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This paper aims to clarify in terms of the minimalist program the structure of a particular construction to be termed the subject-\textit{because} construction, exemplified by just \textit{because} I'm here now doesn't mean that I didn't go. It will be argued that the construction involves not only the subject-\textit{because} merged in $[\text{Spec, T}]$ but also a null subject in $[\text{Spec, v}]$ whose $\phi$-features delete the uninterpretable $\phi$-features of T. This analysis accounts for the absence of subject-verb agreement for the subject-\textit{because}, its (non)-occurrence in (non)-Case-marking positions, and its failure to agree with emphatic reflexives as well as pronominal subjects in tag-clauses.*
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1. Introduction

Taking the view that uninterpretable features are the mechanism which forces dislocation, Chomsky (1998: 37) assumes that T (Tense) has uninterpretable features of two types: its $\phi$-features and its selectional feature EPP (Extended Projection Principle) which requires that something be merged in subject position. As an implementation of this assumption, consider the derivations of a sentence like an unpopular candidate was elected. At some point in the derivation, this sentence has the structure shown in (1a), where the $\phi$-features of T seek

* This paper is an extended and revised version of the presentation I made at the 72nd general meeting of the English Literary Society of Japan held at Rikyo University on May 20–21, 2000. I am indebted to June Abe, Masachiyo Amano, Sadao Ando, Noboru Kamiya, Heizo Nakajima, Ken-ichi Takami, and two anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions and criticism for earlier versions of this paper. I am particularly indebted to Jude Gretchen, Eloise Pearson Hamatani, and Daniel Long for acting as my informants. Needless to say, all remaining errors are mine.
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for its Goal and Agree with $\phi$-features of an unpopular candidate. The Case is deleted as an ancillary operation of Agree because structural Case is taken to be a reflex of $\phi$-features (Chomsky (1998)). At the stage that the subject merges in [Spec, T], T deletes its strong EPP feature against the [N-] feature of the subject, thereby yielding the dislocated structure (1b).¹

(1) a. T-was [vP elected [DP an unpopular candidate]]

$$\{\text{EPP, } \not\exists\} \quad \{\not\exists, \text{CASE, N}\}$$

AGREE

b. [TP [DP an unpopular candidate], T-was [vP elected ti]]

$$\{\not\exists, \text{CASE, N}\} \quad \{\text{EPP, } \not\exists\}$$

Successful implementation of the operation deletes all of the uninterpretable features, making the derivation converge.

This approach gains initial plausibility from the ungrammaticality of (2a–d), which show that adverbial clauses cannot occupy subject positions ((2a, b) are from Jackendoff (1977: 97)). Since adverbial clauses are not nominal categories, they don’t have Case or $\phi$-features necessary to delete the uninterpretable $\phi$-features of T. The $\phi$-features of T remain undeleted, crashing the derivation.

(2) a. *When you tickle me bothers me.

b. *If she came wouldn’t surprise me.

c. *Although the car is made in Japan doesn’t mean that it is wholly reliable.

d. *Since I’m here now proves that I didn’t go.

Evidence that adverbial clauses lack Case comes from sentences like (3), in each of which the sentence-anaphor it refers to the content of an adverbial clause in a left-peripheral position ((3a, b) are from Jackendoff (1977: 97)). Since the [N-] feature and $\phi$-features of it delete the EPP and $\phi$-features of T respectively, T has no features to delete Case. Therefore, if adverbial clauses had Case, (3a–d) would be unacceptable contrary to the fact.

¹ In an attempt to eliminate categorial features from the narrow syntax, Chomsky (1999: 5) assumes that “[person] plays the role formerly assigned to [D] or [N] features.” As far as, however, there is no overwhelming evidence that [person] plays a crucial role in deleting the EPP feature of T, it is not problematic to assume, following Chomsky (1995), that the [N-] feature of a nominal category deletes the EPP feature of T. We will return to this point in section 7.
(3) a. When you tickle me, it bothers me.
b. If she came, it wouldn't surprise me.
c. Although the car is made in Japan, it doesn't mean that it is wholly reliable.
d. Since I'm here now, it proves that I didn't go.

It is worth noting at this point that because-clauses, though normally adverbial, can occupy subject positions as shown in (4a–e). If the account of (1) is right, sentences in (4) should be unacceptable like those in (2).

(4) a. (Just) because I object to his promotion doesn't mean that I'm vindictive. (Quirk et al. (1985: 1106))
b. Just because he is a professor of medicine at Cambridge does not make his findings unquestionable.
   (British National Corpus (BNC), A3N 143)
c. Just because they have been disowned by Labour has not stopped them hitching their star to its bandwagon.
   (BNC, AJM 1145)
d. Just because you crumb up your marriage doesn't give you a right to recreate Lissa as Cruella de Ville in high heels.
   (BNC, A6W 649)
e. Just because they work smoothly and efficiently and have a good reputation is no excuse for not keeping actively in touch with this area.
   (BNC, HBN 844)

A question that now arises is why the because-clauses in (4) can occupy subject positions though they are normally adverbial.

Hirose (1991, 1998) fully discusses some semantic peculiarities of this construction in terms of the construction grammar,2 but to the best of

---

2 Hirose (1991, 1998) points out that the subject-because construction exhibits two peculiarities, which are hard to accommodate in the framework of the generative grammar. First, the construction must be a negative sentence.

( i )  \( \{ \text{that}/*\text{just because} \} \) John is absent means that he is sick.

(Hirose (1998: 9))

Second, the main verbs of the construction must be such as verbs of inference (prove, show, mean, etc.), a copular-verb, and causative verbs (make, oblige, force, etc.) (see (4a–e)). Although these are important to investigate, we would like to leave them for future research and limit ourselves to clarifying the structure of the construction in minimalist terms. See Hirose (1998) for the illuminating account of the peculiarities in question.
my knowledge, no generative literature has so far brought serious attention to the syntax of the construction in question. The purpose of this paper is to provide an answer of the question raised just above, and make it clear what structure the subject-\textit{because} construction has. In considering these questions, we follow the general assumptions of the minimalist program developed by Chomsky (1995, 1998).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 shows that the subject-\textit{because}, like an ordinary subject, occupies [Spec, T] at some point in the derivation. Section 3 gives several arguments that the subject-\textit{because} is a nominal category which lacks Case and $\phi$-features. Section 4 clarifies the syntactic structure of the subject-\textit{because}-construction. Section 5 examines the adequacy of the structure proposed in section 4. Section 6 presents further arguments for our analysis. Section 7 concludes this paper.

2. Subject Properties of the Subject-\textit{Because}

In this section, we show that the subject-\textit{because} behaves like an ordinary subject with respect to several syntactic operations, and conclude that it occupies [Spec, T] at some point in the derivation.

Evidence for the subjecthood of the subject-\textit{because} comes from conjunction reduction. A well-formed reduction of two clauses results when the shared chunk of material in both clauses fills the same syntactic role, namely subject. This generalization is exemplified by (5a–d), taken from Anderson (1975: 9).

\begin{enumerate}
\item (5) a. John bought a banana and ___ sold his old rutabaga. (SUBJ–SUBJ)
\item b. John bought the last rutabaga and ___ gloated. (SUBJ–SUBJ)
\item c. *John likes rutabagas but ___ disagree with me. (OBJ–SUBJ)
\item d. *Rutabagas grow around here, but John hates ___. (SUBJ–OBJ)
\end{enumerate}

With this point in mind, observe (6), where the subject-\textit{because} undergoes the conjunction reduction like \textit{John} in (5a, b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item (6) Just because you are older than me doesn’t mean that you are superior to me or ___ justify the fact that you despised me. (SUBJ–SUBJ)
\end{enumerate}

The fact that (6) is grammatical like (5a, b) thus reveals that the
subject-*because* is a subject at some point of the derivation. Only form this fact, we cannot determine which structural positions the subject-*because* occupies.

Consider (7a, b), where the subject-*because* moves out of non-finite complements to raising predicates such as *seem*.

(7) a. Just because there’s a word for beauty seems to be no reason to argue that there’s such a thing as beauty.
b. Just because the car is made in Japan seems to be no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable.

Raising out of non-finite complements to *seem* is restricted to subjects originated in [Spec, T] (Bresnan (1994: 95–96)). Non-subjects cannot be raised out of non-finite complements to *seem* as illustrated by *John *seems*[you to like ti]. Thus, the grammaticality of (7a, b) shows that the subject-*because* originates in [Spec, T] and raises to the matrix subject position as shown in (8).

(8) [TP [because the car ...]] T seemed [TP t; to be no reason ...]]

Further evidence comes from the consideration of long-distance extraction out of *that*-clauses. As is obvious from the paradigm (9), non-subjects can be extracted out of *that*-clauses, but subjects occupying [Spec, T] cannot.

(9) a. Rutabagas, she thinks that John hates ___.
b. How did you think that John fixed the car ___?
c. John, she thinks (*that__) hates rutabagas.

This phenomenon, called the *that*-trace effect, is also displayed when the subject-*because* is extracted out of *that*-clauses.

(10) Just because the car is made in Japan, I think (*that__) doesn’t mean that it is wholly reliable.

The grammaticality of (10) thus proves that the subject-*because* occupies [Spec, T] before moving to a left-peripheral position.

The facts offered above have made it possible to conclude that the subject-*because*, like an ordinary subject, occupies [Spec, T] at some level of the derivation as shown in (11) below.

(11) [TP [because I’m here now] T-doesn’t [vP mean that I didn’t go]]

This conclusion, if it is right, raises the following question:

(12) Does the subject-*because* bear the [N-] feature, Case, and *-features needed to delete the EPP and *-features of T? In what follows, we will consider the question (12) and show that the
subject-because has neither Case nor φ-features, but the [N-] feature needed to delete the strong EPP feature of T.

3. The Subject-Because and Its Formal Features

3.1. Does the Subject-Because Bear [N-] Feature?

An adverbial because-clause has often been analyzed as PP with CP being the complement to P (see (13)), which we call the PP analysis for convenience (cf. Emonds (1978, 1985)).

(13) [PP because [CP John likes Mary]]

The PP analysis of adverbial clauses renders it plausible to hypothesize that the subject-because is also PP. This might seem to be right, since the subject-because shows the same distribution as the PP subject of locative inversion. Note that both the subject-because and the PP subject can appear immediately to the right of C (Complementizer), i.e. that, as shown in (14) and (15) below.

(14) I expect that on these trails can be found many kinds of mushrooms.

(15) a. Elizabeth could reassure Harry that just because she wants to do things for herself doesn’t mean that she doesn’t want him. (BNC, 3SC 400)

b. Some people think that just because the car is made in Japan doesn’t mean that it is wholly reliable.

These examples may support the PP analysis of the subject-because, but the subject-because can occupy positions that the PP subject of locative inversion cannot, that is, positions unique to nominal categories. First, the subject-because can appear immediately to the right of the Aux (Auxiliary) preposed by the SAI (Subject-Aux Inversion) to form a yes-no question (see (16a, b)).

(16) a. Doesn’t just because there’s a word for beauty mean that there’s such a thing as beauty?

b. Isn’t just because the car is made in Japan a reason to argue that it is wholly reliable?

Such a position is where only nominal categories can appear, as shown by the following paradigm ((17a–c) are taken from Abney (1987: 172); (17d) is from Bresnan (1994: 108)).

(17) a. Does the fact that John smokes stogies bother you?

b. *Does that John smokes stogies bother you?

c. *Would (for John) to smoke stogies bother you?
d. *Was among the ruins found a skeleton?

Second, the subject-\textit{because} can occupy the subject position of the ECM (Exceptional Case Marking) complement (see (18a, b)), a position that nominal categories are restricted to appearing as shown by (19a-d) ((19a-c) are taken from Abney (1987: 172); (19d) is from Bresnan (1994: 109)).

(18) a. I believe just because the car is made in Japan to be no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable.
   b. I maintain just because there’s a word for beauty to be no reason to argue there’s such a thing as beauty.

(19) a. I expect the fact that John smokes stogies to bother everyone.
   b. *I expect that John smokes stogies to bother everyone.
   c. *I expect for John to smoke stogies to bother everyone.
   d. *I expect on this wall to be hung a portrait of our founder.

On the basis of the fact that the subject-\textit{because} exhibits the parallel distribution to nominal categories but not to PP, we cannot regard the subject-\textit{because} as PP. It is natural instead to assume that the subject-\textit{because} is a nominal category that bears the [N-] feature to delete the EPP feature of T. Considering this point, we analyze the subject-\textit{because} as NP with CP being a complement to N as in (20) below.

(20) [NP just because [CP John isn’t here]]

The nominal nature of \textit{because} is also supported by the fact that \textit{because} must insert \textit{of} to permit nominal complements (see (21a, b)). Since the \textit{of}-insertion applies only to lexical heads with [N-] feature,

\[3\] It should be noted here that there are PP subjects which undergo the SAI and occupy the ECM subject position ((ia, b), taken from Jaworska (1986: 350))

(i) a. Is after the holidays too late for a family gathering?
   b. They considered after the holidays to be too late for a family gathering.

However, whether these kinds of subjects are purely PPs is controversial. Qurik et al. (1985: 658) view the subjects as derived from sentences that have been restructured so as to leave only the adverbial prepositional phrase:

(ii) a. (The proposal that we meet) on Tuesday will be fine
    b. (Meeting) during the vacation will be fine.

See also Bresnan (1994) for several pieces of evidence that the subjects in (i) belong to nominal categories.
such as nouns and adjectives (Chomsky (1981: 50)), the grammaticality of (21a) serves as support that *because* is a nominal category.

(21) a. because *(of) the heavy traffic
    b. { *although/*unless/*when/*if/*since } of the heavy traffic

3.3. Does the Subject-*Because* Bear φ-Features?

English displays distinctions of number as to subject-verb agreement even when subjects are common nouns (e.g. *the car and the bicycle* {are/*is} *here*), but in that case it doesn’t exhibit any distinctions of person for subject-verb agreement (e.g. *the man/the car* *has just arrived*.). It is therefore eligible to check whether the subject-*because* has a number feature, but not a person feature, of φ-features.4 To see this, observe (22a, b). Here, two subject-*because* clauses are coordinated, but the auxiliary *do* must display singular form for agreement.

(22) a. Just because John hates a rutabaga and just because Mary likes it {doesn’t/*don’t} mean that they don’t get along well together.
  b. Just because North Korea is a communist society and just because (South) Korea is a democratic society {doesn’t/*don’t} mean that they will remain separated forever.

From this fact it follows that the subject-*because* doesn’t have the number feature of the φ-set. If it did, the auxiliary *does* in (22a, b) would display plural form for agreement.

There is another argument in favor of the hypothesis that the subject-*because* lacks the number feature of the φ-set. If the subject-*because* is a nominal category as we argued in the previous subsection, it should be pre-modified by determiners such as *this* and *that* in the same way that nominal categories are.

---

4 In English, all of the noun phrases (except 1st and 2nd person pronouns) are 3rd person for purpose of concord (Quirk et al. (1985: 340)).

(i) {the man/he/the car/it} has just arrived.

One implication of this fact is that [3rd person] is an unmarked value of person feature for nominal categories. It is not unnatural then to assume that the subject-*because* bears [3rd person]. We will return to this point in section 4.2.
The ungrammaticality of (23) is explicable on the assumption that the subject—because lacks the number feature of \( \phi \)-features. In terms of the fact that determiners must agree with nominal heads in number features (e.g. \{these/*that\} books), it is reasonable to assume that determiners bear an uninterpretable number feature which Agrees with the number feature of nominal heads (cf. Abney (1987: 226)). Based upon this assumption, the subject—because in (23) will have the following representation.

(24) *\[DP the/this/that [NP because [we are here]]]\]

In (24) because lacks the number feature of the \( \phi \)-set, and the uninterpretable number feature of D remains undeleted, making the representation illegitimate. On the other hand, if because had the number feature, it would delete the uninterpretable number feature of D, rendering the representation legitimate.

3.3. Does the Subject—Because Bear Case?

Given Chomsky's (1998) thesis that structural Case is a reflex of agreement, it is expected that the subject—because should lack Case, because the subject—because doesn't display subject-verb agreement as we saw in (22) above. This expectation is borne out. Notice that the subject—because cannot appear either in the object position of a preposition (see (25b)) or between the verb and particle (see (26b)), each of which is widely assumed to be a Case-marking position (see (27) and (28)).

(25) a. (Just) because information has been summarized about a data source may not justify the failure to retain the base data.

b. *The failure to retain the base data may not be justified by because information has been summarized about a data source.

(26) a. I found out just because the car is made in Japan to be no reason that it is wholly reliable.

b. *I found just because the car is made in Japan out to be no reason that it is wholly reliable.

(27) a. I learned about John’s weakness for stogies.

b. *I learned about that John smokes stogies.
c. *I learned about of John's weakness for stogies.

\[(28)\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Mikey looked the reference up.
  \item b. *Mikey pointed that Gary had left out.
  \item c. *Mikey teamed with the women up.
\end{itemize}

(Johnson (1991: 593–594))

Also problematic with the hypothesis that the subject-\emph{because} carries Case is the fact that two subject-\emph{because} clauses appear in a sentence-initial position as shown in (29) below.

\[(29)\] After all, just because she had been unaccompanied at Emma's house, just because she had accepted his invitation to dinner, did not mean that she was unattached.

(BNC, GV8 1072)

If the subject-\emph{because} had Case, one of the two subject-\emph{because} clauses in (29) would fail to be Case-checked, crashing the derivation contrary to the fact.

Still worse, the assumption that the subject-\emph{because} has Case forces us to treat the subject-\emph{because} and ordinary \emph{because} as different lexical items. While the subject-\emph{because} has Case, the ordinary \emph{because}-clause doesn't. This loses the fact that both \emph{because}-clauses have the same meaning of reason or cause irrespective of whether they occupy the subject position or not. On the other hand, if we assume the subject-\emph{because} to be a Case-less adverbial clause, there is no need to distinguish the subject-\emph{because} from the ordinary \emph{because}-clause.\(^5\)

The discussions so far lead to the conclusion that the subject-\emph{because} has the [N-] feature, but neither Case nor the number feature of the \(\phi\)-set needed to delete the uninterpretable \(\phi\)-features of T. Notice that the feature specification of the subject-\emph{because} is similar to that of the expletive \emph{there} (Chomsky (1995)). The subject-\emph{because}, like \emph{there}, can delete its [N-] feature against the strong EPP feature of T, but the

\(^5\) Despite these arguments, there appear to be counterexamples against the view that the subject-\emph{because} lacks Case. The subject-\emph{because} appears to the left of raising verbs, an allegedly Case-marked position (see (7) above). This doesn't serve as sufficient evidence, since \emph{that}-clause, the expletive \emph{there}, and the PP subject of locative inversion, all of which arguably lack Case, occupy the same position.

\[(i)\]

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. That John left seems to be true.
  \item b. There seem to be many students in the park.
  \item c. On the hill appears to be located a cathedral.
\end{itemize}

(Bresnan (1994: 96))
uninterpretable \( \phi \)-features of T remain undeleted because the subject-
because lacks the number feature of \( \phi \)-set (see (30)).

(30) \[ TP \text{ [because I'm here now] T-doesn't mean that I didn't go]} \]
\[ \{ N \} \quad \{ \text{EPP, } \phi \} \]
A question that we must ask is summarized as follows:

(31) Why can the subject-because occupy [Spec, T] though the
uninterpretable \( \phi \)-features of T remain undeleted?

4. A Structure of the Subject-Because Construction

In this section, we will explore a possible solution for the question
(31), and spell out the syntactic structure of the subject-because con-
struction.

4.1. A Possible Analysis

One plausible analysis of the subject-because construction is to apply
Authier's (1991) analysis of sentential subject constructions to the con-
struction in question. Based on the observation that sentential sub-
jects behave in parallel with topic phrases (cf. Emonds (1976), Koster
(1978), Safir (1985)), Authier assumes that sentential subjects are topics
base-generated in left-peripheral positions and that the constructions in-
volve the movement of a null wh-operator to an A' -position, as illus-
trated in (32) below.

(32) \[ [[\text{That the earth is round}]_{i} \quad [\text{Op}, [TP \, t_{i} \, T- \quad [vP \, t_{i} \, upsets \, John]]]] \]
A similar analysis is provided for the subject-because construction if we
assume that the subject-because is a topic located in a left-peripheral
position (see (33)).

(33) \[ [[\text{because ...}]_{i} \quad [\text{Op}, [TP \, t_{i} \, T-doesn't \, t_{i} \, mean \, that \, ...]]]] \]
\[ \{ \text{N, } \not\phi, \text{ CASE} \} \quad \{ \text{EPP, } \not\phi \} \]
The trace of Op, being a variable, bears [N-], Case, and \( \phi \)-features,
which suffice to delete the uninterpretable EPP and \( \phi \)-features of T.
This analysis thus has answered the question (31), but it runs into
several difficulties as we will see below. To see the first problem, con-
sider the following pair of sentences:6

6 According to our informants, (34a) seems awkward in written English, but is
fully acceptable in colloquial English.
(34)  a. Some people think just because the car is made in Japan doesn’t mean it is wholly reliable.
    b. *We think John, Robin dislikes.
The difference between (34a) and (34b) demonstrates that the subject-
*because can appear in null-that clauses, but topic elements cannot, and
therefore indicates the need to distinguish the subject- *because from the
topic element.

The Op-analysis raises another problem when we consider the base-
generation position of the subject-*because. In terms of the view that
the core functional categories are C, T, and v, there are two possible
positions for the subject-*because: [Spec, C] and TP-adjoined position.
The possibility of [Spec, C] should be rejected, since the subject-*be-
cause can appear immediately to the right of that (see (15a, b) above).
If we assumed the subject-*because to be base-generated in [Spec, C], it
should precede that contrary to the fact. On the assumption that the
subject-*because is adjoined to TP, on the other hand, we can express
the fact that the subject-*because must follow that. Yet such an
assumption faces a problem. Recall that the subject-*because can
occupy the subject position of the ECM complement as in (18a, b)
above. If the subject-*because is adjoined to TP, the relevant part of
(18a) will have a structure like (35).

(35)  I believe [TP [just because the car is made ...]i [TP Opi to be
        no reason ...]]
Notice that the ECM complement is an argument θ-marked by the
matrix verb. Thus, the adjunction of the subject-*because to the ECM
complement would violate the adjunction condition (36), proposed by
Chomsky (1986: 6).

(36)  Adjunction is possible only to a maximal projection that is
non-argument.

There is yet another problem with the TP-adjunction hypothesis.
According to Johnson (1994), the TP-adjunction structure constitutes a
barrier against head-movement. This is exemplified by (37a, b), taken
from Johnson (1994: 31).

(37)  a. *Has [TP certainly [TP the woman left]]?
    b. *Will [TP probably [TP there be a man at the party]]?
If this is correct, the TP-adjunction hypothesis would predict (16a, b)
above, repeated here as (38a, b), to be ungrammatical on a par with
(37a, b).

(38)  a. Doesn’t just because there’s a word for beauty mean
that there's such a thing as beauty?
b. Isn't just because the car is made in Japan a reason to argue that it is wholly reliable?

Similar problems also occur when we consider the possible landing site of Op. Op cannot be thought to be adjoined to TP. Otherwise, it would predict sentences like (18) to be ungrammatical in breach of the condition (36), and expect sentences like (16) to be ungrammatical because of the TP-adjunction structure being a barrier against head-movement.

To summarize, the problems raised above strongly suggest the failure to assume that the subject-because is a topic located in a left-peripheral position and that the construction involves the movement of Op to an A'-position. Hence, we have to assume that the subject-because is in [Spec, T] at least in overt syntax.

4.2. An Alternative Analysis

In the previous section we have argued that the subject-because occupies [Spec, T] in overt syntax. Now questions arise: Does the subject-because originate in [Spec, v]? Is the subject-because an external argument \( \theta \text{-marked} \) by the verb?

The hypothesis that the subject-because is an external argument of the verb is problematic on empirical grounds. The first problem concerns (29) above, repeated here as (39) for convenience.\(^7\)

(39) After all, just because she had been unaccompanied at Emma's house, just because she had accepted his invitation to dinner, did not mean that she was unattached.

(BNC, GV8 1072)

On the assumption that the subject-because is an argument of the verb, the \( \theta \)-criterion should require it to receive an external \( \theta \)-role from the verb. If so, however, one of the two subject-because clauses in (39) would fail to be \( \theta \)-marked by the verb, giving rise to a violation of the

---

\(^7\) An anonymous reviewer argues that the reason that (39) is acceptable is that the two subject-because clauses are coordinated by a covert conjunct. This suggestion may be interesting, but the construct of a covert conjunct seems to be difficult to postulate, judging from the grammaticality of Mary *(and) Bill agree with the proposal.
\( \theta \)-criterion. Therefore we cannot regard the subject-\textit{because} as an external argument of the verb.\(^8\)

Consideration of small clauses gives an additional support that the subject-\textit{because} is not an external argument of the verb. The subject position of a small clause is taken to be a \( \theta \)-position, since that position cannot be occupied by the expletive \textit{there} (see (40), taken from Radford (1997: 147)).

(40) *I don't consider there any good reason why I should do it.
(cf. I don't consider there to be any good reason why I should do it.)

If the subject-\textit{because} is an argument, then it should occupy the subject position of a small clause. However, this prediction is not fulfilled, as the deviance of (41) shows.

(41) ?I \{consider/believe\} [just because the car is made in Japan no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable].
(cf. I \{consider/believe\} [just because the car is made in Japan to be no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable].)

From the discussions so far it may be concluded that the subject-\textit{because} is a non-argument in the sense that it is not \( \theta \)-marked by the verb. If this is tenable, the \( \theta \)-criterion requires something to be present in the base subject position to receive a \( \theta \)-role from the verb. This makes it natural to postulate that the subject-\textit{because} construction has an empty subject, which occupies a position lower than [Spec, T], namely [Spec, v]. This in turn poses an obvious question: what types of empty categories does the empty subject correspond to? Candidates for the empty subject that come to my mind are PRO, Op, and \textit{pro}. The possibility of PRO is rejected since the controller of PRO must be an argument. Recall that the subject-\textit{because} is not an exter-

---

\(^8\) It should be noted that ECM complements don't allow for the multiple occurrences of subject-\textit{because}-clauses.

(i) *I consider just because she had been unaccompanied at Emma's house, just because she had accepted his invitation to dinner to not have meant that she was unattached]

The ungrammaticality of (i) is accountable if we assume that the outer subject-\textit{because} is adjoined to TP. Since the ECM complements are arguments \( \theta \)-marked by the higher verbs, the TP-adjunction of the outer subject-\textit{because} violates the adjunction condition (36).
nal argument of the verb. Nor is the postulation of Op maintained for the following reason. Assume, following the Op-hypothesis conceived above, that the subject-\textit{because} construction has Op in [Spec, \textit{v}]. Since Op is a \textit{wh}-operator, it must move to an A' -position in the left-peripheral area, as illustrated in (42) below.

(42) $[\text{Op}_i \left[ \text{TP} \left[ \text{just because the car is ...} \right] \text{T-doesn't} \left[ \text{vP} \text{t}_i \text{mean that ...}\right] \right]]$

Note that the Op-movement leaves a variable trace, which obeys Principle C of the binding theory. The principle requires that variables be A-free. In (42), the variable trace in [Spec, \textit{v}] is A-bound by the subject-\textit{because} in [Spec, \textit{T}], thereby violating Principle C. For this reason we cannot look upon Op as occupying [Spec, \textit{v}] in the subject-\textit{because} construction. The remaining possibility is to hypothesize that the empty subject is \textit{pro}. Evidence that \textit{pro} is involved in the subject-\textit{because} construction comes from a sentence that behaves semantically like the subject-\textit{because}-construction, but has an overtly realized pronominal element (compare (43a) and (43b)).

(43) a. Just because I'm here now, it doesn't mean that I didn't go.
   
   b. Just because I'm here now doesn't mean that I didn't go.

In (43a), the sentence anaphor \textit{it} refers to the content of the \textit{because}-clause in a left-peripheral position. (43a) and (43b) have the same interpretation (cf. Hirose (1991: 26–27)). The fact that there is an overt element (i.e. \textit{it}) in a construction sharing the same interpretation with the subject-\textit{because} construction is evidence that there is a corresponding covert element in the relevant construction.

The hypothesis that the subject-\textit{because} construction has \textit{pro} raises yet another question. Why cannot adverbial clauses such as \textit{when}-clause and \textit{since}-clause in (2) above allow \textit{pro} to appear in [Spec, \textit{v}] as in (44) below?

(44) $[^{\text{TP}} \left[ \text{when you tickle me} \right] \text{T-doesn't} \left[ \text{vP} \text{pro mean that ...}\right] ]$

Let us suppose that the subject-\textit{because} and \textit{pro} form a binding relation so as to clarify their coreferential relation. Rizzi (1986: 530) argues that in addition to coindexation and c-command, the binding relation must involve categorial matching between the binder and bindee (see Webeluhuth (1992: 93) for a similar view). This requirement, we would like to rephrase as in (45) for convenience.

(45) The binder and bindee must agree in categorial feature values.
This condition requires that there must be no mismatch between the binder and bindee in categorial feature values. As an illustration of this condition, consider the following pair of parasitic gap construction, taken from Chomsky (1982: 55).9

(46)  a. *a book [[PP from which] I copied t without buying [NP e]]
    b. a book [[NP Op] that I copied t without buying [NP e]]

In (46a) the binder from which is a PP, which doesn’t agree with the bindee that is an NP, and therefore (46a) is ungrammatical. In (46b), on the other hand, both the binder and bindee are NPs and hence it is grammatical.

Given the condition (45), we can provide an answer of the question why sentences in (2) don’t allow for the appearance of pro in [Spec, v]. Recall that adverbial clauses such as when-clause and since-clause are not nominal categories as shown by the grammaticality of (21b). Therefore, such adverbial clauses cannot bind pro because the former don’t agree with the latter in categorial features. If adverbial clauses allowed pro to occur in [Spec, v] as in (44), the condition (45) would be violated. Thus we cannot assume that pro occupies [Spec, v] in sentences like (2). On the other hand, since the subject-because is a nominal category as we argued in section 3.1, the subject-because and pro agree in nominal features and therefore can form a binding relation, satisfying the condition (45).

We have now given several arguments as to the position of the subject-because and the occurrence of pro in [Spec, v]. Now we are in a position to answer the question (31). To summarize, (43b) has the following structure:

(47) [TP [just because I’m here now]i T-doesn’t [vF proi mean that
       {N} {EPP, ′,} {′, CASE
       I didn’t go}]

In (47) pro merges in [Spec, v], where T deletes its ′-features against the ′-features of pro and its Case is deleted. After the subject-because merges in [Spec, T], T deletes its strong EPP feature against the [N-] feature of the subject-because. In (47) all of the three uninterpretable features are deleted and the derivation converges.

If we are to argue that pro resides in [Spec, v] in the subject-because

9 Chomsky attributes this observation to David Pesetsky.
construction, then an obvious question arises: how is *pro* licensed? Adopting Rizzi's (1986) licensing condition on *pro*, we would like to explore a solution of this issue. Rizzi proposes that in order for *pro* to be licensed, (i) it must be Case-marked and (ii) its content must be identified by the features on the designated head.

The first requirement is straightforwardly met since the Case of *pro* is deleted as an ancillary operation of Agree between the *ϕ*-features of T and of *pro*. The second requirement, however, seems to be difficult to satisfy, since in many cases the identification of *pro* needs rich morphological agreement between the *pro* and verb. If rich morphological agreement were the only way to identify *pro*, *pro* would not be identified in the subject-because construction, because of poor morphological agreement in English. However, *pro* is sometimes allowed when the value of the person feature is uniquely determined. According to Farrell (1990), in Brazilian Portuguese a null object appears without any agreement on the licensing head and the null object is uniquely the third person. In English imperatives which don't display subject-verb agreement, *pro* in the subject position is almost always limited to the second person (Potsdam (1998)). These observations show that rich agreement morphology is not a sufficient condition for the identification of *pro*.

Instead of Rizzi’s identification requirement on *pro*, we hypothesize that *pro* can be identified in the subject-because construction due to the binding relation between the subject-because and *pro*. Notice that the subject-because, though it lacks the number feature for agreement, has an unmarked person value for nominal categories, i.e. [3rd person] (see note 4). Therefore, the binding relation between the subject-because and *pro* guarantees that *pro* be limited to the third person.

In sum, we have proposed that the subject-because construction has the structure (47), in which *pro* serves to delete the uninterpretable *ϕ*-features of T. In the next section, we will examine the adequacy of the proposed structure mainly on the base of the facts that we have presented in section 3.

5. The Adequacy of the *Pro*-Analysis for the Subject-Because Construction

5.1. The Absence of Subject-Verb Agreement

Let us at first consider the absence of subject-verb agreement in the
subject-\textit{because} construction. In section 3.2 we have seen that T doesn’t display plural agreement even with coordinated subject-\textit{because} clauses. Relevant examples are repeated here as (48) below for convenience.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Just because John hates a rutabaga and just because Mary likes it \{doesn’t/*don’t\} mean that they don’t get along well together.
\item Just because North Korea is a communist society and just because (South) Korea is a democratic society \{doesn’t/*don’t\} mean that they will remain separated forever.
\end{enumerate}

Interestingly, when the coordinated \textit{because}-clauses are in a left-peripheral position, the sentence anaphor that refers to them must be in singular form as shown in (49a, b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item Just because John hates a rutabaga and just because Mary likes it, \{it doesn’t/*they don’t\} mean that they don’t get along well together.
\item Just because North Korea is a communist society and just because (South) Korea is a democratic society, \{it doesn’t/*they don’t\} mean that they will remain separated forever.
\end{enumerate}

The similarity between (48) and (49) reveals that what T Agrees with in subject-\textit{because} constructions like (48) is the null counterpart of the sentence-anaphor it, or pro with [singular] for the number feature, but not the subject-\textit{because} itself. We can thus attribute the singularity of T in the subject-\textit{because} construction to the fact that the number feature of T Agrees with that of pro as illustrated in (50) below.

\begin{enumerate}
\item [[just because ...] and [just because ...] T-doesn’t [pro mean [singular] [singular] \[AGREE\] [that ...]]
\end{enumerate}

Hence, even if the subject-\textit{because} clauses are coordinated as in (48), T must be in singular form.

\subsection{5.2. The Occurrence of the Subject-\textit{Because} in Case-Marking Positions}

In section 3.3 we have argued that the subject-\textit{because} lacks Case, but as seen in (7) and (18) above it appears in putative case-marking positions such as the ECM subject position and the subject position of
Why can the subject-\textit{because} occupy Case-marking positions though it lacks Case? Let us at first consider the case of (7a, b).

At some point in the derivation, (7b) has the structure shown in (51). There are two possible operations on this structure: either pro is moved into [Spec, T] or the subject-\textit{because} is merged into [Spec, T].

\begin{equation}
(51) \begin{array}{c}
\text{[TP} \quad \text{T-to } [vP \text{ pro} \text{ be no reason to } ...]
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\{EPP\} \quad \{\phi, \text{CASE}\}

Raising pro is not allowed, since Move is more costly than Merge. Therefore, the subject-\textit{because} is inserted via Merge as shown in (52).

\begin{equation}
(52) \begin{array}{c}
\text{[TP} \quad \text{[because the car is made ...]i T-to } [vP \text{ pro} \text{ be no reason } ...]
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\{N\} \quad \{EPP\} \quad \{\phi, \text{CASE}\}

Subsequent to the merger of (52) with the matrix verb \textit{seem} and T, we have the structure shown in (53), where the \phi-features of the matrix T Agree with those of pro and its Case is deleted.

\begin{equation}
(53) \begin{array}{c}
\text{[TP} \quad \text{[just because } ...]i T-to be } [vP \text{ pro} \text{ be no reason }
\end{array}
\end{equation}

\{EPP, \phi\} \quad \{\phi, \text{CASE}\}

AGREE

...]]

At this point the only legitimate operation is raising the subject-\textit{because} into [Spec, T] of the matrix clause to delete the EPP feature of the matrix T. Raising of pro into [Spec, T] would skip [Spec, T] of the embedded clause and violate the Minimal Link Condition.\textsuperscript{10}

Let us see how the pro-analysis can account for the appearance of the subject-\textit{because} in the ECM subject position (see (18a, b) above). At some point in the derivation, (18a) has the same structure as (52) above, in which the subject-\textit{because} merges in [Spec, T] for the same reason that we mentioned above. With (52) merging with the matrix

\textsuperscript{10} An anonymous reviewer argues that the present analysis would predict (i) to be grammatical.

( i ) *There is likely just because the car is made in Japan to be no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable.

The ungrammaticality of (i) lies in the inherent property of the expletive \textit{there}; it is inserted only in subject positions of verbs of existence and appearance. In (i) \textit{there} is merged in the subject position of \textit{likely} which doesn’t belong to verbs of existence and appearance, and hence (i) is ungrammatical.
verb believe, we have a structure like (54), where Agree deletes the \( \phi \)-set of believe and Case of pro.

\[
(54) \quad [\text{vP} \text{believe} [\text{TP} [\text{because the car is made}]i \text{T-to} [\text{vP} \text{pro}i \text{be no} \{\phi\} \{\phi, \text{CASE}\} \text{AGREE}]]]
\]

It is interesting at this point to suppose that the subject-\textit{because} carried \( \phi \)-features and raised into [Spec, T] of the matrix clause as shown in (55) below.

\[
(55) \quad *[\text{TP} [\text{because the car is made}]i \text{T} [\text{vP} \text{believe} [\text{TP} i \text{to} [\text{vP} \text{pro}i \text{be no} \{\phi, \text{N}\} \{\phi, \text{EPP}\} \text{no reason}]]]
\]

In this case, the \( \phi \)-features of the subject-\textit{because} would delete those of the matrix T, incorrectly making the derivation converge. Recall that the \( \phi \)-features of a nominal category are interpretable and still available even when checked. On the other hand, if the subject-\textit{because} lacks \( \phi \)-features, the \( \phi \)-features of the matrix T remain undeleted and the derivation crashes. This gives an additional argument for the view that the subject-\textit{because} lacks \( \phi \)-features needed to delete the \( \phi \)-features of T.

5.3. The Non-Occurrence of the Subject-\textit{Because} in a Non-Case-Marking Position

If the conclusion reached at in section 3.3 that the subject-\textit{because} lacks Case is right, it is predicted that the subject-\textit{because} should be in a non-Case marking position. This prediction, however, is not borne out (see (56a, b)).

\[
(56) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{*It is likely [because the car is made in Japan to be no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable].} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*It is believed [because the car is made in Japan to be no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable].}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that the expletive \textit{there}, though it lacks Case, cannot be in a non-Case-marking position.

\[
(57) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{*It is likely [there to be a riot in Tokyo].} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*It is believed [there to be a riot in Tokyo].}
\end{align*}
\]

The ungrammaticality of (57) is explicable on the standard assumption that \textit{there} lacks Case. Since T of a raising complement doesn’t have \( \phi \)-features necessary to delete Case, the associate \textit{a riot} has to Agree
with the matrix T in their $\emptyset$-features. But at the stage that the matrix subject it merges in [Spec, T], the matrix T has no $\emptyset$-features to delete the Case of it. Accordingly, the Case remains undeleted, crashing the derivation.

A similar account is provided for the ungrammaticality of (56a, b) under the pro-analysis of the subject-because construction. At the stage that the subject-because is inserted in [Spec, T] via Merge, (56a) has the structure shown in (58), where the [N-] feature of the subject-because deletes the EPP feature of the non-finite T but the Case of pro is left undeleted.

\[
(58) \quad \text{[TP [because the car is ...]}_{i} \text{ to } \text{pro}_{i} \text{ be no reason to ...]}_{i}\]
\[
\quad \{\text{N}\} \quad \{\text{EPP}\} \quad \{\emptyset, \text{CASE}\}
\]

After (58) merges with the matrix TP, (56a) will have the structure shown in (59), where Agree deletes the $\emptyset$-features of the matrix T and the Case of pro. At this point the matrix T has no $\emptyset$ features to delete Case, and therefore the Case of it remains undeleted, crashing the derivation.

\[
(59) \quad *[\text{TP it T-is likely [TP [because the car ...]}_{i} \text{ [to pro}_{i}\]
\quad \{\emptyset, \text{CASE, N}\} \quad \{\text{EPP, }\emptyset\} \quad \{\emptyset, \text{CASE}\}
\quad \underline{\text{AGREE}}
\quad \text{be no reason to]}_{i}]]
\]

It is necessary at this point to note that the ungrammaticality of (56a, b) can be accounted for even on the hypothesis that the subject-because bears $\emptyset$-features. Since T of a raising complement lacks $\emptyset$-features necessary to delete Case, the subject-because deletes its $\emptyset$-features against those of the matrix T. The Case of the matrix subject it is left undeleted, and so the derivation crashes. However, we have provided several arguments that the subject-because lacks $\emptyset$-features. If we adopted the hypothesis that the subject-because bears $\emptyset$-features, the facts in (22) and (23) would remain unaccountable. Thus we have to account for the ungrammaticality of (56a, b) without recourse to the hypothesis that the subject-because bears $\emptyset$-features.

In this section, we have shown that the proposed structure (47) captures the inability of T to agree with the subject-because, its occurrence in Case-marking positions, and its non-occurrence in non-Case-marking positions. In the next section, we will offer further arguments for the present analysis of the subject-because construction.
6. Further Arguments for the Pro-Analysis of the Subject-Because Construction

6.1. Emphatic Reflexive

The first argument for the pro-analysis has something to do with emphatic reflexive pronouns. When emphatic reflexive pronouns float away from their antecedents, the grammatical functions of the antecedents must be subjects as the paradigm (60) shows.

(60)  a. Bob is himself unwilling to do that.
      b. That is in itself sufficient reason.
      c. *I gave Bob a book himself.
      d. *I talked about that to Bill in itself. (Postal (1974: 196))

In addition to this requirement, the floating emphatic reflexives must agree with the antecedents in number features as shown in (61).

(61) The Wright brothers financed all the work {*himself/they} by operating a small bicycle shop.

With these points in mind, observe (62). At first sight the subject-because might be thought to be an antecedent of the emphatic reflexive.

(62)  a. Just because courses are attended by women, taught by women and are about women, does not in itself make them feminist. (BNC, CVX 415)
      b. Just because the car is made in Japan is itself no reason to argue that it is wholly reliable.

However, the emphatic reflexive must be in singular form even when two subject-because clauses are coordinated.

(63)  a. Just because John hates a rutabaga and just because Mary likes it doesn’t {it itself/*themselves} mean that they don't get along well together.
      b. Just because North Korea is a communist society and just because (South) Korea is a democratic society doesn’t {it itself/*themselves} mean that they will remain separated forever.

These examples strongly suggest that the subject-because is not an antecedent of the emphatic reflexive. If we assume that the subject-because bears the number feature of š-features, why the emphatic reflexive in (63) must be in singular form is left unanswered. The singularity of the emphatic reflexive, on the other hand, follows from the pro-analysis. In each of (63a, b), pro in [Spec, v] has [singular] for the
number feature with which the emphatic reflexive agrees, and hence the reflexive must be in singular form. Thus, (63a, b) lend further support to the pro-analysis of the subject-because construction.

6.2. Tag-Questions
There is another argument in support of the pro-analysis of the subject-because construction, which concerns tag-questions. As we can see from tag-questions like (64a, b), the pronominal subject of a tag clause must agree with the subject of the main clause in number features.

(64) a. John and Bob fooled Mary, didn’t {they/*he/*she}?
   b. John and Bob were fooled by Mary, weren’t {they/*he/*she}?

Note that tags can combine with the subject-because construction.

(65) Just because I’m here now doesn’t mean I didn’t go, does it?
In (65), the subject-because might appear to be an antecedent of the pronoun it in the tag-clause. However, the pronominal subject of a tag clause must be in singular form even if two subject-because clauses are coordinated.

(66) a. Just because John hates a rutabaga and just because Mary likes it doesn’t mean that they don’t get along well together, does {it/*they}.
   b. Just because North Korea is a communist society and just because (South) Korea is a democratic society doesn’t mean that they will remain separated forever, does {it/*they}.

The facts in (66) strongly suggest that the subject-because is not an antecedent of the pronominal subject of a tag-clause. Under the pro-analysis the singularity of the pronominal subject in (66) can be attributed to the presence of pro in [Spec, v]. The number feature of the pronominal subject in a tag-clause matches that of pro, and hence the subject must be in singular form. On the other hand, if we assume that the subject-because has the number feature of -features, why the pronominal subject is always singular as in (66a, b) remains unexplained.

6.3. Why Cannot Because of Occupy the Subject Position?
In subsection 3.2 we have concluded that the subject-because is a nominal category with [N-] feature, and supported this conclusion by
noting that *because takes nominal complements by inserting of. This argument, however, entails that *because of because of is also a nominal. It is then predicted that the because of should occupy [Spec, T] like a subject-because. This prediction is not borne out, however (see (67)).

(67) *[just because of my being here] doesn’t mean that I didn’t go.

This problem is solvable under the pro-analysis given the view that because of is a compound consisting of because and of (Emonds (1985)). This is evident from the fact that intensifiers such as just and merely cannot intervene between because and of as shown by the ungrammaticality of *because {just/merely} of the bad weather. Provided that because of is a compound, its category status is established by Williams’s (1981) righthand head rule, which states that the righthand head of a compound determines its syntactic category and so must itself belong to a syntactic category. The righthand head rule requires that the structure of because of be the one shown in (68). Here, of is the righthand head of because of, and therefore must itself become the syntactic category of because of.

(68) PP [-N]
    /    /
   P0 [-N]
    /  /
[N⁺N] N⁻¹ P⁻¹ [-N]
    /  /
because of

Given that the category of because of is P, the pro-analysis can account for the ungrammaticality of (67). (67) will be assigned a structure like (69).

(69) *[TP [PP because of my being here] T-doesn’t [.P pro mean ...]]

If because of merges in [Spec, T], because of and pro don’t agree in categorial feature values, violating the condition (45). Therefore, the condition (45) prevents because of from occupying [Spec, T].

11 We are grateful to Masachiyo Amano for pointing out this problem.
7. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have clarified a syntactic structure of the subject-
because construction, a main feature of which is to hypothesize that the construction involves not only the subject-because merged in [Spec, T], but also an implicit subject whose $\phi$-features agree with the $\phi$-features of T. The proposed structure has accounted for the singularity of T for the subject-because, its occurrence in Case-marking positions, its non-occurrence in non-Case-marking positions, and its inability to agree with the emphatic reflexive as well as the pronominal subject in a tag-clause.

Finally, we would like to consider some implications of our analysis for the minimalist program. First, if the present analysis is on the right track, it constitutes an argument in favor of the view that the EPP feature and Case are divorced (Collins (1997), Chomsky (1995, 1998, 1999)). Recall that we crucially assume that the deletion of the EPP feature by the subject-because operates independently of the deletion of Case of the empty subject. This manner of “feature-checking” is similar to the one implemented in there constructions. Our analysis therefore is valid only under the hypothesis that the EPP feature exists independently of Case.

Recall that our analysis crucially makes use of the categorial feature [N-] in order to delete the EPP feature of T. As opposed to the framework of Chomsky (1995), Chomsky (1999: 5) seeks to get rid of categorial features from the computational system of a language, and reduce their roles to [person] features. It is not clear whether there is a priori reason that [person] features are more adequate than categorial features to delete the EPP feature of T. However, our analysis, as it stands, provides support for the relevance of categorial features to the computational system.
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