.

(6.25)  

a. atama-ga head-NOM  
b. 70-paasento-o 70-percent-ACC

The extracted nouns under this definition are initial candidates for ATNs.

**Idiom filtering**
Once bare nouns are identified, they first go through idiom filtering. Our preliminary evaluation revealed that there are some problematic cases in which ATN candidate nouns are contained in verbal idiomatic expressions, as example (6.26) shows.
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Although *me* ‘eye’ is a strong ATN candidate, as listed in Table 6.4, case (6.26) should be treated as part of an idiomatic expression rather than as a zero nominal argument expression. Recall that we previously stated in Chapter 2 that Vieira and Poesio (2000) also list “idiom” as one use of definite descriptions (the English equivalent to Japanese bare nouns in terms of their behaviors), along with same head/associative anaphora, etc. Thus, we decided to add an idiom filtering operation before we apply syntactic/semantic checking.

Idiom filtering consists of two components: general rules and an idiom dictionary. There are two general rules to filter out ATN-involving idiomatic expressions:

(i) nominalized verbal + o | ni + verb, and
(ii) noun + ni + iku | kuru.\(^\text{13}\)

If a nominalized verbal, a syntactically defined ATN candidate, is followed by a particle o or ni, and any verb, the verbal will not go into further checking. This rule eliminates VPs such as *benkyo-o-suru* ‘studying-ACC-do’ and *suimin-o-toru* ‘sleeping-ACC-take.’ Secondly, if any noun is followed by a particle ni and either verb *iku* ‘go’ or *kuru* ‘come,’ the noun will be dropped from the candidate list. This rule excludes VPs like *tasuke-ni-kuru* ‘rescuing-for-come’ and *kankoo-ni-iku* ‘sightseeing-for-go.’

Other idiomatic expressions, which are hard to generalize, are listed one-by-one in the idiom dictionary.

**Syntactic/semantic checking**

The syntactic/semantic properties used to sort ATNs in the processes [1] and [2] are informed by the results of the preliminary analysis presented in Table 6.4 above. For syntactic filtering, we defined the following five POSs and POS sequences:

(i) nominalized verbal,
(ii) derived noun,
(iii) formal noun,
(iv) numeral noun + suffix (e.g., *iti-bu* ‘one part’), and
(v) verbal adjective + suffix (e.g., *kiken-sei* ‘dangerous property’).

For semantic filtering, we decided to use the noun groups of high frequency (more than two nouns categorized in the same group; indicated in bold) to minimize a risk of over-generalization. As a result, we defined the following nine nodes (at the

\(^{13}\) Here, ‘|’ indicates ‘or.’
fourth-eighth levels) in the Goi-Taikei semantic hierarchy, as the semantic category for ATN nouns:

(i) human <kinship>  #72–110,
(ii) human <relationship>  #111–149,
(iii) human <role>  #333–361,
(iv) organization  #362–387,
(v) animate <part>  #552–670,
(vi) clothing  #813–837,
(vii) housing <part>  #866–882,
(viii) amount  #2585–2609, and
(ix) location  #2610–2669.

These include a total of 378 deepest-level nodes.

The preliminary version, which consists of these three processes, has been tested against five sets of corpus materials in order to make further refinements and extensions. The training corpus used for the tests comprises Hiroko 1, Hiroko 2, Minna 1, Minna 2 and Gendai, from our whole corpus. These sets were used to determine what other heuristics should be employed and to evaluate whether newly employed heuristics drawn from the result on one set of corpus materials work as well in another set of materials.

6.5.3.2 Enhanced version

The final configuration of the system, i.e., an enhanced version of the zero nominal argument recognition algorithm, was completed on the basis of an extensive evaluation of the heuristics using the corpus listed above. As a result, the following enhancement and addition of new rules were made.

Refinement of semantic category

Originally, we defined nine semantic properties, including 378 nodes in the hierarchy tree. The definition was simple; all the nodes under a defined category were unconditionally included. This often caused over-detection and hence, the need for further subdivision and refinement of categories arose. Also, evaluation on the training corpus revealed some cases of under-detection, which led to the addition of newly defined categories.

As a consequence of the refinement and addition of the ATN semantic properties, we now have a total of 393 nodes; the whole list is provided in Appendix B. This number does not indicate a simple addition of 15 nodes to the original 378, but is a
synergetic result of adding and subtracting.

**Enhancement of idiom filtering**
The idiom dictionary was enlarged by adding mainly body-part expressions. This addition resulted in the inclusion of a total of 1,003 entries in the dictionary.

**Addition of indefinite description filtering**
ATNs, as the term implies, take (explicit or implicit) arguments that are linked with other entities in the previous discourse or in the situation. Therefore, ATNs are specific and definite in nature. In other words, ATNs are definite descriptions, and indefinite descriptions should be excluded from our ATN candidates. This is what we call “indefinite description filtering.”

How to eliminate indefinite descriptions is not as straightforward as in English, which has a binary (definite vs. indefinite) article system. Definite/indefinite descriptions in Japanese often share the same surface realization, bare nouns, as we mentioned earlier (Chapter 2), so definiteness marking as in English does not work for Japanese. Instead, the distinction is normally inferred from surface level information concerning the sentences in which those descriptions appear. Trenkić (2000) calls this “definiteness inferring.”

Murata (1996) investigated the rules that determine (in)definiteness of Japanese nouns, utilizing clues from surface expressions. Bond (2001) proposes an algorithm with a tractable set of semantic features to represent the definiteness of NPs, to be used in a Japanese-to-English MT system. Given insights from these works, we defined seven indefinite description filtering rules as in (6.27).

(6.27)

(i) noun + ga | wa + aru | nai
   e.g., kutu-ga aru
   shoe-NOM is
   ‘there is a shoe’

(ii) noun + yoo | muki
    e.g., ryokoo-yoo-no baggu
    traveling-for-GEN-bag
    ‘a bag for traveling’

(iii) noun + to-iu
     e.g., ryuugaku-to-iu-no-wa
     studying-abroad-QUO-call
     ‘so-called studying abroad’

(iv) noun + to + wa
     e.g., ninki-to-wa
     popularity-QUO-TOP
     ‘what is popularity’
(v) noun + de + wa + nai
   e.g., atama-de-wa-naku  head-COP-TOP-NEG
   ‘… is not a head’

(vi) noun + ga | o | mo + numeral
    e.g., ie-o 2-ken tateru  house-ACC 2-counter build
    ‘…build two houses’

(vii) noun + ga | wa + amount expression
     e.g., mado-ga ooi  window-NOM many
     ‘…has many windows’

When nouns appear in these expressions, those nouns are pre-excluded from the ATN candidate list. However, nouns with semantic properties of “kinship” and “body part” are exempt from these rules because those nouns are inherently ATNs regardless of the context in which they occur.

**Supplementary checking**

There are some nouns that are non-ATNs in most usages, but function as ATNs in specific cases. Listing these nouns as ATNs creates a high risk of over-detection. Instead, we constructed a special-expression dictionary that lists expressions that include such examples, one of which is presented in (6.28).

(6.28)  kuni-ni kaeru  country-to return

The noun *kuni* ‘country’ is usually treated as non-ATN, but it is marked as ATN only when it appears in the expression in (6.28), which usually means ‘return to one’s own (or native) country.’ The dictionary contains nine such expressions.

Also, there are cases in which the noun group in a certain Goi-Taikei node designated as non-ATN contains only a few ATNs, but ones that are quite frequent. Leaving such nouns there causes under-detection. We constructed a supplementary dictionary, which lists such nouns so that they are always treated as ATNs. The listing includes nouns, such as *deguti* ‘exit’ and *zyusyo* ‘address.’

As a result of these four types of enhancement, the accuracy testing on the training corpus significantly improved from 58% to 85% (F-value, see below), which indicates that the modifications we made are valid.

In sum, the whole process consists of four modules: [1] preprocessing module, [2] ATN candidate extraction module, [3] ATN extraction module, and [4] ZERO insertion module. Let us provide the flow diagram of zero nominal argument detecting processes in Figure 6.5 (next page). Enhanced components are highlighted.

---

14 This includes *ippai*, *takusan*, *ooku*, *tairyoo*, *tairyoo* ‘many/much’ and *sukosi*, *tyotto*, *syooryoo* ‘few/little.’
In the preprocessing module in [1], input text goes through morphological and dependency analyses, which is a prerequisite for the following bare noun extraction. In module [2], bare nouns, as a prime condition of ATN candidates, are extracted, with some filtering processes. Module [3] extracts ATNs according to our definition, while checking some specific cases. Finally in module [4], ZEROS are inserted in the pre-ATN positions in the output.
6.6 System Architecture

ZD was implemented in TurboLinux. All sources relied heavily on analysis and data searching and matching techniques, which were implemented in the programming language C. Other modules, including the user interface and communication were implemented in the CGI scripting language. The architecture is overviewed in Figure 6.6.

![Figure 6.6: Overview of system architecture](image)

Currently, we have two versions of the zero verbal argument detection modules, each of which has access either to Goi-Taikei or to JLPT3/4 for verbal valency search.

6.7 Evaluation

6.7.1 Corpus and method

The performance of ZD was evaluated against two new sets of corpus materials: (i) 15 expository texts, from an intermediate JSL textbook, that contain a total of 57 paragraphs, 225 sentences, and 368 clauses, (ii) one narrative text, a short novel by Shinichi Hoshi, which contains a total of 34 paragraphs, 105 sentences, and 160
The evaluation corpus was manually examined for the presence of ZEROS, in the same way that we did for the corpus analysis presented in Chapter 4. The ZD-detected ZEROS were checked against these manually detected ZEROS, which we consider as “correct.” We indicate the result with recall (R) and precision (P) metrics, defined as follows:

\[(6.29)\]

a. Recall (R): the ratio of ZEROS correctly detected by ZD over all correctly identified ZEROS,

b. Precision (P): the ratio of ZEROS correctly detected by ZD over all ZD-detected ZEROS.

To paraphrase, a recall of less than 100% indicates that ZD missed some of the desired ZEROS, i.e., under-detection, while a precision of less than 100% indicates that ZD detected something that is not regarded as a correct result, i.e., over-detection. We also employ F-value (F), as defined in (6.30), which reflects an average effect of recall and precision.

\[(6.30)\]  
F-value (F): the figure computed by the formula, 
\[(b^2+1) * P * R / b * P + R,\]

where b corresponds to relative importance of precision (P) and recall (R).

Here, we set b to 1 since we equally value precision and recall.

Evaluation was done on the performance of the zero verbal argument recognition component and the zero nominal argument recognition component separately because the two components are based on totally different heuristics, and they are in a sense two different systems. For zero verbal argument, the two valency dictionaries that we integrate into the system, Goi-Taikai and JLPT3/4 were compared for their functions as lexical sources.

6.7.2 Result

The results of the experimental runs are presented in the tables below. First, Table 6.5 (next page) presents the result obtained by testing the process on expository texts that contain 197 zero verbal arguments and 99 zero nominal arguments, which are “correct.”

---

15 We exclude, from the original text, (i) direct quotations (because they are dialogic in nature) and (ii) utterances with “substantive ending,” i.e., verb-less clauses (because our zero verbal argument recognition heuristics presume the existence of a verbal or adjectival predicate or a copula.
In the case of zero verbal argument recognition, the JLPT3/4 version apparently outperformed the Goi-Taikei version, which has a tendency toward over-detection. This is probably because the entries of the JLPT3/4 valency dictionary (designed especially for JSL learning purposes) better fit the intermediate level sentence structures.

Secondly, Table 6.6 presents the results of testing on narrative texts (with 340 zero verbal arguments and 149 zero nominal arguments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero verbal argument</td>
<td>Goi-Taikei</td>
<td>82.06%</td>
<td>63.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JLPT3/4</td>
<td>80.29%</td>
<td>76.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero nominal argument</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>71.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Evaluation of ZD performance on narrative texts

In this corpus, the performance of the two versions (Goi-Taikei and JLPT3/4) is compelling. The Goi-Taikei version still tends to over-detect, but its recall rate is better than that of the JLPT3/4 version. For more “authentic” and “uncontrolled” texts like novels, a wider coverage, as realized in Goi-Taikei, seems to have an advantage.

As for zero nominal argument recognition, accuracy has been achieved at roughly equal rates in both types of corpus at a little over 70%.

6.7.3 Discussion

Overall, the current ZD has achieved an accuracy of 79.00% (JLPT3/4), 71.43% (Goi-Taikei), and 70.29% (nominal), all indicated by average F-value figures. These roughly represent the figures that are considered to be the limit for NLP systems with rule-based shallow processing that does not deploy rich world and semantic knowledge (cf., Tetreault and Allen, 2004). In this regard, ZD has achieved near-maximum accuracy, as a system in its intended design scheme.
6.7.3.1 Possible further enhancement

The current achievement of ZD has also indicated areas for further improvement. The tractable areas that the error analysis has revealed include:

(i) integration of semantic, pragmatic and discourse factors in the ATN selection,
(ii) treatment of ATN candidates with modifiers, and
(iii) refinement of ATN properties.

Of all the under-/over-detection errors, more than about 90% are due to our purely syntactic/lexical approach, i.e., due to error type (i). Look at the following examples.

(6.31) a. しげおくんは いたずらが 好きな子です。
\(\text{sigeo-kun-wa itazura-ga sukina-ko-desu.} \)
Shigeo-TOP mischief-NOM like-kid-COP

‘Shigeo is a mischievous kid.’

b. 先生が いくら 注意しても いたずらします。
\(\text{sensei-ga ikura tyuui-site-mo itazura-si-masu.} \)
teacher-NOM how often warn-do-though mischief-do-POL

‘However often (his) teacher warns him not to, he never stops.’

(6.32) a. 丸山先生は 教え方が 上手で
\(\text{maruyama-sensei-wa osiekata-ga jyoozu-de} \)
Maruyama-TOP teaching-NOM good-COP

‘Ms. Maruyama is good at teaching’

b. ….(skipping a few utterances)

c. 先生は ちょっと驚いた顔で …
\(\text{sensei-wa tyotto odoroiita kao-de ...} \)
teacher-TOP little surprised look with

‘She looked a little surprised…’

A bare noun, sensei ‘teacher,’ appears in the two contexts above (underlined). In (6.31), the noun is most plausibly interpreted as an ATN to denote Shigeo’s (home
room) teacher. In (6.32), on the contrary, the same bare noun should rather be considered to be an NP reference to Maruyama-sensei in (a). This distinction can be made by looking at an NP history list within the discourse, which the current algorithm does not employ.

A few errors (2% of all errors) are related to our definition of ATNs as bare nouns. Currently, all nouns with modifiers or dependents are excluded from the ATN candidate list. This works in most cases, but sometimes causes under-detection in a case like (6.33).

\[(6.33) \quad \text{恵しい友人が に 乗って} \]
\[
sitasii yuujin-ga    kuruma-ni  notte  
\]
\[
close friend-NOM  car-in  ride  
\]

‘(Someone’s) close friend rides in a car’

There are also a few errors that are caused by the current configuration of the ATN semantic property list: errors of both over-detection and under-detection. Further refinement of the list would be desirable.

These suggestions for enhancement are on the assumption that an existing lexicon like Goi-Taikai is used. On the other hand, there is another total alternative, which will be discussed in the next subsection.

6.7.3.2 Possible alternative approach

Our approach makes use of syntactic and semantic properties listed in an existing lexicon, as “approximate” indicators of a certain group of nouns that we intend to extract. This approach has its limitations, as is pointed out by Kurohashi and Sakai (1999). One limitation can be illustrated by the pair of Japanese nouns, sakusha ‘author’ and sakka ‘writer,’ which falls under the same semantic property group (at the deepest level). These nouns have an intuitively different status as far as their valency requirements are concerned; the former requires “of-what work” information, while the latter does not. We risk over- or under-generalization when we designate certain semantic properties, no matter fine-grained they might be. This risk is inevitable when we use a lexicon that was not designed specifically for our intended purpose.

One possible approach to compensate for this risk is a hand-tabulation of nominal valency, such as JLPT3/4 verbal lexicon that we constructed for zero verbal argument recognition. However, this method is not realistic for zero nominal arguments because

---

16 This example pair is taken from Iori (1997).

17 This intuition was verified by an informal poll conducted on seven native speakers of Japanese.
the size of the lexicon for nouns is incomparably larger; *Goi-Taikei*, for instance, lists 76,082 nouns (excluding proper nouns and pronouns) and 20,781 verbs and adjectives. *IPAL Lexicon* selects only 1,081 nouns according to the syntactic and semantic features to be fully described.

Also, there are two critical issues in constructing a nominal lexicon. One is the notoriously hard-to-define argument-adjunct distinction for nouns, which is closely related to the distinction between ATNs and non-ATNs. We experimentally tested seven native-speaking subjects in distinguishing these two. We presented 26 nouns in the same *Goi-Taikei* semantic category (at the deepest level): “persons who write.” There were six nouns that all the subjects agreed on categorizing as ATNs, including *sakusya* ‘author.’ Five nouns, including *sakka* ‘writer,’ on the other hand, were judged as non-ATNs by all the subjects. For the remaining 15 nouns, however, the judgments varied widely. As Somers (1984) suggest for verbs, a binary distinction does not work well for nouns, either. There may also be a line (although it may be very thin) between nouns that take explicit arguments and those that take implicit arguments (i.e., zero nominal arguments). The most clear-cut examples fall in the category of *keisiki-meisi* ‘formal noun’ in *Goi-Taikei*. Among the 40 nouns listed under that part-of-speech code, there are several nouns that can never occur alone, i.e., they always take explicit arguments, such as *baai* ‘case’ and *koto* ‘matter.’ These correspond to Somers’ first type in his six-level scale of valency binding that reflects the degree of closeness of an argument to its head.

The second issue concerns the semantic features used to describe arguments of nouns. Another pair of nouns, *sensei* ‘teacher’ and *kyoosi* ‘teaching professional,’ again in the same *Goi-Taikei* category, are both multi-valent, but in different ways; *sensei* calls for “of-what subject,” “of-what organization,” and “of-whom” elements, while *kyoosi* does not take an “of-whom” complement: *John no kyoosi* ‘John’s teaching professional’ sounds unnatural. The semantic description for each argument is also essential in referent resolution and is an interesting issue for further investigation, but it is beyond the scope of this thesis, focusing as it does on zero argument detection.

As discussed, constructing a so-called nominal valency dictionary involves many critical issues and costly labor, which is actually the primary reason for the choice of our approach, that is, to re-use existing resources, as we stated at the beginning of the chapter. However, our ATN semantic property list (in Appendix B), created as a result of the corpus analysis and evaluation done on this project, might serve as a starting point for the future construction of such a nominal lexicon for Japanese, and in cross-linguistic attempts, as well.
6.8 Output

6.8.1 General aims

Basically, ZD provides “ZERO-made-visible” text as output. In addition, the zero verbal argument recognition component delivers some other information, such as the underlying structure of the input clause and valency patterns, depending on users’ needs. Figure 6.7 shows the user selection interface. Here, the clause splitting result can be manually corrected, when necessary, before it is sent to the ZERO detection processes.

![Figure 6.7: ZD output selection interface](image)

This diverse output aims to inform the users (i.e., teachers) of various types of information about the input clause that they can use as a reference or as material for instructing students on the mechanisms of ZEROS. The output is supplied in the following eight formats:
Chapter 6 Technology and Zero Detector

(i) clause structure frame,
(ii) argument structure frame,
(iii) enhanced case-marking,
(iv) enhanced case-marking with valency information,
(v) ZERO-specified clause,
(vi) ZERO-specified clause with enhanced case-marking
(vii) ZERO-specified clause with enhanced case-marking and valency information,
and (viii) ZERO-specified text.

The interface and the output utilize CGI scripting, which enables a wide variety of presentation styles, including enhancement by color, style, and font, by means of HTML, advantage of which will also be discussed in Chapter 7.

6.8.2 Various output formats

We will present some output formats by using the four-utterance discourse in (6.34) below as input.\(^{18}\)

(6.34)  待っていると、男は帰ってきた。手に紙コップを持っている。表情に変化はない。

Its surface-level English translation is given in (6.35).

(6.35)  Waiting, and man returned.  Carrying paper cup.  Facial expression had no change.

This is a typical example of a ZERO-containing “unambiguous” Japanese discourse given the context in which it occurs. By “unambiguous,” we mean that Japanese speakers find no difficulty in interpreting the discourse even though there seems to be no surface level indication of, for example, who is carrying the paper cup and whose facial expression is being talked about.

**Clause structure frame**

This is a preliminary analysis step for subsequent ZERO identification process, but its output might also be of help to the user in order to understand the underlying structure and processes of ZERO detection. The frame output of an example clause is given in Figure 6.8 (next page).

---

\(^{18}\) This is an excerpt from a short novel by Shinichi Hoshi, “Syanai-no Jiken (It Happened on a Train).”
Clause #3 in the input text is analyzed into predicate and argument structure, and one ZERO (N1-ga) is detected as a result of valency matching and is indicated at the bottom of the output. From here, the users can choose any output type they want to see next.

**Argument structure frame**

This format provides the predicate-argument structure of a given clause. Thus, it simply presents core (explicit and implicit) elements of the clause, excluding any adjuncts. The frames of the first three clauses are given in Figure 6.9.
Here, overt topic markers and focus markers are accompanied by their restored cases indicated in parentheses, here, (ga), in the second clause. We assume that it gives a clear picture of the basic clause structure and promotes awareness of the structure.

**Enhanced case-marking with/without valency information**

As we discussed in Chapter 2, ZERO candidates are defined as arguments in the form of PPs. Therefore, case particles play an important role in the recognition of the argument structure, and hence of the presence of ZEROS. Identifying the overt PPs thus leads to the confirmation of the presence of ZEROS, by matching them against the valency information of the given predicate. The example output is given in Figure 6.10.
As you can see, this format does not locate ZEROS. This aims to provide materials for the overt PP-valency matching exercises.

**ZERO-specified clauses with additional information**

In this format, detected ZEROS are indicated by brackets, with accompanying case particles. Here, we insert ZEROS, maintaining canonical ordering of predicate-arguments: nominative *ga*, followed by accusative *o* and dative *ni*. Also, we avoid using a topic marker *wa* in order to adhere to the canonical valency patterns of the predicates, as defined in the valency dictionary. The sample output is given in Figure 6.11.
Finally, the ZERO-inserted original input text is provided; it aims to give a quick view of ZERO distribution in the text.
6.9 Summary

We have presented how “making the invisible visible” has been blueprinted theoretically and made possible technologically. The embodiment of ZD was made possible where “theory” meets “technology.”

Specifically, we explicated how the system was built upon existing NLP technologies and resources, and how it was harmonized with two sets of theoretically and empirically sound heuristics. This attempt has proven to be successful, as can be seen in the performance results yielded by the evaluation the system underwent, results that meet the standards of NLP research. In addition, spelling out the linguistic rules for the system has clarified the underlying (hypothetical) human processes of understanding ZERO phenomena processes whose implications for the teaching of ZEROS in the JSL context we wish to explore. Integration of these implications into the system is beyond the scope of the present development of ZD, but they will be an invaluable resource for the future expansion of any CALL program that is built around the capability and potential of ZD.

In the following chapter, we will discuss the issues that arise where “technology” meets “pedagogy.”

---

19 This is actually one of our aims in this project, focusing on the CL aspect of NLP, as discussed in Webber (2001); see Section 5.2.
Chapter 7

Pedagogy and Zero Detector

As any CALL system ought to be, Zero Detector is pedagogy-driven, as well as pedagogy-oriented.¹ The Research Policy Statement drafted by EUROCALL states that progress in CALL research “often begins with pedagogical practice or learner needs driving the development of technology-based materials, techniques, or environments.”² The development of ZD also began with a pedagogical discrepancy, i.e., the lack of availability of good teaching materials and techniques for explicating ZEROS, an area that poses a challenge for many Japanese language learners (see Section 2.6 for fuller discussion). In this section, we will discuss in what pedagogical frameworks and for what pedagogical purposes ZD can be useful and propitious for both teachers and learners.

The majority of the previous and related work cited in this chapter is from L1 (first language) or L2 (second language) research conducted for English as the best-studied language in the literature of pedagogy (and in linguistics in general). Many of the principles discussed here, however, hold for L2 pedagogy in Japanese as well, and we will apply them to our discussion here with careful modification and elaboration.

7.1 Enhancing teaching

In the first section of this chapter, we will discuss how Zero Detector can promote effective instruction by JSL teachers of ZEROS themselves and of discourses that contain them. In this respect, we regard teachers as primary users of the program and aim to help them utilize ZD output in order to enhance their instruction of text with ZEROS. As our emphasis will be placed on instructing reading comprehension, rather than

¹ It is a common criticism that some CALL software is largely technology-driven and is remote from being pedagogically sound (e.g., Levy, 1997b; Oxford, 1995).

² The statement is available at http://www.eurocall-languages.org/research/research_policy.htm (retrieved in September, 2004).
teaching writing, we will begin in the next subsection with an overview of the reading process. Hatasa (2003) argues briefly, after an overview of the past and present of CALL for Japanese, that the future agenda includes the development of reading-support systems that present effective reading strategies rooted in reading process research (e.g., Chikamatsu, 2003). This is exactly the issue toward which we direct our discussion.

7.1.1 Reading processes

Reading comprehension is a complex cognitive process that involves text-based “bottom-up” processing and knowledge-based “top-down” processing, interacting simultaneously. Recent second language research views the reader as an active processor who decodes linguistic information from a text (bottom-up processing) and applies his/her non-linguistic background knowledge (top-down processing), while fully utilizing his/her inference skills, in order to construct a coherent representation of the text. This view is known as the interactive model of reading (McCormick, 1988). Figure 7.1 below illustrates the model, following Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) among others.

![Figure 7.1: Interactive model of reading processes](image)

Effective readers constantly integrate top-down and bottom-up processing techniques in
order to understand the text (ibid.). Such readers are effective strategy users; they know when to abandon unsuccessful reading strategies and when to recruit new ones. For instance, they may utilize background knowledge for top-down processing, and switch to bottom-up decoding when they are “meta-cognitively” aware that the former fails or they need compensation, or vice versa.

In bottom-up processing, letter/word recognition and sentence-level syntactic/semantic processing are followed by inferring the relationships between individual clauses or sentences, and then by understanding a larger unit, such as a paragraph (or a discourse segment) and then a whole text. Compared with morphological/syntactic level processes, however, discourse level phenomena have received less attention, and as a result, remain largely unexplored in the study of reading in Japanese and many other languages. This thesis focuses on the inter-sentential (or clausal) level cohesive relations that contribute to the coherence of text, and discusses cohesion recognition as a significant phenomenon in its own right.

### 7.1.2 Cohesion, coherence and reading comprehension

Cohesion is a linguistically realized device that creates textual unity, i.e., coherence. Coherence represents the natural, reasonable connections among utterances that make for easy understanding. Therefore, good readers take advantage of cohesive devices that writers employ for the text to be coherent. Deficiencies in cohesion recognition/interpretation may cause readers to miss/misinterpret important cohesive links, and ultimately, to have difficulty in their comprehension process. This claim is confirmed in research by Demel (1990), among others.\(^3\) Also, activities involving the recognition/interpretation of cohesive ties have been suggested by Williams (1983) and Lubelska (1991), among others. In the JSL context, Kitajima (1997) demonstrates experimentally that referential strategy training has a positive effect on reading comprehension.\(^4\)

As we mentioned earlier (in Chapter 2), ZEROS are a major realization of “reference” in Japanese that takes the form of “ellipsis.” Like other forms of reference, ZEROS also establish cohesive ties between themselves and their referents, as illustrated in (7.1).

---

\(^3\) The role of cohesion (coreference, in particular) in comprehension in general is discussed in Garrod and Sanford (1990). Kintsch and van Dijk (1978) and Just and Carpenter (1980) discuss the role of cohesion in psychological models of comprehension.

\(^4\) The teaching of cohesion and coherence, from a writing instruction perspective, is also an active area of research (e.g., Lee, 2002).
Here, *tamanegi* ‘onions’ in (a) is referred to by a ZERO in (b), which constitutes a cohesive tie between the two utterances. As a result, the two utterances are perceived as a coherent unit, rather than as a random string of discrete sentences. What characterizes this tie is the invisibility of one of its ends, unlike English, which explicitly indicates both ends, usually by a noun phrase (NP) and pronoun pair (i.e., ‘onions’ – ‘them’).

Lexical pronouns in English carry less information than full NPs, which could also create ambiguity. However, they at least provide an indication of reference, complete with clues for the animacy, number and gender of the referents, unlike Japanese ZEROS. This difference (both in visibility and informativeness) is a representative example of cross-linguistic variation in language systems such as Japanese and English (and other explicit-argument languages). As suggested by research that concerns cross-linguistic variations in language acquisition and processing, linguistic distance has an effect on comprehension (Koda, 1996). Thus, explicit instruction and extensive training for recognizing ZERO-involving cohesive ties may have positive effects on comprehension of discourse with ZEROS, especially for learners with a non-ZERO-prone L1.

In order to plan effective instruction and training, there is a crucial prerequisite for teachers, i.e., the knowledge of potential difficulties for learners. This knowledge can be characterized according to two aspects: (i) assessment of difficulty levels, and (ii) prediction of problem areas, which will be discussed in detail respectively in sections 7.1.2.1 and 7.1.2.2.

### 7.1.2.1 Assessing reading difficulty

Levels of difficulty of reading materials has generally been assessed in terms of the vocabulary (and *kanji*, Chinese characters, for Japanese) that they contain, structural complexity, sentence and text length, or thematic content.

Among these criteria, vocabulary is probably one of the most measurable factors...
known to be useful in predicting reading difficulty, or more generally, “readability.” Such a measure is embodied, for instance, by counts of content words, syllables, and so on, i.e., all elements countable by various readability formulas. The formulas, such as “Flesch Reading Ease” and “Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level,” were originally designed (for English) to help classroom teachers choose materials for their students. The formulas usually consider only two factors: (i) the number of syllables in a word, and (ii) the number of words in a sentence. As a more sophisticated type of measure, Reading Tutor provides an online “level checker” that takes text as input and statistically analyzes kanji (Chinese characters) and vocabulary contained in the text according to their JLPT level-based difficulty (Kawamura, 1999).

However, readability is more complex than mere counts of words or syllables, or distributions and frequencies of certain groups of words can suggest. Other potential factors for readability measures include “propositional analysis” and “cohesion analysis,” as pointed out by Horning (1987).

Propositions are idea units into which each sentence is broken, and are built around verbs, which are accompanied by their arguments. In his reading time and recall experiments, Kintsch (1974) found that more propositions require more reading time, and that certain types of propositions are easier to recall than others. In addition, repetition of arguments has a strong effect on readability. The number of different arguments found in the propositional analysis of a discourse is also related to readability.

Cohesion analysis is another facet of readability. Cohesion analysis, originally proposed in detail by Halliday and Hasan (1987), examines a text for five types of cohesive ties (see 2.5.1). As with propositional analysis, cohesive ties have been empirically proven to be related to readability (e.g., Irwin, 1986; McNamara, 2001).

Along the line of the cohesion analysis approach, Fujiwara and Yamura-Takei (2003, 2004) suggested that knowing the different types of ZEROS (as defined in Chapter 2) and their frequency and distribution (as provided in Chapter 4) could help the teacher determine the difficulty level of the text. We conjecture that the output of ZD, as presented in Chapter 6, would serve as a basis for this determination.

In this regard, our goals are in spirit similar to what the Coh-Metrix project, currently on-going at the University of Memphis, attempts to achieve. The Coh-Metrix is an automated cohesion metric tool that computes properties of text cohesion and computes a coherence score that integrates text cohesiveness with the reader’s world knowledge and aptitude (McNamara, Louwerse, and Graesser,

---

5 JLPT (Japanese-Language Proficiency Test) has four different levels, for each of which the essential vocabulary list is publicly provided.

6 The project website can be found at http://cohmetrix.memphis.edu/cohmetrixpr/index.html (accessed on September 11, 2004). The project aims to improve L1 reading comprehension in English of young children and university students, but its insights are significant and applicable to JSL contexts.
unpublished grant proposal). One of the factors they consider for their coherence metric is referential coherence established with the use of anaphora and conceptual overlap, etc., into which category our ZEROS also fall.

As potential measurable or observable factors regarding the use of ZEROS, we consider the following three aspects: (i) density, (ii) type, and (iii) processing cost.

**Density of ZEROS**
How many ZEROS are contained in a certain discourse? This is something that even native speakers or experienced teachers cannot answer without careful analysis. As the analysis provided in 4.1 indicates, the density of ZEROS varies from text to text, averaging one ZERO in every 1.45 clause unit. Take, for example, two 5-clause discourses from a very beginning textbook; one includes no ZEROS, while the other contains two of them. The text writer might have intentionally manipulated this density, but his/her intention is not stated in either the textbook or in the teacher’s manual, probably leaving the recognition of this difference to intuition.

Generally speaking, more ZEROS occur as the text level advances. Let us examine two sets of 2-volume textbook series, *Hiroko 1, 2* and *Minna 1, 2*, in which volume 1 is followed by the more advanced volume 2. In *Hiroko 1*, ZEROS occur in every 2.37 utterances, while *Hiroko 2* has a higher density of ZEROS, one in every 1.39 utterances. The same is observed in *Minna* volumes, 1.60 versus 1.37 utterances. This implies that density of ZEROS corresponds to difficulty level (set by text writers) of a textbook.

**Types of ZEROS**
Density of ZEROS may be one simple indicator of readability. However, one can easily imagine that this will not explain everything. It is probable that, in addition to density, types of ZEROS involved will also affect readability of the text. Our fundamental assumption is that certain types of ZEROS are harder to process than others, and thus their distribution affects readability. We will use the two typologies that we described in 2.4 for ZEROS in order to investigate the validity of our assumption.

The first typology that we made for ZEROS concerns the argument type that classifies zero verbal argument and zero nominal argument. The centering analysis of our corpus indicates that 42% of CBs (i.e., centered entities maintained from the previous utterance; see Chapter 3) are realized by ZEROS of either argument type (see 4.4.2 for details). Assuming that cohesive links established by one type might be harder to recognize than those established by the other type, their distribution may have an effect on readability. Let us present sample discourses in which each type of CB is contained, (7.2) followed by (7.3a: verbal argument) and (7.3b: nominal argument).
(7.2) おかの 上に 家が ある。
oka-no ue-ni ie-ga aru.
hill-GEN on house-NOM exist

‘There is a house on the hill.’

(7.3) a. 今にも Ø ぐずれそうだ。
imanimo (Ø-ga) kuzure-soo-da.
at-any-moment (Ø-NOM) collapse-appear-COP

‘(It ‘house’) is about to collapse.’

b. 今にも Ø 屋根が ぐずれそうだ。
imanimo (Ø-no) yane-ga kuzure-soo-da.
at-any-moment (Ø-GEN) roof-NOM collapse-appear-COP

‘(Its ‘house’s) roof is about to collapse.’

Intuitively, the link established by the zero nominal argument, as in (b), seems to be harder. Theoretically, centering predicts that (b) requires a higher inferential cost to process than (a); (a) is labeled CONTINUE, while (b) is RETAIN, in our definition. Recall that zero verbal arguments are triggered by syntactic requirements and zero nominal arguments by semantic incompleteness. Let us hypothesize here that using zero nominal arguments is harder than using zero verbal arguments to recognize the cohesive ties involved. We will provide some statistics from our corpus, as suggestive evidence for this hypothesis.

Out of 841 utterances in the corpus, 132 utterances (15.70%) have links to the previous utterance, i.e., CBs, by means of zero nominal arguments. This is not a strikingly large ratio, but when we turn to a text level analysis, 57 texts, out of a total of 83, include CBs realized by both types of ZEROS; the remaining 26 include only zero verbal argument CBs, and there were no texts that include only zero nominal CBs. This suggests that zero verbal arguments and zero nominal arguments often interact with each other to create a coherent whole as a discourse. Two sets of text (one narrative set and one expository set) are compared with respect to zero argument type CB distribution in Table 7.1.
Table 7.1: Distribution of CB according to zero argument type in texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Zero verbal CB</th>
<th>Zero nominal CB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Text A (narrative) and C (expository) consist solely of zero verbal argument CBs. Here, we disregard non-ZERO CBs. In Text A, Tom’s family members are described in each discourse segment, hence the dominant use of zero verbal arguments (mostly, zero nominatives). Text C describes the role of music in our daily life, i.e., how young people and doctors enjoy or utilize music, and hence again the frequent occurrence of zero verbal argument CBs (zero nominatives). In Text B (narrative) and D (expository), in contrast, CBs are expressed by both types in a mixed manner. Text B, for example, describes Mayumi’s experience, by referring to her hospitalization, and also to her brother, classmates, friends, and teacher, which results in the use of zero nominal arguments. In the same way, Text D describes robots, while referring to their size and competition matches, etc. In the case of B and D type texts, failure to recognize zero nominal argument CBs is likely to cause readers to perceive a gap in cohesion relations.

The other typology for ZEROS depends on their referent types; we have used eight different types: local, global, intra-clausal, cataphorical, event, situational, indeterminate, and time/weather. This typology is also assumed to have impact on the degree of recognizability and interpretability. Our assumption is that ZEROS with explicit NP antecedents are easier to process than those without (see 4.4.1.4 for classification). These assumptions need further empirical justification with well-thought-out experiments, which in fact is included in our future agenda. Alternatively, we will provide here some statistical evidence that reveals the distributional differences for ZERO types in two distinct “genres”7 of text, which inherently exhibit different degree of readability.

Narrative and expository texts, as two distinct genres, have their own special characteristics. Each genre has its own communicative purpose, which as a consequence gives it internal structure, often called rhetorical structure, and probably affects some linguistic features therein.8 Then, how about the use of ZEROS? Does

7 A genre is defined as “a culturally and linguistically distinct form of discourse” in Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000, page 6), in contrast to a register that “reflect(s) the level of formality or informality of an instance of discourse or its degree of technical specificity versus general usage.”

8 Intuitively, we regard narratives as an easier type, as is also evidenced by the fact that almost all beginning level reading materials consist of narrative texts.
the pattern of use of ZEROS also characterize a genre? In an attempt to answer this question, we will make a comparison of the two different sets of text in regard to the distribution of ZEROS of various types. We will use the Nitizyo sub-corpus (14 texts, 498 utterances) as a narrative sample and Gendai (15 texts, 364 utterances) as an expository sample.

First, let us look at the distribution of referent types in Figure 7.2. Here, we add data from another genre, i.e., the email corpus (64 texts, 914 utterances).

![Figure 7.2: Comparison of ZERO referent type distributions in three different genres of text](image)

Each genre of text exhibits a certain characteristic: a relatively high ratio of ZEROS of “local” reference (74.14%) in narrative texts, and a remarkably higher ratio of “indeterminate” reference in expository texts (19.41%) than in the other two genres (1.15% and 2.99% respectively). In contrast, email texts can be characterized by high frequency of “global” (17.91%) and “situational” reference (23.13%).

These results roughly conform to some general characteristics of the three text genres. The primary communicative purpose of narrative texts is to describe an experience, an event, or a sequence of events in the form of a story. Thus, they naturally involve some main characters (human entities) and objects (non-human entities) that are usually repeated, locally or globally, in the progress of the story. It is, therefore, persuasive that the two prevailing reference types for this genre are “local” and “global.”
Expository texts, on the other hand, aim to provide information; they inform readers about technical or logical ideas with which readers are usually unfamiliar. More specifically, they describe objects, phenomena, and mechanisms, etc., and much of this content is abstract and technical, with no particular personages involved. This explains the abundant use of “indeterminate” reference, rather than reference to explicit NP antecedents.

Email text, as described in Fais and Yamura-Takei (2003), is often said to be a hybrid of written and spoken texts. Its communicative purpose is normally to exchange information to achieve a specific goal set by the participants. The purpose of this particular corpus (i.e., a collection of messages exchanged among six employees of a Japanese company), is to make necessary arrangements for “scheduling a sports outing” and for “organizing the writing and publication of a history of the company” (ibid., page 172). Thus, interactions rely heavily on the shared or prior knowledge of the participants. This feature explains the high frequency of “situational” references in this genre.

In sum, “local/global” are referent types peculiar to narrative texts; “indeterminate” is peculiar to expository texts, and “situational” to email texts. These genre-specific generalizations have also proven statistically valid. When the distribution of “local/global,” “situational,” and “indeterminate” references in the three genres of text are compared, the difference is significant ($x^2 = 134.57$, DF=4, $p < .001$). We assume that knowing this genre-specific tendency is a useful piece of information for teachers when they use these genres of materials.

In addition to these generalized observations, teachers should be aware of inevitable variations within the same genre. Let us compare two texts from the expository set: Text A, which explains the new-employee training system in Japan and Text B, which describes newly invented golf balls. Table 7.2 shows the distribution of referent types in the two texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Text A</th>
<th>Text B</th>
<th>Expository Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>53.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>8.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situational</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indeterminate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>19.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Distribution of reference types in two expository texts

---

9 ZEROS of intra-clausal, cataphorical, and time/weather reference are not found in the texts.
As is apparent, the two texts are distinct from each other, and also, they deviate somewhat from the average of the whole expository sub-corpus. Striking are the relatively high proportion of “local/global” ZEROS in Text A, and the overwhelming frequency of “indeterminate” ZEROS in Text B. In this regard, Text A is closer to a narrative style text, probably because a human entity ‘employees’ are the CENTER of the discussion. In Text B, in contrast, ‘golf balls’ are centered and various “general” people connected to the balls are expressed as indeterminate ZEROS. From these statistics, teachers can reasonably predict potential problem areas for learners in the identification of “global” referents, in case of Text A, and in the interpretation of a discourse involving numerous indeterminate agents, in case of Text B (see 7.1.2.2).

*Processing cost of ZEROS*

We have seen that “density” and “type” of ZEROS vary remarkably from text to text, and from genre to genre. Before we move on to “processing cost” of ZEROS, let us present some data comparing two distinct genres, narrative and expository, based on the centering account of coherence. Figure 7.3 presents the distribution of TRANSITION types found in the two sets of text.

![Figure 7.3: Comparison of TRANSITION type distribution for two genres of text](image)

This figure shows that both narrative and expository sub-corpora exhibit the preferred distribution of TRANSITION types as defined in Rule 2 (the version of Brenann et al., 1987; see Chapter 3). Noticeable differences between the two include the relatively high proportion of CONTINUE in narrative texts, and the high frequency of discourse-medial NULL TRANSITION states in expository texts. The former is closely

---

10 Several JSL teachers pointed out that Text B is one of the hardest materials in the textbook for learners (personal communication).
related to the frequency of “local” ZEROS mentioned earlier, which creates a locally coherent discourse. The latter indicates the more frequent breakdown in cohesive links between adjacent utterances, i.e., the low entity-coherence of expository texts. Judging solely from the entity-based estimation of coherence, expository texts are less coherent than narratives.

Next, we examined the TRANSITION types of utterances with ZERO-CBs in order to make a rough estimation of processing costs. Figure 7.4 presents the distribution.

Figure 7.4: TRANSITION types of utterances with ZERO-CBs in two genres of texts

It is interesting to see that the ratio of the CONTINUE TRANSITION utterances in narrative texts is higher than that in expository, while the ratio of the other three TRANSITIONS yielded the reverse results.

In order to more closely and more precisely examine the centering-predicted degree of coherence, we will turn to the inference cost induced by the TRANSITION sequence types. Again, let us compare Nitizyo and Gendai, the narrative and expository sub-corpora. Table 7.3 below shows the ratios of “low cost,” “medium cost” and “high cost” sequences in the two sets of corpus (see 4.4.4.2 for the definition of each cost group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Narrative Nitizyo</th>
<th>Expository Gendai</th>
<th>Average of the whole corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low cost</td>
<td><strong>56.91%</strong></td>
<td>47.90%</td>
<td>47.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium cost</td>
<td>28.86%</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>34.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High cost</td>
<td>14.23%</td>
<td><strong>22.69%</strong></td>
<td>18.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Comparison of ratios of ZERO-CBs in three levels of processing cost environments
As indicated by the figures in bold, more ZEROS are used in low processing cost environments in narrative than in expository. In expository texts, in contrast, more ZEROS than average are used in the centering conditions that require high processing demands.

We have seen potential factors concerning ZEROS that might affect readability of text, and provided some statistics from our corpus that explain text-to-text and genre-to-genre differences. These differences are what we suggest teachers should be aware of, in addition to the well-utilized differences in terms of vocabulary and sentence structure.

7.1.2.2 Predicting comprehension problems

In the previous subsection, we presented the differences in density, type and processing cost of ZEROS observed in two distinct genres of text: narrative and expository. We also paid attention to text-to-text variations, hoping that these observations and the generalizations drawn from them will reveal implications for the determination of readability. In this subsection, we will demonstrate that our findings will help spot certain problem areas in terms of ZERO interpretation that affect comprehension of a discourse.

As for density, we simply assume that the more ZEROS a discourse contains, the more difficult the interpretation of the discourse will make. This assumption is contrary to the claims (for English) by Irwin (1986) that a greater number of cohesive ties increases reading speed and improves recall. This contradiction is largely due to the implicitness of cohesive ties that we are concerned with; invisible ZEROS have a higher inference cost than other visible cohesive ties, such as an NP-pronoun pair. McNamara (2001) reported that increasing the “explicit” coherence relations improves memory and comprehension. “Implicit” coherence relations created by ZEROS appear to have a different story.

As for types, we assume that some types should be easier to process than others. Take “local” and “global” for instance. ZEROS whose antecedents are found “locally” in the immediately preceding utterances should be easier than ZEROS whose antecedents need “global” search. Among “local” ZEROS, there also should be differences in processing difficulty according to whether they can be interpreted by centering mechanisms alone or whether they require additional semantic-driven inference.

Fujiwara and Yamura-Takei (2003, 2004) conducted a study with 20 JSL learners in an American university concerning their interpretation of three different types of ZEROS: (i) local, (ii) local augmented with semantic information, and (iii) global. Results indicate that type (iii) is harder to interpret than the other two, and these results have proven statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.00; \ DF = 2; \ p < .05$). This suggests that these categorizations (local versus global) can be used to predict difficulty in interpreting
different types of ZEROS. We also suggested that ZEROS with explicit NP antecedents are easier to process than those without, such as “situational” ZEROS, a claim that needs to wait for an empirical validation.

Finally, in terms of processing cost, centering provides hypothetical predictions concerning the processing difficulty of ZEROS. Theoretically and intuitively, ZEROS used in the CON-CON sequence are easier than those in, say, the CON-SHIFT sequence. TRANSITION-sequence-based prediction of comprehension problems is convincing and promising. However, computation of centering TRANSITIONS is not an easy task for teachers or even for trained linguists, and its automation is beyond the scope of this study. Alternatively, we suggest an effective use of ZD output. A sample segment is given in (7.4).

(7.4)  
a. 大人は ジェーンを 見て
   otona-wa zyeen-o mi-te
   adult-TOP Jane-ACC see-and

   ‘When adults see Jane,’

b. Ø 「外人」などと 言いませんが、
   (Ø-ga) “gaizin” nado-to ii-mas-en-ga
   (Ø-NOM) “foreigner”-QUO say-POL-NEG-but,

   ‘(they) do not say “foreigner” but’

c. Ø 特別な目で ジェーンを 見ます。
   (Ø-ga) tokubetuna me-de zyeen-o mi-masu.
   (Ø-NOM) special eye-with Jane-ACC see-POL

   ‘(they) see Jane with special eyes.’

d. Ø 金髪で 鼻が 高くて
   (Ø-ga) kinpatu-de hana-ga takaku-te
   (Ø-NOM) blond-is nose-NOM high-and

   日本人と ずいぶん違うから・・・
   nihonzin-to zuibun tigau-kara...
   Japanese-from very different-because

   ‘Because (she ‘Jane’) is blond and has a high nose, so different from Japanese people, …’
Figure 7.5 demonstrates the ZERO-specified ZD output of the segment (7.4), in which CENTERS are connected with arrows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>大人はジェーンを見て</th>
<th>NULL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ が]「外人」などと言いませんが、</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ が]特別な目でジェーンを見ます。</td>
<td>CON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ が]金髪で鼻が高くて日本人とずいぶん違うから・・・</td>
<td>SHIFT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.5: Sample ZD output with manual addition of coherence relations (1)

Using arrows to make explicit cohesive links or anaphoric relations is one of the conventional techniques traditionally employed by teachers in reading instruction (Williams, 1983; Baumann and Stevenson, 1986; Lubelska, 1991). This technique provides a rough approximation of centering TRANSITIONS, as is clear from the arrows in NULL-CON, CON-CON and CON-SHIFT sequences. The arrow between CON-SHIFT-sequence utterances indicates an abrupt shift in CENTERS. This intuitively easy-to-perceive alternative would work better than technical explication with centering terms, especially for centering-naïve language teachers, and this is where ZD output (in clause-by-clause parallel arrangement, with ZEROS specified) can be of pedagogical significance.

In order to show another benefit of this method, let us present another sample from our corpus in (7.5).

(7.5)  a. この犬のロボットは 頭がよくて、
       kono inu-no robotto-wa atama-ga yoku-te,
       this dog-GEN robot-TOP brain-NOM good-and

   ‘This robot dog is smart, and’

b. 教えてやると
   (Ø-ga) (Ø-ni) (Ø-o) osiete-yaru-to
   (Ø-NOM) (Ø-DAT) (Ø-ACC) teach-EMP-if

   ‘If (you) teach (it) (tricks)’
‘(It) learns many (tricks).’

Figure 7.6 below shows the ZD output with a manual arrow insertion.

As the angles of the arrows suggest, the transition of CENTERS is not maximally straightforward: see, for example, the CON-RET-CON sequence. In addition, there are two ZEROS (indicated by underlining) that are not connected by arrows to any explicit antecedent NPs in the text; they are potentially hard-to-interpret ZEROS without NP antecedents, “situational” in this case. This sequence seems to require a high degree of inference from world knowledge about pet dogs, a situation that teachers should be aware of.

7.1.3 Summary: Teaching

We have discussed how ZD helps teachers promote effective reading comprehension instruction. We discussed the two main aspects of teaching. In particular, firstly, ZD helps teachers predict the difficulties with ZEROS that learners might encounter, by analyzing text in advance. This supports the careful selection of teaching materials and the well-thought-out creation of reading comprehension questions and tests. Moreover, it is a crucial duty for teachers to be prepared for potential problems that might arise in the classroom. This is based on the claim by Moe and Irwin (1986) that “a clear understanding of cohesion can help educators predict comprehension problems” (page 3).

In addition, teacher awareness, not limited to lexical/syntactic characteristics (that are usually easier to observe) but extended to critical inter-sentential phenomena, should lead to a more thorough understanding of the language and a more effective instruction.
of the language as discourse. Graesser, McNamara, and Louwerse (2003) claim that “[v]ery few teachers are aware of the broad landscape of coherence relations” and “[m]ost researchers who have studied text coherence have not yet considered the implications of coherence for teaching reading” (pages 21-22); their claim is intended to speak to the case of L1 instruction in English, yet it is also applicable to the case of L2 instruction in Japanese. This gap is exactly what this thesis, particularly this chapter, attempts to fill. Our major claim is that ZD will provide a basis, i.e., ZERO-specified texts, on which teachers can make the aforementioned observations and determinations that we assume are crucial to effective reading instruction.

### 7.2 Enhancing learning

In this section, we will examine how Zero Detector can promote recognition, by JSL learners, of ZEROS and better understanding of a discourse that contains them, and hence acquisition of native-like perception of coherence of the discourse. In this respect, we regard learners as “indirect” users of the program, having teachers in a facilitator or mediator role who uses ZD output as teaching materials. In the scope of the present study, teachers supposedly create innovative worksheets using ZD output to be discussed in class with or without the use of technology, rather than having learners use the program hands-on.

In what follows, we will begin with a brief overview of language teaching paradigms, in relation to CALL history, and then discuss in which CALL design, rooted in the relatively new teaching paradigm, ZD can be most effectively used.

#### 7.2.1 Language teaching paradigms and CALL

Research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA), in its long history, has been concerned with the question of whether and what kind of language instruction best promotes learners’ second language development, and, as a result, has produced a variety of teaching paradigms and methods. The history seems to have witnessed a number of shifts in focus; namely “focus on what” has always been a major question for SLA researchers and practitioners.

The first, and probably most, influential approach was the so-called traditional grammar-based teaching, later dubbed by Long (1991) “Focus on FormS.” This approach sees language as a system of linguistic forms and functions. Included in this view are the grammar-translation method, which involves teaching forms exclusively or in isolation, and the audiolingual method, which places emphasis on mechanical drilling.

---

11 We will leave the hands-on use of ZD in a self-study mode for future work, which we believe is a promising and interesting direction, from both technological and pedagogical perspectives.
and memorization of language forms.

What came after this strictly form-based approach was communicative language teaching. This approach views language as a means of communication. The natural approach and immersion approach are of this type, which is labeled “Focus on Meaning,” and aims to provide students with opportunities to engage in communicative activities that exclude explicit grammar instruction.

Language teachers and learners, however, face the dilemma that, via traditional methods, learners do not become fluent, and, via communicative methods, students do not become accurate enough. It seems that too much attention to form risks fluency and too much attention to communication compromises accuracy. Therefore, in implementing a balanced teaching methodology, it is necessary to somehow integrate “attention to form” and “attention to meaning” for successful second language instruction. This view was first implemented by Long (1991), as a new paradigm termed “Focus on Form” that attempts to draw learners’ attention to linguistic form within a meaningful context, as in task-based language teaching (TBLT).

The shifts in focus that are realized in these three different paradigms are summarized in Table 7.4. The table also includes a brief history of CALL, whose design has been influenced by each teaching principle. The main focus of this section is to discuss what could fit in the cells indicated by ‘?’ in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Focus on Form</th>
<th>Focus on Meaning</th>
<th>Focus on Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>grammar-translation,</td>
<td>communicative approach,</td>
<td>TBLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALL Design</td>
<td>audiolingual</td>
<td>immersion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drill and practice,</td>
<td>simulation,</td>
<td>? [1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stimulus-response</td>
<td>role playing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>CALL</td>
<td>? [2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4: Interrelationship between teaching methodology and CALL design

In the realm of “Focus on FormS,” CALL systems also emphasize forms rather than functions and meaning. One representative teaching methodology in this group is Audiolingualism, which peaked in the 1960s. The language laboratory, or simply LL, has spread widely in educational institutions of various levels. The audiolingual approach, based on behaviorism and structuralism, presented the learner with a carefully graded series of conditional and habit-forming modes of exercises, often derogatorily labeled “drill-and-kill.” CALL programs in this vein, usually categorized as “Structural CALL,” present a stimulus to which the learner has to provide a response. The stimulus is usually in the form of text presented on screen, and the response is made
by entering an answer, normally in the form of multiple choice or fill-in-blank, at the keyboard.

It was at the beginning of the 1970s that the “communicative approach” began to take over. This is generally attributed to Hymes (1972) who defined “communicative competence” as opposed to Chomskyan “linguistic competence.” In this paradigm, namely “Focus on Meaning,” CALL programs also focused on communicative language activities. Such activities are realized in CALL, for example, in the form of role playing and simulation (games) that involve interaction with computers fully utilizing multimedia devices, such as sound, graphics and videos, in addition to simulation programs. This type of CALL is often called “Communicative CALL.” For example, an attempt to apply the principles of communicative language learning to the three emerging technologies, NLP, interactive video and speech processing, was made in the Athena Language Learning Project (Murray, 1995).

For the purpose of “Focus on Form,” what type of CALL design is effective and possible? Focus on Form is usually put into practice in the form of task-based language learning (TBLL). TBLL is based on the idea that the acquisition of language and linguistic competence as well as language and language learning awareness can best be realized through tasks which encourage learners not to focus explicitly on the structure and the rules of L2. Learners will acquire the form of the foreign language because they are engaged in exploring aspects of the target language on the basis of authentic content. In this regard, TBLL is closely related to or is compatible with data-driven learning (DDL), proposed by Tim Johns (Johns and King, 1991), which focuses on the exploitation of authentic materials and real, exploratory tasks and learner-centered activities, with the aid of linguistic analysis tools. Most obviously, concepts described as DDL form a relevant backbone of aspects explored and exemplified in TBLL. These concepts can also be realized in CALL applications and environments, and this type of CALL is often labeled Corpus-based CALL, or Task-based CALL (e.g., González-Lloret, 2003), which can go in the cell marked [2] in the table above. As for the cell marked [1], we will leave possible concrete ideas as a future issue (see 7.2.5).

In the next section, we will move further into the discussion on the underlying rationale and potential practical applications of this particular type of CALL, rooted in the principles of “Focus on Form” and “data-driven language learning.”

### 7.2.2 Focus on Form and CALL

There are many SLA researchers involved in CALL, and also many CALL researchers who are concerned with SLA. There is also a symbiotic relationship between rigorous research in SLA and CALL; as Chapelle (1997) put it “[a] glance through the CALL literature of the 1990s reveals the profession’s quest for principled means of designing
and evaluating CALL (page 19).” One such quest concerns the implementation of Focus on Form concepts.

Skehan (1998) presents five cognitive principles for implementing effective task-based instruction (TBI), one of which is to “[m]aximize the chances of a focus on form through attentional manipulation (page 132).” Chapelle (2001) presents six criteria for evaluating appropriateness of CALL activities, one of which emphasizes “[t]he degree of opportunity present for beneficial focus on form (page 55).” More recently, Skehan (2003) explores connections between technology and the concepts of Focus on Form.

### 7.2.3 Focus on Form and JSL

In the field of language pedagogy, studies for ESL usually precede those for other (European and then Asian) languages. Unexceptionally, Focus on Form, which was originally formulated in 1991 by Long, began to be discussed in the JSL community in the late 1990s (e.g., Koyanagi, 1998, 2001, 2002). Koyanagi (2002) reviews previous JSL acquisition work and sees Focus on Form as a promising teaching principle from which JSL pedagogy can benefit and to which Japanese language studies can contribute. Prior to that, Nagatomo (1995) discussed the role of consciousness-raising in the acquisition of Japanese adjectives. Yokoyama (1998, 1999, and 2001) attended to the role of input/output, emphasizing the noticing function, and discussed its implications for JSL classroom activities. She states that some language forms are not suited for learning as “knowledge,” but rather suited for learning through input (Yokoyama, 1999), which is one of the driving forces for us to consider ZD as an acquisition aid, assuming that ZEROS are the kind of phenomenon for which it is difficult to make rules.

### 7.2.4 Attention and noticing

#### 7.2.4.1 Model of SLA

Just like computer systems, humans receive input and produce output. For human language processing, input is the language that they hear or receive and from which they can learn. Output, by analogy, is the language they utter or produce, from which you can observe what they have learned. Unlike computers, however, what lies in between is a “black box.”

Research efforts in SLA have long been focusing on the elucidation of unspecified processes in the box, and have reached a more or less agreed-upon model. A prototypical model that consists of six basic components is illustrated in Figure 7.7, following Gass (1997) and Chapelle (1998).
The concept of **input** is probably the single most important concept of second language acquisition. It is trivial to point out that no individual can learn a second language, dubbed as L2, (or develop an L2 grammar) without input of some sort (Gass, 1997). Even when input is potentially available to a learner, however, we must ask what happens to it before it converts itself to **output**, i.e., L2 production, namely what goes on inside the black box. Gass proposed four stages that lie between input and output.

Firstly, a well-established fact about SLA is that not everything that learners hear or read is utilized as they form L2 grammars. The first stage of input utilization is the recognition that there is something to be learned, that is, that there is a gap between what the learner already knows and what there is to know. This is called apperception. **Apperception** is the process of understanding by which newly observed qualities of an object are initially related to past experiences. Apperception is an internal cognitive act in which a linguistic form is related to some bit of existing knowledge (or gap in knowledge). We can think of apperception as a priming device that prepares the input for further analysis. Thus, apperceived input is that bit of language that is noticed in some way by the learner because of some particular recognizable features.

Apperception relates to the potentiality of **comprehension** of the input; another
level in the process of acquisition is comprehended input.

**Intake** is the process of assimilating linguistic material; it refers to the mental activity that mediates input and grammars.

After the intake component has performed its task of processing the input and matching it against existing knowledge, the resulting outcome occurs in the form of **integration**. Integration is comprised of the processes for using or holding the intake in short term memory to influence the development of the linguistic system, or the “interlanguage” (Selinker, 1972). Finally, the system developed by integration, in turn, affects the L2 output that the learner produces.

In what follows, we will attend, among the components discussed so far, to the component of apperception, the process of noticing aspect in L2, in relation to attention.

### 7.2.4.2 Role of attention

Attention is a cognitive process crucial in human information processing. More precisely, it is the means by which humans actively process a limited amount of information from the enormous amount of information available through their senses, stored memories, and other cognitive processes. Since attention is a limited resource, there must be (i) processes that decide what to attend to, which are referred to as “selective attention”; and (ii) processes that allocate attentional resources to control performance of several tasks simultaneously, referred to as “divided attention.” In order to make any decisions or allocations, there first must be the detection of stimuli.Performing a “dual task” therefore involves the detection of two stimuli that subsequently require efficient allocation of resources. The process is schematically described in Figure 7.8.

![Figure 7.8: Dual task and attention](image-url)

We will refer back to this scheme when we present our CALL design in the Focus on Form framework, in which attention plays an important role.
7.2.4.3 Noticing hypothesis

Attention to (language) input is essential for SLA, as well as for many other cognitive activities. Recent SLA research and theory progress beyond Krashen’s (e.g., 1982) emphasis on the automatic and “unconscious” processes of acquisition, and examine the role of attention in selecting input for processing (see Robinson, 2003 for a summary).

Schmidt (1990) argues, by questioning the notion of “unconsciousness” in Krashen’s work, that learning must be “conscious” in the sense that learners must pay attention to input and “notice” it, and that “noticing is the necessary and sufficient condition for converting input to intake” (page 129).

This “noticing hypothesis” has been supported by the results of a number of empirical studies (e.g., Schmidt and Frota, 1986; Robinson, 1995, 1997; Jourdenais, Ota, Stauffer, Boyson, and Doughty, 1995; Leow, 1997, 2000) although it has also been objected to on theoretical and methodological grounds (Tomlin and Villa, 1994; Truscott, 1998). In spite of these caveats, Schmidt’s hypothesis has inspired much subsequent important work, such as “input enhancement” (Sharwood Smith, 1991) and “Focus on Form” (Long, 1991; Long and Robinson, 1998).

7.2.4.4 Input enhancement

One important technical realization of the noticing hypothesis is input enhancement. It is a manipulation of target language input by making “salient” particular linguistic characteristics of L2 in order to prompt learners to notice them. Making something salient or noticeable in written input involves textual enhancement (i.e., visual enhancement of text), through the use of color, boldface, italics, highlighting, and increase in size or other perceptually salient features. For example, Doughty (1991) performed a computerized experiment regarding the effect of visual input enhancement (highlighting) on the acquisition of English relativization, which yielded a positive result. We conjecture that this salience effect can also be realized by making ZEROS visible, an approach that can be regarded as the ultimate visual enhancement of a particular linguistic feature.

This technique is listed at the top of the list of seven hypotheses about ideal SLA conditions that are relevant for CALL program design reviewed by Chapelle (1998). At the top of her list is that “the linguistic characteristics of target language input need to be made salient” (page 23). As Mills (2000) discussed the technology with which the enhancement is made easy, such as the Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) that we also employed for ZD, the input enhancement technique is better achieved in a computer-assisted environment.

More fundamentally, in order to make particular items noticeable, they must first
be detected in the input text. This can be done manually, but this is exactly where computerization, as realized in ZD, can make a great contribution, with the recent maturity of NLP techniques (see Chapter 5).

### 7.2.5 Summary: Learning

We have discussed the pedagogical framework in which learners can benefit from using ZD. We overviewed the underlying concepts of Focus on Form. The relationship of these major concepts and components within the principle of Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Long, 2000) is illustrated in Figure 7.9 below.

![Figure 7.9: Relationship of major concepts and components in Focus on Form](image)

The figure diagrams how pedagogical interventions (bold-framed) are related to relevant cognitive functions (highlighted). It is up to teachers who plan the TBLT activity to design meaningful “tasks” (while considering “language modes,” “task conditions” and “task complexity”). ZD plays a part in the manipulation of the input in which some “forms” (ZEROS in this case) are “focused” by detecting and visually marking them, either in an explicit or implicit way (see the ZD output options in 6.8.1) so that some divided attention will be directed to “forms” and prompt noticing. As well as enhanced input, “pushed output” (or comprehensible output) is also considered to promote noticing by “cognitively comparing” what learners can produce and what they
cannot ("noticing the gap").\textsuperscript{12} The analysis of learner output, to help comparison, would also be a site where ZD could play a part.

The design and development of a TBLT-based CALL program that incorporates a Focus-on-Form technique realized by ZD, as abstracted in the figure above, would be a promising future direction for research. Such a system would also serve as a test bed for what Chapelle (2001) calls CASLR (Computer-Assisted Second Language Research), which attempts to provide empirical evidence for second language acquisition theory by using a computerized research environment.

### 7.3 Potential of ZD

We have discussed possible pedagogical contributions of \textit{Zero Detector} to the JSL context. Two possible areas for such contribution were presented: (i) enhancement of teachers’ instruction of ZEROS and ZERO-containing discourse comprehension, and (ii) promotion of learners’ recognition of ZEROS and better understanding of ZERO-containing discourse.

In both areas, ZD serves as a teacher’s aid, rather than as an independent tutor, which was our initial intention, as we stated in Chapter 5. In addition, ZD is a simple and modest application; it just makes ZEROS visible and noticeable. Hence, it has great potential; teachers, as primary users, are given enormous flexibility and allowed full rein for their own creativity in using ZD and its output. In addition to what we have proposed in this chapter, there will be many other techniques and methods in which ZD can be used.

Chapter 8

Conclusions

This final chapter summarizes the main issues this thesis has focused on. We highlight the major results and contributions of this work (Section 8.1) and present some interesting and challenging ideas emerging from the results to be developed in future research (Section 8.2).

8.1 Contributions of the thesis

Our primary goal was to investigate a unique linguistic phenomenon commonly found in Japanese discourse, what we dub ZEROS, from four different disciplinary perspectives, namely, theoretical, empirical, technological, and then pedagogical approaches, as schematically illustrated in Figure 8.1.

First, ZEROS were fully explicated “theoretically” for their nature and behaviors...
within the relevant linguistic framework in Chapters 2 and 3. We reviewed the theoretical issues surrounding ZEROS and discussed key concepts in understanding ZEROS. Several typologies of ZEROS were proposed, with clear definitions. We emphasized the role of ZEROS as cohesion markers, and hence as coherence creators in Japanese discourse. We employed Centering theory as an explanatory tool to characterize the relationship between ZEROS and coherence/inference, and gave our version of definitions and parameter settings of centering terms and concepts.

Theoretically-grounded ZEROS were then examined “empirically” in the corpus study, which concerned the distribution of ZEROS and their contribution to coherence, in Chapter 4. To the best of our knowledge and belief, our study is the first and the most comprehensive study to present quantitative and qualitative data that examines the role of ZEROS with respect to coherence in Japanese discourse, in the centering framework, with numerous samples and reliable statistical evidence.

Thirdly, we presented, in Chapter 6, how the invisible ZEROS were “technologically” made visible. We discussed two sets of linguistically-sound heuristics that we employed for the recognition of the two types of ZEROS. The resulting development of Zero Detector was presented with a detailed description of the architecture. We also provided the results of an evaluation of its performance, which turned out to be feasible enough for the approach that we adopted.

Finally, two possible areas for the “pedagogical” contribution of Zero Detector were presented, in Chapter 7, based on the discussion of relevant reading research, SLA theories and language teaching and learning principles.

We placed, in the core of this interdisciplinary approach to ZEROS, the development of Zero Detector, an ICALL system. We assumed that a successful ICALL system is made possible with the collaboration of researchers (or research efforts) from the three communities: CALL, NLP, and SLA. This is what we intended to achieve in this single thesis, by placing ZD in the intersection of the three sub-disciplines, as illustrated in Figure 8.2.
As a final remark, we would like to emphasize that ZD, born and evolved in the intersection where theory, technology and pedagogy meet, is unique and innovative both as a system and as a project, for its emphasis on a previously unrecognized discourse-level phenomenon and its multi-disciplinary research methodologies, with considerable scholastic and technical depth.

8.2 Future Work

Besides many contributions that this thesis did offer, some were left undone or underdeveloped, either for lack of time, or for lack of room in the thesis. In general, such work has been left undone since it would have taken us too far afield and would have turned us away from the major points of this thesis. In this section, we describe some of the issues that we believe deserve to be investigated in future work.

Further enhancement of ZD
The current ZD has achieved fairly good accuracy as a rule-based system with surface-level heuristics and shallow processing. However, it could improve with the addition of “deeper” semantic/pragmatic processing components. Also, the semantic properties for ATN could be re-examined in a larger scale corpus evaluation, for possible adjustment.

Addition of other functions
Automatic creation of comprehension questions involving ZEROS would be of help to
teachers in their material preparation. A function that allows the user to make on-screen correction of the ZD output errors would also be a plus.¹

User study
ZD was evaluated for its performance, but a user study is yet to be conducted to examine how user-friendly the current system is.

Psychological validation
Centering TRANSITION sequence-based prediction of coherence/inference was proposed according to the result of our extensive corpus analysis. The validity of these corpus-driven estimates may need to be subjected to relevant behavioral experiments as well.

Pedagogical validity
Pedagogical validity of ZD was theoretically discussed. Empirical justification, which normally takes another couple of years to obtain results, should naturally follow. As Holland (1995) points out, NLP-based programs tend to take a long time to develop, and they tend to remain experimental. In order to avoid this, it should be experimentally used by learners, in a well-thought-out setting, and evaluated for its impact on the acquisition of ZEROS, which in fact lies in our future agenda for collaboration with JSL teachers.

Designing/development of a TBLL-based CALL curriculum
The next desirable step would be for ZD to be integrated into a larger-scale CALL program or curriculum that effectively utilizes the concept of Focus on Form in a well-planned TBLL activity. The designing and development of such a system would be a promising and rewarding effort for an interdisciplinary project team.

¹ We thank Takako Aikawa for these suggestions, which she made at the ACL 2003 exhibit.
Appendix A: List of corpus sources

Corpus I

This set of corpus materials, collected from the following eight publications, was used for the comprehensive analysis of ZEROS in Japanese discourse in Chapter 4 and for the training of the zero nominal argument recognition in Chapter 6. The abbreviated names, in the left column, were used in the thesis to indicate which corpus a sample discourse segment is taken from.

[Hiroko 1]  Hiroko san no tanosii nihongo 1.
ひろこさんの たのしい にほんご 1（凡人社）

[Hiroko 2]  Hiroko san no tanosii hihongo 2.
ひろこさんの たのしい にほんご 2（凡人社）

Makino, Akiko, Sachiko Sawada, Akemi Shigekawa, Yone Tanaka,
みんなの日本語初級 I 初級で読めるトピック25（スリーエーネットワーク）

Makino, Akiko, Sachiko Sawada, Akemi Shigekawa, Yone Tanaka,
みんなの日本語初級 II 初級で読めるトピック25（スリーエーネットワーク）

[Gendai]  Gendai nihongo syokyuu soogoo kooza
(An Integrated Course for Beginners Modern Japanese).
現代日本語初級総合講座（アルク）

[Nitizyo]  Nitizyo seikatu ni miru nihon no bunka
Ken Ujiie. Available online at http://home.wlu.edu/~ujiek/ (retrieved
on Septempter 1, 2003)
日常生活に見る日本の文化
Corpus II

This other set of corpus materials, comprising the following two publications, was used solely for the evaluation of our system, Zero Detector, in Chapter 6.

Gendai nihongo syokyuu soogoo kooza hatten-hen
現代日本語初級総合講座 発展編（アルク）

Syanai no ziken (‘It happened on a train’)
「車内の事件」エヌ氏の遊園地（講談社文庫）
Appendix B: JLPT3/4 Valency Dictionary

This is the list of 334 predicates (verbs and adjectives) and their valency pattern(s) with semantic information.

These 334 predicates are those listed in the vocabulary for the Japanese-Language Proficiency Test (JLPT) levels 3 and 4 (distributed by the Japan Foundation and Japan Educational Exchange Services in 1994, and revised in 2002). The valency patterns are largely based on the listing provided by Ishiwata and Ogino (1983) and Ishiwata (1999).

This valency dictionary is used, in Zero Detector, as one of the database sets for the recognition of zero verbal arguments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Valency Pattern</th>
<th>Semantic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>aisatusuru</td>
<td>話す (aihatsusuru)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に N1 (人間) N2 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>合う (あう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に N1 (人間) N2 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>会う (あう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に N1 (人間) N2 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td>開く (あく)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td>空く (あく)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>akeru</td>
<td>開ける (あける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ageru</td>
<td>上げる (あげる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ageru</td>
<td>あげる (あげる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に N1 (人間) N2 (具体) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>asobu</td>
<td>遊ぶ (あそぶ)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>atumaru</td>
<td>集まる (あつまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>atumeru</td>
<td>集める (あつめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>abiru</td>
<td>浴びる (あびる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ayamaru</td>
<td>謝る (あやまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に N1 (人間) N2 (具体) N3 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>arau</td>
<td>洗う (あらう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>aru</td>
<td>在る (ある)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>aru</td>
<td>有る(ある)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>aruku</td>
<td>歩く(あるく)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ansinsuru</td>
<td>安心する(あんしんする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>annaisuru</td>
<td>案内する(あんないする)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>iu</td>
<td>言う(いう)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>言う(いう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(抽象) N3(人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>言う(いう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に S と</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(人間) S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ikiru</td>
<td>生きる(いきる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>iku</td>
<td>行く(いく)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>行く(いいく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>行く(いく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>行く(いく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1(具体) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>行く(いく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1(具体) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>igimeru</td>
<td>苦める(いじめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>isogu</td>
<td>急ぐ(いそぐ)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>急ぐ(いそぐ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>itasu</td>
<td>致す(たす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>itadaku</td>
<td>頂く(いただく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>頂く(いただく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 から</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(具体) N3(人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>inoru</td>
<td>祈る(いのる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>祈る(いのる)</td>
<td>N1 が N を N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(抽象) N3(人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>祈る(いのる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に S と</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(人間) S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>irassayaru</td>
<td>いらっしゃる(いれしゃる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>いらっしゃる(いれしゃる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>iru</td>
<td>居る(いる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>居る(いる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1(人間 動物) N2(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>iro</td>
<td>要る(いる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ikeru</td>
<td>入れる(いるる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>入れる(いるる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(具体) N3(具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ukeru</td>
<td>受ける(うける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>受ける(うける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ukeru</td>
<td>動く(うごく)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>動く(うごく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1(人間) N2(場所) N3(場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>動く(うごく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>動く(うごく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1（具体） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>動く(うごく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1（具体） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>utau</td>
<td>歌う(うたう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>utu</td>
<td>打つ(うつ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>utusu</td>
<td>移す(うつす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>uturu</td>
<td>移る(うつる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>移る(うつる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>移る(うつる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>移る(うつる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1（具体） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>umareru</td>
<td>生まれる(うまれる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>uru</td>
<td>売る(うる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>unensuru</td>
<td>運転する(うんてんする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>undoosuru</td>
<td>運動する(うんどうする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>erabu</td>
<td>選ぶ(えらぶ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>選ぶ(えらぶ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>emryosuru</td>
<td>えんりょする</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>oideninaru</td>
<td>おいでになる(おいでになる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>おいでになる(おいでになる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>おいでになる(おいでになる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>okiru</td>
<td>起きる(おきる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>oku</td>
<td>置く(おく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>置く(おく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>okuru</td>
<td>送る(おくる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>送る(おくる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>okureru</td>
<td>遅れる(おくれる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>遅れる(おくれる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 で</td>
<td>N1（具体）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>okosu</td>
<td>怒る(おこる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>okonau</td>
<td>行う(おこなう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>okoru</td>
<td>教える(おしえる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>教える(おしえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（抽象）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>教える(おしえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（抽象） N3（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>教える(おしえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に S と</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（人間） S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>osu</td>
<td>押す(おす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>otiru</td>
<td>落ちる(おちる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>ossyaru</td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>otosu</td>
<td>落とす(落とす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>odoru</td>
<td>踊る(踊る)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>odoroku</td>
<td>罫く(おどろく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>omoi</td>
<td>思い出す(思い出す)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>omou</td>
<td>思う(思いう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>oyogu</td>
<td>氷く(およぐ)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>oriru</td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>oriru</td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>落ちる(落ちる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>oriru</td>
<td>下りる(下る)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>下りる(下る)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>下りる(下る)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>下りる(下る)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>oru</td>
<td>おる(おる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>omeru</td>
<td>折れる(折る)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>owaru</td>
<td>終わる(終わる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>買う(かう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>買う(かう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>kaesu</td>
<td>返す(かえす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>kaeru</td>
<td>帰る(かえる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>帰る(かえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>帰る(かえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>kaeru</td>
<td>変える(かえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>変える(かえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 から N4 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>変える(かえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 から N4 と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>kakaru</td>
<td>かかる(かかる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>かかる(かかる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>kaku</td>
<td>書く(かく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>書く(かく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>書く(かく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>書く(かく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に S と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>書く(かく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に S と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>kakeru</td>
<td>かける(かける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>kakeru</td>
<td>かける(かける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>kakeru</td>
<td>掛ける(かける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>kakeru</td>
<td>かける(かける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>kakeru</td>
<td>かける(かける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>kazaru</td>
<td>飾る(かざる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>kasu</td>
<td>貸す(かす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>katazukeru</td>
<td>片付ける(かたづける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>katu</td>
<td>勝つ(かつ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>勝つ(かつ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>kaburu</td>
<td>貸す(かす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>kamau</td>
<td>構う(かまう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>kayou</td>
<td>通う(かよう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>通う(かよう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>通う(かよう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>kariru</td>
<td>借りる(かりる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>借りる(かりる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 から</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>kawaku</td>
<td>乾く(かわく)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>kawaru</td>
<td>変わる(かわる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>kangaeru</td>
<td>考える(かんがえる)</td>
<td>N1 が S と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>考える(かんがえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>ganbaru</td>
<td>頑張る(がんばる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>頑張る(がんばる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>kieru</td>
<td>消える(きえる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>消える(きえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>消える(きえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1 (具体) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>kiku</td>
<td>聞く(きく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>kikoeru</td>
<td>聞こえる(きこえる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>kimaru</td>
<td>決まる(きまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>決まる(きまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>kimeru</td>
<td>決める(きめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>kyoososuru</td>
<td>競争する(きょうそうする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>競争する(きょうそうする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 と</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>kiri</td>
<td>切る(きる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>kiri</td>
<td>着る(きる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>kudasaru</td>
<td>下さる(くださる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>下さる(くださる)</td>
<td>N1 から N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>kumoru</td>
<td>曇る(くもる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>kuraberu</td>
<td>比べる(くらべる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>比べる(くらべる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 と</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>kuru</td>
<td>来る(くる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>来る(くる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>来る(くる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>来る(くる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1 (具体) N2 (場所) N3 (場所)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>kureru</td>
<td>くれる(くれる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>くれる(くれる)</td>
<td>N1 から N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (具体) N3 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>kureru</td>
<td>暮れる(くれる)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>keikakusuru</td>
<td>計画する(けいかくする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>keikensuru</td>
<td>経験する(けいけんする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>kegasuru</td>
<td>怪我する(けがする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>gesyukusuru</td>
<td>下宿する(げしゅくする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>kesu</td>
<td>消す(けす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>kekkonsuru</td>
<td>結婚する(けっこんする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>結婚する(けっこんする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 と</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>kenkasasu</td>
<td>喧嘩する(けんかする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>喧嘩する(けんかする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 と</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (人間)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>kenkyuusuru</td>
<td>研究する(けんきゅうする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>研究する(けんきゅうする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>kengutusuru</td>
<td>見物する(けんぶつする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>kosyososuru</td>
<td>故障する(こしゅうする)</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>kotaeru</td>
<td>答える(こたえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>komaru</td>
<td>困る(こまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>komu</td>
<td>込む(こむ)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>kopiisuru</td>
<td>コピーする(こぴーする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>goranninaru</td>
<td>ご覧になる(ごらんになる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>kowasu</td>
<td>壊す(こわす)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>kowareru</td>
<td>壊れる(こわれる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>sagasu</td>
<td>探す(さがす)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>sagaru</td>
<td>下がる(さがる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>saku</td>
<td>咲く(さく)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>sageru</td>
<td>下げる(さげる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>sasiageru</td>
<td>差し上げる(さしあげる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>susu</td>
<td>すす(すす)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>sawagu</td>
<td>騒ぐ(さわぐ)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>sawaru</td>
<td>触る(さわる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>sanposuru</td>
<td>散歩する(さんぽする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>sikaru</td>
<td>止まる(止まる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>sitakusuru</td>
<td>頭を撫でる(おでる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>sippaisuru</td>
<td>失敗する(しっぱいする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>syuppatusuru</td>
<td>出発する(しゅっぱつする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>simu</td>
<td>死ぬ(しぬ)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>simaru</td>
<td>閉まる(しむる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>simeru</td>
<td>閉める(しめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>simeru</td>
<td>締める(しめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>syussekisuru</td>
<td>出席する(しゅっけきする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>syuppatusuru</td>
<td>出発する(しゅっぱつする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>zynbisuru</td>
<td>準備する(じゅんびする)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間) N2 (行為)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 syookaisuru</td>
<td>紹介する（しょうかいする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（抽象） N3（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146 syootaisuru</td>
<td>招待する（しょうたいする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（人間） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147 syootisuru</td>
<td>承知する（しょうちする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（行為）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148 syokuzisuru</td>
<td>食事する（しょうじする）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 siraseru</td>
<td>知らせする（しらせする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（抽象） N3（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 siraberu</td>
<td>調べる（しらべる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（・）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 siru</td>
<td>知る（しる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（人間） S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 sinpaisuru</td>
<td>心配する（しんぱいする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 と</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（・） N3（抽象）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 suu</td>
<td>吸う（すう）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 sugiru</td>
<td>過ぎる（すぎる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（時）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 suku</td>
<td>空く（すく）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 が</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 suku</td>
<td>空く（すく）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（具体）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 susumu</td>
<td>進む（すすむ）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（抽象）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 suteru</td>
<td>捨てる（すてる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 suberu</td>
<td>滑る（すべる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（具体）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 sumu</td>
<td>住む（すむ）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 sumu</td>
<td>湧む（すむ）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（行為）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 suru</td>
<td>する（する）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（行為）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 suwanu</td>
<td>座る（すわる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 seikatusuru</td>
<td>生活する（せいかつする）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 seisansuru</td>
<td>生産する（せいさんする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（具体）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 sewasuru</td>
<td>世話する（せわする）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（動物）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 sensoosuru</td>
<td>戦争する（せんそうする）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
<td>N1（人間）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行</td>
<td>ワード</td>
<td>読み方</td>
<td>助詞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>sentakusuru</td>
<td>洗濯する（せんたくする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>soozisuru</td>
<td>掃除する（そうじする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>soodansuru</td>
<td>相談する（そうだんする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>sodateru</td>
<td>育てる（そだてる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>sotugyoosuru</td>
<td>卒業する（そつぎょうする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>taiinsuru</td>
<td>退院する（たいいんする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>taoreru</td>
<td>倒れる（たおれる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>tasu</td>
<td>足す（たす）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>dasu</td>
<td>出す（だす）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>tazuneru</td>
<td>訪ねる（たずねる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>tazuneru</td>
<td>尋ねる（たずねる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>tatu</td>
<td>立つ（たつ）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>tateru</td>
<td>立てる（たてる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>tateru</td>
<td>建てる（たてる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>tanomu</td>
<td>頼む（たのむ）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>taberu</td>
<td>食べる（たべる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>tariru</td>
<td>足りる（たりる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>tyekkusuru</td>
<td>チェックする（ちぇっくする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>tigau</td>
<td>通う（ちがう）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>tyuisuru</td>
<td>注意する（ちゅういする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>tyuisuru</td>
<td>中止する（ちゅうしする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>tyuusyasuru</td>
<td>注射する（ちゅうしゃする）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>takau</td>
<td>使う（つかう）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>takamaeru</td>
<td>捕まえる（つかまえる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>takareru</td>
<td>視れる（つかれる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>tuku</td>
<td>歌う（つく）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>tuku</td>
<td>育てる（つてる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>takuru</td>
<td>作る（つくる）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>takeru</td>
<td>点ける（つける）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>takeru</td>
<td>付ける（つける）</td>
<td>が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>形容詞</td>
<td>意味</td>
<td>例文</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>takeru</td>
<td>漬ける(つける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>tetaeru</td>
<td>伝える(つたえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>tuzaku</td>
<td>続く(つづく)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>tuzukeru</td>
<td>続ける(つづける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>tutumu</td>
<td>包む(つつむ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>tutomeru</td>
<td>勤める(つとめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>turu</td>
<td>釣る(つる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>tureru</td>
<td>連れる(つれる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>dekakeru</td>
<td>出かける(でかける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>dekriru</td>
<td>出来る(できる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>dekriru</td>
<td>できる(できる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>tetudau</td>
<td>手伝う(てつだう)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>deru</td>
<td>通る(とおる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>tooru</td>
<td>飛ぶ(とぶ)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>todokeru</td>
<td>届ける(とどける)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>tobu</td>
<td>取る(とる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>tomaru</td>
<td>止まる(とまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>tomaru</td>
<td>止まる(とまる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>tomeru</td>
<td>止める(とめる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>torikaeru</td>
<td>取り替える(とりかえる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>toeru</td>
<td>取る(とる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>toru</td>
<td>撮る(とる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>naosu</td>
<td>直す(なおす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>naoru</td>
<td>直る(なおる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>1st Argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>naoru</td>
<td>治る（なおる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>naku</td>
<td>聞く（なく）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>naku</td>
<td>聞く（なく）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>nakusu</td>
<td>無くす（なくす）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>nakunaru</td>
<td>無くなる（なくなる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>nakunaru</td>
<td>亡くなる（なくなる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>negeru</td>
<td>投げる（なげる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>nasaru</td>
<td>なさる（なさる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>narau</td>
<td>習う（ならう）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>narabu</td>
<td>並ぶ（ならぶ）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>naraberu</td>
<td>並べる（ならべる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>naru</td>
<td>なる（なる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>naru</td>
<td>喋る（なえる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>nareru</td>
<td>惣れる（なれる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>nigeru</td>
<td>遠げる（にげる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>nyuinsuru</td>
<td>入院する（にゅういんする）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>nyugakusuru</td>
<td>入学する（にゅうがくする）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>niru</td>
<td>似る（にる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>nugu</td>
<td>脱ぐ（ぬぐ）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>nusumu</td>
<td>盗む（ぬすむ）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>nuru</td>
<td>撈る（ぬる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>nureru</td>
<td>気れる（ぬれる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>nemuru</td>
<td>睡る（ねむる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>neru</td>
<td>睡る（ねる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>nokoru</td>
<td>殺する（のこる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>noboru</td>
<td>登る（のぼる）</td>
<td>N1 が</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>动詞</td>
<td>接続格</td>
<td>例文</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>登る（のぼる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を</td>
<td>N1（具体） N2（場所）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>登る（のぼる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>登る（のぼる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1（人間） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>登る（のぼる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 に</td>
<td>N1（具体） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>登る（のぼる）</td>
<td>N1 が N2 から N3 へ</td>
<td>N1（具体） N2（場所） N3（場所）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

249 nomu 飲む（のむ） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

250 norikaeru 乗り換える（のりかえる） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

251 noru 携る（のる） N1 が N2 に | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

252 haikensuru 拝見する（はいけんする） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

253 hairu 入る（はいる） N1 が N2 に | N1（具体） N2（具体） |

254 haku 履く（はく） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

255 hakobu 運ぶ（はこぶ） N1 が N2 を N3 に | N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（場所） |

256 hazimaru 始まる（はじまる） | N1 が | N1（行為） |

257 hajimeru 始める（はじめる） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（行為） |

258 hasiru 走る（はしる） N1 が | N1（具体） |

259 hataraku 働く（はたらく） N1 が | N1（人間） |

260 hanasu 話す（はなす） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |

261 harau 払う（はらう） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

262 haru 貼る（はる） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

263 hareru 晴れる（はれる） | N1 が | N1（具体） |

264 hantaisuru 反対する（はんたいする） N1 が N2 に | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |

265 hieru 冷える（ひえる） | N1 が | N1（具体） |

266 hikaru 光る（ひかる） | N1 が | N1（具体） |

267 hiku 引く（ひく） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

268 hiku 弾く（ひく） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

269 bikkurisuru びっくりする（びっくりする） | N1 が | N1（人間） |

270 hikkosu 引っ越す（ひっこす） | N1 が | N1（具体） |

271 hiraku 聞く（ひらく） | N1 が | N1（具体） |

272 hirow 扱う（ひらう） N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |

273 hiowu 増える（ふえる） N1 が | N1（*） |
<p>| 274 | huku | 吹く（ふく） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 275 | hutoru | 太る（ふとる） | N1 が | N1（動物） |
| 276 | humu | 踏む（ふむ） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 277 | huru | 舞る（ふる） | N1 が | N1（具体） |
| 278 | benkyoosuru | 勉強する（べんきょうする） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |
| 279 | hengisuru | 返事する（へんじする） | N1 が | N1（人間） |
| 280 | hoosoosuru | 放送する（ほうそうする） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |
| 281 | honyakusuku | 翻訳する（ほんやくする） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |
| 282 | magaru | 曲がる（まがる） | N1 が | N1（具体） |
| 283 | makeru | 負ける（まける） | N1 が N2 を | N1（具体） N2（場所） |
| 284 | mattigaeru | 間違える（まちがえる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 285 | matu | 待つ（まつ） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 286 | maniau | 図る（まるとる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 287 | mawaru | 回る（まわる） | N1 が | N1（具体） |
| 288 | mieru | 見える（みえる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（具体） N2（具体） |
| 289 | migaku | 磨く（みがく） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 290 | miseru | 見せる（みせる） | N1 が N2 を N3 に | N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（人間） |
| 291 | mitukaru | 見つかる（みつかる） | N1 が | N1（人間） |
| 292 | mitukeru | 見つける（みつける） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 293 | miru | 見る（みる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 294 | mukau | 向かう（むかう） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 295 | mukaeru | 迎える（むかえる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 296 | mesiagaru | 召し上がる（めしあがる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 297 | moosiageru | 申し上げる（もうしあげる） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |
| 298 | moosu | 申す（もうす） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（具体） |
| 299 | motu | 持つ（もつ） | N1 が N2 を | N1（人間） N2（抽象） |
| 300 | modoru | 落る（もどる） | N1 が N2 を N3 に | N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（具体） |
| 301 | moosu | 申す（もうす） | N1 が N2 を N3 に | N1（人間） N2（具体） N3（具体） |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Verb Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>renrakusuru</td>
<td>連絡する(れんらくする)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に N1 (人間) N2 (抽象) N3 (人間)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>wakasu</td>
<td>湯かす(わかす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (具体)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>wakaru</td>
<td>分かる(わかる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 が N1 (人間) N2 (抽象)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>分かる(わかる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 に N1 (行為) N2 (人間)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>分かる(わかる)</td>
<td>N1 が S と N1 (人間) S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>wakareru</td>
<td>別れる(わかれる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 と N1 (人間) N2 (人間)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>waku</td>
<td>沸く(わく)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (具体)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>wasureneru</td>
<td>忘れる(わすれる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (∗)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>watasu</td>
<td>渡す(わたす)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N3 に N1 (人間) N2 (具体) N3 (人間)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>wataru</td>
<td>渡る(わたる)</td>
<td>N1 が N2 を N1 (人間) N2 (場所)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>warau</td>
<td>笑う(わらう)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (人間)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>wareru</td>
<td>割れる(われる)</td>
<td>N1 が N1 (具体)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Semantic properties for ATN

This is the list of the nodes in the *Goi-Taikei* semantic attribute tree that we defined as ATN. Each node is given a label in Japanese (along with English translation that we added) and designated with a number. In the chart, indenting of each entry indicates the depth of the nodes in the hierarchy tree; ranging from the 4th level (indicated by no indenting) to the 10th level (indicated by 6-space indenting).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>人間＜親族関係＞</th>
<th>human &lt;kinship&gt;</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>家族 family</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夫妻 married couple</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夫 husband</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>妻 wife</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>親・祖父母・先祖</td>
<td>parent/grandparent/ancestor</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>親 parent</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>父 father</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>母 mother</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祖父母 grandparent</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祖父 grandfather</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祖母 grandmother</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>先祖 ancestor</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>子・孫・子孫</td>
<td>child/grandchild/descendant</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>息子 son</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>娘 daughter</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孫 grandchild</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孫(男) grandson</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孫(女) granddaughter</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>子孫 descendant</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>兄弟 sibling</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>兄弟(年上) older sibling</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>兄 older brother</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>姊 older sister</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>兄弟(年下) younger sibling</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 弟 younger brother | 98 |
| 妹 younger sister | 99 |
| 親戚 relative | 100 |
| おじ・おば uncle/aunt | 101 |
| おじ uncle | 102 |
| おば aunt | 103 |
| おい・めい nephew/niece | 104 |
| おい nephew | 105 |
| めい niece | 106 |
| いとこ cousin | 107 |
| いとこ(男) male cousin | 108 |
| いとこ(女) female cousin | 109 |
| 親戚(その他) other relative | 110 |

<p>| 人間＜対人関係＞ | human &lt;personal relation&gt; | 111 |
| 人間＜交際関係＞ | human &lt;social relation&gt; | 112 |
| 仲間・成員・仲間等 | companion/member, etc. | 113 |
| 中間・成員 companion/member | 114 |
| 中間 companion | 115 |
| 同士 comrade | 116 |
| 信徒 believer | 117 |
| 連れ companion | 118 |
| 成員 member | 119 |
| のけ者・じゃま者 | 120 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>相手</th>
<th>partner</th>
<th>121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>パートナー</td>
<td>partner</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>敵・味方</td>
<td>enemy/ally</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友・なじみ</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友人</td>
<td>friend</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>知人</td>
<td>acquaintance</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>恋人</td>
<td>sweetheart</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>恋人（男）</td>
<td>boyfriend</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>恋人（女）</td>
<td>girlfriend</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>マスター・メイターグラント</td>
<td>host and guest</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>主</td>
<td>host</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>主（男）</td>
<td>host (male)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>主（女）</td>
<td>hostess</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>客</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>客人</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顧客</td>
<td>customer</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人間＜相対的地位＞</td>
<td>human &lt;rank, position&gt;</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>師弟</td>
<td>master and pupil</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>師匠</td>
<td>master</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>弟子</td>
<td>pupil</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目上</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目上</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目下</td>
<td>junior</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>先輩・後輩</td>
<td>senior/junior</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>先輩</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後輩</td>
<td>junior</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>組織</td>
<td>organization</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>団体・党派</td>
<td>organization/party</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>団体</td>
<td>association</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>収開</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>集団</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家庭</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人＜役割＞</td>
<td>person &lt;role&gt;</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 首脳 | head | 334 |
| 幹部 | executive | 335 |
| 指導者 | leader | 336 |
| 担当者 | person in charge | 337 |
| 係り | person in charge | 338 |
| 役員 | official | 339 |
| 補佐 | assistant | 340 |
| 代理 | representative | 342 |
| 原告・被告 | accused/accused | 343 |
| 本人 | person in question | 344 |
| 使者・探偵 | messenger/detective | 345 |
| 使者 | messenger | 346 |
| 探偵 | detective | 347 |
| 人＜所有関係＞ | person <ownership> | 348 |
| 所有者 | owner | 349 |
| 人＜所有関係（その他）＞ | person <other ownership> | 350 |
| 仕手 [して] | leading role | 351 |
| 人＜読み・書き＞ | person <reader/writer> | 352 |
| 筆者 | author | 353 |
| 読者 | reader | 354 |
| 論者 | advocate | 355 |
| 演技者・観客 | performer/audience | 356 |
| 演技者 | performer | 357 |
| 観客 | audience | 358 |

| 組織 | organization | 362 |
| 団体・党派 | organization/party | 372 |
| 団体 | association | 373 |
| 収開 | group | 377 |
| 集団 | body | 383 |
| 家庭 | family | 387 |

| 人＜役割＞ | person <role> | 333 |

| 人（専門技術職） | person (professional) | 226 |
| 番人 | guard | 302 |
| 使用人 | employee | 304 |
| 使用人（男） | employee (male) | 305 |
| 使用人（女） | employee (female) | 306 |

| 人＜役割＞ | person <role> | 333 |

<p>| 256 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>附属語</th>
<th>キラシイガキ</th>
<th>478</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>山腹</td>
<td>mountain pass</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>谷</td>
<td>valley</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>崖</td>
<td>cliff</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>洞穴</td>
<td>cave</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>動物（部分）</th>
<th>animal (part)</th>
<th>552</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>頭部</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>頭</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>頭面</td>
<td>face</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ひたい</td>
<td>forehead</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ほお</td>
<td>cheek</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あご</td>
<td>chin</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目（器官）</td>
<td>eye (organ)</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目（器官（本体））</td>
<td>eye (organ (main part))</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目（器官（部分））</td>
<td>eye (organ (part))</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>鼻</td>
<td>nose</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>鼻（本体）</td>
<td>nose (main part)</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>鼻（部分）</td>
<td>nose (part)</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>口</td>
<td>mouth (body)</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>口（本体）</td>
<td>mouth (main part)</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>唇</td>
<td>lip</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>くちばし</td>
<td>peak</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>舌</td>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>くちばし</td>
<td>peak</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>耳</td>
<td>ear</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>耳（本体）</td>
<td>ear (main part)</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>耳（部分）</td>
<td>ear (part)</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>首</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>のど</td>
<td>throat</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>うなじ</td>
<td>nape</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>頸体</td>
<td>trunk</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>胸</td>
<td>chest</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>腹</td>
<td>belly</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>腰</td>
<td>waist</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>肩</td>
<td>shoulder</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>背</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>腦</td>
<td>side</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 屎 | buttocks | 584 |
| 尾 | tail | 585 |
| 頸体（その他） | trunk (other) | 586 |
| 乳房 | breast | 587 |
| へそ | navel | 588 |
| 陰部 | genitals | 589 |
| 手・足 | hand/leg | 590 |
| 手（上肢） | upper limb | 591 |
| 腕 | arm | 592 |
| 肘 | elbow | 593 |
| 手 | hand | 594 |
| 手首 | wrist | 595 |
| 手のひら | palm of a hand | 596 |
| 手の甲 | back of a hand | 597 |
| 手の指 | fingers | 598 |
| 足（下肢） | lower limb | 599 |
| 腿 | thigh | 600 |
| 膝 | knee | 601 |
| 腓 | shin | 602 |
| 足 | foot | 603 |
| 足首 | ankle | 604 |
| 足の裏 | sole of a foot | 605 |
| 足の甲 | instep | 606 |
| 足の指 | toe | 607 |
| 指 | finger | 608 |
| 関節 | joint | 609 |
| 翼・ひれ・水かき等 | wing/fin/webfoot, etc | 610 |
| 翼 | wing | 611 |
| ひれ | fin | 612 |
| 水かき等 | webfoot | 613 |
| 内臓・膜・筋肉 | internal organ/membrane/muscle | 614 |
| 内臓 | internal organ | 615 |
| 呼吸器 | respiratory organ | 616 |
| 消化器 | digestive organ | 617 |
| 循環器 | circulatory organ | 618 |
| 泌尿器 | urinary organ | 619 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>語彙</th>
<th>言葉</th>
<th>頁碼</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>生殖器</td>
<td>sexual organ</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>神経系</td>
<td>nerve</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>腺</td>
<td>gland</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>膜</td>
<td>membrane</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>筋肉</td>
<td>muscle</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>皮・毛</td>
<td>skin/hair</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>皮</td>
<td>skin</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>皮膚</td>
<td>skin</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ほくろ・いぼ</td>
<td>mole/wart</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>甲殻</td>
<td>carapace</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>筋肉</td>
<td>muscle</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>軟質</td>
<td>shell</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>毛</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>毛髪</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>眉・瞼(まゆ・まつげ)</td>
<td>eyebrow/eyelash</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ひげ</td>
<td>mustache/beard</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>体毛</td>
<td>body hair</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>羽毛</td>
<td>feather</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>骨・歯・爪等</td>
<td>bone/tooth/nail</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>骨</td>
<td>bone</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>歯茎</td>
<td>tooth/gum</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>歯</td>
<td>tooth</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>歯茎</td>
<td>gum</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爪・角・牙</td>
<td>nail/horn/tusk</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爪</td>
<td>nail</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>角(つなの)</td>
<td>horn</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>牙</td>
<td>tusk</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>植物(部分)</td>
<td>plant (part)</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>芽・苗</td>
<td>bud/seedling</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>苗</td>
<td>seedling</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>根</td>
<td>root</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>茎・株</td>
<td>stalk/stump</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>茎</td>
<td>stalk</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>株</td>
<td>stump</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>枝・葉</td>
<td>branch/leaf</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実・種子・穂</td>
<td>fruit/see/ear</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>種子</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>稲</td>
<td>ear</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>樹脂・果皮</td>
<td>resin/rind</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>細胞</td>
<td>cell</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>成分</td>
<td>ingredient</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>物品(持ち物)</td>
<td>thing (belonging)</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>衣服(本体(上半身))</td>
<td>clothing (main (upper half))</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>衣服(本体(下半身))</td>
<td>clothing (main (lower half))</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>靴下</td>
<td>sock</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>脚き物</td>
<td>footwear</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家屋(部分)</td>
<td>housing (part)</td>
<td>866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家屋(部分)</td>
<td>housing (part &lt;space&gt;)</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>袖側</td>
<td>porch</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>露台</td>
<td>balcony</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家屋(部分)</td>
<td>housing (part &lt;space (other)&gt;)</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家屋(部分)</td>
<td>housing (part &lt;component&gt;)</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>屋根</td>
<td>roof</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>天井</td>
<td>ceiling</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>柱・梁(はらい・はり)</td>
<td>pillar/beam</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>壁</td>
<td>wall</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>窓</td>
<td>window</td>
<td>879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>床</td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>土台</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>家屋(付属)</td>
<td>housing (accessory)</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>建具</td>
<td>fitting</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幕</td>
<td>curtain</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文字</td>
<td>意味</td>
<td>番号</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日覆い</td>
<td>sunshade</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>棚・台・壇</td>
<td>shelf/table/platform</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>乗る物(部分)</td>
<td>vehicle</td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>乗る物(部分(移動(空圏)))</td>
<td>vehicle (part (transfer (air)))</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>乗る物(部分(移動(水圏)))</td>
<td>vehicle (part (transfer (water)))</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>乗る物(部分(移動(陸圏)))</td>
<td>vehicle (part (transfer (land)))</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報酬</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>功績</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顔つき</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目つき</td>
<td>eye expression</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>泣き</td>
<td>weep</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>笑い</td>
<td>smile</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>感嘆</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>声</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>身震い</td>
<td>shudder</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行為</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>動作</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立ち居</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相続</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>賛否</td>
<td>approval or disapproval</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>認否</td>
<td>approval or denial</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>創作物</td>
<td>creation</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報酬</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>功績</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顔つき</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目つき</td>
<td>eye expression</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>泣き</td>
<td>weep</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>笑い</td>
<td>smile</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>感嘆</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>声</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>身震い</td>
<td>shudder</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行為</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>動作</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立ち居</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相続</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>賛否</td>
<td>approval or disapproval</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>認否</td>
<td>approval or denial</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>創作物</td>
<td>creation</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報酬</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>功績</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顔つき</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目つき</td>
<td>eye expression</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>泣き</td>
<td>weep</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>笑い</td>
<td>smile</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>感嘆</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>声</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>身震い</td>
<td>shudder</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行為</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>動作</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立ち居</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相続</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>賛否</td>
<td>approval or disapproval</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>認否</td>
<td>approval or denial</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>創作物</td>
<td>creation</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報酬</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>功績</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顔つき</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目つき</td>
<td>eye expression</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>泣き</td>
<td>weep</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>笑い</td>
<td>smile</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>感嘆</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>声</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>身震い</td>
<td>shudder</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行為</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>動作</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立ち居</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相続</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>賛否</td>
<td>approval or disapproval</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>認否</td>
<td>approval or denial</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>創作物</td>
<td>creation</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報酬</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>功績</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顔つき</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目つき</td>
<td>eye expression</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>泣き</td>
<td>weep</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>笑い</td>
<td>smile</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>感嘆</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>声</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>身震い</td>
<td>shudder</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行為</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>動作</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立ち居</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相続</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>賛否</td>
<td>approval or disapproval</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>認否</td>
<td>approval or denial</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>創作物</td>
<td>creation</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>報酬</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>功績</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表情</td>
<td>expression</td>
<td>1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顔つき</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目つき</td>
<td>eye expression</td>
<td>1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>泣き</td>
<td>weep</td>
<td>1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>笑い</td>
<td>smile</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>感嘆</td>
<td>exclamation</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>声</td>
<td>voice</td>
<td>1349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>身震い</td>
<td>shudder</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>行為</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>動作</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>立ち居</td>
<td>movement</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相続</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>賛否</td>
<td>approval or disapproval</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>認否</td>
<td>approval or denial</td>
<td>1737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>案</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>創作物</td>
<td>creation</td>
<td>1037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人名</td>
<td>person’s name</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>順号</td>
<td>title</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>名称(その他の)</td>
<td>name (other)</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>番号</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>1065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>図</td>
<td>diagram</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書(部分)</td>
<td>document (part)</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>文書類</td>
<td>document</td>
<td>1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>倉格</td>
<td>price</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ことわざや表現</td>
<td>含むページ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事情</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>常態・異常</td>
<td>2512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>形勢</td>
<td>2518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>境遇</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>安否</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>面</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ガップ</td>
<td>2573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>片</td>
<td>2578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>枠</td>
<td>2583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>数量</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>数</td>
<td>2586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>量</td>
<td>2587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>個数・回数等</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>値・額</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>度量衡</td>
<td>2591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>度</td>
<td>2592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>速度</td>
<td>2593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>量(その他)</td>
<td>2594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>単位</td>
<td>2595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>計算値</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>全体・部分</td>
<td>2598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>部分</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>組</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>群</td>
<td>2602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>単複</td>
<td>2604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>程度・限度</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>場</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>位置</td>
<td>2611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>席</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>跡</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>範囲</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>点・許</td>
<td>2615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>点(場所)</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>許[もと]</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>境・目</td>
<td>2618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>境</td>
<td>2619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>目(位置)</td>
<td>2620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>内外</td>
<td>2621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>内</td>
<td>2622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>内部</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>奥</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>底</td>
<td>2625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>外</td>
<td>2626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>口(場)</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表裏</td>
<td>2628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>表[おもて]</td>
<td>2629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>裏</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陰(表裏)</td>
<td>2631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上下[じょうげ]</td>
<td>2632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上・下[うえ・しも]</td>
<td>2633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上[うえ]</td>
<td>2634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>中[ちゅう]</td>
<td>2635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>下[しも]</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上・下[かみ・しも]</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上[かみ]</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>中[なか]</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>下[しも]</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>頂</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>左右</td>
<td>2642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>左</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>右</td>
<td>2644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>側[わき]</td>
<td>2645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>前後(場)</td>
<td>2646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>前</td>
<td>2647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後</td>
<td>2648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>方向</td>
<td>2649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>向き</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>方面</td>
<td>2651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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