

Why do Japanese learners misuse *the* when uniqueness or maximality is not presupposed? – a possibility of L1 transfer

Makoto KANEKO (Okayama University, Japan)

1. Introduction

Aim: to examine misuse of English *the* by L1 Japanese learners in partitive indefinite contexts

Background

- Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko & Wexler (2010): L1 transfer effect is observed in the acquisition of English *the* by article-less L1 speaking learners
- Ko, Ionin & Wexler (2010): these learners misuse *the* in partitive indefinite contexts (where existential presupposition is established but uniqueness or maximality is not presupposed); such misuse is due to their mis-set of semantic universals provided by UG
- Kaneko (1996): L1 Japanese learners effectively misuse *the* in partitive indefinite contexts.

Claims

- Japanese demonstrative, *sono*, is acceptable in some partitive indefinite contexts.
- Japanese learners' misuse of *the* in partitive indefinite contexts may be triggered by their confusion between English *the* and Japanese *sono* rather than their mis-set of semantic universals

Outline

Section 2: review of the details of the three previous works

Section 3: Japanese *sono* and its plural form *sore-ra-no* lack uniqueness or maximality presupposition

Section 4: L1 transfer hypothesis for misuses of *the* by Japanese learners

Section 5: summary of the talk and some possible extension of this study

2. Previous works

2.1. Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko & Wexler (2010)

- (1) L1 Korean¹ L2 English learners “treat definite descriptions as equivalent to demonstrative, ex. interpreting *the dog* as equivalent to *that dog*.” (Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko & Wexler 2010: 2)
- (2) Both definite and demonstratives presuppose uniqueness (when the referent is singular) or maximality (when the referent is plural). (ibid.)
- (3)a. Definite descriptions refer uniquely relative to the situation corresponding to discourse context (default situation). (idem.3)
 - b. Demonstrative descriptions refer uniquely relative to the [immediately] salient situation distinct from the discourse context. (non-default situation). (ibid.)

Comprehension tests

- subjects: 7 native English speakers, 17 L1 Korean speakers with advanced proficiency of English + 16 L1 Korean speakers with intermediate proficiency
- The default discourse context is established by the first sentence.
- Non-default salient situation is established after the subjects effectuate the first indication

- (4)a. Here are four pens and *four balloons*.
 1. Please draw arrows above *two balloons*.

¹ Korean demonstrative systems are very similar to Japanese one (Kinsui, Okazaki & Jo 2002).

2. Now, please draw triangles on those balloons. (idem.9)
- b. Here are four cars and *four books*
 1. Please draw circles around *two books*.
 2. Now, please draw arrows above the books. (ibid.)

Results

- (5a): Almost all Korean learners and native speakers use non-default salient situation to interpret *those*
- (5b): 82% of native English speakers use default discourse context to interpret *the*.
More than 95% of L1 Korean speakers use non-default salient situation to interpret *the*.

(5a).	<i>those balloons</i> in (4a)	Native	advanced L1 Korean	intermediate L1 Korean
	all (default)	--	2%	5%
	same (non-default)	<u>100%</u>	<u>97%</u>	<u>95%</u>
	different	--	1%	--
b.	<i>the books</i> in (4b)	Native	advanced L1 Korean	intermediate L1 Korean
	all (default)	<u>82%</u>	3%	--
	same (non-default)	18%	<u>97%</u>	<u>95%</u>
	different	--	--	5%

Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko & Wexler's (2010) analyses

- Korean demonstratives presuppose uniqueness or maximality computed with respect to non-default salient situation, as English demonstratives
- The different reactions in (5b) between native English speakers and L1 Korean speakers verify L1 transfer hypothesis in (1).

But

- The results don't confirm that Koreans analyze demonstratives as presupposing maximality.
- Because the antecedent denotes only TWO entities, the subjects are forced, in order to get a plural reading, to interpret the antecedent and the demonstrative phrase as co-referent.
- We cannot a priori exclude a possibility that if the first indication in (4a) is 'please draw arrows above THREE balloons', the subjects mark only two of them, after having heard the second indication.

2.2. Ko, Ionin & Wexler (2010)

- (6) Some L1 Korean learners misuse English *the* when native English speakers might use a partitive indefinite.

Forced choice elicitation tasks

- subjects: 20 L1 Korean L2 English learners.
- For three different contexts in (7a,b,c), each subject is required to choose among *a (an)*, *the* and zero.

- (7a). *partitive indefinite / existential preupposition is explicitly established by underlined DP*
 Elissa: How is your nephew Aaron doing? He is such a nice little boy!
 Robert: He has some good news-his parents finally allowed him to get a pet-just one! So last week, he went to our local pet shop. This pet shop had five puppies and seven kittens, and Aaron loves all of them. But he could get only one!
 Elissa: Oh, so what did he do?
 Robert: Well, it was difficult for him to make up his mind. But finally, he got (**a / the / --**) **puppy**. Aaron went home really happy. (Ko, Ionin & Wexler 2010: 236)

- b. *partitive indefinite / existential presupposition is implicitly established through bridging*
 Jane: Your friend Lucy looks really excited. What’s going on?
 Mary: Well, last Sunday was a really big day for her. She went to the airport to see her mother off, and ran into the Boston Red Sox team. You know what? She was very lucky—she got an autograph from **(a / the /--)** player. And afterwards, she met some friends at the airport! What a day. (ibid.)
- c. *brand-new indefinite*
 Elissa: How is your nephew Joey doing? He is such a nice boy!
 Robert: Well, he was a bit depressed the last few days. So, his parents decided to get him a pet. So last week, he went to our local pet shop.
 Elissa: Oh, so did he buy some animal there?
 Robert: No, he did not like the puppies in the pet shop, in fact. But then he was walking home, and he found **(a / the / --)** kitten in the street! So now he has a new pet after all. (ibid.)

Results

- L1 Korean learners misuse *the* when the existential presupposition is established significantly more often than when it is not established.

(8)	Incorrect use of <i>the</i>	correct use of <i>a</i>	article omission
(7a): explicit existential presupposition	<u>26.25%</u>	73.75%	0%
(7b): implicit existential presupposition	<u>32.5%</u>	63.75%	3.75%
(7c): no existential presupposition	<u>6.25%</u>	92.5%	1.25%

(9) *Fluctuation hypothesis of Ko, Ionin & Wexler (2010: 214)*

- L1 Korean L2 English learners have access to semantic universals provided by UG
- Fluctuating among possible parameter settings, they mis-set *the* as a marker of presuppositionality, rather than definiteness (presuppositionality+ uniqueness or maximality)

2.3 How about Japanese?

- Kaneko (1996): L1 Japanese L2 English learners overuse *the* in partitive indefinite contexts in (10).

(10) Once there was a boy. He wanted to write a letter. He went to his mother. She showed him some pencils. So he took (a / the /--) pencil. And he wrote his letter. (Kaneko 2006 / cited in Ionin 2003: 300)

- Is misuse of *the* by L1 Japanese learners due to their confusion between two semantic universals, presuppositionality (without uniqueness or maximality) and definiteness (with it)?

Claims

- A Japanese demonstrative, *sono*, does not always convey uniqueness or maximality (section 3)
- The presuppositionality analysis of *the* by Japanese learners comes from L1 transfer. (section 4)

3. Japanese data

3.1 *sono*+NP(-*tati* /*ra*)

- (11) *Japanese three demonstratives*² (Hoji et al. 2003)
- kono* NP: specified as [Proximal]. A linguistic antecedent is not necessary.
 - ano* NP: specified as [Distal]. A linguistic antecedent is not necessary.
 - sono* NP: neither specified as [Proximal] nor [Distal]. A linguistic antecedent is necessary³.

² *ano*, *kono* and *sono* roughly correspond to *i*, *ce*, *ku* in Korean. (Kinsui, Okazaki & Jo 2002)

³ *sono* also may be deictically used to refer to something closer to the hearer. Hoji et al. (2003: 113) however “suggest that a marked operation creates, on the basis of ‘visual contact’ with an object, what corresponds to a linguistic expression that can serve as an antecedent [...] and this is what underlies the deictic use of so-NPs.”

· *sono* is often used to translate anaphoric uses of English *the*⁴.

- (12)a. We keep a dog, and are all fond of **the** dog. (*the* translated with *sono* in *Kenkyusya's English-Japanese Dictionary for the General Reader*: 2246) [direct anaphoric use]
 b. His car struck a telegraph pole; you can still see **the** mark on the pole. (*the* translated with *sono* in *Genius English-Japanese Dictionary*: 1940) [indirect anaphoric use]

Indirect anaphoric use

· in (13), *sono* is attached to *hyoosi* ‘cover’ lexically involving an argument to be saturated (=Löbner’s (1985) ‘functional noun’) → superficially similar to “the cover” invoking bridging inference
 · BUT Iori (2007: 158): *sono* itself serves to fulfill the argument of ‘cover’, and is paraphrased by *sore-no* (demonstrative pronoun *sore* ‘that’+ genitive *no* ‘of’); *sono* is literally translated by ‘of that’.

- (13) Boku-ga aidokusi-teiru zassi-ga atte [...] kondo **sono** hyoosi-ni [...] (Iori 2007: 159)
 I-Nom adore-Prog magazine-Nom exist, this time SONO cover-Loc
 ‘I adore a magazine, and this time, on SONO cover [= (φ) cover **of that**]...’

· (14b): bridging *the* is not appropriate when one to one correspondence between the antecedent (*truck*) and the NP (*hubcap*) is not established (when involving Löbner’s (1985) ‘relational noun’).

On the other hand, Japanese translation with <SONO *hubcap*> for (14b) is natural.

· (15): *sono tyoso* = (φ) work of **his**: B’s replay ‘which work’ → unique work is not presupposed.

- (14)a. I bought a truck. **The** hood was scratched. (Barker 2005: 93) [A truck has only one hood]
 b. I bought a truck. #**The** hubcap was scratched. (idem.) [A truck has four hubcaps] <√*sono*>
 (15) A: Konoaida, gakkai-no kaizyoo-de sensee-ga **sono** tyosyo-ni meotoosi-teorare-ta yo
 Last day meeting-Gen place-Loc professor-Nom SONO work-Dat was.reading you know
 B: E, do-no tyosyo? (Iori 2007: 146)
 Oh, which-Gen work
 ‘A: Last day, at the meeting, Professor was reading SONO work [= (φ) work of **his**], you know.
 – B: Oh, which work?’

sono+NP-tati/ra

· In Japanese, plurality of human nouns may be clarified by suffixes *-tati* or *ra*.

· Indirect anaphoric <*sono-NP-tati*> does not necessarily induce maximality: ex. (16)

- (16) Hata ... kyoozyu to sono gakusee-tati-wa [...] KG broadband station-nituite
 Hata professor and SONO student-TATI-Top KG broadband station-about
 happyoosimasu. (<http://www.jeam.jp/2003conference/news/kwansei.html>)
 give.a.talk.
 ‘Professor Hata and SONO student [=student of **his**⁵] give a talk about KG broadband station’

⁴ *sono* has other common points with *the*. It allows a combination of bound variable and indirect anaphoric uses, as in (i). In English, as in (ii), the combination of bound variable and bridging uses are allowed only with *the* and not with demonstratives.

(i) Dono zidoosya-gaisya-mo **sono** ko-gaisya-o suisensita
 which automobile-company-also SONO child-company-Acc recommended

‘Every automobile company recommended its subsidiary.’ (adapted from Hoji et al. 2003: 104)

(ii) Every singer complained that {**the** / *this / *that} accompanist played too loudly. (Lyons 1999: 273)

⁵ <*sono gakusee-tati*> can be used to refer to some or all the students of Prof. Hata. The choice is sensitive to the cardinality of the restrictor set. The bigger the set is, the harder the reference to the maximal set is.

Direct anaphoric use

- *sono*+NP(-*tati*) conveys by default uniqueness or maximality: (17a) without parenthetical expressions
- But uniqueness or maximality is easily cancelled: (17a) with parenthetical expressions
- Such cancellation of maximality is difficult with English *the*: (17b).

- (17)a. watasi-wa suunin-no gakusee-o sidoositeiru. Kore-made kareka-no kenkyuu-ga
I-Top some student-Acc supervise now-until their study-Nom
sintensusu yoo dekirudakenokoto-o si-tekita. {Sikasi **sono gakusee**-ga (hito-ri dake da
advance so that my.best-Acc do-Perf but **SONO student**-Nom one-CL only Cop
ga) / Sikasi **sono gakusee-tati**-ga (zennin de-wa nai ga)} watasi-ni hankoosuru noda
though / but **SONO student-TATI**-Nom (all Cop-Top Neg though) me-Dat rebel
'I supervise some students. Until now, I have done my best so that their studies advance well.
But **SONO-student** (although only one of them) rebel against me.
/ But **SONO-student-tati**, (although not all of them) rebel against me.'
- b. I supervise some boy students and girl students. Until now, I have done my best so that their
studies advance well. ***The boy students**, who are not all of them, rebel against me.

- Why does a direct anaphoric *sono* by default induce maximality, which is easily canceled?
- 1. Maximality is conversationally implicated by way of Gricean Quantity Principle:
(17a): maximal information = among several students that the speaker supervises, all rather than
some rebel against him.
2. The maximal co-reference between the antecedent and the direct anaphoric expression requires
least effort from the hearer than their partial co-reference⁶.

Further evidence of lack of uniqueness for a use of direct anaphoric *sono*

- *sono* may accompany the second occurrence of a proper name. ex. (18)
- Iori (2007): direct anaphoric *sono* is used for a textual motivation (to establish cohesion with the preceding context)

- (18) Junko wa "anata nashi dewa iki-rare-nai" to itteita. **sono** Junko ga ima
Junko Top "you without if alive-can-Neg Comp was.saying **SONO** Junko-Nom now
hoka-no otoko-no kodomo-o huta-ri mo un-deiru. (Iori 2007: 98)
another guy-Gen child-Acc two-CL even give.birth.-Resultative
'Junko used to say that she could not be alive without me. **SONO** Junko (=The same Junko)
gave birth to two children with another guy.'

3.2 *sore-ra-no*+NP

- plural form of *sono*: *sore-ra-no*= demonstrative pronoun *sore* + 'plural' marker *ra* + genitive *no*
- plurality of *tati* / *ra* consists not only of homogeneous members (ex. *student-tati* means 'students'), but also of heterogeneous members (ex. *student-tati* may mean 'students and part-time workers').
- Nakanishi & Tomioka (2004): heterogeneous plurality is a basic use of *-tati/ra*.

(19) *Kobayakawa's (2004: 42) observation*

- a. <*sono*+NP> represents a group of entities conceived as belonging to the same category.

⁶ A similar default maximal co-reference and its cancellation are observed with PRO, as in (i) and (ii).

- (i) The chair_k preferred [PRO_k] to gather the committee at 6. [maximal co-reference]
(ii) The chair_k preferred [PRO_{k+}] to gather at the meeting at 6. [partial co-reference]

- b. $\langle \text{sore-ra-no} + NP \rangle$ represents a group of entities conceived as belonging to different subcategories of the same category.
- (20)a. Taro-wa pen-o ni-hon katta. Sikasi, {**sono** / **?*sore-ra-no**} pen-wa amari yoku
Taro-Top pen-Acc two-CL bought but **SONO** / **SORE-RA-GEN** pen-Top very well
kake-nakat-ta. (Kobayakawa 2004: 42)
write-Neg-Pst
'Taro bought two pens. But **SONO** pen didn't write very well.'
- b. Taro-wa feruto pen to booru pen-o katta. Sikasi, {**sono** / **sore-ra-no**} pen-wa
Taro-Top felt pen and ball-point pen-Acc bought but **SONO** / **SORE-RA-GEN** pen-Top
amari yoku kake-nakat-ta. (ibid.)
very well write-Neg-Pst
'Taro bought a felt pen and a ball-point pen. But **SONO** / **SORE-RA-NO** pen didn't write well.'
- c. Taro-wa feruto pen-o ni-hon to booru pen-o san-bon katta. Sikasi **sore-ra-no**
Taro-Top felt pen-Acc two-CL and ball-point pen-Acc three-CL bought but **SORE-RA-NO**
pen-wa, zenbu de-wa nai ga, amari yoku kake-nakat-ta.
pen-Top all Cop-Top Neg though very well write-Neg-Pst
'Taro bought two felt pens and three ball-point pens. But **SORE-RA-NO** pen, which are not all
of them, didn't write very well.'

- (20a): the antecedent = two pens of the same kind $\rightarrow \sqrt{\text{sono} / \text{?*sore-ra-no}}$
- (20b): the antecedent = two pens of the different subcategories $\rightarrow \sqrt{\text{sono} / \sqrt{\text{sore-ra-no}}}$
 sono : the difference of subcategories is neutralized
 sore-ra-no : the relevant pens are conceived as different subcategories of the PEN category.
- (20c): the antecedent = two felt pens and three ball-point pens $\rightarrow \sqrt{\text{sore-ra-no}}$
 $\langle \text{sore-ra-no pen} \rangle$: members consisting of two different subcategories, and not necessarily all
the pens mentioned before, if accompanied by an expression canceling maximality⁷

4. Proposals and discussion

4.1. Proposals

review of Section 3

- Japanese demonstrative, *sono*, manifest superficially similar distributions with direct and indirect anaphoric *the*, and is often used to translate it.
- All the three sequences $\langle \text{sono} + NP \rangle$, $\langle \text{sono} + NP\text{-tai} \rangle$, and $\langle \text{sore-ra-no} + NP \rangle$ do not necessarily induce uniqueness or maximality.

- (21) *L1 transfer hypothesis for Japanese learners' misuse of THE in partitive indefinite contexts*
L1 Japanese L2 English learners misuse *the* when the existence of the referent is (directly or indirectly) presupposed but its uniqueness or maximality is not presupposed, because they mis-analyze English *the* as equivalent to Japanese *sono* which does not necessarily presuppose uniqueness or maximality.
- (22) *Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko & Wexler's (2010: 14) hypothesis*
- a. The demonstrative analysis [i.e. regarding *the* as equivalent to a demonstrative] overrides all other analyses whenever it is applicable.

⁷ I here take into account only the direct anaphoric use of $\langle \text{sore-ra-no} + NP \rangle$. Its indirect anaphoric use seems to be difficult, as in (i). But more research is needed to clarify the status of indirect anaphoric use of $\langle \text{sore-ra-no} + NP \rangle$.

(i) nihongo to kankokugo-wa {*?sore-ra-no* / *sono*} kigen-ga sira-re-tei-nai.
Japanese and Korean-Top {**SORE-RA-NO** / **SONO**} origin-Nom know-Pas-Perfect-Neg
'As regards Japanese and Korean, **the** origins are not known.'

- b. When the demonstrative analysis is not applicable, the presuppositional analysis [i.e. regarding *the* as a marker of existential presupposition] is adopted but only part of the time.

What is needed to verify the hypothesis (21)

- 1) effectuate the same forced choice production tests in (7a,b,c) with L1 Japanese learners: not yet done
- 2) examine if each subject accepts the translation with *sono* → subsection 4.2
- 3) examine if the subjects who misuse *the* in (7a,b,c) coincide with those who accept the translation with *sono*: not yet done

4.2 Simple statistical research and prevision

- Subjects: 23 Japanese students of Okayama University between 18 and 23 years old
- Task: to judge the acceptability of Japanese translations with *sono* of (7a,b,c) (see appendix I)
- Results

(23)	ok	?	??	*
(7a): direct anaphoric <i>sono</i>	7 (30.4%)	5 (21.7%)	5 (21.7%)	6 (26.1%)
(7b): indirect anaphoric <i>sono</i>	10 (43.5%)	8 (34.8%)	4 (17.4%)	1 (4.3%)
(7c): brand-new <i>sono</i>	2 (8.7%)	6 (26.1 %)	5 (21.7%)	10 (43.5%)

- (i) Very few subjects accepted <*sono* + NP> for (7c) where the NP denotes a brand-new referent.
- (ii) The acceptability of indirect anaphoric *sono* for (7b) is relatively high.
 - The relative strangeness of this example comes from a distance between the antecedent and *sono*.
 - If the antecedent is nearer, and the contextual saliency is clearer, the acceptability is higher.

(24)a. Jason-wa Boston Celtics-no team-ni ai, **sono** sensyu-no sain-o moratta.
 Jason-Top Boston Celtics-Gen team-into ran, **SONO** player-Gen autograph-Acc got
 ‘Jason ran into the Boston Celtics and got an autograph from **SONO** player [which I explicitly told the subjects to interpret as singular]’

b. judgments of 23 informants ok: 14 (60.9%) ? 4 (17.4%) ?? 3 (13.0%) * 2 (8.7%)

- (iii) The acceptability of direct anaphoric *sono* is lower than that of indirect anaphoric *sono*.
 - The relative unacceptability comes from the fact that *sono* in (25a), as a demonstrative, requires contextual saliency of *puppies*, while a contrast between *puppies* and *kittens* disturbs to establish it.
 - The same is true for English demonstratives. Ex. (25b).
 - When there is no contrast, <*sono*+*puppy*> without uniqueness is OK. Ex. (26)

(25)a. Elissa: How is your nephew Aaron doing? He is such a nice little boy!
 Robert: He has some good news-his parents finally allowed him to get a pet just one! So last week, he went to our local pet shop. This pet shop had five puppies and seven kittens, and Aaron loves all of them. But he could get only one!
 Elissa: Oh, so what did he do?
 Robert: Well, it was difficult for him to make up his mind. But finally, he got **SONO puppy**. Aaron went home really happy. (=7a))

b. This pet shop has a puppy and a kitten. I bought {?this / ?that / the} puppy.
 (26) pet shop-ni-wa koinu-ga nana-hiki imasita. watasi-wa **sono koinu-o** kaimasita.
 pet-shop-Loc-Top puppy-Nom seven-CL were I-Top **SONO puppy-Acc** bought
 ip-piki dake desu ga.
 one-CL only Cop though
 ‘The pet shop has seven puppies. I bought **SONO** puppy, though only one of them.’

Prediction from the hypothesis (21)

- When anaphoric *sono* is not appropriate to translate *the*, L1 Japanese learners do not use *the*.
- English *the* is used when the uniqueness of the referent is established through entailment, as in (27a), by way of the visible or immediate situation, as in (27b), or through world knowledge, as in (27c).
- Yang & Ionin (2009): L1 Mandarin Chinese L2 English learners “over-rely on the discourse factors of previous mention and association in determining whether *the* or *a* should be used.”

- (27)a. *through entailment* (“roof” is a ‘functional noun’ in Löbner’s (1985) sense)
The roof of our house is leaking. (Yang & Ionin 2009: 4) [**sono*]
- b. *in the visible or immediate situation*
Don’t go there, **the** dog will bite you. (ibid.) [**sono*]
- c. *through world knowledge*
The sun is shining. (ibid.) [**sono*]

- In none of the above three contexts, a translation with *sono* is possible.
- prediction to be verified: L1 Japanese learners, as well as Mandarin Chinese learners, cannot appropriately use *the*.

5. Concluding remarks and remaining problems

- Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko & Wexler (2010): article-less L1 learners mis-identify English *the* as demonstrative whenever it is possible (L1 transfer).
- Ko, Inoin & Wexler (2010): their mis-use of *the* in partitive indefinite contexts is due to fluctuation among possible parameters provided by UG
- My claim: Japanese learners misuse *the* in partitive indefinite contexts (as reported by Kaneko 1996), because they misunderstand anaphoric *the* as equivalent to Japanese *sono*, which lacks uniqueness or maximality presupposition⁸.

Remaining problems

- 1) Full experimental research with L1 Japanese learners is needed to verify my L1 transfer hypothesis.
- 2) Why do Japanese <*sono*+NP> and <*sore-ra-no*+NP> not presuppose uniqueness or maximality differently from their English counterparts?
 - <*sono*+NP>: *sono* is decomposed into a demonstrative part *so* and genitive *no* and that *sono* is syntactically an adjunct of NP rather than its determiner.
 - <*sore-ra*>: *-ra* is not a genuine plural marker but rather a marker of non-homogeneity of members.

⁸ A specific indefinite use of *this* and *these*, as in (ia) do not presuppose maximality, as in (ib,c). Japanese *sono* has the same specific use, as in (ii). One may ask if its lack of uniqueness or maximality is reduced to its indefinite specificity meaning. But the lack of uniqueness or maximality presupposition is also observed in non-specific intensional contexts (see appendix II).

- (i)a. I want to see **this** new movie – I can’t remember its name and I have no idea what it’s about, but someone mentioned to me that it’s really interesting. (Ionin 2006: 183)
- b. Yesterday at the meeting, the professor was reading **these** works of his, you know. –Which works? (provided by an anonymous reviewer)
- c. Professor Smith and **these** students of his gave a talk about KG broadband station. (ibid.)
- (ii) [the first sentence of a journal article in *Asahi Shinbun* 28/12/2010: 7]
Filipin-ni huninsi-te han-tosi, tuini **sono** hi-ga yattekita.
Philippine-Loc installation-and half year, at.last. SONO day-Nom came
‘Half a year has passed since my installation in the Philippines. At last, **this** day came.
(the following sentences talk of the day when the writer of the article received a call from some Philippine guy who talked about the ‘famous’ treasure concealed by Japanese Army during the world war II)

3) Is L1 transfer hypothesis is valid for other article-less languages?

- Korean: *ku* similar to Japanese *sono* (Kinsui et al.2002) → L1 transfer analysis promising
- Serbo-Croatian: non-existence of an equivalent of *sono* → L1 transfer unlikely (Ko, Perovic, Ionin & Wexler 2008)

4) Is there L1 transfer effect of *sore-ra-no* when L1 Japanese speakers learn French plural definite article *les*?

(28) *comprehension test analogous to (4b)*

Voici quatre voitures et quatre livres (Here are four cars and four books)

1. Tracez des cercles autour trois livres. (Draw circles around two books)

2. Ensuite, tracez des triangles au-dessus des livres. (Now Draw triangles on the books.)

(29) *Comprehension test* (translation with *sore-ra-no* is possible)

Après avoir acheté un crayon, Taro a acheté deux stylos feutre et trois stylos à bille. Mais **les** stylos n'ont pas bien marché.

'After having bought a pencil, Taro bought two felt pens and three ball-point pens. But **the** pens didn't write very well.'

Question: How many and what pens did Taro try?

5) Comparison of lack of uniqueness or maximality of Japanese *sono* and that of 'weak definites'

(30)a. I met **the** student of a famous linguist last night at a restaurant. (Barker 2005: 100)

b. The term double crush describes...a type of fracture or other injury resulting from being driven over by **the** two wheels of a car or other vehicle. (idem.98)

c. J'ai abîmé l'aile de ta voiture. — Laquelle ? (Corblin 2001: 46)

I broke the wing of your car. — Which one?

Common point

- Weak definites require a 'relational' head noun and an overt genitive prepositional phrase argument: in (31a), "the genitive of phrase constitutes a proper syntactic argument of the relational head noun *corner*. In contrast, locative prepositional phrases [in (31b)] are not arguments, and function as modifiers of a syntactically non-relational use of *corner*." (Barker 2005: 90)

(31)a. I hope the café located on **the** corner of a busy intersection. [√not unique]

b. I hope the café located on **the** corner near a busy intersection. [*not unique]

Difference

- Weak definites are observed typically when the possessive phrase involves an indefinite genitive. With a definite genitive, lack of uniqueness is possible only when the head NP denotes a set of relatively few entities whose number is small and fixed: ex. (32a) vs. (32b).
- Such restriction is not imposed on *sono*. Ex. (33c)

(32)a. L'épaule nue de Marie luisait dans l'ombre. (Corblin 2001 : 46) [√not unique]

'The bare shoulder of Marie was shining in the darkness.'

b. J'ai trouvé ce détail dans l'article de Chomsky. [*not unique]

'I found this detail in the paper of Chomsky.'

c. Chomsky-wa sono ronbun-no naka-de koo kai-teiru. [√not unique]

Chomsky-Top SONO paper-Gen in-Loc like this write-Progressive

'Chomsky writes like this in one of his papers.'

References

- Barker, C. 2005. Possessive Weak Definites. In J-Y. Kim, Y. Lander & B. H. Partee (eds), *Possessives and Beyond: Semantics and Syntax*, Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Corblin, F. 2001. Défini et génitif : le cas des définis défectifs. In J.-M. Marandin (ed) *Cahier Jean-Claude Milner*. Lagrasse, Verdier : 19-54.
- Hoji, H., S. Kinsui, Y. Takubo & A. Ueyama. 2003. The demonstratives in modern Japanese. In Li, Y.-H.-A. & A. Simpson (eds.) *Functional structure(s), form and interpretation*. Routledge: 97-128.
- Ionin, T. 2003. Article Semantics in Second Language Acquisition. Ph.D. thesis MIT.
- Ionin T. 2006. *This is definitely specific: specificity and definiteness in article systems*. *Natural Language Semantics* 14: 175-234.
- Ionin, T., S. Baek, E. Kim, H.Ko & K. Wexler. 2010 That's the meaning: Interpretation of definite and demonstrative descriptions in L2-English. *4th Generative Approach to Language Acquisition-North America*. University of Toronto, September 1-3, 2010.
- Iori, I. 2007. *Nihongo-ni okeru tekisuto-no kessokusee-no kenkyuu* (Study of textual cohesion in Japanese), Tokyo: Kuroshio Pub.
- Genius English-Japanese dictionary* 2006. forth edition. Tokyo: Taisyukan.
- Kaneko, Y. 1996. *Knowledge of the English article system in second language learning: To "the" or not to "the"*. Undergraduate thesis. Smith College, Northampton, MA.
- Kenkyusya's English-Japanese Dictionary for the General Reader*. 1986. fifth edition. Tokyo: Kenkyusya.
- King, J. C. 2001. *Complex demonstratives: a quantificational account*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kinsui, S., T. Okazaki & M. Jo (2002) Sizisi no Rekisiteki/Taisyoo-gengogakuteki kenkyuu (A Historical and constrative study on demonstratives —Japanese/Korean/Turkish). In N. Ogoshi (ed.) *Taisyoo Gengogaku*. Tokyo Univ. Pub: 217-247.
- Ko, H., A. Perovic, T. Ionin & K. Wexler 2008. Semantic universals and variation in L2 article choice. In R. Slabakova et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of GASLA 2007*. Somerville. Cascadilla Press: 118-129.
- Ko, H., T. Ionin & K. Wexler. 2010. The Role of Presuppositionality in the Second Language Acquisition of English Article. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41.2: 213-254.
- Kobayakawa, S. 2004. Nihonngo-no hokusuu-hyooen—sore-ra-no + meesi to byoogo-meesi (Plurality in Japanese—sore-ra-no+noun and nominal reduplication. *Mind and language* 3 (University of Human Environments, Japan): 35-50.
- Löbner, S. 1985. Definites. *Journal of Semantics* 4: 279-326.
- Lyons, C. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nakanishi, K. & Tomioka, S. 2004. Japanese plurals are exceptional. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13: 113-140.
- Tsutsumi, R. 2006. On the non-deictic use of Japanese demonstratives. In M. Wada (eds) *The structure of Language: Views from Asian Languages. Report of Project Kenkyu Program* 73-98.
- Yang, M. & T. Ionin 2009. L2 English Articles and the Computation of Uniqueness. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition–North America, University of Connecticut*.

Appendix

I. Japanese translation of (7a,b,c) [extensional contexts]

次の下線のソノの使用を、4段階評価：ok (自然) / ? (言えるかもしれないが少し変) / ?? (かなり変) / *(全く変)で判定してください。どの例でも、「ソノ+名詞」は単数解釈とします。

- (i)a. エリザ： あなたの甥のアーロンはどうしていますか？あの子はとってもいい子ですね。
ロバート：あの子には素敵なことがあったんです。両親が、とうとうペットを飼うことを許してくれたのです。一匹だけですけれどもね。それで先週、近所のペットショップに行きました。そのペットショップには、子犬が5匹と子猫が6匹いてアーロンはどれも気に入りました。でも一匹だけ選ばなければなりませんでした。
エリザ： ほう。それであの子はどうしたんですか？
ロバート：選ぶのは難しかったけれども、あの子はとうとう、その子犬を選びました。それで本当に幸せな気分です。
- b. ジェイン： あなたの友達ルーシーは本当に興奮しているようだけどどうしたのですか？
メアリー：それが、先週の日曜にとってもいいことがあったのです。ルーシーは空港に母親を見送りにいって、ボストンレッドソックスのチームに出くわしたのです。それでどうしたかわかりますか？彼女はその選手のサインをもらったんです。それにその後も空港で友達に出会ったのです。なんという日だったことでしょう。
- c. エリザ： あなたの甥のジョイはどうしていますか？あの子はとってもいい子ですね。
ロバート：それが、ここ数日すこし落ち込んでいたんです。それで、両親がペットを買ってあげることにしました。先週、近所のペットショップに行ったそうです。
エリザ： ほう。それであの子はそこでペットを買ったのですか？
ロバート：いや、あの子はペットショップの子犬が気に入らなかったのです。でもその後、家に歩いて帰っていて、通りでその子猫をみつけました。それでなにはともあれ、今はペットを一匹飼っているというわけです。

II. Intensional non-specific contexts

- (II)a. [-definite, +presuppositional], presuppositionality established explicitly, intensional
Elissa: How is your niece Amy doing?
Robert: Great! Her parents finally allowed her to get a pet at a local pet shop. *Amy knows that this pet shop has five puppies and six kittens!*
Elissa: Oh, so which one of these animals is she going to buy?
Robert: She has not quite decided yet. But she definitely wants to buy (a / the / --) puppy. She is going to the pet shop on Friday. (Ko, Ionin & Wexler 2010: 236)
- b. [-definite, +presuppositional], presuppositionality established implicitly (by bridging)
Jane: Hi, how are you? I heard that your brother Jason is going to the airport tomorrow. Is he going somewhere?
Mary: Oh, no! Jason will go there to meet the Boston Celtics team. The team will be leaving Boston on the 7 a.m. flight. Jason wants to get the autograph of (a / the / --) player. Any player would do — this would make him really happy! (ibid.)
- c. [-specific, -definite, -presuppositional]
Clark: I heard that your husband has a very long commute to work. What does he do in the train?

June: Well... nothing. That is a bit of a problem now. He gets so bored in the train. He plans to buy {a / the} long novel. Then he will have something to do during his long commute. (ibid.)

Results	Incorrect use of <i>the</i>	correct use of <i>a</i>	article omission
(IIa) explicit existential presupposition	28.75%	62.50%	8.75%
(IIb) implicit existential presupposition	22.50%	67.50%	10.00%
(IIc) no existential presupposition	2.5%	93.75%	3.75%

Japanese translation

- (III)a. エリザ： あなたの姪のアミーはどうしていますか？
 ロバート：それが素敵なおことがあったんですよ。両親が、とうとう、近所のペットショップでペットを買うことを許してくれたのです。あの子は、そのペットショップには今、子犬が五匹と子猫が6匹いると調べてきたそうです。
 エリザ： ほう。それであの子はどれを選ぶでしょうかね？
 ロバート：まだはっきりとは決めてないみたいです。でも、ぜひその子犬が欲しいと思っているようです。金曜にペットショップに行くそうです。
- b. ジェイン： こんにちは、どうしてですか？お兄さんのジェイソンさんが、明日の朝空港に行くと言ったんですけど。どこかにお出かけですか？
 メアリー：いやそうじゃないんです。ジェイソンは、ボストン・セルティックスのチームに会いに行くのです。チームは朝7時の便で、ボストンを発ちます。ジェイソンは、その選手のサインをもらおうとしているのです。どの選手のサインでも、もらえたら最高に嬉しいのだそうです。
- c. クラーク： あなたの旦那さんは、通勤時間が本当に長いと言ったんですけど、電車の中で何をされているのですか？
 ジェイン：それがね、何もしてないんですよ。あの人は電車の中でひどく退屈しているようです。それで、その長編小説を買おうとしているようです。そうしたら、長い通勤でも、手持ちぶさたということはないでしょう。

judgments of three types of indefinite contexts by 23 informants (18-23 years old)

	ok	?	??	*
(IIIa): direct anaphoric <i>sono</i>	0 (0%)	9 (39.1%)	8 (34.8%)	6 (26.31%)
(IIIb): indirect anaphoric <i>sono</i>	9 (39.1%)	9 (39.1%)	3 (13.0%)	2 (8.7%)
(IIIc): brand-new <i>sono</i>	3 (13.0%)	4 (17.4%)	6 (26.1%)	10 (43.5%)