Frank Sode
Goethe University Frankfurt

Ayaka Sugawara
Waseda University

Nouniness, factivity and implicative readings: The case of Japanese wasureru ('forget')

Recent years have seen a growing interest in the study of the connection between factivity and nouniness/de niteness with a special attention to languages that have predicates that license sentential arguments with nominal features or combine with overt or covert de niteness markers, see for example Kastner (2015) and Simeonova (to appear) for an overview.

A recent example is the study of Korean embedded clauses that feature the nominalizer kes and the declarative marker ta in Bogal-Allbritten & Moulton (2018) (=A&M). In their study, building on Shim & Ihsane (2015); Kim (2009), A&M explain the fact that kes-complements can have both factive and non-factive interpretations depending on the type of predicate they combine with under the assumption that kes is semantically a de nite determiner that calls for arguments of a propositional-type. Whether we arrive at a factive interpretation or not depends on a contextually given relation R that is either fact-introducing (=R_{fact}) – in case the predicate combines with facts (as for example Korean 'know') – or identity (=R_{id}) – in case the predicate calls for an event-type argument (as for example Korean 'see').

Similar to kes in Korean, Japanese no and koto can introduce sentential arguments with nouny properties, Makino (2003); Hiraiwa (2010). They show up with both, factive and non-factive predicates; cf. Uchibori (2000). In this paper, we explore the question: Do no/koto-arguments always have a factive interpretation when they combine with a predicate that has both, factive and non-factive readings? We explore this question in a corpus study for the Japanese verb wasureru ('forget') that has factive and non-factive (= implicative) readings. The answer from our corpus study for both, no- and koto-arguments, is: no.

Background. Forget can be used to report that someone didn't remember to do something, as in (1-a). On this ('implicative') reading it is <u>implied</u> that no corresponding action was performed (on the ocassion). It can also be used to report that someone didn't remember a fact, as in (1-b). On this ('factive') reading it is <u>presupposed</u> that a corresponding action was performed.

(1) a. I forgot to take out the trash.   'I didn't take out the trash'; <u>implicative</u>
     b. I forgot that I (already) took out the trash.   'I took out the trash'; <u>factive</u>

Our data. No- and koto-arguments can be used to express implicative, (2), and factive readings, (3). Examples from our corpus study are given in (4)-(6).[1]

(2) Mari ga gomi o dasu { <u>no</u> / <u>koto</u> } o wasuretanode, ima yaranakereba naranai.
     'Since Mari forgot to take out the trash, I have to do it now.'

(3) a. Mou gomi o dashita { <u>no</u> / <u>koto</u> } o wasurete shimatta.
         'I forgot that I took out the trash already/earlier.'   (temporal adverbial)
     b. Taroo wa, Mari ga gomi o dashita { <u>no</u> / <u>koto</u> } o wasurete ita.
         'Taro forgot that Mari took out the trash.'   (tense; different subjects)
     c. Chiizu ga sugoku tsuoi nioi ga suru { <u>no</u> / <u>koto</u> } o wasurete ita.
         'I forgot that the cheese was super smelly.'   (non-action predicate)

V + no-o wasure (implicative & factive) [From: Health and Physical Education textbook, instructions on taking medication] (Context: Medicine may not be effective if you take less than instructed, whereas it could be harmful if you take more than instructed.)

(4) nomu <u>koto</u>-o wasure-ta-ri,   non-da <u>koto</u>-o wasure-nai yoo-ni suru.
     take koto-acc forget-past-connector take-past koto-acc forget-neg yooni do
     'Do not forget to take it [the medicine], nor forget having taken it.'

V + no-o wasure (factive) [From: Yahoo!知恵袋 (Internet BBS)] (Context: A neighbor seems to observe our family kind of openly.)

(5)   Mado-o   akete-iru-<u>no</u>-o
        window-acc open-stative-no-acc (factive)