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This paper claims that the syntactic category of Japanese relative clauses can be larger than TP. The fact that Focus Particles can be found within Japanese relative clauses shows that the licenser, Focus-head, should be located at the CP-zone, adopting Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) cartographic analysis, on the assumption that Focus Particles can be licensed in situ. However, not every relative clause is larger than TP. We will present new data on Nominative/Genitive Conversion, which lead to a generalization that Focus Particles cannot appear in Japanese relative clauses where genitive subjects are allowed. This can be explained straightforwardly if we assume that Focus Phrase is missing in this type of relative clause. We will try to explore the mechanism of the case alternation phenomenon, with the refinement of Saito’s (2004) dichotomy of T (declarative T and adnominal T).*
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1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to reconsider the categorial status of Japanese relative clauses (RCs), with special reference to the licensing of Focus Particles. Based on Saito (1985), Murasugi (1991) argues that Japanese RCs should be TP (IP in her terminology) in terms of ECP (Empty Category

* This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 140th National Conference of Japan Linguistics Society, held at University of Tsukuba on June 19, 2010, and at the poster session of GLOW-in-Asia VIII, held at Beijin Language and Culture University on August 13, 2010. For their insightful comments and suggestions, we are grateful to Yoshio Endo, Nobuko Hasegawa, Ikumi Imani, Hideki Maki, Satoru Nakai, Mamoru Saito, Seichi Sugawa, and Yuji Takano as well as the audiences at those conferences. We are also indebted to two EL anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions, and would like to thank William Herlofsky and Phillip Morrow for proofreading. Needless to say, all remaining errors are our own. This research was financially supported in part by the grants from Nagoya Gakuin University and the Center for Linguistics, Nanzan University.
Principle). Let us briefly review her argument for this claim. Observe (1) and (2) below.

(1) a. [the reason [(why,)] Mary thinks [that John left e_i]]]
   b. *[Mary-ga [John-ga e_i kaetta to] omotteiru] riyuu_i
      Mary-Nom John-Nom left C thinking reason
      ‘the reason Mary thinks that John left’

(2) [[John-ga e_i kaetta] riyuu_i]
    John-Nom left reason
    ‘the reason John left’ (Murasugi (1991: 141))

(1a) shows that relativization from a pure adjunction position is unbounded in English. On the other hand, relativization from a pure adjunct is clause-bound in Japanese, as shown in the contrast between (1b) and (2). Murasugi (1991) claims that the difference between (1a) and (1b) can be explained in terms of ECP, under the assumption that only X-zero categories can be proper governors of antecedents, and proposes that Japanese RCs are TPs, while English RCs are CPs. In (1a), the lower C can antecedent-govern the initial trace, for the initial trace receives the same index as the intermediate trace through Spec-head agreement. The intermediate trace is antecedent-governed by the higher C, which receives the same index as why or the empty operator through Spec-head agreement, as represented in (3):

(3) [NP the reason_i [CP why_i (OP_i) [C_i T [VP T [CP t_i [C_i C_i T ... t_i ]]]]]]

Therefore, why can move from the most deeply embedded position in (1a). On the other hand, in (1b), given that Japanese RCs are TPs, the relative operator must adjoin to TP, for the clause is not projected to CP. It follows that the relative operator cannot govern the intermediate trace, since it is not in an X-zero position, as illustrated below:

(4) [NP [TP OP_i [TP [VP [CP t_i [C_i T ... t_i ] C_i ]] V] T]] riyuu_i]

Thus, the contrast between (1a) and (1b) can be straightforwardly explained in terms of the ECP. In addition, the fact that Japanese RCs do not have relative pronouns supports Murasugi’s proposal that Japanese RCs are TPs.

When Murasugi claims that Japanese RCs are TPs, there is no theoretical room available other than Spec, CP. Since Rizzi (1997) proposes that a complementizer (C) can be dissolved into several functional heads, properties of this zone have been under investigation both in individual languages and cross-linguistically. Now that there are some placeholders available in the CP-zone, we need to reconsider the RC status from the cartographic
point of view.\(^1\) We claim that Japanese RCs with nominative subject are larger than TP, but those with genitive subject are TP, considering their different compatibility with Focus Particles.

2. Focus Particles

In the field of Japanese (descriptive) grammar it is well known that *wa*-marked phrases cannot appear in RCs.

(5) a. *Taro-wa itta konsato
   Taro-Top went concert
   ‘the concert which Taro went to’

b. *Hanako-wa tsukutta keki
   Hanako-Top made cake
   ‘the cake that Hanako made’

It is also recognized that there are two functions of *wa*: topic and contrastive. In (5) the *wa*-marked phrases are topics. Differently from that function, contrastive-*wa* may appear in subordinate clauses, including RCs.

(6) Nihongo-o shanai-de-wa tsukau gaikokujin
   Japanese-Acc office-in-Foc use foreigner
   ‘a foreigner who uses Japanese only in the office’

---

\(^1\) Japanese pronominal sentential modifiers are roughly divided into two sub-types: relative clauses and gapless clauses. The former clauses in which an element (i.e. an argument) corresponding to a head noun is missing. The latter are the equivalent of relative adverbal clauses such as “the day when Tom graduated from college.” Though the line between these two types of clauses is sometimes rather fuzzy, we limit our discussion to the former, throughout this paper. Our concern is to examine the categorial status of RCs. One of the reasons to exclude the latter type comes from its poorly understood properties. For example, Miyagawa (2008) claims that the Transitivity Restriction does not apply to the gapless clauses, providing the following example:

(i) (?)Taro-no Hanako-o susumeta riyuu-o osiete.
   Taro-Gen Hanako-Acc recommended reason-Acc tell me
   ‘Tell me the reason Taro recommended Hanako.’

We believe that it is necessary to consider this judgment carefully. Related to this, there seems to be the possibility that an empty subject (i.e. *pro*) is involved in the case of gapless clauses. Examine the contrast of grammaticality between RCs and gapless clauses in terms of VP-preposing (cf. Ochi (2001)).

(ii) *Tabeta Taro-no ranchi
    ate Taro-Gen lunch
    ‘the lunch that Taro ate’

(iii) Hanako-o susumeta Taro-no riyuu
    Hanako-Acc recommended Taro-Gen reason
    ‘the reason that Taro recommended Hanako’
Note that not only contrastive-"wa", but also other emphatic elements can appear in RCs.

(7) Taro-ga joshi-dake/nomi/bakari-ni watashita omiyage
    Taro-Nom girls-only-to handed gift
    ‘the gift that Taro handed only to girls’

These elements are known as *toritate-shi* ‘Focus Particles (FPs)’ in Japanese linguistics. Adopting Rizzi’s cartographic approach to the CP-zone, we can assume that these FPs are licensed with some corresponding functional head in C. Following Rizzi’s analysis, the most plausible licenser would be the functional head, Focus. Hasegawa (2007, 2009) claims that in Japanese an element can be licensed in situ, if its corresponding head is located in the CP-zone of a clause. Furthermore, following Sano (2007), we take the stance that FPs have their own licensors, even if no licenser is phonetically realized. Examine the following sentences in (8), cited from Sano (2007: 73).

(8) a. Ken-wa sake-sae nonda yoda.
    Ken-Top alcohol-even drank seem
    ‘It seems that Ken drank even alcohol.’

b. Ken-wa sake-sae nonda.
    Ken-Top alcohol-even drank
    ‘Ken drank even alcohol.’

c. Ken-wa sake-demo nonda yoda.
    Ken-Top alcohol-even drank seem
    ‘It seems that Ken drank alcohol or anything like that.’

d. *Ken-wa sake-demo nonda.
    Ken-Top alcohol-even drank
    ‘Ken drank alcohol or anything like that.’

As shown in (8c) and (8d), the example-specifying particle, *-demo*, requires some specific form (e.g. *-yoda*) at the end of predicate. On the other hand, *-sae*, belonging to FPs, does not require such an additional explicit expression, as in (8b). That is, some FPs need their own corresponding predicates, and others do not. However, we assume that this difference is superficial. In other words, all the FPs are connected to their predicates. FPs which do not require corresponding predicates need implicit licensors, Focus-head. Hence, regardless of whether an FP requires a specific predicate or not, we can assume that an FP needs a licenser, a functional head of Focus. If we are on the right track, the relevant structure is as follows:
Since Focus-head is projected to Foc P, it can be said that the syntactic status of an RC containing FPs should be Foc P, as shown in (9).

3. Nominative/Genitive Conversion

Nevertheless we do not intend to insist that all the Japanese RCs are Foc P. We claim that RCs with genitive subjects are exceptional. As is well known in Japanese linguistics, Nominative/Genitive Conversion (NGC) is witnessed in Japanese RCs.

(10) a. Taro-ga/no nonda kusuri
    Taro-Nom/Gen took medicine
    ‘the medicine that Taro took’

b. Gakusei-ga/no katta hon
    students-Nom/Gen bought book
    ‘the book that students bought’

c. Kokosei-ga/no eranda manga
    high school students-Nom/Gen chose comics
    ‘the comics that high school students chose’

d. Taro-ga/no tabeta keki
    Taro-Nom/Gen ate cake
    ‘the cake that Taro ate’

Since Harada (1971), there has been considerable research on how genitive Case is licensed. We will return to this problem in Section 4. Harada identifies what is called ‘Transitivity Restriction (TR),’ which indicates that the conversion is not observed when a pronominal sentential modifier has an object in it. However, this is not the only restriction for NGC. One array of data will be presented in which NGC also cannot be allowed. Consider the following examples.
A genitive subject with an FP is not allowed in an environment where NGC could be possible without it, while a nominative subject with the same FP does not cause any problem. The ungrammaticality with genitive subjects does not come from the unnaturalness of combination between FPs and genitive Case marker *no*. Note that the presence of FPs and the emergence of genitive Case have nothing to do with each other in themselves. They are independent, and we can easily find examples in which both appear at the same time.

Furthermore, this effect of FPs is not limited to the subject of an RC. We can find the same restriction when the FPs are suffixed to adverbial expressions in RCs, as shown in (13).

(13) Shusho-ga/*no senkyo-de-wa nobeta koyaku
    Premier-Nom/Gen election-at-Foc stated pledge
    ‘the pledge that Premier stated at the election’

The observation we have made leads to the following descriptive generaliza-
FPs cannot be licensed in RCs with genitive subjects. This generalization has not been identified in previous research. Given that an RC containing an FP needs Focus-head to license it, as discussed in Section 2, it follows that RCs with genitive subjects do not have Focus-head. That is, they are TPs, but not Foc Ps.

This may be supported by Inoue’s (1976) Complementizer Blocking Effect, another restriction in the distribution of genitive subjects: NGC is blocked by a presence of an overt complementizer. Inoue reports that the conversion at issue cannot be observed when some elements like -toiu ‘to say’ are inserted between an RC and its head noun.

(15) Taro-ga/*no kiita toiu uwasabanashi
    Taro-Nom/Gen heard of to say rumor
    ‘a rumor they say Taro heard of’

It is customary to regard the expression -toiu as a kind of complementizer, as in Ogawa (2001). When there is an overt complementizer like -toiu between an RC and its head noun, a genitive subject cannot appear within its RC. Putting aside the exact syntactic position of -toiu within the CP-zone, we can say that the Complementizer Blocking Effect is the same phenomenon as where an FP blocks NGC. That is, the existence of elements in the CP-zone prevents genitive Case from being licensed.

Based on these observations, we can say that when an RC contains an FP, its syntactic category must be Foc P at least, though the Focus-head is not phonetically realized.

Now that we have seen that RCs with genitive subjects are TP, smaller than those with nominative subjects, our next step is to explain how the genitive Case should be licensed in RCs. Before we discuss this, let us briefly review previous studies on NGC.

4. Previous Research

This section deals with a brief review of the major approaches to NGC. In 4.1, two approaches, what we call, the D approach and the C approach, are introduced in brief. In 4.2, we present a brief view of Saito’s (2004) analysis, on which the present analysis will be built.

4.1. The D Approach and C Approach

For NGC, there have been two major approaches introduced so far, which we call the D approach and the C approach. The D approach has been
represented in Miyagawa (1993) and Ochi (2001), among others. In this approach, the position where genitive Case is licensed is different from that of nominative Case. Although nominative Case is licensed at Spec, TP, genitive Case is licensed at Spec, DP. In the case of genitive Case, the genitive subject moves up to Spec, DP from Spec, TP either overtly or covertly, for Case-checking. One type of evidence for this approach can be found in scope interaction proposed by Miyagawa (1993).\(^2\) Let us look at his examples below.

(16) a. [[[Rubii-ka sinzyu]-ga yasuku-naru] kanoosee-ga] 50% ruby-or pearl-Nom cheap-become probability-Nom 50% izyoo da. over is ‘The probability that rubies or pearls become cheap is over 50%.’

*‘The probability that rubies become cheap or the probability that pearls become cheap is over 50%.’

b. [[[Rubii-ka sinzyu]-no yasuku-naru] kanoosee]-ga 50% ruby-or pearl-Gen cheap-become probability-Nom 50% izyoo da. over is ‘The probability that rubies or pearls become cheap is over 50%.’

‘The probability that rubies become cheap or the probability that pearls become cheap is over 50%.’

In the case of the nominative subject in (16a), the interpretation is unambiguous, that is, it has only the reading that the head noun kanoosee ‘probability’ takes scope over the nominative subject rubii ka sinzyu ‘ruby or pearl.’ On the other hand, the interpretation of the example with a genitive subject in (16b) is ambiguous. Namely, the reading for which the nominative subject takes scope over the head noun kanoosee ‘probability’ is also yielded in addition to the same reading in (16a). This difference indicates that the genitive subject, not the nominative subject, is Case-checked at a position higher than N (i.e. Spec, DP). Because of this movement, there are two kinds of interpretations available in the case of the genitive sub-

\(^2\) Scope interaction cannot be a clue for the structural difference of genitive subject in the case of RCs, for an empty category corresponding to a relative head, whether a trace or pro, does bring about scope ambiguity.
ject. However, the suggestions for how this movement to Spec, DP takes place differ among researchers. For example, Miyagawa (1993) claims that this movement occurs in covert syntax. On the other hand, Ochi (2001) insists that it takes place optionally in overt syntax. To summarize, for the D approach, genitive Case is licensed by D, whether it moves into Spec, DP overtly or covertly.

As for the C approach, the following is a brief review of Hiraiwa (2001), which claims that genitive Case is licensed by the combination of special mechanisms, based on Chomsky’s (2000) theory of Agree. Let us consider his example as shown in (17).

(17) John-wa [ame-ga/no yamu made] kenkyuusitu-ni i-ta.
    John-Top rain-Nom/Gen stop-Pres until office-in be-Past
    ‘John was in his office until the rain stopped.’

Example (17) does not contain an overt nominal head in a clause, but still NGC is possible. This indicates that a genitive subject in a clause is not licensed by N or D, but by a special inflection called rentai ‘attributive’ predicate. Focusing on the predicate, Hiraiwa (2001) demonstrates that there is evidence that the attributive form appears before the postposition made ‘until.’

(18) John-wa izyoona made-ni sinkeisitu-da.
    John-Top abnormal up to-in nervous-is
    ‘John is extraordinarily nervous.’

Izyoona ‘abnormal’ is an attributive form, and its declarative form, izyooda cannot appear at the same position. Therefore, it is clear that the predicate in example (17) is an attributive form, for it appears in front of made ‘until.’ Hiraiwa (2001) proposes that this form and the Agree system participate in licensing the genitive Case: the attributive predicate corresponds to T, V, and C via Agree, and the C-T-V amalgamate licenses genitive Case. This mechanism is illustrated in (19), slightly revised from Maki and Uchibori (2008: 201).

(19) \[
\text{Agree} \quad \left[ \text{CP} \left[ \text{TP} \left[ \text{Subj}_{\text{Gen}} \right] \ldots \left[ \text{VP} \ldots \right. \text{predicate}_{\text{rentai}} \ldots \right. \text{T}_{\phi}] \ldots \text{C}_{\phi}] \right. \right.
\]

Because of the C-T-V amalgamate via Agree, the \( \phi \)-feature of T is copied or transferred onto C and the Case of the goal is valued genitive. Similarly, a shushi ‘conclusive’ predicate also amalgamates, but does not involve C. The T-V amalgamate is created and the \( \phi \)-feature of T agrees with
the Case of the goal, which is valued nominative. Thus, both nominative
and genitive subjects stay at Spec, TP and their Cases are valued by the
φ-feature of T and C respectively. In summary, with the C approach, no
movement to Spec, DP is involved, and Agree is responsible for licensing
the genitive subject at Spec, TP in RCs.

4.2. Declarative T and Adnominal T (Saito (2004))

This subsection will discuss Saito’s (2004) insightful analysis, which will
be the point of departure for the rest of this paper. Based on Hiraiwa’s
(2001) approach, Saito also proposes an approach which does not involve
D-head. The difference between Hiraiwa’s and Saito’s analysis, however, is
what checks genitive Case. As we have seen in 4.1, Hiraiwa proposes that
the amalgam system and Agree enable C to check genitive Case. On the
other hand, Saito’s proposal is that there are two types of Ts: declarative T
and adnominal T. The former checks nominative Case and the latter checks
either nominative or genitive Case. As for TR (the intervention effect, in
his terms) such as in (20), Saito claims that it has to do with adnominal T.

(20) Taro-ga/*no hon-o kat-ta mise
     Taro-Nom/Gen book-Acc buy-Past shop
     ‘the shop where Taro bought a book’

The nominative subject is perfectly grammatical with overt object, hon
‘book.’ The genitive subject, on the other hand, is not allowed, when an
overt object appears. Saito proposes that when an adnominal T checks
genitive Case, not nominative Case, it absorbs the Case-feature of v. That
is why the [Acc] feature of the object cannot be checked, and the accusa-
tive object cannot be phonologically realized, in the case of the genitive
subject. The schemata of a declarative T and an adnominal T are below in
(21).

(21) a. TP
    NPi [Nom] T′
      vP T [Nom]
        t_i v′
          VP v [Acc]
            NP [Acc] V
b. TP
    NPi [Gen] T′
      vP T [Gen] (or [Nom])
        t_i v′
          VP v
            *NP [Acc] V
(21a) is a case of a declarative T. The Case feature of [Nom] in T-head licenses the [Nom] of the subject NP which moves up from the Spec, vP. Also, v checks the [Acc] feature of the object. (21b), on the other hand, is a case of an adnominal T. T-head has either the [Nom] feature or the [Gen] feature. When T checks the genitive Case, it absorbs the [Acc] feature of v and the object does not appear. In this way Saito explains the NGC and its TR.

To summarize, Saito (2004) claims that an adnominal T licenses either nominative Case or genitive Case at Spec, TP, while a declarative T licenses nominative Case only.

5. Proposal for NGC

Although we need to consider in detail what consequences each approach will bring for the compatibility with the data (11) and (13), in the rest of the paper we are to propose a new analysis of NGC based on Saito (2004): NGC depends on the property of T. The reason we do not adopt the D approach is that NGC can be observed in the environment without any nominal head, as shown in (17). The following in (22) is another example from Hiraiwa (2001: 77–78).

(22) [Boku-ga/no omou ni] John-wa Mary-ga
    I-Nom/Gen think-Pres-Adn Dat John-Top Mary-Nom
    suki-ni-tigainai.
    like-must-Pres
    ‘I think that John likes Mary.’

The sentence (22) does not have an overt nominal head for the clauses allowing the NGC. This leads us to giving up the possibility that D may be involved with NGC.

For the C approach, C is assumed to function as part of a case-assigning/checking mechanism (of NGC). As seen in Section 3, however, our analysis on data in (11) reveals that C may not exist in the RCs with genitive subjects, which brings us to the reason for our being against the C approach. Of course, this sort of decision of rejecting other approaches may be hasty and naïve, and some people might suggest that we should investigate them more carefully. Nevertheless we adopt Saito’s T-dichotomy as a point of departure, since our analysis fits well with Chomsky’s (2008) feature inheritance, which can give an intriguing analysis of English ECM constructions. Chomsky argues that the φ-features on C are transmitted to T, which assign nominative Case to a DP in Spec, TP. In English the ECM
construction which lacks \(C\) cannot assign nominative Case to the embedded subject DP, which eventually gets accusative Case from \(v-V\) of a matrix clause. We can find a parallelism between the ECM and the NGC in that the transmission of \(\varphi\)-features to \(T\), which brings about the nominative Case assignment/checking, depends on the presence of \(C\).

We believe that Saito’s (2004) analysis is insightful in that \(T\) is crucial for case alternation in NGC. Saito does not mention the whole structure of DPs containing pronominal sentential modifiers. Our task is to combine Saito’s insight with the structures of RCs we clarified in Section 3. Maintaining Saito’s (2004) insight on T-dichotomy, we propose the following refinement.

(23) There are two types of \(T\): declarative \(T\) and adnominal \(T\):

The former assigns \([\text{Nom}]\) to Spec, TP; the latter \([\text{Gen}]\) to Spec, \(vP\).

There is only one \(T\) (i.e. declarative \(T\)) which checks \([\text{Nom}]\), and the other \(T\) (i.e. adnominal \(T\)) checks \([\text{Gen}]\) under the TR.\(^3\)

The difference between this proposal and Saito’s (2004) is that the former claims that it is only \([\text{Gen}]\) that an adnominal \(T\) can check, while the latter claims that adnominal \(T\) can check either \([\text{Nom}]\) or \([\text{Gen}]\). Let us compare the two analyses schematically. The following diagram illustrates Saito’s original analysis.

(24) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. declarative } T \rightarrow [\text{Nom}] \\
\text{b. adnominal } T \rightarrow \begin{cases} [\text{Nom}] \\ [\text{Gen}] \quad \text{TR} \end{cases}
\end{array}
\]

In (24) there are two Ts which can check \([\text{Nom}]\): declarative \(T\) and adnomi-

\(^3\) As for the TR, we will maintain Saito’s version of this restriction in this paper: an adnominal \(T\) absorbs the Case-feature of \(v\). This is because our main concern in this paper is to specify the syntactic category of RCs in Japanese, but not to provide a technically detailed account for NGC. However, Saito’s assumption of case absorption seems to be specific to NGC, though it may work for the NP-ellipsis analysis of null objects. In this respect we admit that it is necessary to explore a more general explanation that can account for Hiraiwa’s (2001) generalization of accusative Case checking in Japanese: Spell-out of morphological accusative Case triggers nominative Case checking on \(T\) in the next strong phase. We would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this issue to our attention.
nal T. On the other hand, our proposal is schematized in (25).

\[(25)\]
\[
a. \text{declarative } T \rightarrow [\text{Nom}]
\]
\[
b. \text{adnominal } T \rightarrow [\text{Gen}] \quad \text{TR}
\]

Note that this analysis is symmetrical in that there is no redundancy in the checking of [Nom], due to the one-to-one relationship between T-type and its Case assigning/checking capacity.

Our proposal provides the example in (26) with the structures illustrated in (27).

\[(26)\] Taro-ga/no nonda kusuri

Taro-Nom/Gen took medicine

‘the medicine that Taro took’

4 We have to leave untouched the RCs which have adjectival predicates. Note, however, that the term “declarative T” is different from the similar term *shushi-kei* ‘conclusive form’ used in traditional Japanese linguistics. We assume that declarative T merges with C, while adnominal T does not. This distinction is necessary when we deal with the RCs with nominal adjectives (*na*-type adjectives), such as in *Hanako-ga/no suki-na keki* ‘the cake Hanako likes.’ In addition we assume that the ending of *shushi-kei* (-*da*) is a sentence-final particle with the meaning of assertion, which means that this particle appears only in the CP-zone of root sentences, in principle. That is why the following expression is not permitted.

\[(iv)\] *Hanako-ga suki-da keki* (cf. *Hanako-ga/no suki-na keki*)

Hanako-Nom like cake

‘the cake Hanako likes’

We take *suki-na* to be an underlying form for either declarative T or adnominal T. Therefore, in the case of nominal adjectives, their (rough) internal structures are illustrated respectively below.

\[(v)\]
\[
a. [\text{Hanako-ga suki-na-T-C keki}]
\]
\[
b. [\text{Hanako-no suki-na-T keki}]
\]

5 As an alternative we can assume that T uninherited from C (or defective T) cannot have genitive Case-assigning ability. In this case, a D may be in charge of licensing genitive Case under Agree, as claimed in the D approach (See Miyagawa (1993), Ochi (2001) among others), though it is not necessarily the sole option. We do not pursue this in this paper and leave it for future research.

6 For explanatory convenience, we use CP for the RCs with nominative subjects, instead of using Foc P which is assumed to exist in those RCs. Actually further research is needed on the exact internal structure of C in this sort of RCs, including the question of where *-toiu* occupies in the CP-zone.
Let us assume that C selects declarative T; otherwise adnominal T is selected. In the case of nominative subject, declarative T is merged with vP. By definition this T assigns/checks nominative Case to a DP in Spec, TP. Or if we adopt Chomsky’s feature inheritance, we may say that φ-features that originally appear on C are inherited to T at the point of derivation where C is merged with TP, and this helps declarative T to assign/check nominative Case to the Spec, TP, and to raise a DP to it. On the other hand, when there is no C, adnominal T is selected. Without C, no feature inheritance can take place. It means that T does not have EPP property and φ-features. Then T assigns/checks genitive Case to the DP located in Spec, vP by Agree. As explained in Section 3, in the case of the Complementizer Blocking Effect, complementizers like -toiu, transmit EPP property and φ-features to the T-head.

In this section we have presented our analysis for NGC in RCs, revising Saito’s proposal on two types of T.

6. Conclusion

We have proposed that the categorial status of Japanese RCs, formerly thought to be TPs, can be larger than TP, on the assumption that FPs within RCs must be licensed by Focus-head which is supposed to exist at the CP-zone. But not all the Japanese RCs are larger than TP. From the new data on NGC, we have claimed that RCs with genitive subjects are TPs, for
the conversion is not allowed when FPs appear within RCs. This can be explained straightforwardly if we assume that an intervening functional head (i.e. Focus) cannot allow the predicate of RC to be adnominal T which can assign only [Gen]. As pointed out in Section 5, there is much that must be considered on the compatibility of other approaches with our new data (i.e. (11) and (13)) and the generalization (14). Nevertheless, it is hoped that this research may advance our understanding of Japanese RCs.
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