ANOTHER LOOK AT THE SCOPE OF A NOMINATIVE OBJECT IN JAPANESE[*]

Michiya Kawai
Huron University College and Western University

1.   Introduction

Nominative objects (NomOs), such as in (1b), have been one of the well-known issues in Japanese syntax (Kuroda 1971, Kuno 1973, Sano 1985, Tada 1992, Koizumi 1994, Nomura 2003, 2005, Kawai 2006, Saito 2009, among others). Sugimura (2010:3) presents in (1) [her (4)] what is regarded as the "standard" judgment pattern on those data. After a clarification discussion, she presents in (2) [her (8b/a)] what she considers a more appropriate judgment. For the remainder of this paper, we base our discussion on the latter judgment pattern.

(1) a.   John-ga   migime-dake-o   tsumur-e-ru.
            John-nom right eye-only-acc   close-PT-pres
            'John can close only his right eye' *can>only, ??only>can*

     b.   John-ga   migime-dake-ga   tsumur-e-ru.
            John-nom right eye-only-nom   close-PT-pres
            'John can close only his right eye' **can>only, only>can*

(2) a.   Taroo-wa   shirogohan-dake-o   tabe-rare-ru.
            Taroo-top   rice-only-acc   eat-PT-pres
            'Tarooo can eat rice on its own'   *can>only, *only>can*

     b.   Taroo-wa   shirogohan-dake-ga   tabe-rare-ru.
            Taroo-top   rice-only-nom   eat-PT-pres
            'Taroo can only eat rice (and nothing else)'*can>only, only>can*

NomOs are hosted by such stative predicates as *((ra)r)e* 'potential (*PT*, henceforth)', *deki* 'can/complete', *wakar* 'understand', *-tai* 'want', among others. In what follows, we exclusively use *PT* for simplicity. For concreteness,

---

we assume that the nominative Case feature of NomOs is licensed in Spec-TP (Koizumi 1994) via the operation of AGREE (Chomsky 2000, 2001). For an alternative view, see the discussion in Section 4.1.

Sugimura (2010) claims that the sentences in (2) involve *restructuring,* a "cross-linguistic phenomenon where apparent bi-clausality disappears, and clauses act as a unit." For example, in (2), *PT* is a *functional restructuring* (FR) predicate, which involves head movement of the lower V (*tabe*) to the matrix predicate (*PT*); this process derives "transparency for case-agreement" by extending the domain of AGREE. The head movement of *hanas* to *PT* extends the case-agreement domain of the embedded object to the entire TP, as schematically shown in (3).

(3)   a. $[_{TP}$ $[_{vP} [_{VP}$ AccO $…t_1…] V_1$-PT] T]
       b. $[_{TP}$ NomO$_2$ $[_{vP} [_{VP}$ t_2 $…t_1…] V_1$-PT] T]
       c. $[_{TP}$ $[_{vP} [_{VP}$ NomO $…t_1…] V_1$-PT] T]

The accusative object (AccO) in (2a) takes only narrow scope, whereas the NomO in (2b) takes wide or narrow scope relative to *PT*. Under Sugimura's analysis, the AccO is case-licensed *in-situ* by *tabe* in (2a), thus taking narrow scope (3a). In (2b), on the other hand, the NomO can be case-licensed by the matrix T in two ways: either (i) the NomO moves to the specifier of the matrix T, resulting in the wide scope reading, as in (3b), or, (ii) it remains *in situ* for the narrow scope reading (3c). The latter option is possible because the NomO is in the case-licensing domain of T after restructuring via head movement. Let us call this analysis as the *Head Movement Analysis of NomOs* (**HMA**, henceforth).

In order to support the HMA, Sugimura offers the following scope asymmetry found in two constructions: viz., a causative (*CAUS*, henceforth) sentence (4a) and a *ni*-purpose clause (*NI*, henceforth) sentence (4b).[1] Namely, the NomO in (4a) can take wide scope over – or narrow scope under – *PT*, whereas the NomO in (4b) can take only wide scope over *PT*. This asymmetry, according to Sugimura (2010:6–7), arises because *CAUS* is a FR-predicate, whereas *ik* in (4b) is a *lexically restructuring* (LR) predicate.

(4)   a.   Taroo-wa Hanako-ni shirogohan-dake-ga tabe-sase-rare-ru.
             Taroo-top Hanako-dat rice-only-nom   eat-CAUS-PT-pres
             'Taroo can make Hanako only eat rice (and nothing else)'
             'Taroo can make Hanako eat rice on its own'
             only>can, can>only   (Sugimura 2010: ≈ (9a))

       b.   Midori-wa sono café-ni aisu-dake-ga   tabe-ni ik-e-ru.
             Mirodi-top that café-to ice cream-only-nom eat-NI go-PT-pres
             'Modori can only go to that café to eat an ice cream'
             *only>can; *can>only*   (Sugimura 2010: ≈ (10a))

Sugimura (2010:11) describes the scope asymmetry found in (4a) and (4b) as follows:

---

[1] (4b) is somewhat awkward, but, in proper context, it is perfectly acceptable. For some reason, it sounds better if it is embedded; the sentence improves dramatically inside a relative clause, for example.

when head movement is available, a nominative object can appear either in the complement of an embedded verb or in the domain of a matrix verb since the relevant opaque domain is expanded. In contrast, when head movement is not available, a nominative object must be base-generated in the domain of the matrix verb. This means that –sase has two options for its structural realization, whereas *ik* has only one option.

In this paper, we closely examine the scope property of NomOs in *CAUS-* and *NI*-sentences, showing the empirical problem of the HMA. In her discussion, Sugimura (2010) exclusively uses *NP-dake-ga* 'only-NP-nom', which strongly biases toward the wide scope reading (Section 3.1). When we use an indefinite NomO in *NI*-sentences, which is known to take narrow scope (Lasnik 1999, 2007, Saito 2009), the narrow scope reading of the NomO is available (Section 3.2). We conclude that the alleged FR/LR-scope asymmetry in (4) is an artifact of the choice of NomOs, and, thus, the HMA cannot be maintained.[2] Section 4 offers an informal discussion on the nominative case licensing mechanism, and a brief concluding remark is given in Section 5.

2.   Nominative object, restructuring, and two derivations

Let us return to the baseline data in (4). Since they are not a minimal pair, some pragmatic factors may interfere with proper judgment. In order to control this, we use (5), instead, as the baseline data for the subsequent discussion. Recall that, according to Sugimura, the NomO has ambiguous scope in a causative (*CAUS*) sentence (5a), whereas it has only wide scope over *PT* in a purpose clause (*NI*) sentence (5b).

(5)   a.   Mari-wa Chie-ni   zensai-dake-ga   tabe-sase-rare-ru.
              Mari-top Chie-dat   appetizer–nom   eat-CAUS-PT-pres
              'Mari can make Chie eat only appetizer'
              can>only
              'The only thing Mari can make Chie eat are appetizers'
              only>can

       b.   Mari-wa sono café-ni zensai-dake-ga   tabe-ni ik-e-ru.
              Mari-top the   café-to appetizers-only-nom   eat-NI go-PT-pres
              '*Mari can go to the café to eat only appetizers'
              **can>only*
              'Appetizers are the only thing Mari can go to eat at the café'
              only>can

Sugimura argues that this follows from the HMA. Namely, (i) having an FR-predicate, (5a) involves head movement of *tabe* 'eat' to *CAUS*, whereas the postposition *–ni* in the purpose clause blocks head movement of *tabe* to *ik* in (5b), as schematically illustrated in (6a)/(6b), respectively; (ii) functional restructuring extends the agreement domain of *tabe* to the matrix clause (6a) but

---

[2] Lisa Travis (p.c.) has informed me that Sugimura (2012) became aware of some of the concerns expressed here, acknowledging them in footnotes. Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain a copy of Sugimura 2012 while writing this paper; thus, I base all my remarks here solely on Sugimura 2010 and Dobler, Sugimura, and Travis 2010.

not with a LR-predicate (6b); (iii) thus, the matrix T in (5a) can case-license the NomO either *in-situ* or in Spec-TP because they are in the same case-licensing domain (7); but (iv) the matrix T cannot do the same in (5b) because the NomO is not in its case-licensing domain (8a).

(6) a. [[[OBJ   V-] CAUSE-PT] T]
                            head movement

    b. [[[OBJ   V-NI]   go-PT] T]
                            *head movement

(7) a. [[[[NomO t_1] V_1-CAUS] –PT] T]
    b. [$NomO_2$ [[[t_2 t_1] V_1-CAUS] –PT] T]

Case-licensing domain of NomO

(8) a. * [[[[Nom-O V …] –*NI*   go–PT] T]
                Case licensing domain of NomO

    b. [$NomO_2$ [[[pro_2 V …] –*NI*]   go–PT] T]

Given (iv), the wide scope reading in (5b) must involve base generation of NomO in the matrix Spec-TP, which binds *pro* in the embedded object position (6b). Sugimura (2010), thus, concludes that both the movement-approach (e.g., Tada 1992, Koizumi 1994, Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005, 2007) and the base-generation approach (Takano 2003) to NomOs must be available in Japanese. If Sugimura is correct, then LR-predicates do not undergo *restructuring* in the sense described by Sugimura above, because (8b) remains bi-clausal.

Observe that the HMA is essentially designed to capture the scope asymmetry outlined in (5). In other words, it aims to derive the descriptive generalizations in (9) from (10) in conjunction with other principles of grammar. Therefore, the correctness of (9) and (10) is critical for the HMA. If either statement in (9) turns out to be descriptively incorrect, then the HMA cannot be maintained, since (10) specifically derives the dichotomy in (9).

(9) a. The scope of a Japanese NomO with an FR predicate can be either wide or narrow, as shown in (5a).
    b. A Japanese NomO in a non-FR predicate *takes only wide scope*, as shown in (5b).

(10) a. *CAUS* is a FR-predicate, triggering restructuring.
     b. (*NI*-) *ik* is not a FR-predicate; thus no restructuring takes place.

If, on the other hand, either of the statements in (10) turns out to be false, then the core of HMA may still be maintained. Naturally, by doing so, the elegance of the analysis might be reduced somewhat. Sugimura (2010:8–10) offers supporting arguments for (9) and (10). For (10), she offers two arguments (i.e., question-answer pairs and reduplication) with the assumption that "word formation is part of the syntax (Halle & Marantz 1993)," although we do not

review her arguments here. It suffices us to observe that causative *(s)ase-* is a bound morpheme attaching to a verb stem, as shown in (11).

(11) a.   tabe -ase   -ru.   b.   *   ase-ru.[3]
            eat   -CAUS   -pres   CAUS-pres
            'cause someone to eat'

It is highly plausible that *tabe* in (11a) syntactically incorporates into *CAUS* via head movement. *NI*-clauses, on the other hand, are not morphologically bound to *ik*, judging from the surface morphology. Under the HMA, that means that a *NI-clause* does not incorporate into *ik*, and, thus, the embedded verb does not head-move to *ik*. Thus, (10) seems quite plausible.

The same cannot be said about (9), however. Sugimura does argue for (9a), mainly using Nomura's (2003, 2005) argument.[4] Interestingly, Sugimura (2010) spares few empirical argument for (9b), simply stating that a NomO "obligatorily takes wide scope" (p. 6). I am sympathetic to Sugimura's judgment; the wide-scope reading of the NomO in (5b) is indeed dominant. But, then, Sugimura only uses *dake*-NomO for her discussion, the dominant reading of which is the wide scope reading, as to be shown below. Therefore, (9b) must be tested against other types of NomOs.

3.   Scope properties of nominative objects

---

[3] A process similar to *do*-support (Lasnik 1995) applies to a *CAUS*, when it is used by itself, as in (i). This strongly suggests that a *CAUS* cannot be stranded. Also, this raises a question on the validity of Sugimura's question-answer argument. She claims that *s-ase-ta* alone cannot be a legitimate answer to the question in (iia). Yet, in proper context it can be used as a proper answer without the verb, as in (ib).

(i)   a.   Hontoo-ni   Mari-ni   toshokan-no hon-o   kaes-ase-ta-no?
            True-adv   Mari-dat library-gen books-acc return-CAUS-past-Q
            'Did you really make Mari return the library books?'

      b.   Un.   Chanto   s-ase-ta   -yo.
            Yeah   Properly   do-CAUS-past   -prt
            'Yeah, I made her do it as I was supposed to'

(ii) a.   John-o   hashir-ase-ta-no?
            John-acc   run-CAUS-past-Q
            'Did you make John run?'

      b.   Un.   Hashir-ase-ta   -yo.'   c. * Un. S-ase-ta.
            Yes   run-CAUS-past -part   Yes caused
            'Yes, I did' or 'Yes, I made (him) to run'

[4] This issue is far from being settled. See Bobaljik and Wurmbrand's (2012) comment on this. Neither do I intend to try to settle it here. One source of the difficulties is that minute prosodic changes, such as a slight pause, or intonation change, after a NomO, could subtly affect the interpretation. Sugimura (2010) follows Nomura's (2003, 2005) arguments on this matter, and we, in turn, follow Sugimura's position for our discussion.

In this section, we will examine the empirical validity of (9b) using NomOs other than *NP-dake-ga* 'only NP'. In particular, we show that NomOs behave differently with respect to scope if they are indefinite.

3.1. *Only, everyone,* **and indefinite NPs.**

Saito (2009) notes that different types of nouns behave differently with respect to scope taking: e.g., (i) indefinite NPs take narrow scope relative to negation, as in (12a); and (ii) quantified NPs, such as *NP-dake-ga*, tend to take wide scope over negation, as in (12b). Lasnik (1999) shows essentially the same point; the raised subject can take the wide or narrow scope if it is indefinite (13a); however, the same is not the case with quantified NPs, as in (13b).

(12) a. Kono ike -ni-wa sakana-ga i-na-i.
This pond-in-Top fish-nom be-not
'There is no fish in this pond.' *not>fish, * fish>not*

    b. Kono ike -ni-wa koi-dake-ga i-na-i.
This pond -in-Top carp-only-nom be-not
'It is only carp that this pond does not have' *only>not, *not>only*

(13) a. Some politician$_1$ is likely [t$_1$ to address John's constituency].
some>likely, likely>some

    b. Every coin$_1$ is 3% likely [t$_1$ to land heads].
*every>3% likely, *3% likely>every*

In this discussion, we will leave it open as to how the narrow scope reading of indefinites, such as in (12a)/(13a), is obtained. If we allow A-reconstruction of scope in a principled way, then the unavailability of scope reconstruction for quantified NPs, as in (12b)/(13b), becomes unexplained. If we were to follow Lasnik (1999), but *contra* Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2012), in that there is no quantifier reconstruction of A-movement, then the narrow scope reading of a raised indefinite NP must be possible for an independent reason (Saito 2009). Settling this question is well beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, here, we follow Saito (2009) in assuming that "reconstruction in…Case chains…is difficult with quantified NPs but is readily available or even forced with indefinites."

    To sum up, examples (12b) and (13b) show that *dake* 'only' has a strong tendency to take wide scope. With this property of *dake*, we would expect a strong bias toward the wide scope reading for (5b), the crucial test case for Sugimura's (2010) analysis. That is, the alleged unambiguous wide scope reading of NomOs in LR-context may be due to this property of *dake*, not a reflection of the lack of head movement.

    The examples in (15) demonstrate the distinct scope properties of nominative marked *everyone*, *most*, *only*, and indefinites (14) (Lasnik 1999, 2007, Miyagawa 2003, Saito 2009). As (16)–(18) show, the generalizations in (14) hold in Japanese, as well.

(14) a.   *everyone* can take scope over or under negation.
       b.   *most* and *only* take scope over negation.
       c.   indefinites (have strong tendency to) take scope under negation.

(15) a.   Everyone didn't take that exam.   *everyone>not, not>everyone*
       b.   Most people didn't take that exam.   *most>not*
       c.   Only John didn't take that exam.   *only>not*

(16) Mari-wa   zen-in-ga   hihan-deki-   na-i.
      Mari-Top   all-nom   criticize-can- not-present
      'Mari can't criticize anyone'   *all>not >can*
      'Mari can't criticize everyone'   *not>can >all*

(17) Mari-wa   Chie-dake-ga   hihan-deki-   na-i.
      Mari-Top   Chie-only-nom   criticize-can- not-present
      'It is only Chie that Mari cannot criticize' *only>not>can,*
      '*Mari cannot criticize only Chie'   **not>can>only*

(18) Mari-wa   hito-ga   hihan-deki-   na-i.
      Mari-Top   person-nom   criticize-can- not-present
      'Mari cannot criticize a person'   *not>can>a person*
      '*There is a person who Mari cannot criticize' **a person>not>can*

The generalizations in (14) capture the scope relation of NomOs and negation. *PT* is known to take scope under negation; thus, the same generalizations hold with the NomOs and *PT*, as shown in (19)–(21). Thus, we obtain (22) for Japanese, a set of parallel conditions to (14) (See also Nomura 2005).

(19) Mari-wa   zen-in-ga   hihan-deki-   -ru.
      Mari-Top   all-nom   criticize-PT-   -present
      'For each one of them, Mari can criticize'   *all>can*
      'Mari can criticize everyone'   *can>all*

(20) Mari-wa   Chie-dake-ga   hihan-deki-   -ru.
      Mari-Top   Chie-only-nom   criticize-PT-   -present
      'It is only Chie that Mari can criticize'   *only>can,*
      '*Mari can criticize only Chie'   **?can>only*

(21) Mari-wa   hito-ga   hihan-deki-   -ru.
      Mari-Top   person-nom   criticize-PT-   -present
      'Mari can criticize a person'   *not>can>a person*
      '*There is a person who Mari can criticize' ** a person> not> can*

(22) a.   *Zen-in-* 'all' takes either wide or narrow scope.
       b.   DP-*dake* has a tendency to take scope over negation/*PT*.
       c.   Indefinites (e.g. *hito*) tend to take scope under negation/*PT*.

If so, it is expected that the quantified NP *zensai-dake-ga* in (5b) has a strong bias toward the wide scope interpretation. That is, the generalization in (9b) may be an artifact of (22). In order to test (9b), we need data with indefinites.

3.2.　Modified baseline data with indefinites

Now, we examine the baseline data in light of (22). If the HMA is indeed correct in that head movement of the lower predicate is blocked, then, even an indefinite NomO must take wide scope because it cannot be nominative-licensed in its θ-position. This predication, however, is not borne out, as shown below. In (23), I do not think the wide scope reading is available.

(23)　Mari-wa sono jugyoo-ni kanji-ga　　benkyooshi-ni　　ik-e-ru
　　　 Mari-top the　class-to　 kanji-nom　study-NI　　　　go-PT-pres

　　　 (koto-o　　 shir-anak-atta).
　　　 (that-acc　 know-not-did)

　　　 'Mari (did not know that she) can go to the class to practice kanji'
　　　 can>kanji, ? kanji>can*

(24)　Mari-wa sono jugyoo-ni zen-in-ga　　　hihanshi-ni ik-e-ru (koto-o…
　　　 Mari-top the　class-to　 everyone-nom criticize-NI go-PT-pres …
　　　 'Midori (did not know that she) can go to the class to criticize everyone'
　　　 can>all, all>can

On the other hand, as shown in (24), *zen-in-ga* 'everyone' is compatible with both the wide and narrow scope reading. This result is duplicated with negation in (25)/(26).

(25)　Mari-wa sono jugyoo-ni kanji-ga　 benkyooshi-ni ik-e-　na-i.
　　　 Mari-top the　class-to　 kanji-nom study-NI　　　　go-PT-not-pres

　　　 (koto-o　　 shir-anak-atta).
　　　 (that-acc　 know-not-did)

　　　 'Mari (did not know that she) can't go to the class to practice kanji'
　　　 can>not>kanji,
　　　 '*(… know that) kanji was what she couldn't go to the class to study'
　　　 **kanji>not>can*

(26)　Mari-wa sono jugyoo-ni zen-in-ga　　　hihanshi-ni ik-e-na-i (koto-o …
　　　 Mari-top the　class-to　 everyone-nom　criticize-NI go-POT-not-pres …
　　　 'Mari (… know that she) can't go to the class to criticize everyone.'
　　　 not>can>all,
　　　 '(… know that) not everyone, she can go to the class to　criticize'
　　　 all>not>can

In fact, the *NI*-sentences above show precisely the results predicted by (22); viz., *zen-in* 'everyone' may take either wide or narrow scope, whereas indefinite *kanji* 'Chinese characters' takes narrow scope. This result is problematic for the HMA since NomOs are taking narrow scope in a LR-context, contrary to (9b).
　　　　Now, recall that Sugimura (2010) does not offer any empirical argument for the alleged inaccessibility of narrow scope reading of NomOs in *NI*-sentences. As for the evidence for (9b), Sugimura (2010) does not use a

minimal pair. By not doing so, some unwanted (pragmatic) factors might have interfered with the judgment. When we use a minimal pair, as in (27) and (28), I do not find any marked scope asymmetry.

(27) Mari-wa sono café-ni Bahha-dake-ga   kiki-ni   ik-e-ru.
      Mari-top the café-to Bach-only-nom   listen-NI go-PT-pres
      'Mari can go to the café to listen to only Bach'   *can>only*
      'Mari can't go to that café to listen to anything but Bach'   *only>can*

(28) Mari-wa Chie-ni sono café-de Bahha-dake-ga kik-ase-   rare-ru.
      Mari-nom Chie-dat the   café-at Bach-only-nom listen-CAUS-   PT-pres
      'Mari can make Chie listen to only Bach at the café.'   *can>only*
      'Mari can't make Chie listen anything but Bach at the café'   *only>can*

The wide scope reading of the NomO says that the café has no other records but Bach's music; the narrow scope interpretation is that the café allows Chie to listen exclusively to Bach's music, even though the café has a good collection of other classical music. The wide scope reading is the preferred one, in my view; yet, together with the informants I consulted with, I found the narrow scope reading of NomOs readily accessible in both cases. I even find the contrast between (5a) and (5b) comparable to (27) and (28). In short, we do not find any empirical evidence for (9b), but evidence against it.

　　　To sum up, the alleged scope asymmetry of NomOs between *CAUS* and *NI* was shown to be absent, and, therefore, the HMA of nominative case-licensing analysis, which predicts its existence, cannot be maintained. On the basis of the result of this study, we may say that the case-licensing of NomOs is not blocked even when the lower predicate does not morphologically incorporate (i.e., head-move) to the matrix predicate.

3.3.　Restructuring and head movement

Let us return to (10b): *NI*-sentences do not involve FR (head movement). Thus, under the HMA, *NI*-sentences are without *restructuring*; they maintain bi-clausality (cf. (8)). This is contradictory to our findings above. We saw that indefinite NomOs can take narrow scope, indicating that they can be case-licensed *in-situ*. In other words, *NI*-sentences seem to undergo restructuring.

　　　Consider (29). The goal PP is an argument of *ik*, thus, being outside the *NI*-purpose clause (29a). (29b/c) shows that a NomO/AccO may scramble out of a *NI*-clause without affecting the interpretation. This indicates that the purpose clause is not an island for scrambling.

(29) a. Mari-wa [sono café-ni [zensai-dake-ga   tabe]-ni ik]-e-ru.
         Mari-top the   café-to appetizers-only-nom   eat-NI   go-PT-pres
         'Mari can go to the café to eat only appetizers'

      b. Mari-wa [zensai-dake$_1$-ga   sono café-ni[t$_1$ tabe-ni] ik]-e-ru.
         Mari-top appetizers-only-nom the   café-to eat-NI   go-PT-pres

      c. Mari-wa [zensai-dake$_1$-o   sono café-ni[t$_1$ tabe-ni] ik]-e-ru.
         Mari-top appetizers-only-acc the   café-to eat-NI   go-PT-pres

Interestingly, a *NI*-purpose clause itself can be scrambled above the goal with AccO, as in (30a). This does not seem possible with a NomO, as in (30b).

(30) a. Mari-wa [[zensai-dake-o   tabe]$_1$-ni sono café-ni   t$_1$ ik]-e-ru.
        Mari-top appetizers-only-acc eat-NI the   café-to   go-PT-pres
        'Mari can go to the café to only eat appetizers'

   b. ?? Mari-wa [[zensai-dake-ga   tabe]$_1$-ni sono café-ni t$_1$ ik]-e-ru.
        Mari-top appetizers-only-nom eat-NI the   café-to   go-PT-pres
        'Mari can go to the café to only eat'

The contrast in (30a/b), though subtle, suggests that licensing of NomO requires the structural proximity of *NI*- and *ik*, even though they are not morphologically incorporated.   This strongly suggests that *NI*-sentences do undergo a restructuring process – by eliminating the bi-clausality, and that this process requires adjacency of the *NI*-clause and *ik*. If this view is correct, then contrary to the HMA's position, restructuring does not require head movement, and, thus, the FR/LR-distinction is superfluous with respect to *restructuring*, per se.
     This conclusion is tentative, even though I still think the contrast in (30) is real. The contrast in (30) is quite subtle, and (30b) improves when it is embedded in another sentence, such as *Mari did not know that*.   Further investigation is in order.

4.   Case-licensing of NomO: Covert Ā-movement

Below, we briefly speculate on the mechanism of case licensing of NomOs and scope marking that is compatible with the findings above. Under the HMA, nominative case is licensed in the Spec TP, and the scope is marked by the surface position of the NomOs. For the low scope reading, the NomO remains *in-situ*, and, for wide scope, the NomO "optionally undergo movement to satisfy an EPP feature on T, where it takes scope over the modal, along the line of Nomura (2005)" (Sugimura 2010:7).   The EPP-feature must be eliminated immediately after it enters into the derivation (Chomsky 2000), so NomOs must move overtly. This is a problematic assumption since wide scope of NomOs obtains without overt raising, as shown in (31).

(31) a. Mari-wa [tomodachi-to shirogohan-dake-o   tabe]-rare-ru.
        Mari-top   friends-with   rice-only-acc   eat-PT-pres
        'Mari can eat only rice with her friends'
        *can>only, *only>can*

   b. Mari-wa [tomodachi-to shirogohan-dake-ga   tabe]-rare-ru.
        Mari-top   friends-with   rice-only-nom   eat-PT-pres
        'Mari can only eat rice (and nothing else) with her friends'
        can>only, only>can

The examples in (31) are exactly like the examples in (2) except for the presence of *tomodachi-to* 'with friends' on the left of the NomOs; both the PPs and NomOs must be inside the lower clause. In (31b) wide scope reading of the NomO is available, even though the NomO remains *in-situ*.

(32) a.   Mari-wa   [steeji-ni   piano-dake-o   ok]-e-ru.
            Mari-top   stage-on   piano-only-acc   place-PT-pres
            'Mari can place only the piano on the stage'
            can>only, *only>can

      b.   Mari-wa   [steeji-ni   piano-dake-ga   ok]-e-ru.
            Mari-top   stage-on   piano-only-nom   place-PT-pres
            'Mari can place only the piano on the stage'
            only>can, can>only

The same holds with (32a/b), where the PP is an argument of *ok* 'place'. The wide scope reading of the NomO is available in (32b), indicating that scope is not overtly marked in Japanese, contrary to the view under the HMA.

        This conclusion is consistent with that of Saito's (2009): viz., Japanese NomOs *covertly* move to *the outer Spec*, not the (inner) Spec of TP. Below, a abbreviated version of his argument is given. If a NomO moves to the TP Spec, an A-position, then the NomO would acquire a cluster of properties associated with A-moved items (Saito 1985, Mahajan 1990); for example, A-moved NomOs are expected to exhibit subject properties; however, they do not. Japanese reflexive *jibun* is a subject oriented reflective; in (33), only *Mari* is the antecedent for *jibun,* even though *Chie* should be able to be, if it were A-moved. (See Saito 1982, 2009, for more arguments on this). If a NomO is licensed by T, but not inside TP Spec, the NomO must be moved to an Ā-position, i.e., the outer Spec of TP (34).

(33)   Mari₁-ga   Chie₂-ga jibun₁/*₂-no ie-de   shikar-e-ru (koto).
        Mari-nom   Chie-nom self-gen   house-in   scold-PT-pres fact
        '(the fact that) Mari can scold Chie in her house'

(34)   [$_{TP}$ **Ā** [$_{T'}$ subject [$_{T'}$ A [$_{T'}$ [$_{vP}$ …] T]]]]

The next question is: where is the NomO in (35a) – *in-situ* or in TP Spec? The HMA assume the latter. Saito (2009), however, argues that this movement must be covert using the data with floated quantifiers (FQs). It has been well-established (cf. Kuroda 1980, Haig 1980) that Japanese FQs must be linearly adjacent to their associates or their traces (copies).

(35) a.   Gakusee-ga Terugugo-ga   hanas-e-ru   (koto).
            students-nomTelugu-nom   speak-PT-pres   (that)
            '(that) the students can speak Telugu'

      b.   Gakusee-ga san-nin Terugu-go-ga   hanas-e-ru   (koto).
            students-nom3-FQ$_{subj}$ Telugu-nom   speak-PT-pres   (that)
            '(that) three students can speak Telugu'

      c. ?? Gakusee-ga Terugu-go-ga   san-nin hanas-e-ru   (koto).
            students-nomTelugu-nom   3-FQ$_{subj}$ speak-PT-pres   (that)
            '(that) three students can speak Telugu'

(35b) shows that FQ$_{subj}$ is adjacent to the subject, thus being well-formed. (35c), on the other hand, is ungrammatical because the NomO intervenes between the

subject and the FQ. Saito (2009) suggests that the structure involved in (35c) must be (36a), with the NomO (somewhere) inside VP. Suppose that the NomO overtly raises, instead; then, the subject must also scramble out so as to maintain the surface word order, resulting in (36b).

(36)   a.   [$_{TP}$ subject   [$_{VP}$ NomO FQ$_{subj}$ V]]
       b.   [subject$_1$ [NomO$_2$ [$_{TP}$ t$_1$ FQ$_{subj}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_2$ V]]]]

If so, (35c) would have been well-formed, since FQ$_{subj}$ is adjacent to the trace (copy) of the subject. In other words, given the ungrammaticality of (35c), the NomO may not be in Spec-TP. While this account leaves open the question of where the NomO is in (36a), the problem of (36b) seems clear. Therefore, Saito concludes that the ungrammaticality of (35c) shows that the NomO must not overtly move into Spec of TP.

   What remains is how to capture *covert* movement in the minimalist theoretical apparatus (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2008). In the standard approach, overt movement is motivated by a movement-inducing feature (e.g., EPP- or OCC-feature), but what motivates covert raising? To be more precise, under the recent minimalist view, movement is the *internal merge* of *terms*, and the overt/covert distinction reduces to whether the head or tail of a chain (i.e., a sequence of *occurrences*) is pronounced (e.g., Bobaljik 1995, Brody 1995). The optionality of movement vanishes.

   Lasnik (1999) discusses an interesting case of optional overt movement and covert feature raising in English. Lasnik reports that some dialect of English allows *make-out* (≈ pretend) with or without particle movement, as shown in (39a/b), respectively. The sentence in (39a) involves the raising of *John* to the matrix object position (Lasnik and Saito 1991, Lasnik 1999), as illustrated in (40a), whereas *John* in (39b) remains *in-situ*, as in (40b).

(39)   a.   Mary made John out to be a fool.
       b.   Mary makes out John to be a fool.
(40)   a.   Mary made John out   [~~John~~ to be a fool].
       b.   Mary makes __   out   [John to be a fool].

This optional raising to object has consequences in scope in this dialect, Lasnik reports. With overt raising to object, the object must take wide scope, whereas without overt raising, the object may take narrow scope reading. For example, in this dialect, the raised universal quantifier in (41a) may not take scope under the negation of the infinitive, whereas the non-raised quantifier in (41b) can.

(41)   a.   The mathematician made every even number out not to be the sum
            of two primes.
       b.   The mathematician made out every even number not to be the sum
            of two primes.

The data in (42) and (43) show the same point. The NPI (*any*) in the matrix PP can be licensed by the negation in the raised object (42b), but not in the non-raised object (42b). Likewise, *each other* in the matrix PP is licensed by *the defendants* only if it is raised (43a); otherwise, the anaphor license fails (43b).

(42) a.   The lawyer made no witness out to be idiots during any of the
            trials.
     b. ?* The lawyer made out no witness to be idiots during any of the
            trials.
(43) a.   The DA made the defendants out to be guilty during each other's
            trial.
     b. ?* The DA made out the defendants to be guilty during each other's
            trial.

Lasnik (1999:202) concludes that "[w]hen raising of a universal does take place … that universal cannot "reconstruct" so as to take scope under lower clausal negation." The optionality raising may be due to the optionality of EPP-feature in the matrix V (or, in Agr$_O$). When no raising takes place, "the nominal's Case will be checked by covert raising of its formal features to the V" (p. 204). Let us assume the overall correctness of Lasnik's analysis of this construction. That is, overt movement is triggered by optional EPP-features, whereas the case of the embedded subject is licensed via covert feature raising. Within the present theoretical framework, *covert feature raising* for case-licensing (i.e., case-feature checking) seems to be best handled by AGREE, as suggested by Sugimura (2010). Let us assume with many other researchers that it suffices for nominative case features to case-agree with its licenser.

Recall that, in this dialect of English, the scope is marked by the surface position of the scope bearing item. This fact contrasts with the scope marking of NomOs in Japanese, as we saw above: viz., the scope marking of NomOs is not overt. In a sense, one may expect this contrast from the fact that English is a *wh*-movement language and Japanese, a *wh-in-situ* language. In Japanese, "overt" movement of DP does not seem to be the primary mechanism for scope marking, although scrambling does affect scope (Saito 1985, Miyagawa 2001). Rather, Japanese marks *wh*-scope with the scope particle –*ka* (Hagstrom 1998, 2000). Unlike *wh*-scope, a NomO has no scope-marking particle associated with it; yet, the position of T associated with it should suffice for wide scope marking. That is, the relevant feature of T agrees with that of a NomO, thereby marking the T as the scope marker of the NomO at the interface. As for narrow scope, the surface position of a NomO would suffice for the interface to identify it.

5.   Summary

In this paper, we argued that the HMA account for the scope asymmetry alleged in (1)/(3)/(5) fails. The HMA attempts to derive the asymmetry in terms of the dichotomy between FR- and LR-predicates, which in turn follows from the presence/absence of head movement (Section 2). However, we demonstrated that the (un)availability of head movement does not correlate with the scope asymmetry; in fact, the alleged scope asymmetry does not seem to exist (Section 3). With indefinite NomOs, narrow scope reading is available with a *NI*-sentence (Section 3.2). Therefore, there was no empirical basis for (9b): i.e., NomOs in *NI*-sentences obligatorily take wide scope, the effect of which the HMA is designed to derive. It appears that *NI*-sentences undergo *restructuring*, in spite of the absence of head movement (Section 3.3).

We then speculated an alternative mechanism of nominative case-licensing for NomOs (Section 4). What seems promising is that a NomO does

not overtly raise to the (outer) Spec-TP in Japanese (Saito 2009). The case-licensing is done via AGREE, and, thus it suffices for the NomO to be in the agreement domain of the licenser (Chomsky 2008); it need not raise to the specifier of its licenser. If so, *restructuring* must take place irrespective of *CAUS*- and *NI*-construction; that is, contrary to the HMA, *restructuring* takes place in both FR- and LR-predicates, thereby rendering the FR-LR distinction superfluous for syntax.

In the English *make-out* construction (Lasnik 1999), scope is overtly marked by the position of the relevant DP, whose movement is triggered by the EPP-feature (or Agr_O) optional in these dialects of English. Case-licensing of the non-raised DPs is done covert feature raising, or (long-distance) feature agreement. In Japanese, on the other hand, scope marking of NomOs can be done without (overt) movement (*pro* Saito 2009, and *contra* Koizumi 1994, Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005, Sugimura 2010, among others); rather, the interface reads off the scope from the position of a NomO *in situ* (narrow scope), or from the position of the licenser T (wide scope) via agreement established for case-licensing of the DP. Naturally, there are many outstanding questions regarding this topic, and more empirical investigation is in order.

References

Bobaljik, J. 1995. *Morphosyntax: The syntax of verbal inflection*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Bobaljik, J., and S. Wurmbrand. 2005. The domain of agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory* 23: 809–865.

Bobaljik, J., and S. Wurmbrand. 2007. Complex predicates, aspect, and anti-reconstruction. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 16:27-42.

Bobaljik, J., and S. Wurmbrand. 2012. Word order and scope: Transparent interfaces and the ¾ signature. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43: 371–422.

Brody, Michael. 1995. *Lexico-Logical Form: A Radically Minimalist Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries: The framework. In *Step by Step: Minimalist Essays in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 2001. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 20, 1–28. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL. [Reprinted in A. Belletti ed., 2004. *Structure and Beyond: The Cartography and Syntactic Structures Volume 3*, 104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.]

Chomsky, N. 2008. On phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. R. Friedin, C. Otero, and M. L. Zubizarreta, 133–166, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dobler, E., M. Sugimura, and L. Travis. 2010. Domain mismatches: PF vs. LF and XP vs. X and AGREE. Paper presented at the 33th GLOW conference, University of Wrocław. The abstract available at: http://www.ifa.uni.wroc.pl/~glow33/MAIN-ABSTR.pdf

Hagstrom, P. 1998. *Decomposing Questions*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Hagstrom, P. 2000. The movement of question particles. In *Proceedings of the Northeast Linguistics Society (NELS) 30*, M. Hirotani, A. Coetzee, N. Hall, and J.-Y. Kim eds., 275-286. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Haig, J. 1980. Some observations on quantifier floating in Japanese. *Linguistics* 18: 1065–1083.

Halle, M., and A. Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the piece of inflection. In *The View from Building 20*, eds. K. Hale and S. J. Keyser, 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kawai, M. 2006. Raising to object in Japanese: A small clause analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 329–339.

Koizumi, M. 1994. Nominative objects: The role of TP in Japanese. In *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics 1*, eds. M. Koizumi and H. Ura. MITWPL 24, 211-230. MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Kuno, S. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. 1971. Remarks on the notion of subject with reference to words like *also, even* and *only*. Part II. *Annual Bulletin 4*: 127–152. Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics, University of Tokyo, Tokyo.

Kuroda, S.-Y. 1980. Bonkoozoo-no hikaku [Comparison of sentence structures]. In *Nichieigo hikaku kooza 2: Bunpoo [Lectures on comparative studies of English and Japanese 2: Grammar]*, ed. T. Kunihiro, 23–61. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Lasnik, H. 1995. Verbal morphology: *Syntactic Structures* meets the minimalist program. In *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Carlos Otero,* eds., H. Campos and P. Kempchinsky, 215–275. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

Lasnik, H. 1999. Chains of arguments. In *Working minimalism*, eds. S. D. Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 189-215. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lasnik, H. 2007. Some milestones in the development of Binding Theory. (Ms.) Lecture notes, August, 2007. Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan.

Lasnik, H., and M. Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In L. M. Dobrin, L. Nichols and R. M. Rodriguez eds., *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society Part One: The General Session*. Chicago, Il: Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago.

Mahajan, A. 1990. *The A/A-bar Distinction and Movement Theory*. Ph.D Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Miyagawa, S. 2001. The EPP, scrambling, and *wh*-in-situ. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 293–338. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Miyagawa, S. 2003. A-movement scrambling and options without optionality. In *Word Order and Scrambling*, S Karimi ed., 177–200. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nomura, M. 2003. The true nature of nominative objects in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, eds. E. Kaiser and S. Arunachalam, 69–183. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 9.1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Penn Linguistics Club.

Nomura, M. 2005. *Nominative case and AGREE(ment)*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Saito, M. 1982. Case marking in Japanese: A preliminary study (Ms.), Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Saito, M. 1985. *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications*. Doctoral Dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Saito, M. 2009. On the scope properties of nominative phrases in Japanese. Paper presented at the GLOW in Asia VII, EFL University, Hyderabad.

Sano, M. 1985. LF movement in Japanese. *Descriptive and Applied Linguistics* 14: 245–259.

Sugimura, M. 2010. Lexical vs. functional predicates in Japanese and their agreement domains. *Proceedings of the 2010 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association.* Canadian Linguistic Association. Available at the CLA webpage: http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~cla-acl/actes2010/CLA2010_Sugimura.pdf

Sugimura, M. 2012. *Domain Extension: A Study of Restructuring Predicates In Japanese and the Role of Head Movement*. Doctoral Dissertation. McGill University, Montréal, QU.

Tada, H. 1992. A/A-bar partition in derivation. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Takano, Y. 2003. Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: A prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 779–834.