1. Introduction

Every formulation of Binding Theory (B) proposed so far predicts that a pronoun can be bound out of the smallest tensed clause containing it. Conditional clauses in Japanese manifest a property that contradicts this prediction. Specifically, the pronominal subject of a conditional clause in Japanese must be disjoint from the subject of the next higher clause:

(1) *Taroo-top he-nom mike-acc hold-nonpast comp
    man-nom change-nonpast
    ‘If he holds a mike, Taroo becomes quite another man.’

The ill-formedness of (1) contrasts with the fact that the pronominal subject of a conditional clause in English can be coreferential with the subject of the next higher clause:
This paper provides a solution to the peculiarity of conditional clauses in Japanese by proposing a new formulation of Binding Theory (B). Specifically, I will argue that the binding domain for a pronoun should vary depending on the LF position of its Case-licenser.

2. The Conditional Clauses in Japanese

Conditional clauses in Japanese are expressed with different forms of tense and complementizer, as exemplified below:

(3) a. Taroo-ga sono siai-ni kat-u to, ...
Taroo-Nom the game-Dat win-Nonpast Comp(Cond.)

b. Taroo-ga sono siai-ni kat-ta ra, ...
Taroo-Nom the game-Dat win-Past Comp(Cond.)
‘If Taroo wins the game, …’

In (3a), the conditional complementizer to selects the nonpast-tense marker -u, while in (3b), the conditional complementizer ra selects the past-tense marker -ta. There is no significant difference in meaning between the two types of conditional clauses.

The pronominal subject of the conditional clause in Japanese, whether it is headed by to or ra, must be disjoint from the subject of the next higher clause, as shown in (1) and (4):

(4) *Taroo-i-wa, kare-i-ga maiku-o mot-ta ra, hito-ga
Taroo-Top he-Nom mike-Acc hold-Past Comp man-Nom
kawar-u.
change-Nonpast
‘If he holds a mike, Taroo becomes quite another man.’

The ill-formedness of (1) and (4) contrasts with the well-formedness of (5), which shows that the pronominal subject of an indicative complement clause in Japanese can be bound by the subject of the next higher clause:

\[ (5) \]

1 All the arguments in what follows, when based on the conditional clauses headed by the complementizer ra, can be carried over to those headed by the complementizer to. A third type of conditional clause in Japanese, with the complementizer nara, will be discussed in section 4. Other types of conditional clause in Japanese, such as tosuruto-clause or -eba clause, are not discussed in this paper.
(5) Tarooi-wa, karei-ga maiku-o mot-u to
Taroo-Top he-Nom mike-Acc hold-Nonpast Comp(Ind.)
it-ta.
say-Past
‘Taroo said that he would hold a mike.’

That the ill-formedness of (1) and (4) is related to BT (B) is shown
by the well-formedness of (6), where the pronominal subject of the
conditional clause is replaced by an anaphor or an r-expression:

(6) Tarooi-wa, zibun-ga/Hanako-ga maiku-o mot-ta
Taroo-Top self-Nom/Hanako-Nom mike-Acc hold-Past
ra, hito-ga kawar-u.
Comp man-Nom change-Nonpast
‘If he himself/Hanako holds a mike, Taroo becomes quite
another man.’

Suppose that every TP and DP with a subject counts as the binding
domain for pronouns in it, but that the finite conditional clause does
not count as the binding domain for its pronominal subject. Given
this assumption, we make several predictions. First, a sentence in
which kare is placed in a non-subject position in the conditional clause
and is free in the clause should be ruled in. This prediction is borne
out by the well-formedness of (7) and (8):

(7) Tarooi-wa, Hanako-ga karei-ni denwa-o si-ta ra,
Taroo-Top Hanako-Nom he-Dat call-Acc do-Past Comp
yorokobu.
get pleased
‘Taroo gets pleased if Hanako calls him.’

(8) Tarooi-wa, karei-no hahaoya-ga hayaku kaetteki-ta
Taroo-Top he-Gen mother-Nom early come back-Past
ra, yorokobu.
Comp get pleased
‘Taroo gets pleased if his mother comes back early.’
Second, a sentence in which the pronominal subject of the conditional
clause is free in the next higher clause should be ruled in. This predic-
tion is also borne out, as in (9):

(9) Tarooi-wa, karei-ga hayaku kaetteki-ta ra, tuma-ga
Taroo-Top he-Nom early come back-Past Comp wife-Nom
yorokobu no-o sittei-ru.
get pleased Comp-Acc know-Nonpast
‘Taroo knows that if he comes back early, his wife gets
pleased.’

In (9), the binding domain for kare is the clausal complement of the verb sittei-ru ‘know,’ in which it is free. Hence, (9) is ruled in. Third, even if kare is the subject of the conditional clause, the sentence should be ruled in if it is not c-commanded by a coindexed NP. This prediction is also borne out, as in (10):

(10) Tarooi-no hahaya-wa, karci-ga hayaku kaetteki-ta
     Taroo-Gen mother-Top he-Nom early come back-Past
     Comp get pleased
     ‘Taroo’s mother gets pleased if he comes back early.’

For these reasons, it is reasonable to assume that (1) and (4) are ruled out as a violation of BT (B).

Before we conclude that the ill-formedness of (1) and (4) is attributed to BT (B), two potential objections must be dismissed. First, Japanese is a so-called ‘pro-drop’ language, and probably for this reason, the overt pronouns are generally avoided unless they have a focus interpretation. Thus, we can obtain a more natural sentence if we replace kare in (5) by an empty subject. Similarly, if the overt pronominal subject in (4) is replaced by an empty subject, we obtain a perfectly well-formed sentence:

(11) Tarooi-wa, [e]i maiku-o mot-ta ra, hito-ga
     Taroo-Top mike-Acc hold-Past Comp man-Nom
     kawar-u.
     change-Nonpast
     ‘Taroo would be better if he were thinner than he had been.’

Given the contrast between (4) and (11), one might argue that (4) is ruled out by a version of Avoid Pronoun Principle (APP) rather than BT (B) (cf. Chomsky (1981: 64–65)). However, such an approach cannot be maintained for two reasons. First, APP cannot distinguish between (4), where the overt pronoun is excluded, and (5), where it is less natural but acceptable. Second, an overt pronominal subject is excluded even when an empty subject is excluded:

(12) a. Tarooi-wa, ima-no zibun-ga mukasi yorimo
     Taroo-Top present self-Nom former than
     yasete-i-ta ra, yo-katta noni.
     thin-be-Past Comp better-would be
     ‘Taroo would be better if he were thinner than he had been.’

b. *Tarooi-wa, ima-no [e]-ga mukasi yorimo yasete-i-ta ra.
yo-katta noni.


(12b) is ruled out since a base-generated empty category cannot accompany a modifier. However, even in such an environment, the overt pronoun is still excluded, as in (12c), and only zibun ‘self’ is permitted, as in (12a).

Another potential objection is based on the well-known fact that the overt pronouns in Japanese such as kare cannot function as bound variables. It is occasionally assumed that BT (B) is a constraint on bound variable interpretation rather than a constraint on coreference and that coreference is constrained not by grammatical principles but by pragmatic strategies (Reinhart (1983)). If this were correct, the distribution of kare could not be ruled by BT (B), since it cannot function as a bound variable. It cannot be denied that there are some pragmatic restrictions relevant to coreference relations. However, the fact that (4) and (10) cannot be distinguished without reference to the hierarchical notion of c-command suggests that there must be a syntactic constraint on the distribution of kare (cf. Lasnik (1991)). Although the fact that kare cannot function as a bound variable must be explained by some condition, the condition cannot rule the distribution of coreferential kare, since kare cannot function as a bound variable regardless of the position it occurs, whereas it can be coreferential with another NP if it is free in its binding domain, as shown by the following contrast:

\[
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad \text{a. } *\text{Daremo-ga/}^*\text{Tarooi-ga karei-o suisensi-ta (koto)} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{everyone/Taroo-Nom he-Acc recommend-Past (fact)} \\
& \text{b. } *\text{Daremo-ga/}^*\text{Tarooi-ga karei-no hahaoya-o} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{everyone/Taroo-Nom he-Gen mother-Acc} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{suisensi-ta (koto)} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{recommend-Past (fact)}
\end{align*}
\]

For these reasons, I conclude that (1) and (4) are ruled out by BT (B),\(^2\) which I will reformulate so that the finite conditional clause in

---

\(^2\) If (4) is ruled out by BT (B) and if the empty category in (11) were an empty pronoun (pro), (11) would also be ruled out by BT (B). We assume, however, that the empty subject in (11) is not an empty pronoun, which is subject to BT (B),
Japanese does not count as the binding domain for its pronominal subject for principled reasons. Before doing this, however, I will look at another potential exception to the standard formulation of BT (B) in the next section in order to preclude an alternative solution to the issue at hand.

3. The Subjunctive Clauses in Romance Languages

Another instance of pronouns that falls out of the standard formulation of Binding Theory (B) is observed in subjunctive clauses in Romance languages. Consider the French example in (14):

(14) Il veut qu’il vienne. (Hestvik (1990: 211))

He wants that-he come-Subj

‘He wants to come.’

The pronoun in (14) is free in a finite complement clause, and nevertheless, it must be disjoint in reference from the matrix subject.

Generalizing Pica’s (1987) analysis of anaphors, Hestvik (1990) proposes that XP-pronouns such as il in (14) undergo LF-movement to the Spec of their governors. On this proposal, he argues that when the pronoun in (14) is coreferential with the matrix subject, BT (B) is violated for the following reasons: when the tense in a subjunctive but PRO, which is subject to Chomsky’s (1986) formulation of BT (A). The assumption that a finite clause permits a PRO subject is supported by the fact that Modern Greek lacks controlled infinitive clauses and uses finite subjunctive clauses whose subject is PRO instead (Terzi (1997)) and a number of similarities between the conditional clause and the subjunctive complement clauses (Iatridou (2001)). Alternatively, suppose our formulation of BT (B) in reference to the notion of ‘Case-licenser’ (see section 4). Suppose also that the (null) Case-licenser of pro (or PRO) is not T but another functional category that remains in TP even after T-to-C movement takes place (cf. Baltin (1995)). Then, the binding domain for the pro/PRO subject of the conditional clause, unlike the binding domain for the overt pronominal subject, does not extend to the next higher clause even after T-to-C movement takes place. Hence, we can rule in (11), with a pro/PRO subject, without ruling in (4), with an overt pronominal subject. If the replacement of the overt pronominal subject by an empty one has the effect of downsizing its binding domain even in the environments where T-to-C movement takes place, we can make a (partial) understanding of why the APP effects exist at all, without reference to APP itself or a principle of economy of representation.

I thank Etsuroh Shima, Yoshihito Dobashi, and Nobuhiro Miyoshi (personal communication) for bringing this issue to my attention.
clause has a relation to the tense in the matrix clause, the pronominal subject of the subjunctive clause is governed by the matrix verb. The subject pronoun which is governed by the matrix verb must move to the Spec of the matrix verb. After the movement, it is locally bound by the matrix subject in its binding domain.

It is tempting to provide a unified explanation for the obviation effect of the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in Japanese and the subjunctive clause in Romance languages since it would keep the standard formulation of BT (B) intact. Note also that the subjunctive mood is an instance of the irrealis mood, which signals irrealis modalities such as potentiality, uncertainty, prediction, obligation, and desire, and the conditional clauses in Japanese share the irrealis modality.

However, there are reasons to believe that the transparency of the conditional clauses in Japanese for binding should not be equated with that of the subjunctive clauses in Romance languages. First, if the obviation effect in Japanese were attributed to the (universal) semantic property of 'irrealis' shared by the conditional clauses and the subjunctive clauses, it would be left unexplained why the conditional clauses in other languages, such as English, do not manifest the same property, as shown in (2).

Second, Hestvik (1990) argues that the transparency of the subjunctive clause in Romance languages for binding is related to the presence of a relation between the matrix tense and the subjunctive tense. In contrast, there is no relation, as far as morphology is concerned, between the matrix tense and the conditional tense in Japanese. Thus, any pairing of the two forms of the matrix tense (past or nonpast) and those of the conditional tense is permitted:

(15) a. Taroo-ga heya-ni haitteku-ru to, zen’in-ga
    Taroo-Nom room-in enter-Nonpast Comp all-Nom
    mukuti-ni nar-umu.
    silent become-Nonpast
    ‘If Taroo enters the room, everyone becomes silent.’

   b. Taroo-ga heya-ni haitteki-ta ra, zen’in-ga mukuti-ni
      nar-uu.
   c. Taroo-ga heya-ni haitteku-ru to, zen’in-ga mukuti-ni
      nar-ta.
   d. Taroo-ga heya-ni haitteki-ta ra, zen’in-ga mukuti-ni
      nar-ta.

Significantly, with the nonpast tense in the matrix clause, the condition-
al clause may be in the past tense, and with the past tense in the matrix clause, the conditional clause may be in the nonpast tense. That is, there is no correlation between the matrix tense and the conditional tense in Japanese.

Third, the pronominal subject of the subjunctive clause can be coreferential with the matrix clause object. Thus, in (16), *Elena* can be the antecedent of the pronominal subject of the embedded clause:

(16) Le permití *Elena* que [pro-i usara mi coche].

(I) permitted Elena that she use-Subj my car

(Hestvik (1990: 211))

Hestvik (1990) claims that (16) is well-formed because, if the pronominal subject of the subjunctive clause moves to the Spec of the matrix VP, it is taken out of the c-commanding domain of the matrix clause object and a BT (B) violation is obviated at LF.\(^3\) Now, if the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in Japanese moved to the matrix [Spec, V], (17) would be ruled in for the same reasons as (16). However, in contrast to (16), the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in Japanese cannot be coreferential with the matrix clause object:

(17) *Hanako-wa, kare]-ga kanozyo-to kekkonsi-ta ra,

Hanako-Top he-Nom her-with marry-Past Comp

Taro0,-ni kin’ensuru-yoo iu tumorida.

Taro0-Dat quit smoke-to tell will

‘Hanako will tell Taroo to quit smoking, if he marries her.’

If the ill-formedness of (17) must be attributed to BT (B),\(^4\) Hestvik’s proposal, even if it can explain Romance examples, cannot be extended to account for Japanese examples.

---

\(^3\) A hidden assumption in Hestvik (1990) is that BT (C) does not apply at LF, where the pronoun moved to [Spec, V] c-commands the referential object NP. However, this assumption is controversial. See Chomsky (1995: chapter 3) and Fox (2000).

\(^4\) One cannot attribute the ill-formedness of (17) to a general prohibition against backward binding, because (i) is well-formed, where the pronoun precedes its antecedent:

(i) Dareka-ga kare]-o home-ta ra, Taroo]-wa genki-ni

someone-Nom he-Acc praise-Past Comp Taroo-Top fine-Dat

nar-u.

become-Nonpast

‘Taroo will be fine if someone praises him.’
The question is: why is it that the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in Japanese has its binding domain fixed as the next higher clause, without raising up to the higher clause? In the next section, we will focus on this question.

4. Binding Theory (B) and T-to-C Movement

In accounting for the peculiarity of the conditional clauses in Japanese, it is worthwhile comparing the morphological forms of the tense and complementizer of conditional clauses with those of indicative clauses. First, in the conditional clauses in Japanese, the forms of tense and complementizer must correspond to each other. There are two instances of conditional clauses in Japanese: the conditional complementizer to selects the nonpast-tense marker -u, whereas the conditional complementizer ra selects the past-tense marker -ta. The morphological correspondence in the forms of tense and complementizer must be strictly maintained; if this correspondence is broken, the sentences become severely ill-formed:

(18) a. *Taroo-ga sono siai-ni kat-u ra, ...
Taroo-Nom the game-Dat win-Nonpast Comp(Cond.)
b. *Taroo-ga sono siai-ni kat-ta to, ...
Taroo-Nom the game-Dat win-Past Comp(Cond.)

In contrast, there is no morphological relation between T and C in an indicative complement clause:

(19) Taroo-wa, Jiroo-ga siai-ni kat-u/kat-ta to itta.
Taroo-Top Jiroo-Nom game-Dat win-Nonpast/win-Past Comp(Ind.) said
‘Taroo said that Jiroo would win/had won the game.’
The indicative complementizer to is compatible with both the past and nonpast tenses.

Second, as shown in (15), the tense in the conditional clause does not have a particular selectional relation to that of the matrix clause. In this respect, the conditional clause is similar to the indicative complement clause: the tense in the indicative complement clause may be different from that of the matrix clause. Thus, the nonpast tense form -u in the indicative clause is compatible with the past tense form in the matrix clause in (19). The past tense form -ta in the indicative complement clause is also compatible with the nonpast tense form in the
matrix clause in (20):

(20) Taroo-wa, Jiroo-ga siai-ni kat-u/kat-ta
Taroo-Top Jiroo-Nom game-Dat win-Nonpast/win-Past
to
Comp(Ind.) say-Nonpast
‘Taroo says that Jiroo will win/won the game.’

These observations lead us to the conjecture that it is not the relation of the conditional tense to the matrix tense but the relation of the conditional tense to the conditional complementizer that lies behind the peculiar behavior of the pronominal subject of a conditional clause in Japanese with respect to BT (B):

(21) When there is a morphological selectional relation between
the tense and complementizer in a clause, the binding do-
main for its pronominal subject is fixed as the next higher
clause containing it.

As a way to explain the descriptive generalization in (21), let us propose to define Binding Theory (B) as in (22):5

(22) Binding Theory (B):
A pronoun must be free in the smallest TP or DP which
contains it, its Case-licenser, and a subject.

5 Pronouns but not anaphors or r-expressions are sensitive to the Case-related re-
quirements. Thus, only pronouns have different morphological realizations de-
pending on what Case they have. This is one of the reasons for which I incorpo-
rate the notion of ‘Case-licenser’ in the formulation of only BT (B) (cf. Ogawa
(2002)). The proposal that semantic interpretation is affected by morphological in-
formation such as Case may be a departure from Chomsky’s (1995) assumption that
PF is extraneous to the core computational system of human language. But
Chomsky’s (2001) system, in which the three components of the derivation of
<PHON, SEM> proceed cyclically in parallel, can be interpreted so that PF- and
LF-rules apply simultaneously and/or interactively in the process of cyclic spell-out.
I thank Yoshihito Dobashi for pointing out this issue to me.

The proposal that BT (B), but not BT (A), is formulated on the notion of ‘Case
licenser’ is also incompatible with Reinhart and Reuland’s (1993) proposal that
there are no grammatical conditions such as BT (A) or BT (B) and that their effects
follow from the process of ‘reflexive marking’ which requires that, if two arguments
of a predicate are coindexed, one of them be SELF anaphor. Independently,
Kayne (2001) also proposes a movement approach to pronoun-antecedent relations
which renders BT (B) superfluous. But see Abe (2002) for arguments that BT (B)
should be an independent grammatical principle. The effects of focus on disjoint
reference discussed in Abe (2002) and references therein are put aside here.
With (22), let us assume that the T in the conditional clause in Japanese undergoes LF movement to C for the checking of a morphological selectional feature. This is plausible since there is a morphological correspondence between T and C in the conditional clause. Given this assumption, we can explain why the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in Japanese must be disjoint from the subject and object of the next higher clause. Suppose that the Case-licenser of a nominative subject in [Spec, T] is the T. Then, if T moves to C for selectional feature checking, the binding domain for the pronoun in [Spec, T] is fixed as the next higher TP rather than the TP of which it is the subject. Since the pronouns in (1), (4), and (17) are bound in the higher TP, they are ruled out in violation of BT (B). On the other hand, the binding domain for the pronominal object in (7), whose Case-licenser is the embedded V, does not extend beyond the embedded TP. Hence, (7) does not violate BT (B).

There is no morphological correspondence between T and C in the indicative complement clause, as shown in (19). Hence, in (5), there is no T-to-C movement and the binding domain for the pronominal subject of an indicative complement clause is fixed as the clause, in which it is free and (5) is ruled in without violating BT (B).

Another argument for (22) comes from the fact that, in (23), the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in English may be coreferential with the subject of the next higher clause:

\[(23) \text{Mary, yells at Bill if she is hungry. } (= (2))\]

Under our proposal, this fact can be related to the fact that the conditional complementizer if can take either the past or nonpast tense as

---

6 We assume that the conditional clause in (17) is preposed to a position between the subject and the indirect object and that it is reconstructed at LF to a position between the indirect object and the complement clause. (17) violates BT (B) since in this LF representation, the pronominal subject is c-commanded by the indirect object.

7 As pointed out by Etsuro Shima (personal communication), a similar obviation effect is observed for the pronominal subject of the adjunct clause headed by toki 'when' or node 'because.' This fact can undermine our proposals if the verbs in the toki-clauses and node-clauses are always compatible with both the past and nonpast tenses. However, this seems not to be the case. I will leave any issue concerning the two types of adjunct clauses for future research, because there are complications about their syntax and semantics of which I do not have a sufficient understanding yet.
its complement. Since it shows that the T-to-C movement for morphological selectional feature checking does not take place in the conditional clause in English, the binding domain for its pronominal subject does not extend to the next higher clause. Hence, (23) does not violate BT (B) and is ruled in.8

As an additional argument, in the nara-clause, a third type of conditional clause in Japanese, the complementizer nara does not select a particular form of tense, as shown in (24):

(24) Taroo-wa, [e], yakuin-ni eraba-re-ta
      Taroo-Top committee-Dat select-Pass-Nonpast/Past
      nara, arayuru kyouryoku-o osima-nai darou.
      Comp any corporation-Acc reject-Neg will
      ‘Taroo will be willing to cooperate anything if he is selected for a committee.’

In our theory, this implies that in (24) there is no T-to-C movement that would extend the binding domain for the embedded pronominal subject. Then, we predict that the pronominal subject of the nara-clause, just like the if-clause, may be coreferential with the subject of the next higher clause. The possibility of coreference between kare and Taroo in (25) corroborates our theory:9

---

8 The matrix tense and the conditional tense must be identical in English, a fact which is called ‘tense harmony.’ The tense harmony, an instance of morphological selectional relation, cannot be checked by the LF movement of the conditional T to the matrix T. Otherwise, the binding domain for the pronominal subject of the conditional clause in English would be enlarged to the matrix clause and (23) would be ruled out by BT (B). As Yoshiaki Kaneko points out to me (personal communication), however, it is possible to assume that, while the T-C relation in Japanese is checked by movement, the tense harmony in English is checked by the Agree-mediated relation between the matrix T (Probe) and the conditional T (Goal), without syntactic head-movement (Chomsky (2001)). Kaneko also suggests that the difference between Japanese and English may be related to the fact that English has a very limited range of head-movement, whereas Japanese permits a wide range of head-movement, including predicate raising.

9 The nara-clause has a different semantic relation to the matrix clause than the to/ra-clause. The event denoted by the matrix clause must occur after the one denoted by the to/ra-clause, but such a restriction is not imposed on the nara-clause. In fact, in some examples, the event denoted by the nara-clause preferably takes place temporally after the one denoted by the matrix clause. Because of these semantic differences, the fact that replacement of ra in (4) and (6) by nara does not improve the sentences does not necessarily undermine our approach.
(25) Tarooi-wa, karei-ga yakuin-ni erabar-e-ru/ta
Taroo-Top he-Nom committee-Dat select-Pass-Nonpast/Past
nara, arayuru kyouryoku-o osima-nai darou.
Comp any coorporation-Acc reject-Neg will

5. Conclusion and Further Remarks

In this paper, I demonstrated that the pronominal subject of a finite conditional clause must be disjoint from any argument of the next higher clause when the conditional clause is headed by ra or to (in Japanese), but no such restriction is imposed when it is headed by nara (in Japanese) or if (in English), an asymmetry which cannot be accommodated under a standard formulation of Binding Theory (B). I explained this asymmetry by proposing a new formulation of BT (B) incorporating the notion of ‘Case-licenser’ and by assuming that the tense (T) that has a morphological selectional relation with C moves to C and extends the binding domain for the clausalmate subject pronoun.10

I did not apply Hestvik’s (1990) analysis of the pronominal subject of the Romance subjunctive clauses to that of the Japanese conditional clauses, mainly because there is no morphological relation between the matrix tense and the conditional tense in Japanese. However, there are a couple of similarities between subjunctive clauses and conditional clauses, in addition to their irrealis modality. First, even in Japanese, there is a semantic relation between the matrix tense and the conditional tense: the event denoted by the matrix clause must occur temporally

10 We are not claiming that the binding domain for a pronominal subject always extends to the next higher clause if T moves to C in the embedded clause. In Belfast English, the overt T-to-C movement in the embedded clause is compatible with a pronominal subject of the clause that is coreferential with the matrix subject, as in (i):

(i) Who did John hope would he see? (Pesetsky and Torrego (2000: 11))

Pesetsky and Torrego (2000) claim that the T-to-C movement in (i) takes place for EPP feature checking. We can assume that, unlike the T-to-C movement for morphological selectional feature checking, the T-to-C movement for EPP feature checking is either an overt movement reconstructed at LF, where BT (B) applies, or a movement in the PF component after Spell-Out. Diagnostics for distinguishing between head-movement for EPP feature checking and head-movement for morphological selectional feature checking need to be discovered in a future research.
after the one denoted by the to/ra-headed conditional clause; no such sequential relation is required between the event denoted by the matrix clause and the one denoted by the nara-headed conditional clause or the indicative complement clause. Second, Iatridou (2000) suggests a common cross-linguistic picture that, if there is a relation in verbal morphology between the subjunctive clause and the matrix clause, the same relation also holds between the conditional clause and the matrix clause. Thus, if M1 and M2 stand for particular combinations of morphemes on the verbs, the following relations hold:

(26)  
a. if ... M1 ... then ... M2 ... 
b. want-M2 that ... M1 ...

Third, even in Japanese, the counterpart of (26b) manifests the same properties as that of (26a) with respect to binding. Consider (27):

(27)  
Tarooi-wa [{PROi/zibuni-ga/*karei-ga}  
  Taroo-Top  PRO/self-Nom/he-Nom  
  Tokyo-ni iki] ta-katta. 
  Tokyo-to go want-Past

‘Taroo wanted (PRO/*himself/*him) to go to Tokyo.’

(27) shows that the subject of the complement of tai ‘want’ may be either PRO or an overtly realized anaphor bound by the matrix subject, but cannot be an overt pronoun coreferential with the matrix subject. This shows the same pattern as (4), (6), and (11) (cf. note 2).

For these reasons, it may be better to explore a unified approach to the ill-formedness of (1), (4) and (14) than to assume that pronouns in Romance languages move, whereas those in Japanese do not. A possible way to make the present analysis compatible with Hestvik’s idea is to assume that a pronoun moves to the Spec of its Case-licenser and that the T in the subjunctive complements in Romance languages moves up to the next higher T, whereas the T in the conditional clauses in Japanese moves up to the selecting C. Given this assumption, we can provide a unified account, in accordance with (22), for the Romance facts in (14) and (16) and the Japanese facts in (4), (17) and (27). However, in order to raise this account to something more than

---

11 In (27), unlike in (1) and (4), kare cannot be used even if it is disjoint from Taroo. This is due to the fact that tai ‘want’ selects an obligatory control complement.
a technical solution to the issue, we must answer the question of why subjunctive and conditional clauses differ in the functional categories their T moves to (see also note 8). In the minimalist framework, the question of what feature triggers the pronoun movement also needs to be answered.
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