A NON-EXCEPTIONAL APPROACH TO EXCEPTIONAL CASE-MARKING IN JAPANESE

KEIICHIRO KOBAYASHI and HIDEKI MAKI

Kanto Gakuin University and Gifu University

Japanese has Multiple Object Constructions because the transitive light verb *v* can multiply agree with its objects. By virtue of this property of the transitive light verb *v*, Japanese also has ECM Constructions with finite complement clauses. When the matrix *v* has multiple EPP-features, the whole complement clause is first attracted to the matrix *v*P-Spec, followed by subsequent Attract of the embedded accusative subject to the outer-Spec of *v*. Rich productivity of the construction follows from the fact that it only makes use of the general devices of the language. With such devices being unavailable, English ECM Constructions are lexically-specified and void of such rich productivity.*

Keywords: *Exceptional Case-Marking, multiple object construction, the EPP-feature*

1. Introduction

In Rosenbaum (1967) and Postal (1974) the alternation in (1) was described by a transformational rule that raises the complement subject to the matrix object. Kuno (1976) proposed that Japanese examples like (2b), i.e. the so-called “ECM Constructions” (ECMCs, hereafter), derive from the structure of (2a) through the same operation.¹

* For invaluable comments leading up to the final version, we are grateful to two anonymous *EL* reviewers. An earlier version of this paper was read at Yokohama National University. We are indebted to Yoshio Endo, Roger Martin, Kazumi Matsuoka, Toshikazu Ikuta, Hideaki Yamashita and other participants in that meeting for their comments. Thanks are also due to Ae-Ryung Kim for pointing out interesting Korean examples, which we couldn’t discuss in this article because of the space restriction. Needless to say, all remaining inadequacies are our own.

¹ We will use the term ECMCs simply as a descriptive label for constructions like (2b).

- (1) a. I believe that John is an honest boy.
 b. I believe John to be an honest boy.
- (2) a. John-ga Mary-ga tensai da to omotta/shinjita/
 John-Nom Mary-Nom genius is that thought/believed/
 minashita.
 considered
 ‘John thought/believed/considered that Mary was a
 genius.’
 b. John-ga Mary-o tensai da to omotta/shinjita/
 John-Nom Mary-Acc genius is that thought/believed/
 minashita.
 considered

However, the alternation in (2) differs from that in (1) in several respects. For example, as Kuno (1976: 40–41) himself points out, irrespective of the Case form of the complement subject, the embedded clause is tensed both in (2a) and (2b). Note that *da* is generally regarded as a finite copula. The aim of this paper is to clarify how the alternation in (2) differs from that in (1). Specifically we argue that ECMCs like (2b) are Multiple Object Constructions in one of their possible structures where the accusative NP is the outer object of the matrix verb and the remaining complement clause is its inner object, with the former having been raised from the latter.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we briefly review previous analyses of ECMCs and their problems. Section 3 provides our analysis of Japanese ECMCs. Section 4 discusses consequences of our claim, and Section 5 concludes this paper.

2. Previous Analyses

2.1. The Overt A-Movement Analysis

Kuno (1976) points out that the fact in (3) where the accusative NP precedes the matrix adverb suggests that the NP has raised to the matrix object position in (2b).

- (3) Yamada-wa Tanaka-o, orokanimo, tensai da to
 Yamada-Top Tanaka-Acc stupidly genius is that
 omotte ita.
 thinking was
 Lit. ‘Yamada thought Tanaka, stupidly, was a genius.’

Though the exact landing site of the accusative NP is different de-

pending on the definition of the object position, the raising analysis of English ECMCs is proposed in recent frameworks, such as Lasnik and Saito (1991) and Koizumi (1995), among others. Lasnik and Saito point out binding facts as evidence for the analysis, and Sakai (1998) observes parallel facts in Japanese. Consider the examples in (4).

- (4) a. ?*Rie-wa karera-ga_i mujitsu da to otagai-no_i
 Rie-Top they-Nom innocent are that each other-Gen
 shoogen-niyotte shinjite iru.
 testimony-based on believing is
 'Rie believes that they_i are innocent based on each
 other's_i testimony.'
- b. Rie-wa karera-o_i mujitsu da to otagai-no_i
 Rie-Top they-Acc innocent are that each other-Gen
 shoogen-niyotte shinjite iru.
 testimony-based on believing is
 'Rie believes them_i to be innocent based on each other's_i
 testimony.'

The accusative NP in (4b), in contrast to the nominative NP in (4a), binds the anaphor inside the matrix adjunct at the stage where Condition (A) of the Binding Theory applies. Sakai claims that raising of the accusative NP is an overt operation targeting the matrix *vP*.²

However, the acceptability of examples like (5) would be a problem for the overt A-movement analysis.³

- (5) John-ga dare-o hannin daroo ka to kangaete iru.
 John-Nom who-Acc culprit be-Mod Q that thinking is
 'John wonders who probably is the culprit.'
 (Sells' (1990)(26))

² Sakai (1998), as in Oka (1988), does not regard the complementizer *-to* 'that' as a category C. Therefore, it does not head a CP projection, and thus does not block A-movement from the embedded clause in the derivation of (2b) as an improper movement.

³ Ueda (1988: 44) regards (i) as unacceptable. Compare (i) with (5). It is not clear why the lack of a modal in the complement clause in (i) causes unacceptability.

(i) *Boku-wa [dare-o baka ka]-to omotta.
 I-Top who-Acc fool Q that thought
 Lit. 'I wondered who to be stupid.'

Harada (1972) shows with example (6) that a *wh*-phrase must be within the c-command domain of a Q morpheme.

- (6) *_{IP} Dare-ga [_{CP} [_{IP} John-ga sono hon-o katta] ka]
 who-Nom John-Nom that book-Acc bought Q
 shiri-tagatte iru] (koto)
 wanting-to-know is fact
 ‘[who wants to know [Q [John bought that book]]]’

The acceptability of (5) thus shows that the accusative *wh*-phrase remains inside the domain of the Q morpheme *-ka* at LF.

Sakai (1998: 489) observes a similar fact with respect to *wh*-pronouns as Negative Polarity Items (NPIs). When a *wh*-pronoun is separated from the particle *-mo*, which behaves as an NPI together with a *wh*-pronoun, it must be in the c-command domain of the latter. Now, consider (7), where a *wh*-pronoun occurs as an accusative subject.

- (7) Masao-ga dare-o_i [t_i baka da to mo] omotte inai.
 Masao-Nom anyone-Acc fool is that Q thinking ing-Neg
 ‘For no x, Masao thinks that x is a fool.’

(7) is acceptable. Thus, Sakai concludes that the c-command condition can be satisfied by chain-binding. Note that in (7), while the *wh*-pronoun *dare* ‘anyone’ is not in the c-command domain of *-mo* after raising, its trace is. Sakai claims that the c-command condition can be satisfied if the trace of the *wh*-pronoun is in the c-command domain of the licensing morpheme.

If chain-binding holds in (7), it should also hold in (5), and thus, the acceptability of (5) is expected. However, (5) and (7), in contrast to (3), resist the placement of the matrix adverb after the accusative NP, as shown in (8) and (9), suggesting that the accusative NP remains in situ.

- (8) *John-ga dare-o kashikokumo hannin daroo ka to
 John-Nom who-Acc wisely culprit be-Mod Q that
 kangaete iru.
 thinking is
 ‘John wonders who, wisely, would be the culprit.’
 (9) *Masao-ga dare-o kashikokumo baka da to mo
 Masao-Nom anyone-Acc wisely fool is that Q
 omotte inai.
 thinking isn’t
 ‘For no x, Masao thinks that x, wisely, is a fool.’

Also relevant to this issue are the facts of clefting. Postal (1974: 132) points out that while *that*-clause complements of ECM verbs can

occur as a focus of Pseudoclefts, as shown in (10a), ECM complements cannot, as shown in (10b). He attributes the unacceptability of (10b) (Postal's (96a)) to his claim that raising of the complement subject has broken up the constituenthood of the complement clause.⁴

- (10) a. What I believe is that Bill is intelligent.
 b. *What I believe is Bill to be intelligent.

At this point, let us consider the problem of (10b) more carefully under the assumption that the accusative NP in (10b) moves to the matrix ν P-Spec. Also in this case, raising of the accusative NP breaks up the constituenthood of the complement clause. However, the resulting sequence *Bill to be intelligent* is still a constituent, i.e. a matrix ν P, after the matrix verb has moved out of it. Therefore, it seems that the problem of (10b) is not that raising of the accusative NP breaks up the constituenthood of the complement clause, but that the accusative NP moves out of the complement clause. Suppose, as in the analysis of Pseudo-VP Ellipsis in Kim and Sohn (1998), that the formation of a focus phrase in Pseudocleft Constructions involves Attract of a phrase with a focus feature to FocP-Spec above TP to check the same feature of the Foc head, followed by subsequent deletion of the TP. Under this analysis, (10b) cannot be derived because the phrase with a focus feature, i.e. the complement clause, does not dominate the NP *Bill*, when the complement clause is attracted to FocP-Spec. Instead, the structure of (11) will be derived after the complement clause is attracted.

- (11) [_{FocP} [_{t_i} to be intelligent]_j [_{TP} I believe [_{ν P} Bill [_{ν P} t_j]]]]]

TP-deletion must apply to (11) because it is an operation needed to exclude non-focused elements from the focus phrase. However, it cannot delete the TP in (11) because the NP *Bill* contained in the TP does not have its antecedent in the preceding Topic phrase, and is not recoverable.

A problem with the overt A-movement analysis is that the Japanese examples corresponding to (10b) seem to be fairly acceptable. Nakau (1973: 112) regards the Cleft Sentences that focus the *to*-complement

⁴ Cf. Kizu (1997: 236–237) and references therein for the constituenthood of the focus in Japanese cleft sentences.

clauses as ungrammatical. However, they seem to be marginally acceptable to us. Consider (12).

- (12) ?John-ga omotta no wa [Mary-ga/o tensai da]-to
 John-Nom thought Nm Top Mary-Nom/Acc genius is that
 da.
 is
 'What John thought was that Mary was a genius.'

Notably, (12) has the same degree of marginal acceptability, regardless of whether the complement subject is nominative or accusative.⁵ Suppose, for the sake of discussion, that the same analysis that applies to Pseudoclefts in English applies to (12). Then, we can explain the fact in (12) only if the accusative embedded subject is allowed to remain in situ without raising overtly to the matrix *v*P-Spec. In this case, such a problem as was observed in the derivation of (10b) will not arise, even if the complement subject is accusative. That is, (12) will undergo the same derivation as that of (10a), irrespective of whether the complement subject is nominative or accusative. In contrast, if (12) with the accusative NP has only the derivation with overt raising, the above problem will arise, and (12) with the accusative NP will be incorrectly predicted to be as unacceptable as (10b).

2.2. The Accusative NP in the Complement Analysis

On the other hand, if we assume, as in Ueda (1988) and Kaneko

⁵ One of the anonymous *EL* reviewers finds (12) unacceptable, regardless of whether the complement subject is nominative or accusative. We also admit that (12) is awkward. However, it seems to be possible that a phonetic factor caused by the sequence of *da to da* in (12) contributes to the awkwardness of (12). Toshikazu Ikuta (personal communication) points out that (12) sounds more acceptable when the matrix copula *da* is replaced with other forms of copulative expressions. Compare (12) with (i).

(i) John-ga omotta no wa [Mary-ga/o tensai da]-to
 John-Nom thought Nm Top Mary-Nom/Acc genius is that
 dearu/desu/kamo-shirenai/jan.
 is(formal)/is(formal)/may be/is(informal)

Although we have to account for the degradedness of (12) somehow, we would like to regard (12) acceptable in this paper and pay more attention to the fact that the difference of acceptability is not observed in (12) regardless of whether the complement subject is nominative or accusative, in contrast to the case of English examples in (10). We would like to thank Toshikazu Ikuta for bringing the fact in (i) to our attention.

(1988), that the accusative NP remains inside the complement clause and that it is exceptionally Case-marked by the matrix verb (following Chomsky's (1986) analysis of English ECMCs), the acceptability of (5) and (7) is not a problem, but the word-order fact in (3) and the binding fact in (4b) remain problematic.⁶ As for the word-order problem, Kaneko (1988) claims that the surface word order results from scrambling of the accusative NP. However, this account is not desirable if the same account should apply to Raising-to-Subject Constructions. Consider the example in (13) pointed out by Sakai (1998).

- (13) Mary-ga ayamatte tensai da to omow-areta.
 Mary-Nom mistakenly genius is that think-was
 'Mary [was] mistakenly believed to be a genius.'

(13) cannot be derived by scrambling because, as pointed out by Saito (1985), subject NPs cannot undergo scrambling.

2.3. The Accusative NP as a Matrix Object Analysis

The facts in (5) and (7) seem problematic for the analyses in Saito (1983, 1985), Takahashi (1993), Nemoto (1993) and Ura (1994), where the accusative NP is base-generated as a matrix object controlling a *pro* subject of the embedded clause, as shown in (14).

- (14) John-ga Mary-o_i [_{CP} [_{IP} *pro*_i kashikoi] to] omotte iru.
 John-Nom Mary-Acc is-smart that thinking is
 'John thinks of Mary that she is smart.'

(Takahashi's (1993) (34))

Note that if the accusative NP is a direct object of the matrix verb, the accusative *wh*-phrase in (5) and the *wh*-pronoun in (7) must be base-generated outside the c-command domain of the Q morpheme *-ka* and *-mo*, respectively, and the examples are incorrectly predicted to be ungrammatical.

2.4. The Optional Raising Analysis

While the proponents of the overt A-movement analysis propose that raising of the accusative NP is obligatory in Japanese ECMCs, Hiraiwa

⁶ Kaneko (1988) differs from Ueda (1988) in that the accusative NP in his analysis undergoes movement from IP-Spec to CP-Spec.

(2001) claims that it is optional, following Lasnik's (1999a) analysis of English ECMs. Hiraiwa points out that not only the embedded nominative subject but also the accusative subject can follow an embedded adverb, in apparent contradiction to the fact in (3).⁷

- (15) John-ga [[gakkyuu-iin kurai] Mary-ga/-o
 John-Nom class-representative as Mary-Nom/-Acc
 majime da]-to omotta.
 earnest is that thought
 'John thought that Mary was as earnest as a class representa-
 tive.'

Hiraiwa also points out the fact that the accusative NP can be clefted either with an argument in the embedded clause, as shown in (16a), or with the matrix subject, as in (16b) (In (16), Nm = nominalizer).

- (16) a. [John-ga [t_i t_j muite-nai]-to kanjita no] wa
 John-Nom suitable-not that felt Nm Top
 Mary-o_i sono shigoto-ni_j da.
 Mary-Acc the job-Dat is
 Lit. 'It is Mary to the job that John felt to be not suit-
 able.'
- b. [t_i [t_j sono shigoto-ni muite-nai]-to kanjita no]
 the job-Dat suitable-not that felt Nm
 wa John-ga_i Mary-o_j da.
 Top John-Nom Mary-Acc is
 Lit. 'It is John, Mary that felt to be not suitable for the
 job.'

Under the assumption that the focused phrases in Multiple-Cleft Constructions must be clause-mates (cf. Koizumi (1995)), these facts seem to show that the accusative NP raises only optionally.⁸

⁷ We do not quote Hiraiwa's (2001) original example (his (11)) here because of its rather unclear nature of modification. We owe the example in (15) to Yoshio Endo.

⁸ We assumed that the focus of clefting must be a syntactic constituent in the discussion of the example in (12) in Section 2.1. Although multiple foci in (16a, b) may not seem like constituents, they still can be regarded as syntactic constituents. Thus, Koizumi (1995) claims that the multiple foci occur as a result of clefting the VP or some larger phrase out of which the verb has overtly moved. Under this analysis, the multiple foci in (16a, b) would be a VP or some larger phrase, i.e. a

Under this analysis, the accusative NP (=wh-phrase) in (5) and (7) can be Case-marked in situ. However, Hiraiwa's analysis is challenged by the example in (17b) from Sakai (1998), where the accusative NP shows the high binding behavior with respect to Condition (C) of the Binding Theory. Compare (17b) with (17a).

- (17) a. Rie-wa kare-ga_i mujitsu-da to Takashi_i-jishin yori
 Rie-Top he-Nom_i innocent-is that Takashi_i-self than
 tsuyoku shinjite iru.
 strongly believing is
 'Rie believes that he_i is innocent more strongly than
 Takashi himself_i does.'
- b.?*Rie-wa kare-o_i mujitsu-da to Takashi_i-jishin yori
 Rie-Top he-Acc_i innocent-is that Takashi_i-self than
 tsuyoku shinjite iru.
 strongly believing is
 'Rie believes him_i to be innocent more strongly than
 Takashi himself_i does.'

If raising of the accusative NP is optional, (17b) should have a derivation without raising, hence without a violation of Condition (C), contrary to the fact.

Lasnik points out the same problem in English. Consider the examples in (18) from Lasnik (1999a).

- (18) a. Joan believes he_i is a genius even more fervently than
 Bob_i does.
- b. *Joan believes him_i to be a genius even more fervently
 than Bob_i does.

(18b) poses the same problem that (17b) does to the optional raising analysis. To explain the unacceptability of (18b), Lasnik claims that while overt raising of an accusative NP is optional with lexical NPs, it is obligatory with pronouns. This claim is based on the examples in (19) and (20).

- (19) a. Mary made John out to be a fool.
 b. Mary made out John to be a fool.

syntactic constituent, dominating two NPs. The analysis of (16a, b) which we will adopt in Section 3 differs from Koizumi's analysis, but we will still maintain the assumption in question. We thank an anonymous reviewer for clarifying our thinking about the discussion here.

- (20) a. Mary made him out to be a fool.
 b. *Mary made out him to be a fool.

When the ECM verb is a complex predicate like *make out*, the accusative NP *John* is allowed to the right of *out* as well as to the left, as shown in (19). In contrast, an accusative pronoun is not allowed to the right of *out*, as shown in (20b). Assuming that an example like (19a) exhibits overt raising, Lasnik claims that the acceptability of (19b) shows the optionality of overt raising with lexical NPs, and that the unacceptability of (20b) shows the obligatoriness of overt raising with pronouns.

However, it seems that we cannot apply Lasnik's (1999a) account of (18b) to (17b), because an adverb belonging to the complement clause can precede the accusative NP in Japanese, irrespective of whether the latter is a lexical NP or a pronoun. Compare the example in (21) with (15).

- (21) John-ga [[gakkyuu-iin kurai] kanojo-ga/-o
 John-Nom class-representative as she-Nom/-Acc
 majime da]-to omotta.
 earnest is that thought
 'John thought that she was as earnest as a class representative.'

Another possible solution for (17b) under the optional raising analysis is to adopt Yatsushiro's (1996) claim about binding in Japanese. She points out that in (22), the complement of the unaccusative verb remaining in its underlying position binds into the matrix locative phrase.

- (22) Otagai-no heya-ni [Uli to Susi]-ga ita.
 each other-Gen room-Loc Uli and Susi-Nom were
 'Uli and Susi were in each other's room.'

She argues that in Japanese, checking of the EPP-feature of T is not necessary for an NP to act as the specifier of T for the purpose of *binding*; it acts as such if it agrees with T (cf. also Lasnik (1999b: 190–191)).

With this analysis carried over into the probe-goal theory of Agree in Chomsky (2000, 2001), the high binding property of the accusative NP in (17b) is expected under the assumption that Agree is induced between the matrix *v* and the accusative NP, irrespective of whether the accusative NP raises or not. In (17b), it is possible that the matrix *v* does not have an EPP-feature, and that the accusative NP is not overtly

attracted by ν . However, the ϕ -feature of ν , i.e. a probe, agrees with the accusative NP, i.e. the goal, because the latter has an uninterpretable Case-feature. Note in this connection that the examples in (23) show the high binding properties of the accusative NPs which *must* be Case-marked in situ.

- (23) a. Rie-wa *kaminoke-no ippon ni-itaru-made* karera-o_i
 Rie-Top hair-Gen single to-reach-till they-Acc
 mujitsu da to otagai-no_i shoogen-niyotte
 innocent is that each other-Gen testimony-based on
 shinjite iru.
 believing is
 'Rie believes them_i to be every inch innocent based on
 each other's_i testimony.'
- b. ?*Rie-wa *kaminoke-no ippon ni-itaru-made* kare-o_i
 Rie-Top hair-Gen single to-reach-till him-Acc
 mujitsu-da to Takashi_i-jishin yori tsuyoku
 innocent-is that Takashi_i-self than strongly
 shinjite iru.
 believing is
 'Rie believes him_i to be every inch innocent more
 strongly than Takashi himself_i does.'

(23a) is as acceptable as (4b), and (23b) is as unacceptable as (17b).

Assuming that these examples show that the binding facts follow from Agree in Japanese, we will regard them as no longer relevant to the issue of whether raising occurs overtly or not. However, as far as the other evidence for the thesis of optional raising (i.e. the word-order fact in (15) and the Clause-mate Condition in (16)) is concerned, Hiraiwa's (2001) analysis seems descriptively more adequate than the other analyses introduced above.

2.5. A Problem Common to the Previous Analyses

It is noteworthy that all the previous analyses mentioned in this section including Hiraiwa (2001) seem to assume that Japanese ECM verbs are *lexically-specified*, as in the case of their apparent English counterparts. However, it seems rather difficult to lexically specify ECM verbs in Japanese. Though Kuno (1976: 43) claims that ECM verbs are restricted largely to the verbs whose complements represent the internal feelings of the matrix subject, such semantic characterization is obviously not appropriate, as shown by the examples in (24).

- (24) a. %Taroo-wa [Hanako-o baka da]-to itta/sakenda/
Taro-Top Hanako-Acc fool is that said/shouted/
tsubuyaita/sasayaita/wameita/nonoshitta.
muttered/whispered/yelled/cursed
Lit. 'Taro said/shouted/muttered/whispered/yelled/
cursed Hanako (to be) a fool.'
- b. %Taroo-wa [Hanako-o hannin da]-to kiita/kanjita/
Taro-Top Hanako-Acc culprit is that heard/felt/
satotta.
realized
Lit. 'Taro heard/felt/realized Hanako (to be) the cul-
prit.'
- c. %Boku-wa [jibun-o keppaku da]-to
I-Top self-Acc innocent is that
yakusokusuru/chikau.
promise/swear
Lit. 'I promise/swear myself (to be) innocent.'
- d. %Taroo-wa [Hanako-o bijin da]-to
Taro-Top Hanako-Acc beauty is that
odoroita/yorokonda/nageita/kuyanda.
was-surprised-at/was-pleased-with/deplored/regretted
Lit. 'Taro was surprised at/was pleased with/deplored/
regretted Hanako (to be) a beauty.'
- e. %Boku-wa [Taroo-o hannin da]-to hookokushita/
I-Top Taro-Acc culprit is that reported/
tsutaeta/setsumeishita/hirometa.
communicated/explained/propagated
Lit. 'I reported/communicated/explained/propagated
Taro (to be) the culprit.'
- f. %Boku-wa [Taroo-o hannin ka]-to tazuneta/kiita
I-Top Taro-Acc culprit Q that questioned/asked/
utagatta/jimonshita.
suspected/wondered
Lit. 'I questioned/asked/suspected/wondered Taro (to
be) the culprit.'

ECM verbs range over a variety of semantic types such as manner-of-speaking verbs (24a), perception verbs (24b), performative verbs (24c), psychological verbs (24d), verbs of communication (24e), and interroga-

tive verbs (24f).⁹ The unacceptability of (25) shows that the matrix verbs in (24) do not select accusative NPs, but they select embedded clauses containing the NPs, supporting our analysis of the examples in (24) as ECMCs.

- (25) *Boku-wa John-o itta/kiita/yakusokushita/odoroita/
I-Top John-Acc said/asked/promised/was-surprised at/
hookokushita/tazuneta.
reported/questioned
Lit. 'I said/asked/promised/was surprised at/reported/
questioned John.'

Note that although one might find the examples in (24) somewhat awkward, they do not have the unacceptability that would be expected in the wrong choice of ECM triggers for English ECMCs. Therefore, our analysis should generate the examples in (24) (and hopefully account for their slight degradedness) rather than rule them out.¹⁰ Thus, the facts in (24) lead us to the generalization in (26).¹¹

- (26) Any transitive verb selecting a *to*-clause as its sole object can "exceptionally Case-mark" the embedded subject.

Now, considering the generality of the facts in (24), it seems redundant to lexically specify ECM triggers in Japanese. After all, almost every clause-taking transitive verb would have to be specified as an ECM trigger.

Incidentally, it should be noted that Japanese seems to have genuine counterparts to English ECMCs as well. Takezawa (1987: 73ff.) points out that Japanese has ECMCs with small-clause complements like (27), in which the complement clause lacks tense and the accusative NP can-

⁹ Kaneko (1991) also points out the case where the seemingly non-ECM verb *mikkoku-suru* 'tip off' occurs as an ECM verb. We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for bringing the paper to our attention.

¹⁰ One of the anonymous *EL* reviewers finds the examples in (24c, d) unacceptable. As we will claim in the next section, ECMCs (represented by the examples in (2b) and (24)) and Multiple Object Constructions (represented by the example in (32a)) share the same syntactic source in Japanese. Accordingly, our analysis will predict that the baseline data of ECMCs in Japanese should be as degraded as (32a) is. Our problem, rather, is why the example in (2b) is fully acceptable, in contrast to the examples in (24). We will put this problem aside here for future research.

¹¹ We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for refinement of the generalization in (26).

not alternate with a nominative NP. He regards *ni* in (27) as a non-finite form of the copula *da*.

- (27) John-wa [Mary-no kodomo-nitaisuru aijoo-o totemo
John-Top Mary-Gen child-toward affection-Acc very
kandooteki ni] omotta
moving be thought
Lit. 'John thought Mary's affection toward (her) child (to
be) very moving.'

This type of ECMCs is certainly lexically-specified, as shown by the examples in (28).

- (28) Boku-wa [John-o kichigai ni] omotta/kanjita/*shinjita/
I-Top John-Acc crazy be thought/felt/believed/
*kanchigaishita/*danteishita/*kitaishita/*suiteishita.
mistook/determined/expected/guessed
Lit. 'I thought/felt/believed/determined/expected/guessed/
mistook John (to be) crazy.'

In sum, the Japanese ECMCs in (2b) and (24) are quite different constructions from the English ECMCs represented in (1b) (or their genuine counterparts in Japanese in (27) and (28)). Differing from English ECMCs, which allow narrow lexical specifications, the Japanese ECMCs in (2b) and (24) are general phenomena which should be explained based on the generality of the devices that generate them.

Let us, therefore, distinguish the *apparent* ECMCs (AECMCs, hereafter) in (2b) and (24) from the *genuine* ECMCs in (27) and (28). Assuming that genuine ECMCs receive essentially the same analysis that English ECMCs do, i.e. an analysis based on the lexical properties of ECM verbs, we will concentrate on AECMCs in the next section.

3. An Analysis

Because of the problems in (5), (7), (12) (with the accusative complement subject), (15) (with the accusative complement subject) and (16a), we do not adopt an overt A-movement analysis of Japanese AECMCs like Kuno (1976) and Sakai (1998). Because of the same problems, we do not adopt the proposal in Saito (1983, 1985), Takahashi (1993), Nemoto (1993) and Ura (1994) that the accusative NP is a base-generated matrix object controlling a *pro* subject of the embedded clause. On the other hand, in consideration of the facts in (3) and (16b), we cannot accept the claim in Ueda (1988) and Kaneko (1988)

that the accusative NPs remain in situ, either. Accordingly, we adopt Hiraiwa's (2001) central claim that the matrix ν has EPP-features optionally. However, our claim differs from Hiraiwa's (2001) in that while he proposes that raising of the accusative NP to the Spec of the matrix ν is optional, what we regard as optional is raising of the whole complement clause to the inner-Spec of the matrix ν and subsequent raising of the accusative complement subject to the outer-Spec of the matrix ν .

Hiraiwa's hypothesis does not necessarily imply that it is the accusative NP that optionally raises in the derivation of Japanese AECMCs. Consider the English ECMC in (1b), in this respect. It is predicted under the probe-goal theory of Chomsky (2000, 2001) that the infinitival complement in (1b) has neither ϕ -features nor a Case feature. If it did, the relation of Matching could hold between the ϕ -set of the matrix ν and that of the infinitival complement (or its head T, more strictly), and Agree would be induced between the two. As a result, Agree could not be induced between the ϕ -set of the matrix ν and that of the embedded accusative subject, and the Case feature of the accusative subject could not be excluded.

In this respect, it is noteworthy that in contrast with infinitival clauses, finite clauses seem to have ϕ -features and a Case feature. Consider the example in (29), an English ECMC, from Doherty (1997: 211).

(29) I believe [_{CP} *(that) the end is nigh] to be obvious].

In an ECMC (29), a finite clause is exceptionally Case-marked, and (29) is marginally acceptable when the finite clause is headed by the complementizer *that*. Since Agree is induced between the matrix ν and the finite clause, (29) shows that finite clauses have ϕ -features and Case features in English, at least when they are headed by *that*.

As we will claim shortly, the finite complement clause in the AECMC (2b) is a TP suffixed by a complementizing morpheme *-to*. Therefore, if we apply the above observation in English to (2b) in Japanese, it is expected that the T head of the complement clause in (2b) has both ϕ -features and Case features, and that Agree will be induced between the matrix ν and the complement clause in the derivation of AECMCs in Japanese.¹²

¹² One of the anonymous *EL* reviewers points out that finite T independently has

In the derivation of (2b), (30) is generated as the structure for the complement clause.

(30) [_{TP} Mary-o [_{VP} tensai da]]-to

In (30), the accusative subject is merged with TP, because we assume that T does not obligatorily assign nominative Case in Japanese, following Oka (1988: 198). We also assume that in AECMCs, the TP-structure in (30) is directly selected by an AECM verb as its complement, as shown in (31) (cf. fn. 2).

(31) [_{VP} [_{VP} [_{TP} Mary-o tensai da]-to omotta] *v*]

In (31), the matrix *v* agrees with the complement TP, as proposed above, and the value of the accusative Case is assigned to the TP.

At this stage, it is expected that the ϕ -features of the matrix *v* and the embedded subject will match at the same time, inducing Agree. In this connection, let us note Kuroda's (1988) claim that multiple objects are allowed in Japanese. Although examples like (32a) are somewhat degraded due to the Double-*o* Constraint, (32b) is acceptable, where the effect of the constraint is avoided by clefting.

(32) a. ??John-ga Mary-o atama-o nagutta.

John-Nom Mary-Acc head-Acc hit

'John hit Mary on the head.'

b. John-ga Mary-o nagutta no wa atama-o da

John-Nom Mary-Acc hit Nm Top head-Acc is

'It is on her head that John hit Mary.'

If we assume that these examples are allowed because the transitive light verb *v* in Japanese has the property of "feature-checking" more than once (cf. Ura (1996)), and if feature-checking is translated into the relation of Agree in the framework of minimalism in Chomsky (2000,

a ϕ -set to "Case-check" its subject. Therefore, if the T head of the complement TP bears the ϕ -set which induces Agree with the matrix *v*, the T head of finite clauses in Japanese should have both [+interpretable] ϕ -features and [-interpretable] ϕ -features, one acting as a goal and the other acting as a probe. At present, it is not clear to us whether this proposal is problematic or not. If it is, however, we might have to claim that [+interpretable] ϕ -features belong not to T, but to the complementizing morpheme *-to*. Note that the embedded CP subject cannot agree with the matrix verb without the presence of the complementizer *that* in (29). We put aside this problem here for future research. We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for bringing this problem to our attention.

2001), nothing prevents the ν in (31) from agreeing both with the complement TP and with the complement subject *Mary-o*, simultaneously. According to the Defective Intervention Constraint (DIC), in a structure like (33), where α is c-command and β and γ match the probe α , if β is inactive, it blocks the effect of matching between α and γ (cf. Chomsky (2000: 123)).

$$(33) \quad \alpha > \beta > \gamma$$

In (31), however, the complement TP does not *c-command* but it *dominates* its subject so that the former cannot act as β in (33), and consequently ν is allowed to agree both with the complement TP and its subject. We assume that as far as closeness is strictly determined in terms of c-command relation (cf. Chomsky (2000: 122)), the complement TP and its subject is equidistant from the matrix ν . Besides, since we regard the subordinator *-to* as a particle adjoined to TP, but not as C, there is no CP phase blocking Agree between the matrix ν and the accusative NP (cf. fn. 2). Accordingly, (31) surfaces as a possible structure of ν P for (2b), if ν does not have EPP-features.

If, on the other hand, ν has EPP-features (multiple in this case), the complement TP is attracted to ν P-Spec first, as shown in (34).¹³

$$(34) \quad [\nu_P [\text{TP Mary-o tensai da}]\text{-to}_i [\nu_P t_i \text{ omotta}] \nu]$$

Because ν has an additional EPP-feature in this case, it has to be checked somehow. Without any expletive element in the lexical array for (2b), the accusative NP *Mary-o* in (34) is attracted by the EPP-feature of ν as the last resort, deriving (35). With the embedded clause being a TP, A-movement of *Mary-o* to the outer-Spec of T is not blocked as a case of improper movement.

$$(35) \quad [\nu_P \text{ Mary-o}_j [\nu_P [\text{TP } t_j \text{ tensai da}]\text{-to}_i [\nu_P t_i \text{ omotta}] \nu]]$$

Therefore, (35), which overtly has double objects, is another possible structure for (2b). In sum, our analysis allows (31) and (35) as possible structures for AECMCs like (2b).

Let us now consider how the facts about AECMCs shown in the previous section can be explained based on this analysis.

First, the high binding properties of the accusative NP introduced in the previous section (i.e. the acceptability of (4b) under Condition (A)

¹³ We omit the matrix subject in (34) for its irrelevance to our discussion.

of the Binding Theory, the unacceptability of (17b) under Condition (C), the acceptability of (23a) under Condition (A), and the unacceptability of (23b) under Condition (C)) are all explained based on Agree, irrespective of whether the accusative NP is overtly attracted to the matrix *vP*-Spec or not. As we assumed in the previous section, Agree with a head allows an NP to behave as a specifier of the head for the purpose of binding.

Second, the fact concerning the adverbial placement in (3) is predicted if AECMCs undergo the derivation illustrated in (35) with overt raising. In this case, the accusative NP in the matrix outer object can end up preceding the matrix adverb (adjoined to the matrix *vP*).

Third, the example in (5) with a *wh*-phrase and that in (7) with an NPI represent the AECMCs where the matrix *v* has no EPP-feature (see (31)). In these cases, the phrases at issue are appropriately c-commanded by the relevant morphemes, i.e. the Q morpheme *-ka* in (5) and the particle *-mo* in (7), respectively.¹⁴ Our analysis also correctly predicts the unacceptability of (8) and (9), where the c-command condition is not satisfied.

The account of (5) and (7) extends to the account of the example in (36) from Kuno (1976: 28).

- (36) Dareka-ga [minna-o baka da]-to omotte iru.
 Someone-Nom all-Acc fool is that thinking is
 (someone > all, all > someone)

Kuno points out that (36) is ambiguous marginally allowing the wide scope reading of *minna* 'all' with respect to *dareka* 'someone,' due to the scope interaction caused by raising of the accusative NP.

In this connection, consider (37) from Yatsushiro (1996).

- (37) Dokoka-ni daremo-ga ita.
 somewhere-Loc everyone-Nom was
 'Everyone was somewhere.'
 (somewhere > everyone, *everyone > somewhere)

Yatsushiro argues that in the unaccusative construction (37), the complement of the unaccusative verb remains in its underlying position and

¹⁴ We regard the Q morpheme *-ka* and the NPI-licenser *-mo* also as particles attached to clauses.

has low scope. Based on this observation, she points out that in Japanese, binding and scope diverge, and that checking of EPP-feature is necessary for the purpose of taking scope.

If this claim about scope-taking is on the right track, the ambiguity of (36) reflects two possible structures which our analysis allows for (36), depending on the presence or the absence of the EPP-features of the matrix v . Accordingly, our analysis predicts that the accusative NP following an embedded adverb would not have a wide scope reading with respect to the matrix subject, because the accusative NP is not positioned at the (outer-)Spec of the matrix v . This prediction is actually borne out, as shown in (38).

- (38) Dareka-ga [[rikoo to-iuyori] minna-o baka da]-to
 Someone-Nom wise rather-than all-Acc fool is that
 omotte iru.
 thinking is
 Lit. 'Someone is believing, rather than being wise, everyone
 to be a fool.'

(someone > all, *all > someone)

Fourth, let us turn to the cleft data in Japanese. Although the proper analysis of Japanese cleft sentences is unclear, it must reflect the generalization that the focus of the construction is a constituent (cf. fn. 4)). In this respect, our analysis correctly predicts the acceptability of (12) (with the accusative NP) while keeping the above generalization, since it can generate a structure of AECMCs where the complement clause keeps its constituency, i.e. the structure without overt raising (see (31)).

Fifth, let us consider Raising-to-Subject Constructions in Japanese. In (13), the matrix adverb follows the exceptionally Case-marked *nominative* NP. Given the well-known fact that Japanese T allows multiple specifiers, the nominative subject of the clausal subject in (39a) may further move to check the extra EPP-feature of the matrix T, deriving (39b). Since the matrix adverb can be adjoined to the matrix TP, the word-order in (13) is obtained as a result of movement in (39b).

- (39) a. [_{TP} ayamatte [_{TP} Mary-ga tensai da]-to omow-areta]
 b. [_{TP} Mary-ga_i [_{TP} ayamatte [_{TP} t_i tensai da]-to omow-areta]]

Parallel treatment of Raising-to-Subject Constructions and AECMCs is supported by the fact about the *Wh-Q* Constraint in (40) (parallel to (5) and (8)) and by the fact about NPI-licensing in (41) (parallel to (7)

and (9)). Note that the *wh*-phrases and *wh*-pronominal NPIs marked with *nominative* Case cannot be followed by a matrix adverb.

- (40) Dare-ga (*ayamatte) tensai daroo ka to omow-areta.
 who-Nom mistakenly genius be-Mod Q that thought-was
 'It was (mistakenly) wondered who probably was the genius.'
- (41) Dare-ga (*ayamatte) tensai da to mo omow-arete inai.
 who-Nom mistakenly genius is that Q thought-be ing-Neg
 'For no x, one thinks (mistakenly) that X is a genius.'

Sixth, let us turn to (15) with the accusative complement subject. The acceptability of (15) follows trivially, as in the analysis of Hiraiwa (2001), in its derivation without overt raising (see (31)).

Seventh, let us consider the Multiple Cleft Constructions in (16), whose derivations are not clear at present. In this paper, following the analysis of Pseudo-VP Ellipsis in Korean by Kim and Sohn (1998), we assume for the sake of discussion that in the formation of the focus phrases in (16), the lower focused phrase adjoins to the higher focused phrase to check its strong [+focus] feature against the same feature of the latter, and that the newly formed amalgamated single focus moves to FocP-Spec above TP. The TP deletes after this movement, and the examples in (16) are derived. The general assumption that the focused element must be a syntactic constituent is maintained under this analysis because the foci in the examples of (16) are dominated by a constituent FocP (cf. fn. 8). Note that the process of amalgamation is restricted by the Clause-mates Condition. Our analysis correctly predicts the Clause-mates Condition effect in (16). This is because the accusative NP in AECMCs can end up being either a matrix (outer) object or a complement subject, as in the analysis of Hiraiwa (2001).

Eighth and finally, our analysis naturally explains the generalization in (26) describing the facts in (24). Japanese allows Multiple Object Constructions, and because of this, AECMCs are possible in this language. Note that nothing in the derivation of AECMCs hinges on the lexical properties of the matrix verbs. Therefore, any transitive verb is expected to take an AECM complement, as far as it selects a *to*-clause as its sole object.

4. Consequences

A wide variety of AECMCs are observed in Japanese, and examples like (42) appear to show that AECM complements contain A-bar

chains headed by the accusative NP because A-chains cannot be formed across a complex NP.

- (42) Boku-wa sono hito-o_i [[e_i e_j kite iru] fuku-ga_j
 I-Top that person-Acc wearing is clothes-Nom
 yogorete-iru]-to omou.
 dirty-are that think
 'I think of that person that his clothes are dirty.'

In fact, Oka (1988) suggests the possibility that the accusative NP in AECMCs is in the specifier of a clausal projection, and A-bar binds *pro* in the complement clause, as is claimed to be possible with A-bar dependency in Japanese in Saito (1985).

To see if this claim is tenable, let us use a variety of AECMCs observed by Oka (1988). Consider the example in (43).

- (43) Bill-ga Mary-o_i [John-ga e_i horete iru]-to omotte iru.
 Bill-Nom Mary-Acc John-Nom loving is that thinking is
 'Bill thinks of Mary_i that John loves e_i.'

Oka argues that a complement *object* is "exceptionally Case-marked" by the matrix verb in (43). He reasonably claims that (43) (Oka's (15)) is an ECMC and not the result of scrambling because the embedded verb *horeru* 'love' does not select an accusative NP, but it selects a dative NP.

However, if (43) is an AECMC, the chain in (43) proves not to be an A-bar chain, because it does not exhibit Condition (C) type reconstruction effects. Consider the example in (44).

- (44) Bill-ga [John-no_i hisho]-o_j [kare-ga_i e_j horete iru]-to
 Bill-Nom John-Gen secretary-Acc he-Nom loving is that
 omotte iru.
 thinking is
 'Bill thinks of John's_i secretary_j that he_i loves e_j.'

Now, if the chains in AECMCs are not A-bar chains but A-chains, as we claim, how can (42) be generated? In this connection, let us observe another AECMC in (45), where an outer subject of Multiple Subject Constructions occurs as an "exceptionally Case-marked" NP.

- (45) Bill-ga [John-o [musuko-ga byooki da]]-to omotte iru.
 Bill-Nom John-Acc son-Nom sick is that thinking is
 'Bill thinks of John that a son is ill in bed.'

(Oka (1988: 219))

In the derivation of (45), the accusative NP *John-o* is generated as the possessor argument of the complement subject *musuko-ga*, and is

attracted (through “Possessor-Raising”) to the outer-Spec of the embedded T, to check an additional EPP feature of the embedded T. Note that the accusative Case of NP *John-o* remains unchecked when it is attracted to the outer-Spec of the embedded T. However, in terms of our analysis, the accusative NP may agree with the matrix ν when the clause containing it agrees with the ν .¹⁵

Given this account of (45), the apparent A-bar dependency across the complex NP in (42) can be similarly viewed as an A-chain formed through “Possessor-Raising.” Specifically, the accusative NP can be regarded as a specifier of the complement subject in the structure (46a), which is “possessor-raised” to the outer subject in (46b) to check an additional EPP-feature of the embedded T.

- (46) a. [_{TP} [_{DP} sono hito- o_i [[pro_i t_j kite iru] fuku_j]]-ga yogorete iru]-to
 b. [_{TP} sono hito- o_i [_{TP} [_{DP} t_i [[pro_i t_j kite iru] fuku_j]]-ga yogorete iru]]-to

At the stage where (46b) is embedded as an AECM complement, nothing prevents the matrix ν from agreeing with the accusative NP, as well as the whole complement TP. If the matrix ν has EPP-features, the complement TP is attracted to ν P-Spec, followed by subsequent movement of the accusative NP to the outer-Spec of ν .

The question remains, however, as to how the complement object in (43) can be A-moved and “exceptionally Case-marked” since if e_i were a trace, (43) would be a violation of the Binding Condition (A).

Consider, in this connection, the Greek example in (47) from Soames

¹⁵ As one of the anonymous *EL* reviewers points out, our claim might seem dubious that the embedded T in (45) has its (additional) EPP feature checked by the accusative NP which it does not agree with. However, there seems to be no reason why the ϕ -features and the EPP feature of a head must be checked by the same element. Consider the translation of an Icelandic example in (i) from Chomsky (2000: 130).

(i) me(dat) thought(pl) [_{l_{mc}} [they(pl,nom) be industrious]]

According to Chomsky (2000, 2001), the raised quirky Case subject in (i) satisfies the EPP feature of the matrix T, but it fails to satisfy the ϕ -features of T. Accordingly, long-distance agreement holds between ϕ -features of T and the same features of the embedded nominative subject. In this case, an EPP feature and ϕ -features of a head are satisfied separately by different elements.

and Perlmutter (1979: 162) (In (47), Subj=subjunctive).

- (47) O filos mu fenete na kerdizi to pegnidi
 the friend my seem/3sg Subj be-winning the game
 mono aftos.
 only he/Nom
 'Only my friend seems to be winning the game.'

(Lit. 'My friend seems that only he is winning the game.')

Soames and Perlmutter argue that (47) is a Raising-to-Subject Construction, and that when the embedded subject, i.e. *o filos mu*, is raised into the matrix subject position, a pronominal copy of the raised NP, either empty or lexically specified, is left behind. In (47), a lexically specified pronoun, i.e. *aftos*, is left behind in the embedded subject position. Soames and Perlmutter also point out that an example like (47) in Greek differs from English Raising Constructions, in that the embedded verb in (47) is inflected and finite. In this respect, one can regard raising in (47), i.e. Copy Raising, as a device to allow A-movement out of a finite clause.

Though it is not necessarily assumed that Copy Raising Constructions undergo overt raising, and theoretical motivations for admitting Copy Raising differ among analyses, the idea that A-chains can terminate in resumptive pronominals is inherited by McCloskey and Sells (1988), Yoon (1996), Ura (1996), among others. As McCloskey and Sells (1988) point out, under the assumption that A- and A-bar chains are symmetrical, it is natural for a given language to choose the option of allowing A-chains to terminate in pronouns, just as it has the option of allowing A-bar chains to terminate in pronouns, giving rise to resumptive pronoun strategies. Specifically, since, as Saito (1985) claims, Japanese has a null pronoun acting as a resumptive pronoun in A-bar chains, the same should hold in A-chains, as well.

Now, let us assume that Copy Raising exists as overt raising, and that (43) has undergone Copy Raising. Then, (43) should have an (empty) pronominal left behind in the complement object position. Note also that the complement clause of (43) (or that of Japanese AECMCs in general, for that matter) is finite, as in the Greek example (47). As for the licensing condition for a pronominal copy left behind by Copy Raising, McCloskey and Sells (1988, fn. 11) suggest that it is subject to the Binding Condition (B). If so, our problem concerning (43) does not arise. That is because the pronominal copy in (43) would not violate the Binding Condition (A) in this case.

If *pro* can occur in any argument position (cf. Hoji (1985), among others), the A-bar dependency analysis can generate examples like (48) (Oka's (16c)), where the resumptive *pro* is not in the subject of the embedded clause, as in (42), but in the object of the embedded clause.

- (48) [*Bill-ga [Mary-o_i [Tom-ga [[e_j e_i horete iru] otoko_j]-o
 Bill-Nom Mary-Acc Tom-Nom loving is man -Acc
 kiratte iru]-to omotte iru]
 hating is that thinking is
 "Bill thinks of Mary_i that Tom hates the man who loves e_i"

Oka regards (48) as acceptable. However, it seems to us that (48) is far worse than (42). In this respect, our analysis correctly rules out (48).¹⁶ (49) represents a stage of the derivation of (48) where "Possessor-Raising" applies to the NP *Mary-o*, and raises it to the initial position of the complement clause.

- (49) a. [TP Tom-ga [DP Mary-o_i [[e_j e_i horete iru] otoko_j]]-o kirat-
 te iru]-to
 b. [TP Mary-o_i [TP Tom-ga [DP t_i [[e_j e_i horete iru] otoko_j]]-o
 kiratte iru]]-to

In (49b), the possessor NP *Mary-o*, i.e. the specifier of the object DP, is "possessor-raised" to the outer subject. In contrast with the licit application of "Possessor-Raising" in (46), the application of "Possessor-Raising" in (49) is precisely what Shibatani and Cotton (1976-77) regard as an illicit operation. That is, (50b) cannot be derived from the structure of (50a) through Possessor-Raising.

- (50) a. [TP Tony-ga [DP Bhutto-no musume-ga]
 Tony-Nom Bhutto-Gen daughter-Nom
 wakar-u]
 recognize-Pres
 'Tony can recognize Bhutto's daughter.'

¹⁶ Judgments vary for (48), and one of the anonymous *EL* reviewers finds (48) acceptable, as Oka (1988) does. The grammatical status of examples like (48) is extremely crucial in our analysis of AECMCs, because (48), if acceptable, is quite amenable to A-bar dependency analyses like Oka's (1988). In this paper, however, we will follow our judgments of (42) and (48), and try to explain why (42) is acceptable, while (48) is not. At the present, we would like to leave open the question of why judgments of (48) vary among speakers.

- b. *<sub>[TP Bhutto-ga_i [_{TP} Tony-ga [_{DP} e_i musume-ga]
 Bhutto-Nom Tony-Nom daughter-Nom
 wakar-u]]</sub>
 recognize-Pres

Our analysis excludes (48) and (50b) in the same manner. Since the derivations of both (48) (cf. (49)) and (50b) undergo A-movement across the embedded subject, the resulting A-chains must terminate in (empty) pronouns (cf. the references cited above). Unless the empty pronouns are inserted at the tail of the chains, the resulting A-chains would violate the Binding Condition (A). Note, however, that Ura (1996) convincingly argues that language-particular rules are subject to the general economy condition, and that insertion of a pronominal copy of an A-moved element applies only if the derivation crashes without invoking it. Under this assumption, it is predicted that while *pro* can be inserted to the object positions in (43), where Case-assignment is obligatory, it cannot be inserted either to DP-Spec in (49b) or to DP-Spec in (50b), where Case-assignment is optional.

Thus, our analysis correctly accounts for the productivity of AECMCs represented in (42), (43) and (45), while excluding (48).

5. Conclusions

We proposed that the ECMCs in Japanese whose complement clauses are finite, i.e. AECMCs, undergo radically different derivations from the derivations of English ECMCs. They are generated by the same mechanism that generates Multiple Object Constructions by virtue of the property of the Japanese transitive light verb *v* that it can multiply agree with its objects. The question of whether the accusative NP is a matrix object or an embedded subject is no longer substantial because the accusative NP “checks” the formal features of both the matrix *v* and the embedded T (cf. Ura (1996)).

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, Noam (1986) *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Its Use*, Praeger Publishers, New York.
 Chomsky, Noam (2000) “Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework,” *Step by Step: Essay on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger

- Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka, 89–155, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001) "Derivation by Phase," *Ken Halle: A Life in Language*, ed. by Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Doherty, Cathal (1997) "Clauses without Complementizers: Finite IP-Complementation in English," *The Linguistic Review* 14, 197–220.
- Harada, Kazuko (1972) "Constraints on *Wh*-Q Binding," *Studies in Descriptive and Applied Linguistics* 5, 180–206, Division of Languages, International Christian University, Tokyo.
- Hiraiwa, Ken (2001) "Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese," ms., MIT.
- Hoji, Hajime (1985) *Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Kaneko, Yoshiaki (1988) "On Exceptional Case-Marking in English and Japanese," *English Linguistics* 5, 271–289.
- Kaneko, Yoshiaki (1991) "Reigai-teki Kaku-hyooji to Mojuraa Apuroochi (Exceptional Case-Marking and Modular Approach)," *Gendai Eigogaku-no Ayumi (Footsteps of Contemporary English Linguistics)*, ed. by Yasui Minoru Hakushi Koki Kinen Ronbunshuu Henshuu Inkai (the Editorial Board of a Festschrift for Dr. Minoru Yasui's Seventy Years of Age), 194–202, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Kim, Jeong-Seok and Keun-Won Sohn (1998) "Focusing Effects in Korean/Japanese Ellipsis," *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 8, 459–470.
- Kizu, Mika (1997) "Sluicing in *Wh*-in-situ Languages," *CLS* 33, Part 1: *The Main Session*, 231–244.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi (1995) *Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kuno, Susumu (1976) "Subject Raising," *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, 17–49, Academic Press, New York.
- Kuroda, Shige-Yuki (1988) "Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese," *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, ed. by William Poser, 103–144, CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Lasnik, Howard (1999a) "Chains of Arguments," *Working Minimalism*, ed. by Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 189–215, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Lasnik, Howard (1999b) *Minimalist Analysis*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito (1991) "On the Subject of Infinitives," *CLS* 27, 324–343.
- McCloskey, James and Peter Sells (1988) "Control and A-Chains in Modern Irish," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 143–189.
- Nakau, Minoru (1973) *Sentential Complementation in Japanese*, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Nemoto, Naoko (1993) *Chains and Case Positions: A Study from Scrambling in*

- Japanese*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Oka, Toshifusa (1988) "Abstract Case and Empty Positions," *Tsukuba English Studies* 7, 187-227, University of Tsukuba.
- Postal, Paul (1974) *On Raising: One Rule of English Grammar and Its Theoretical Implications*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Rosenbaum, Peter S. (1967) *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Saito, Mamoru (1983) "Comments on the Papers on Generative Syntax," *Studies in Generative Grammar and Language Acquisition*, ed. by Yukio Otsu, Henk van Riemsdijk, Kazuko Inoue, Akio Kamio and Noriko Kawasaki, 79-89, International Christian University, Tokyo.
- Saito, Mamoru (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Sakai, Hiromu (1998) "Raising Asymmetry and Improper Movement," *Japanese Korean Linguistics* 7, 481-497.
- Sells, Peter (1990) "Is There Subject-to-Object Raising in Japanese?" *Grammatical Relations: A Cross-Theoretical Perspective*, ed. by Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrel and Errapel Mejias-Bikandi, 445-457, CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Chiseko Cotton (1976-77) Remarks on Double-Nominative Sentences," *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 5, 261-277.
- Soames, Scott and David Perlmutter (1979) *Syntactic Argumentation and the Structure of English*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Takahashi, Daiko (1993) "On Antecedent-Contained Deletion," ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Takezawa, Koichi (1987) *A Configurational Approach to Case Marking in Japanese*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Ueda, Masanobu (1988) "Exceptional Case-Marking in Japanese," *Sophia Linguistica* 22/23, 39-46, Sophia University.
- Ura, Hiroyuki (1994) *Varieties of Raising and the Feature-Based Bare Phrase Structure Theory*, *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 7, MIT.
- Ura, Hiroyuki (1996) *Multiple Feature-Checking: A Theory of Grammatical Function Splitting*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Yatsushiro, Kazuko (1996) "On the Unaccusative Construction and Nominative Case Licensing," ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Yoon, James (1996) "Ambiguity of Government and the Chain Condition," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 105-162.

(Keiichiro Kobayashi)

1-17-13-506 Katakura

Kanagawa-ku

Yokohama-shi

Kanagawa 221-0865

e-mail: kobakei@kanto-gakuin.ac.jp

(Hideki Maki)

231-1-202 Noritake

Gifu-shi

Gifu 502-0931

e-mail: makijp@cc.gifu-u.ac.jp