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It is a controversial issue whether a QR-like operation is clause-bound or not. This paper suggests that there is no single answer to this question, drawing evidence from the scopal property of some focus particles in Japanese. The answer largely depends on what is the target of the operation and the nature of the subject of the clause involved. Different focus particles have different targets of raising, and this not only correlates with the clause-boundedness of the operation but also with the possibility of their cooccurrence with a certain type of adverb, as well as with their scope order relative to a causative predicate.*
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1. Introduction

This paper focuses on the differences and similarities among several focus particles in Japanese, including sae ‘even,’ its apparent synonym made ‘even/as far as,’ and dake ‘only.’ Sae shows a number of characteristics not shared by these other particles: it may extend its scope over a clausal boundary (section 2); it does not interact in scope with a causative morpheme (sections 3 and 4); and it can yield degraded acceptability when used with a certain type of adverb (section 5).

* Throughout the process of writing this paper, I have benefited greatly from the discussion via e-mail with Toshinobu Mogi. I am likewise indebted to two anonymous EL reviewers for their comments and suggestions, which have led to substantial revisions. My thanks also go to Charles E. Fox and Robert MaClLean for suggesting stylistic corrections, as well as to other friends who contributed in one way or another to the existence of the present paper. None of them, however, is responsible for any remaining errors or shortcomings.
The negative-polarity focus particle *shika* 'anything but' shows similarities to *sae* in some respects and to *made* and *dake* in others. It will be argued that these differences and similarities are derived from the interaction of different targets of the movement involved in the particles with the nature of subjects and adverbs, coupled with the working of some universal principles (sections 6–8). Some arguments against an alternative analysis will be given (section 9), followed by a summary and concluding remarks (section 10).

2. Complex Sentences

Aoyagi (1994) observes that the focus particle *sae* 'even' in Japanese may extend its scope across a clausal boundary, as shown by an example like (1):

(1) Taro-wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okane-sae nusunda] to
Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-even stole C
shuchooshita
claimed
‘Taro claimed that Aiko stole even Jiro’s money’

This sentence is ambiguous between the embedded and the matrix scope readings of *sae* 'even.' Under the embedded scope reading, Taro’s claim is that Aiko stole even Jiro’s money; here we obtain solely from the embedded clause the scalar implicature of *sae*, to the effect that Jiro’s money is the least likely thing for Aiko to steal.¹ Under the matrix scope reading, on the other hand, Jiro’s money is the least likely thing for Taro to claim that Aiko would steal, an implicature involving the entire sentence. The following is similar:

(2) Taro-wa [Aiko-ga osake-sae nomu] koto-o kitaishita
Taro-Top Aiko-Nom sake-even drink C-Acc expected
‘Taro expected that Aiko would drink even sake’

Thus under the embedded scope reading, sake is the least likely thing

¹ *Even* and its Japanese analogue *sae* are often analyzed with two implicatures, existential and scalar, and I will make reference to these notions in explicating the relevant scope of *sae* and of its apparent synonym *made* discussed below. See Karttunen and Peters (1979), Rooth (1985), Francescotti (1995), Kuroda (1992: Ch. 2), and Sakahara (1985), among many others, for analyses of *even* and *sae.*
for Aiko to drink; under the matrix scope, sake is the least likely thing for Taro to expect that Aiko would drink.

This scope extension over a clausal boundary does not, however, appear to be a general property of focus particles in Japanese. Before seeing this, consider first the following examples involving made:

(3) a. Aiko-wa Jiro-no okane-made nusunda
    Aiko-Top Jiro-Gen money-even stole
    ‘Aiko stole even Jiro’s money’

b. Tarо-wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okene-o nusunda]
   Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-Acc stole
to-made shuchooshita
   C-even claimed
   ‘Taro claimed even that Aiko stole Jiro’s money’

In both of these examples, made, glossed as ‘even,’ functions as a focus particle with a meaning close to that of sae, though not identical with it. Since the particle attaches in (3b) to the to-clause, a matrix element, it takes matrix scope and any constituent of this clause may be its focus.2 Suppose we take Jiro-no okane ‘Jiro’s money’ as the focus of made in (3b) as well as in (3a). Since made is semantically associated with a meaning like ‘as far as,’ we may paraphrase (3a) and (3b) in English as (4a) and (4b), respectively:3

(4) a. Aiko went as far as to steal JIRO’S MONEY.

b. Taro went as far as to claim that Aiko stole JIRO’S MONEY.

Now observe what happens if we replace sae in (1) and (2) with made:

(5) Tarо-wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okane-made nusunda] to
   Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-even stole C
   shuchooshita
   claimed
   ‘Taro claimed that Aiko stole even Jiro’s money’

---

2 By the rule of association with focus in the sense of Jackendoff (1972: 249). See also Rooth (1985). In the terminology of Taglicht (1984: 63), the to-clause that made syntactically attaches to is the syntactic-semantic focus of the particle, and any constituent of this clause may be its contextual-pragmatic focus, depending on the context.

3 The foci are indicated by capitals, here and below.
Unlike (1), it is difficult, if not impossible, to give (5) the matrix scope reading of the relevant particle: the sentence cannot easily be associated with an English paraphrase like (4b), although the embedded scope reading with a paraphrase like ‘Taro claimed that Aiko went as far as to steal JIRO’S MONEY,’ which contains (4a), is unproblematic. Similarly in (6), we easily obtain the embedded scope reading of made on which Taro expected that Aiko would go as far as to drink SAKE, but it is not so easy to obtain the matrix scope reading on which Taro went as far as to expect that Aiko would drink SAKE. This reading is clearly weaker than the corresponding matrix scope reading of sae in (2). Made does not easily extend its scope over a clause-boundary, at least not as easily as its apparent synonym sae.4

A similar situation is observed with another focus particle dake ‘only,’ which also cannot easily extend its scope beyond a clausal boundary:

(7) Taro-wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okane-dake nusunda] to
Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-only stole C
shuchooshita
claimed
‘Taro claimed that Aiko stole only Jiro’s money’

(8) Taro-wa [Aiko-ga osake-dake nomu] koto-o kitaishita
Taro-Top Aiko-Nom sake-only drink C-Acc expected
‘Taro expected that Aiko would drink only sake’

Thus dake in (7) can only take scope within the bracketed clause, giving the implication that Taro claimed that Aiko didn’t steal anything but Jiro’s money. The particle cannot take scope over the matrix clause to give the implication that Taro didn’t claim that Aiko stole anything but Jiro’s money. Similarly, (8) may be associated with the embedded-scope implication that Taro expected that Aiko wouldn’t drink anything but sake, but not with the matrix-scope implication that he didn’t expect that Aiko would drink anything but sake.

---

4 See Mogi (1999, 2000) for other differences between sae and made.
ON THE SCOPE OF SOME FOCUS PARTICLES

The same is true with a negative polarity focus particle *shika* 'anything but,' which combines with a negative to give a meaning similar to *dake*:\(^5\)

(9) a. Taro- wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okane- shika
Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-SK
nusum- anak-atta] to shuchooshita
steal- Neg- Past C claimed
‘Taro claimed that Aiko didn’t steal anything but Jiro’s money’

b. ?*Taro- wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okane-shika nusunda] to
Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-SK stole C
shucooshi- nak- atta
claim- Neg- Past
‘Taro didn’t claim that Aiko stole anything but Jiro’s money’

(10) a. Taro- wa [Aiko-ga osake- shika nom- anai] koto- o
Taro-Top Aiko- Nom sake- SK drink- Neg C- Acc
kitaishita
expected
‘Taro expected that Aiko would not drink anything but sake’

b. ?*Taro- wa [Aiko-ga osake- shika nomu] koto- o
Taro-Top Aiko- Nom sake- SK drink C- Acc
kitaishi- nak- atta
expect- Neg- Past
‘Taro didn’t expect that Aiko would drink anything but sake’

In the (a)-examples above, the negative associate of *shika* appears in the same embedded clause as does *shika*; the scope of the particle is within the embedded clause and the sentences are acceptable. In the (b)-examples, *shika* appears in the embedded clause but its associate appears in the matrix clause. Since the associate of *shika* functions effectively as its scope marker, the unacceptability of the (b)-examples indicates that the particle cannot extend its scope beyond a clausal

\(^5\) Since *shika* itself does not correspond to any one English word, I will simply represent it as SK in the English glosses.
boundary, just like *dake* ‘only’ and *made* ‘even.’

Why, then, is it that *sae* ‘even’ is unlike these particles in that it can extend its scope over a clause-boundary? To answer this question, we turn to different constructions to examine what other differences there are between *sae* and the other particles and see if there is any unifying principle.

3. Periphrastic Causatives

Consider first causative sentences involving *dake* (11a) and *made* (11b):

(11) Taro-wa Aiko-ni | a. osake-dake/b. osake-made |
    Taro-Top Aiko-Dat | sake-only/sake-even |
    nom-ase-ta 
    drink-cause-Past

‘Taro made Aiko drink | only/even | sake’

(11a) is ambiguous with respect to the relative scope order between *dake* ‘only’ and the causative (*s)a* ‘cause.’ If *dake* is understood as under the scope of the causative, the sentence means that to drink only sake is what Taro made Aiko do; the implication is that he caused her not to drink anything but sake. If the particle is taken as scoping over the causative, the sentence implies that sake is the only thing that Taro made Aiko drink, or that he did not make her drink anything but sake. (11b) is similarly ambiguous: *made* may take narrow or wide scope relative to the causative. With the narrow scope of *made*, the sentence means that Taro made Aiko go as far as to drink SAKE (with sake focussed). With its wide scope, the sentence means that Taro went as far as to make Aiko drink SAKE. This wide scope reading of *made*, but not its narrow scope reading, implies that before making her drink sake, Taro had already performed some other causative activity, such as making her drink beer or wine. This is an existential implicature, associated with the wide scope *made* (see note 1). Conversely, the narrow scope reading of *made*, but not its wide scope reading, existentially implicates that Aiko, of her own free will, had already performed some activity other than drinking sake; she may already have drunk beer and wine before Taro ordered her to drink sake.

The ambiguity disappears, however, with *sae* instead of *made*:

(12) Taro-wa Aiko-ni osake-sae nom-ase-ta
    Taro-Top Aiko-Dat sake-even drink-cause-Past
‘Taro made Aiko drink even sake’
Here the reading of *sae* as scoping over the causative is the only option available. Thus the sentence is understood as implying that Taro had already done some activity other than making Aiko drink sake, an existential implicature similar to the one we have found with the wide scope *made* in (11b). However, unlike (11b), (12) cannot be understood with anything like the narrow-scope existential implicature that Aiko had already drunk something other than sake before Taro ordered her to drink sake, indicating that *sae* is not able to take narrow scope relative to the causative. The lack of narrow scope is also explicable in terms of scalar implicature: the only scalar implicature available in (12) is one associated with *sae* scoping over the causative, such that sake is the least likely thing for Taro to make Aiko drink.

However, *sae* may take narrow scope relative to the causative if we change the portion embedded by *(s)ase* in (12) into a more clause-like form, as in (13):

(13) Taro-wa Aiko-ni osake-sae nom-u yooni sase-ta
Taro-Top Aiko-Dat sake-even drink-Pres C cause-Past
‘Taro made Aiko drink even sake’

In (13), a CP headed by *yooni* is embedded as a complement of *sase*. The TP complement of this CP is in the present tense, with its verb inflected for the present form *nom-u* ‘drink-Pres.’ *Sae* appearing in this TP may take scope under, as well as over, the matrix causative: the narrow-scope scalar implicature that sake is the least likely thing for Aiko to drink is available, in addition to the wide-scope one similar to what we have observed in (12).

Why is the narrow scope of *sae* available in (13) but not in (12)? The next section will give an answer to this question.

4. Target of Raising and Lexical Causatives

Chomsky (1995: 377) suggests that a potential target of Quantifier Raising (QR) may be T or v, v the light verb in a transitive construction. Aoyagi (1998, 1999) claims that particles like *dake* and *made* (those called *fuku-joshi* ‘adverbial particle’ in the traditional grammar of Japanese) raise at LF to v, while particles like *mo* ‘also’ and *sae* (those called *kakari-joshi*) raise to T, although he does not discuss *made* in detail and his proposal is for an account of focus-related phenomena rather than the scopal difference we are concerned with. Let
us adopt Chomsky-Aoyagi's idea of T being a potential target of QR-like operations, and assume that the collection of formal features of sae, FF(sae), raises to T whereby it gets scope. This assumption suffices to make sae in (12) take scope over and not under the causative, since there is only one occurrence of T, namely the one in the matrix clause, and FF(sae) can only move to this T over the causative. FF(sae) in (13), in contrast, has the option of moving to the embedded T or to the matrix T, giving rise to the narrow as well as the wide scope reading of sae relative to the causative.

Scope is determined in terms of c-command: X scopes over Y if X c-commands Y, where X c-commands Y if the lowest category that dominates X also dominates Y. We are assuming the category-segment distinction in adjunction structure (May (1985), Chomsky (1986)): adjunction of α to β gives a two-segment category $\beta = [\beta_2 \alpha \beta_1]$ in which α c-commands $\beta_1$ (but not conversely); α also c-commands whatever β c-commands, since $\alpha$ is not dominated by $\beta$ (but only by one of its segments, $\beta_2$). See Chomsky (1995: 43f, 339f). Thus if FF(sae) adjoins to T to give $T = [T_2 \text{FF(sae)} T_1]$, FF(sae) c-commands and scopes over $T_1$ and whatever T c-commands.

Now what about dake and made? Here we depart from Chomsky and Aoyagi and assume that FF(dake/made) may target not just v but a wider range of categories including V, A, N, and even P, as long as they have a predicate-like property. This is because dake/made can appear in constructions lacking v, such as unaccusative constructions and adjectival or predicate-nominal constructions. See Sano (1985, 1996, 1997, 1998) for arguments that categories like P and N may be targets of raising for dake.

In a transitive construction with v, FF(dake/made) may target either V or v. The distinction between raising to v and raising to V does not

---

6 Most of the traditional generative-grammatical approaches to the sase-causative construction analyzed it in terms of a biclausal structure, with sase of a root clause $S_1$ taking a clausal complement $S_2$. The emergence of the so-called predicate-internal subject hypothesis, however, has made it possible to reinterpret $S_2$ as syntactically a VP or vP whose Spec position may be occupied by the subject of $S_2$; the root $S_1$ retains a clausal status as TP/IP when it contains T/I. We thus assume that an example like (12) has a matrix TP whose predicate sase takes a verbal phrase, vP or VP, as a (“clausal”) complement, while (13) has an embedded as well as a matrix TP. See note 9.
correlate with a noticeable semantic difference in most cases, but sometimes it does, particularly when a lexical causative is involved. Thus consider (14), where *made* attaches to the object of the lexical causative *ake* ‘open’:

(14) Taro-wa [vP [vP migihaji-no mado-made [v ake] v] ta
    Taro-Top rightmost-Gen window-even open Past
    ‘Taro opened even the rightmost window’

*FF(made)* has the option of raising to *V* or to *v*. Assume that *v* is basically causative, combined with the head *V* of the VP it selects to give a causative verb (cf. Hale and Keyser (1993)). This assumption correlates nicely with facts concerning the scope of *made* in (14). The raising of *FF(made)* to *v* gets *made* to scope over the causative *v*, giving an existential implicature such that there are other windows that Taro had opened before he opened the rightmost one. On the other hand, the raising of *FF(made)* to *V* gets *made* to scope under the causative *v*, giving an existential implicature such that there are other windows which had been open, whether they had been opened by someone or had opened by themselves, before the rightmost one got opened. The ambiguity of this sort due to the two potential landing sites seems to be observed generally with verbs denoting causation of a change of state, whether or not they have intransitive counterparts denoting just a change of state in the lexicon of the language. Thus while *ake* (=the English transitive open) is a transitive verb with its intransitive counterpart *ak* (the English intransitive open), a verb like *hakaisu-ru* ‘destroy-Pres’ does not have an intransitive counterpart and yet gives rise to the same sort of ambiguity as observed in (14):

(15) Taro-wa [vP [vP migihaji-no mado-made [v hakaishi] v] ta
    Taro-Top rightmost-Gen window-even destroy Past
    ‘Taro destroyed even the rightmost window’

In (15), raising to *v* is associated with the existential implicature that there are other windows that Taro had destroyed before he destroyed the rightmost one, and raising to *V*, with the existential implicature that there are other windows that had already been in the state of being destroyed before Taro destroyed the rightmost one. Now recall that *FF(sae)* targets T. If neither *v* nor *V* is a potential target of *FF(sae)*, we expect that the type of ambiguity just observed will disappear with *sae* replacing *made*. This seems to be true:
(16) Taro-wa migihaji-no made-sae {aketa/hakaishita}
    Taro-Top rightmost-Gen window-even {opened/destroyed}
    ‘Taro {opened/destroyed} even the rightmost window’

Thus the only obvious existential implicature available is something similar to the one associated with the wide scope of made in (14) and (15): unlike (14) and (15), (16) will only be used if Taro had already done some activity before he went as far as to open/destroy the rightmost window.7

Like made, dake gives scope ambiguity depending on the target of raising:

(17) Taro-wa [vP [VP migihaji-no mado-dake [v ake]] v] ta
    Taro-Top rightmost-Gen window-only open Past
    ‘Taro opened only the rightmost window’

If FF(dake) raises to V to scope under v, the sentence is interpreted as implying that Taro brought about the situation in which only the rightmost window was open (perhaps by psychokinesis). If it raises to v and scopes over it, the implication is that Taro did not get any window to open but the rightmost one. On this latter reading, Taro’s behavior may result in a situation where more than one window is open, because some doors may already have been open.8

I will add just one more example with a transitive verb, to confirm the generality of the phenomenon and also as a prelude to the next paragraph:

7 Note incidentally that replacement of made in (14)-(15) (and in (18)-(19) below) with mo ‘also’ gives the same sort of ambiguity as observed with made with respect to the existential implicature (although mo and made differ in matters of scalar implicature, which I will not review here). This indicates that mo should be categorized into the same class as dake/made (as well as perhaps into the class that sae belongs to): the set of categories targeted by FF(mo) includes V and v (as well as T, with Aoyagi (1998, 1999)).

8 Furthermore, the sentence (17) with this dake-v scope order is closer in interpretation than with the v-dake order to the following where dake is replaced by the negative polarity item shika in combination with its associated negative:

(i) Taro-wa [vP [VP migihaji-no mado-shika [v ake]] v] nak-atta
    Taro-Top rightmost-Gen window-SK open Neg-Past
    ‘Taro didn’t open anything but the rightmost window’

This is natural, since the negative that serves as the scope marker of shika appears higher than v so that the scope of shika extends over v. See the penultimate paragraph of section 5.
(18) Taro-wa Aiko-ni oobaa-|made/sae| kise-ta
    Taro-Top Aiko-Dat overcoat-even dress-Past
    ‘Taro made Aiko put on even an overcoat’

Although the English translation by the causative verb *make* suggests that the Japanese example involves a periphrastic causative, it does not; the verb *kise* ‘dress, clothe’ is a lexical causative, the ditransitive counterpart of the monotransitive *ki(-ru)* ‘put-on(-Pres).’ The interpretive pattern is the same as before: with *made*, the sentence allows an existential implicature such that Aiko wore something, whether she had put it on of her own free will or not, other than the overcoat that Taro made her put on: the implicature given by raising to V. This implicature is unavailable with *sae*, as we can see if we properly dissociate the implicature that the relevant focus particle is responsible for, from our normal assumption in everyday life that one usually wears something before putting on an overcoat. With such dissociation, the sentence with *sae* is only interpreted with the existential implicature that Taro had done something (to Aiko), say, making her put on a suit, before he made her put on the overcoat. That is, with *sae* the sentence cannot be used felicitously if Taro had not done any relevant activity before (though with *made* it can). The reason is simply because *sae* has only T as a target of raising, so that it cannot scope under v to give a reading not associated with the implicature of the existence of Taro’s previous activity.

The same obtains with a periphrastic causative counterpart of (18):

(19) Taro-wa Aiko-ni oobaa-|made/sae| ki-sase-ta
    Taro-Top Aiko-Dat overcoat-even put-on-cause-Past
    ‘Taro caused Aiko to put on even an overcoat’

Here we have the monotransitive *ki* ‘put on’ followed by the periphrastic causative *sase*. FF(*made*) may target either the embedded monotransitive or the embedding causative, but FF(*sae*) can only target T, giving the same interpretive pattern as observed in (18). Furthermore, the ambiguity of the scope of *dake/made* that we observed in (11) but left unaccounted for falls under the same account.9

---

9 Left untouched is the question whether *sase* is a lexical realization of v or it is a V (or it is ambiguous between the two options), and whether it takes vP or VP as a complement (or it may take either). See Hasegawa (2001).
5. Interaction with Adverbs

The difference in targets between sae and made/dake has a consequence for difference in the acceptability of sentences involving an adverbial in addition to a focus particle; consider examples like the following:

(20) ??Aiko-wa {yukkuri/shizukani} osake-sae nonda
   Aiko-Top {slowly/quietly} sake-even drank
   'Aiko drank even sake {slowly/quietly}'

(21) Aiko-wa {yukkuri/shizukani} osake-{made/dake} nonda
   Aiko-Top {slowly/quietly} sake-{even/only} drank
   'Aiko {slowly/quietly} drank {even/only} sake'

Here the adverb yukkuri 'slowly' or shizukani 'quietly' appears before the focused object, but the acceptability is degraded when the focus particle is sae, as in (20). Note that the adverb here specifies the manner of the action performed by an agent, here Aiko. Since agency is a property of the specifier position of v under the configurational approach to $\theta$-theory (Hale and Keyser (1993), Chomsky (1995: Ch. 4)), it is reasonable to assume that the agent-oriented manner adverb is a vP adverb, merged with a projection of v; it is in the minimal domain of v in the sense of Chomsky (1995: esp. 178, 299). Thus we assume the structure of sentences like (20)-(21) is roughly as follows:

(22) \[TP \ldots [vP t [\cdot \cdot v \cdot \cdot Adv \cdot \cdot [vP Obj-F V] v]] T]\]

Here t is the trace of the agentive subject, which appears as the wa-marked topic Aiko-wa in (20)-(21); Obj = yukkuri/shizukani. Obj = osake, and F is the relevant focus particle. The presence of Adv does not have any noticeable effect on movement of FF(made/dake) to V/v,10 but it does seem to have an intervention effect on movement of FF(sae) to T. Structurally this is natural: Adv is c-commanded by T (but not by v) and c-commands F, so that it structurally intervenes between T and F to block movement from the position F to the position T but not to V/v. We will turn to the question why an intervening adverb should block movement at all; for the present, let us simply

10 When it does not matter whether V or v is targeted, we juxtapose the two by slash as in V/v.
assume that it does.

Note that there is no decrease in acceptability with a manner vP-adverb when the object with sae is scrambled before the adverb:

(23) Aiko-wa osake-sae | yukkuri/shizukani | nonda
    Aiko-Top sake-even | slowly/quietly | drank
    ‘Aiko drank even sake | slowly/quietly |’

This is simply because the scrambling puts the focused object in a position that is structurally higher than, hence not c-commanded by, the adverb.

An adverb outside vP does not intervene between T and sae attached to the object so that there is no intervention effect of the sort observed in (20); thus temporal adverbials like kinoo ‘yesterday’ and sono toki ‘at that time’ are presumably TP adverbs merged with a projection of T, and we have an acceptable sentence like the following:

(24) Aiko-wa | kinoo /sono toki | osake-sae nonda
    Aiko-Top | yesterday/that time | sake-even drank
    ‘Aiko drank even sake | yesterday/at that time |’

Similarly, frequency adverbs like shibashiba ‘often,’ tokidoki ‘sometimes’ and tamani ‘occasionally’ may also be merged with a projection of T, and sae attached to the object can cooccur with such adverbs:

(25) Aiko-wa | shibashiba/tokidoki/tamani | osake-sae nonda
    Aiko-Top | often/sometimes/occasionally | sake-even drank
    ‘Aiko | often/sometimes/occasionally | drank even sake |’

An adverb may be ambiguous between the activity/process-modifying sense and the event-modifying sense, as in the following:

(26) keisatsu-wa subayaku Taro-o taihoshita
    police-Top quickly Taro-Acc arrested
    ‘the police quickly arrested Taro’

The adverb subayaku ‘quickly’ in (26) may be understood either as attributing quickness to the process denoted by vP, saying that the manner of the arrest is quick, or as attributing quickness to the event denoted by the sentence, saying that the arrest took place right away (see Travis (1988: 292)). On the latter but not the former reading, subayaku may be paraphrased as hayabayato ‘(very) soon.’ The simplest and most natural assumption is that the former interpretation is provided by subayaku merged with a projection of v as a vP adverb, and the latter, by the same adverb merged with a projection of T as a TP adverb. Now consider what interpretation is available when a focus particle attaches to the object:
(27) a. keisatsu-wa subayaku Taro-made taihoshita
   police-Top quickly Taro-even arrested
   ‘the police quickly went as far as to arrest Taro’

b. keisatsu-wa subayaku Taro-sae taihoshita
   police-Top quickly Taro-even arrested
   ‘the police quickly arrested even Taro’

Suppose that there are three persons wanted, including Taro, who is
the most difficult person to arrest. Suppose further that the police
found them together, say, on a street corner. If, almost with one
quick motion, the police arrested all of them, we can felicitously say
(27a) to refer to the quick manner of the arrest, but it would be dif-
ficult to use (27b) to refer to such a situation; the adverb in (27b) will
be more naturally be used as an event-modifying TP adverb for refer-
ing to quick occurrence of the event. We can confirm this by adding
to (27) a temporal adverbial like sono toki ‘at that time’ that virtually
forces the process-modifying manner reading of subayaku:

(28) keisatsu-wa sono toki subayaku Taro-| made/??sae |
police-Top that time quickly Taro-even
   taihoshita
   arrested
   ‘the police quickly arrested even Taro at that time’

Here subayaku is most naturally taken as a manner adverb, merged
with a projection of v, and sae is less felicitous than made. The reason
should be obvious: FF(made) targets V/v so that it does not cross
subayaku even if it is a vP adverb, while FF(sae) must target T so that
it can avoid crossing the adverb only if it is a TP adverb, which it is not
in (28).

We have been putting aside the question of the target of raising for
the negative polarity item (NPI) shika. The most natural assumption
is that FF(shika) targets the Neg head of NegP. On the assumption
that NegP is located between TP and vP (cf. Pollock (1989)), move-
ment of FF(shika) to Neg should interact with adverbials to create basically the same pattern of acceptability as movement of FF(sae) to T,
since Neg and T are both higher than v. Thus vP adverbs but not TP
adverbs intervene between Neg and shika attached the object of a verb
to block the relevant movement:

(29) Aiko-wa | ?*yukkuri/?*shizukani | osake-shika
    Aiko-Top | slowly/quietly | sake-SK
nom-anak-atta
drink-Neg-Past
‘Aiko didn’t drink anything but sake | slowly/quietly |
(30) Aiko-wa | sono toki/tokidoki | osake-shika nom-anak-atta
Aiko-Top | that time/sometimes | sake-SK | drink-Neg-Past
‘at that time/sometimes | Aiko didn’t drink anything but sake’

Just like (23), scrambling the focused object across the manner adverb in (29) puts the former in a position not c-commanded by the latter to make the relevant feature movement possible:
(31) Aiko-wa osake-shika | yukkuri/shizukani | nom-anak-atta
Aiko-Top sake-SK | slowly/quietly | drink-Neg-Past
‘Aiko didn’t drink anything but sake | slowly/quietly |

6. Formulating the Problem

Yanagida (1996) notes contrasts similar to the one between (20) and (23) and the one between (29) and (31) and accounts for them in terms of the FocP (Focus Phrase) that she postulates between IP (=TP) and VP. She claims that phrases focused by particles like sae and shika must undergo syntactic overt movement to the Specifier position of FocP; on the assumption that a VP-modifying adverb positioned before the object-verb sequence demarcates VP (=vP, in our terms), the degraded acceptability of examples like (20) and (29) is attributed to the failure of the required movement of the focused phrase to [Spec, Foc], and the enhanced acceptability of examples like (23) and (31), to its implementation. Her account, however, does not predict that the acceptability depends not only on the relative word order of the focused phrase and the relevant adverb, but also on the choice of one class of focus particles or the other, as shown by such acceptability contrasts as observed in examples like (20)–(21) and (28). We account for

11 Although tokidoki sounds tolerable, some other frequency adverbs, such as tamani ‘occasionally’ and shibashiba ‘often’ sound less acceptable. Furthermore, comparison between (20) and (29) suggests that manner adverbs create worse results with shika than with sae. Evidently there are some other factors to be considered, which I will not investigate here.
these two cases—the word order and the particle choice—in a unified way, by making recourse to the independently motivated distinction between targets of the relevant particles.

Our account, however, must provide an answer to the question noted above but put aside: why is it that an intervening adverb should block the relevant feature movement? The phenomena suggest minimality effect (Rizzi (1990, 2000), Chomsky (1995)), if focus particles are adverbial: their formal features, sharing some properties with adverbs, cannot cross them to adjoin to the targets under minimality. In fact, if what intervenes is a complement alone, there is no minimality-like effect:

(32) Taro-wa (subayaku) Aiko-ni (??subayaku) okane-sae
     Taro-Top (quickly) Aiko-Dat (quickly) money-even
     watashita
     handed

‘Taro (quickly) handed even money (quickly) to Aiko’
Without the parenthesized adverb subayaku ‘quickly,’ the sentence is acceptable even though the dative complement Aiko-ni intervenes between the focused object and T, indicating that FF(sae) can cross the dative to adjoin to T. The acceptability is degraded when the adverb occurs after the dative but not when it occurs before. The adverb after the dative is unambiguously vP-internal, interpreted as the process-modifying manner adverb, and intervenes between the focused object and T to block the relevant feature movement. The adverb before the dative, however, may be vP-internal or external. If vP-external, it will be a TP adverb with the event-modifying interpretation, and does not intervene between T and the object so that the required movement is possible. In fact, it seems that the adverb before Aiko-ni in (32) does not allow the process-modifying manner interpretation, as confirmed by degradation of the acceptability with sono toki ‘at that time’ added to force such an interpretation:

---

12 See Sano (2000) for similar minimality (or intervention) effects of adverbs on Quantifier Raising, which is blocked by an intervening adverb.
13 Note that in contrast with subayaku ‘quickly,’ yakkuri ‘slowly’ seems to allow only the vP-internal manner interpretation, so that replacement of subayaku with yakkuri in (32) gives rise to low acceptability irrespective of the position of the replaced adverb. This is consistent with the low acceptability of a sentence like (20).
The assumption that focus particles are adverbial-like elements that interact with other adverbials to give minimality effect does not seem implausible in itself. However, an account based solely on this assumption does not provide a way to handle the difference in clause-boundedness between sae and dake/made/shika: sae, but not dake/made/shika, may extend its scope beyond a clausal boundary, as discussed in connection with (1)-(10). Of course, one could claim that this is a different issue, to be explained independently. Let us, however, pursue the more interesting path, and explore the possibility of unifying the two cases.

7. A Solution: Interaction with Subject

Clauses generally have subjects. We adopt two basic assumptions, proposed in one form or another in the literature. One is that the overt subject of a clause is raised from some $\theta$-position such as [Spec, v] to [Spec, T], a non-$\theta$-position (see section 8 for the proviso “overt”). The other is that it is the tail of the nontrivial chain $\text{CH}=(\alpha, t)$, namely $t$ occupying a $\theta$-position, not the head $\alpha$, that assumes the $\theta$-role, so that the subject raised to [Spec, T] does not assume a $\theta$-role (but its trace in [Spec, v] does).

The generality of the latter assumption might be questioned. For A'-chains, their heads are typically operators or adjuncts, not arguments, that do not assume $\theta$-roles. But as for A-chains, their heads are typically arguments that must be associated with $\theta$-roles, and one might claim that the chain created by raising to [Spec, T] is an A-chain whose head may have an argument property, as suggested by the fact that the nominal raised to [Spec, T] can serve as the antecedent of a reflexive as in John seems to himself [t to be clever]. While this may indeed be true of English, an independent argument would be required.

---

14 I am indebted to an EL reviewer for bringing this to my attention.
to establish the same conclusion for Japanese, particularly because of possible differences between the two languages in the status of subjects and/or reflexive expressions. Fukui (1984) claims that the Japanese reflexive expression *jibun* ‘self’ is not a true anaphor but rather behaves like an A’-bound resumptive pronoun, as in (34) from Fukui (1984):

(34) *sono hahoyai*-wa jibun,-no musuko-ga shinde-shimatta
the mother-Top SELF-Gen son-Nom died
‘as for the mother, SELF’s (or her) son died’

The italicized antecedent of *jibun*, being a *wa*-marked topic that does not function as an argument, must be occupying an A’-position (say the Spec of TopP). If the antecedent of *jibun* is generally in an A’-position, then the *ga*-marked subject must be as well, since it can serve as the antecedent of *jibun*:

(35) *Taro*-ga Jiro-ˌni jibunˌˌ-no shashin-o miseta
Taro-Nom Jiro-Dat SELF-Gen picture-Acc showed
‘Taro showed Jiro a picture of himselfˌˌ’

With independent evidence, Fukui (1984) in fact argues that the subject position in Japanese is an A’-position. Given the first assumption we have adopted above, the A’-position occupied by a subject must be [Spec, T], and the chain created by raising to [Spec, T] must be an A’-chain. It follows that the subject in [Spec, T] does not assume a θ-role, at least in Japanese.

Now let us turn to our main concern. Apart from their (possible) adverbial nature, focus particles are like adverbs in that they do not assume a θ-role. If a focus particle *fp* merges with an argument nominal, it is not *fp* or its projection (if *fp* projects at all), but the nominal (or the variable bound by the operator associated with *fp*), that receives a θ-role from a θ-assigner like V. It follows that focus

---

15 The implication is that the A/A’ status of [Spec, T] is parameterized, possibly determined by some language-specific property of T, if [Spec, T] is an A-position in English but an A’-position in Japanese. If [Spec, T] is universally an A-position, then the subject in Japanese, if it is indeed in an A’-position, must be occupying some position other than [Spec, T]; it could be an adjunct to a projection of T. The argument to follow holds even if the subject is an adjunct, as long as it is a non-θ-bearer in the minimal domain of T (compare the definition of domain in Chomsky (1995: 178) in terms of containment and the one in Chomsky (1995: 299) in terms of inclusion). See also Ueda (2000), who adopts Fukui’s A’-status view of the Japanese subject.
particles, adverbs, and subjects in [Spec, T] all do not assume a \( \theta \)-role. From this we expect that not only adverbs but also subjects act as potential interveners to block movement of FF\((fp)\). In fact, examples like (5)-(10) show that \textit{dake}, \textit{made} and \textit{shika} cannot extend their scope across the boundary of a subject-containing clause. This is an intervention effect of the subject, blocking movement of FF\((fp)\) over a clausal boundary across the subject.

Note that we are abstracting away the distinction between phrasal and non-phrasal categories, which does not have an independent status in the bare phrase structure theory (Chomsky (1994, 1995: Ch. 4)). We could, however, say that FPP (Focus Particle Phase), AdvP, and NP/DP in [Spec, T] all do not assume a \( \theta \)-role, where FPP is headed by a focus particle taking a phrase like NP/DP as its complement.

Diesing (1992) argues that the subject of an individual-level predicate is base-generated in [Spec, I] without raising and is assigned a \( \theta \)-role by I. It is not clear whether Diesing’s analysis is translatable into our current framework, but let us assume that it is, and that the subject of an individual predicate assumes a \( \theta \)-role. If so, then such a subject should behave similarly to the dative complement in (32)/(33) and should not cause the relevant intervention effect. Unfortunately, most individual-level predicates are intransitive (one-place) adjectives or take complements whose status as a subject (external argument) or an object (internal argument) is unclear in Japanese, making it difficult to examine whether or not there is any intervention effect of the allegedly \( \theta \)-bearing subject on an internal argument that a focus particle could attach to. One candidate for a two-place individual predicate would be the verb \textit{ar(-u)} ‘be/have\(-\text{Pres}\)’ in the possessive sense, combined with an inalienable abstract object as in (ia), in contrast with (ib), where the possessed object is alienable and concrete:

(ia) Taro-{ga/ni} {talent/money}-Nom have
‘Taro has {talent/money}’

If (ia) but not (ib) involves an individual-level predicate construction with the subject \textit{Taro} assuming a \( \theta \)-role as the sole member of the trivial chain, we expect that a focus particle attaching to the object in (ia) but not in (ib) can take scope across the subject. Consider the following, where the scope of \textit{shika} is marked by the matrix negative:

(ii) boku-wa [Taro-ga wazukana {talent/money}-SK have C comow-anai think-Neg
‘I do not think that Taro has anything but a little {talent/money}’

There indeed seems to be a contrast in the expected direction. But probably we should not readily take it as supporting evidence; note the special nature of the construction involved in (i), where the object is marked nominative and the subject alternates between nominative and dative.
Why, then, is it that sae is unlike dake/made/shika in that FF(sae) can cross a subject to extend its scope to a higher clause, as in (1) and (2)? The answer lies in the target of raising: sae, but not the others, has T as its target of raising. Suppose that FF(sae) in a lower TP first moves to adjoin to its head, T₁. Further movement of FF(sae) from such a position to the head of a higher TP, T₂, is not interfered with by the subject in [Spec, T₁], because FF(sae) and the subject are equidistant from T₂, being in the same minimal domain of T₁:

\[(36) \gamma \text{ and } \beta \text{ are equidistant from } \alpha \text{ if } \gamma \text{ and } \beta \text{ are in the same minimal domain.} \quad \text{(Chomsky (1995: 356))}\]

The clause-boundedness of FF(fp) therefore holds when fp = dake/made/shika but not when fp = sae, because of the difference in their potential targets.

The account just given based on equidistance crucially relies on the assumption that the subject occupies [Spec, T]. While this is plausible for the nominative subject marked with ga, the subject marked with the topic marker wa is presumably located in a position higher than [Spec, T], say [Spec, Top] (or [Spec, C], if one does not assume TopP). If so, FF(sae) moved to T in an embedded clause should not be able to move further to a higher T in the embedding one if the embedded clause contains such a topicalized subject. The prediction is borne out; compare (1), repeated below as (37), with (38):

\[(37) \text{Taro-wa [Aiko-ga Jiro-no okane-sae nusunda] to Taro-Top Aiko-Nom Jiro-Gen money-even stole C shuchooshita claimed} \]
\[\text{‘Taro claimed that Aiko stole even Jiro’s money’}\]

\[(38) \text{Taro-wa [Aiko-wa Jiro-no okane-sae nusunda] to Taro-Top Aiko-Top Jiro-Gen money-even stole C shuchooshita claimed} \]
\[\text{‘Taro claimed that Aiko stole even Jiro’s money’}\]

(38) differs from (37) only in the embedded subject being topicalized by wa, but crucially lacks the matrix scope reading of sae that is available in (37).¹⁸

¹⁸ If mo ‘also’ has T as well as V and v as a target of raising (see note 7), we ex-
In fact, even the subject marked with the nominative ga behaves in the same way as the wa-marked subject if interpreted as focalized, with a focal stress on it; if Aiko-ga in (37) is read as such, the scope of sae must be understood as being within the embedded clause. Assuming that such a focalized phrase occupies the Spec position of FocP located higher than TP, we can attribute the lack of the matrix scope reading to the intervention effect of the focalized subject on FF(sae): [Spec, Foc], just like [Spec, Top], is not in the minimal domain of the T head to which FF(sae) is adjoined, functioning as an intervener between the relevant elements.

8. Absence of Interaction with PRO

We have been considering embedded clauses with an overt subject. Let us consider cases of an embedded clause with PRO as its subject. Thus alongside of sentences like (6) and (8) we have sentences like the following:

(39) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO osake- {made/dake} nomu] koto-o
    Taro-Top Aiko-Dat sake- {even/only} drink C-Acc
    kitaishita
    ‘Taro expected of Aiko that (she) would drink {even/only} sake’

pect that it may take scope across an nominative subject but not across a topic, just like sae. Hasegawa (1994: 11) claims that the scope of mo in (ia) may be within the embedded clause or extend over the matrix one:

    Hanako-Nom Taro-Nom Taro-Top that book-also read C said
    ‘Hanako said that Taro read that book also’

The matrix scope reading of mo should be something with the existential implication that there is something other than the book in question that Hanako said Taro read. While this reading appears possible in (ia), it is definitely impossible in (ib), where the intervening subject is topicalized.

19 See Nakamura (1994), Rizzi (1997), among others, for the C-Top-Foc-T hierarchical order in the clausal structure. Recall that Yanagida (1996) assumes a FocP below IP (=TP). This type of FocP that provides a landing site for overt syntactic movement of the phrase that a focus particle is attached to is not necessary in our framework, though not incompatible with it. See Nishioka (2000), who develops Yanagida’s FocP analysis in his analysis of negative polarity items. See also Miyagawa (1997: esp. 10).
In marked contrast to (6) and (8), (39) allows not only the embedded but also the matrix scope reading of the focus particle involved. Under the matrix scope reading of *made*, (39) is interpreted in such a way as saying that Taro went as far as to expect Aiko to drink SAKE; under the matrix scope reading of *dake*, it is interpreted with an implication that Taro didn’t expect Aiko to drink anything but sake. These matrix scope readings are not possible in (6) and (8), where the embedded subject is overt. The question is why the PRO subject does not block movement of FF(*made/dake*) to the matrix V/v just as the overt subject in (6) and (8) does. Recall that the overt subject in (6)/(8) occupies [Spec, T]; it is raised from a \( \theta \)-position ([Spec, v]) to a non-\( \theta \)-position. Since the raised subject in [Spec, T] does not assume a \( \theta \)-role (but its trace does), it functions on a par with an adverb, behaving as a potential intervener to block feature movement of a focus particle, also a non-\( \theta \)-bearer. However, there is no reason to believe that the PRO subject is raised to [Spec, T]; whatever requires an overt subject to raise to [Spec, T] will not require PRO to raise in the same way. Baltin (1995) in fact argues that PRO does not raise to [Spec, T] but stays inside the predicate phrase. In this connection notice that the tense of the clause embedded by a predicate like *kitaisuru* ‘expect’ or *yurusu* ‘allow/permit’ may alternate between the present and the past when the embedded subject is overt but not when it is PRO:

(40) a. Taro-wa [Aiko-ga | tachinaoru/tachinaotta |] koto-o
    Taro-Top Aiko-Nom | rebound/rebounded | C-Acc
    kitaishita
    ‘Taro expected that Aiko | would rebound / had rebounded |’

\(^{20}\) *Kitaisuru* ‘expect’ appears to require that the embedded clause with an overt subject denote an event with “current relevance” (a notion often associated with the present perfect in English) when the embedded predicate is in the past form; thus there is a contrast as shown in sentences like (i):

( i ) Taro-wa [Aiko-ga | sudeni/*kinoo | shupatsu-shita|koto-o kitaishita
    Taro-Top Aiko-Nom | already/yesterday | left
    C-Acc expected
    ‘Taro expected that Aiko (had) left | already/yesterday |’
b. chichioya-wa [musume-ga rikon- {soru/shita}] koto-o father-Top daughter-Nom divorce- {Pres/Past} C-Acc yurushita permitted ‘the father permitted his daughter’s {getting divorced/ having got divorced}’

(41) a. Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO {tachinaoru/*tachinaotta}] Taro-Top Aiko-Dat {rebound/rebounded} koto-o kitaishita C-Acc expected ‘Taro expected of Aiko that (she) {would rebound/had rebounded}’

b. chichioya-wa musume-ni [PRO rikon- {soru/*shita}] father-Top daughter-Dat divorce- {Pres/Past} koto-o yurushita C-Acc permitted ‘the father permitted his daughter to {divorce / have divorced}’

The embedded T in (40) may be regarded as a substantive category, licensing an overt subject and associated with a distinct interpretation according to whether it is realized by the present form ru or the past ta. But the embedded T in (41) can only be ru, the unmarked form of the tense opposition. This instance of ru appears to be semantically tenseless in itself; it merely functions as a morphological place-holder, unable to license an overt subject. We might even assume that it does not license any subject at all; on this assumption a predicate-internal

---

The embedded T in (40) may be regarded as a substantive category, licensing an overt subject and associated with a distinct interpretation according to whether it is realized by the present form ru or the past ta. But the embedded T in (41) can only be ru, the unmarked form of the tense opposition. This instance of ru appears to be semantically tenseless in itself; it merely functions as a morphological place-holder, unable to license an overt subject. We might even assume that it does not license any subject at all; on this assumption a predicate-internal

---

21 The same ru also appears in the clausal complement to the potential predicate deki ‘can’:

( i ) Aiko(-ni)-wa [PRO tachinaoru] koto-ga deki-nai Aiko(-Dat)-Top rebound C-Nom can-Neg ‘Aiko cannot rebound’

Regarding a sentence like (i), McCawley (1972: 34) conjectures that “deki-clauses have a complement in the present tense only because the complementizer koto must be preceded by a tensed clause, and the present tense, as unmarked tense, is inserted when a complementizer demands that an otherwise tenseless clause contain a tense.” The same remark seems to apply to examples like (41). See also McCawley (1998: 232).
subject cannot raise to its Spec, so that only PRO in a predicate-inte-
ernal position is allowed, an overt subject having a Case feature that
needs to be checked by the substantive T.\textsuperscript{22} For our present purposes
it suffices to assume that PRO may stay in a $\theta$-position like [Spec, v].
In such a position, PRO will be a $\theta$-bearer that does not function to
block the relevant movement just as an intervening complement does
not, as in the following (see also (32)):

\begin{equation}
\text{Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO Jiro-ni okane- | made/dake |}
\text{Taro-Top Aiko-Dat Jiro-Dat money- | even/only |}
\text{watasu] koto-o kitaishita}
\text{hand C-Acc expected}
\text{‘Taro expected of Aiko that (she) would hand | even/only |}
\text{money to Jiro’}
\end{equation}

Here the dative object complement \textit{Jiro-ni} intervenes between the ob-
ject focused by \textit{made/dake} and the matrix V/v, but the matrix scope
reading of \textit{dake/made} is available. This indicates that the dative argu-
ment does not induce an intervention effect on the relevant movement,
for the same reason that PRO in [Spec, v] does not: it is a $\theta$-bearer.

One might question the availability of the matrix scope reading of
\textit{made/dake} in a sentence like (42). In fact, the difference in meaning
between the embedded and the matrix scope readings may not be
appreciable here, perhaps due to some semantic property of the matrix
predicate. With a proper choice of predicates the difference will be
clear, and we can determine the availability of the matrix scope reading
by examining whether the sentence at issue is appropriate in a context
that forces it. Suppose Taro has a daughter, Aiko, who keeps a dog
named Pochi as a pet. Because Aiko has been feeding Pochi too
much fattening food and, moreover, because she wants to continue to
do so, Taro thinks he should not let her feed the dog anything other
than nonfattening food. In such a situation one might say something
like (43):

\begin{equation}
\text{Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO Pochi-ni futoranai}
\text{Taro-Top Aiko-Dat Pochi-Dat nonfattening}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{22} Chomsky (1995: 119) assumes that PRO has null Case, to be checked in the
same configuration as Case of an overt nominal. We ignore this possibility.
ON THE SCOPE OF SOME FOCUS PARTICLES

This sentence is appropriate with the matrix scope reading of *dake*. Now suppose further that Taro in fact went as far as to forbid Aiko to feed Pochi even nonfattening food. Then one might say:

(44) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO Pochi-ni futoranai Taro-Top Aiko-Dat Pochi-Dat nonfattening tabemono-made ageru] koto-o kinjita food-even give C-Acc forbade

‘Taro forbade Aiko to give Pochi even nonfattening food’

Again the sentence makes sense with the matrix scope reading of *made*. Movement of FF(*shika*) to the matrix Neg over a clausal boundary across the embedded subject is likewise possible when the crossed subject is PRO; thus while (10b) is unacceptable due to movement of FF(*shika*) to the matrix Neg with the overt subject in the Spec of the embedded T crossed, (45) below is acceptable since the crossed embedded subject is PRO occupying the Spec of the embedded $v$:

(45) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO osake-shika nomu] koto-o Taro-Top Aiko-Dat sake-SK drink C-Acc kitaishi-nak-atta expect-Neg-Past

‘Taro didn’t expect of Aiko that (she) would drink anything but sake’

Similarly, we have a sentence like (46a), which corresponds to the matrix scope reading of *dake* in (43), as well as one like (46b), which corresponds to its (contextually inappropriate) embedded scope reading (see note 23):


---

23 The embedded scope reading would involve the presupposition that Aiko wants to feed Pochi nonfattening food only, which contradicts the supposition we have made.

24 To the best of my knowledge, a contrast similar to the one between (10b) and (45) was first observed by Muraki (1978).
‘Taro didn’t allow Aiko to give Pochi anything other than nonfattening food’

b. Taro-wa Aiko-ni [PRO Pochi-ni futoranai
Taro-Top Aiko-Dat Pochi-Dat nonfattening tabemono-shika age-nai] koto-o yurushita
food-SK give-Neg C-Acc allowed
‘Taro allowed Aiko not to give Pochi anything other than nonfattening food’

9. Argument against a Scrambling-based Account

One might wonder whether the matrix scope reading that we have been claiming exists in sentences whose embedded clause contains the PRO subject is actually made possible by scrambling the focused object out of the embedded clause to some matrix position, rather than by the pure feature movement we have been arguing for. In this scrambling analysis we would have a structure like the following instead of (39) when the relevant particle is assigned matrix scope:

(47) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [osake- {made/dake}] [PRO ti nomu] koto-o kitaishita

However, it is unclear where the allegedly scrambled object is moving to, given the presence of the matrix dative complement Aiko-ni before the object. Furthermore, the matrix scope reading of the relevant particles in sentences like (42)–(44) would force the scrambling analysis to assume that the embedded dative object as well as the focused object is scrambled to some matrix position to the right of the matrix dative, as in the following:

(48) Taro-wa Aiko-ni [...-ni]; [... {dake/made}]; [PRO t_i t_i V] koto-o ...

But this is quite doubtful; evidence indicates that the embedded dative cannot be scrambled to a matrix position to the right of the matrix dative:

(49) Taro-wa Aiko-ni kibishiku [PRO Pochi-ni esa-o
Taro-Top Aiko-Dat severely Pochi-Dat food-Acc ageru] koto-o kinjita
give C-Acc forbade
‘Taro severely forbade Aiko to give food to Pochi’

(50) *Taro-wa Aiko-ni [Pochi-ni], kibishiku [PRO t_i
Taro-Top Aiko-Dat Pochi-Dat severely
esa-o ageru] koto-o kinjita
food-Acc give C-Acc forbade

(lit.) ‘Taro severely forbade Aiko, to Pochi, to give food’

(50) is derived from (49) by scrambling the embedded dative Pochi-ni to a position to the right of the matrix dative; the position must be somewhere in the matrix clause, since it precedes the matrix element kibishiku ‘severely.’ The unacceptability of (50) indicates the impossi-

bility of such scrambling, hence the implausibility of the scrambling analysis suggested for the matrix scope reading of the focus particles in sentences like (39), (42)–(44).

Yoshimoto (1998) and Nishioka (2000) argue that an NPI like shika in an embedded clause is licensed by the matrix Neg by overt move-

ment of the shika-phrase out of the embedded clause to its Spec. The acceptability of sentences like (45) and (46a), coupled with the argu-

ment just given concerning scrambling, indicates, at least, that their overt movement analysis is not the only way to license shika; the pure feature movement analysis presented in this paper, which is independ-

ently motivated for particles other than shika, should also be an op-

10. Summary and Conclusion

Sae presents characteristics apparently unrelated to each other, in-

cluding:

(A) Its scope may extend over a clause with an overt subject to a higher clause.

(B) Its scope cannot be under a causative element, be it periphrastic (s)ase or the light verb v.

(C) It may not be in the c-command domain of a vP adverb in a simplex sentence.

These are, however, manifestations of a single property of the particle, namely that it has T as a target of raising; they are derived from the interaction of this property with universal principles. Since FF(sae) targets T, it may raise to the embedded T and then on to the matrix T, giving (A); the presence of an overt embedded subject, which other-

wise should function as an intervener to block the relevant movement, does not block it, because the subject and the T-adjoined FF(sae) are equidistant from the matrix T. Since FF(sae) does not target V (nor v) but T, it cannot be under the scope of (s)ase or v, giving (B); a pre-
dicted exception to (B) is when the clausal complement of \textit{sase} contains T, in which case FF(\textit{sae}) can target this embedded T to be within the scope of the causative (see (13)). Since a \textit{vP} adverb is located in a position intervening between T and the object focused by \textit{sae}, the adverb induces an intervention effect on movement of FF(\textit{sae}) to T, giving (C) (see, e.g. (20)).

The other focus particles considered in this paper, \textit{dake}, \textit{made}, and \textit{shika}, do not target T but elements lower than it. This virtually gives the negative counterparts of (A)–(C). Raising of FF(\textit{fp}), where \textit{fp} is \textit{dake}, \textit{made} or \textit{shika}, out of a clause to its potential target in a higher clause is blocked by the intervening subject in the former clause (negation of (A)), unless the subject is PRO, which behaves on a par with a complement occupying a \(\theta\)-position. Because FF(\textit{fp}) may target V/\(v\) if \textit{fp} is \textit{dake} or \textit{made}, \textit{fp} may be within the scope of a causative element located higher than the target (negation of (B)). For the same reason, \textit{fp} may also be within the c-command domain of a \(\textit{vP}\) adverb (negation of (C); see (21)). If \textit{fp} is \textit{shika}, FF(\textit{fp}) targets Neg, and this gives rise to the characteristic corresponding to (C) (not its negation), since Neg, just like T, is higher than \(v\) so that a \(\textit{vP}\)-internal adverb may intervene between \textit{fp} and Neg (see (29)). In short, the target makes all the difference.

There are a couple of theoretical implications worth pointing out, related to the empirical evidence from Japanese (in section 4 and also Sano (2000)) for the assumption that the transitive construction involves the light verb \(v\) taking a VP complement (Chomsky (1995: Ch. 4)). First, although it is generally believed that targets of raising are functional categories, our argument that particles like \textit{dake} and \textit{made} have V as well as \(v\) as a target of raising goes against this belief, and casts some doubt on any proposal that posits a functional category only to provide a target of raising. Second, our analysis goes against the “attraction” view of movement according to which there must be some uninterpretable feature in the target of raising that “attracts” or “agrees with” some corresponding feature in the attractee (Chomsky (1995: Ch. 4)). It is quite implausible for a lexical category like V to assume an uninterpretable feature attracting \textit{dake} or \textit{made} only when the particle is present. An analysis in the opposite direction in fact appears plausible: \textit{dake} and \textit{made} have an uninterpretable feature [nominal], a residue of their historically nominal character, that must be checked off by an interpretable lexical feature of a category like V or \(v\) (assuming
that \( v \) shares with \( V \) some lexical feature; see Aoyagi (1999: 38), Hasegawa (2001); this would trigger raising (not attraction) of [nominal] to such a category.\(^{25}\) Whether an analysis along these lines can be generalized to other focus particles remains to be seen, however.
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