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Abstract Case and Empty Pronouns

Toshifusa Oka

0. In section 1, we will argue that there do exist empty pronouns in Japanese. In section 2, we will derive a condition on them from a general consideration.


1.1. Missing Functions as Empty Pronouns.

In Japanese not only the subject but also the object can be missing, as shown in the following:

(1) a. John-ga Mary-o aisiteiru
    NOM   ACC loves
    "John loves Mary"

    b. ø Mary-o aisiteiru
       "ø loves Mary"

(2) a. John-ga Mary-o nagutta
    NOM   ACC hit
    "John hit Mary"

    b. John-ga ø nagutta
       "John hit ø"

Furthermore, it seems that any other function can be missing. For example, a dative object is missing in (3b), and a subject in NP in (4b).

(3) a. John-ga Mary-ni kisusita
    NOM   ACC kissed
    "John kissed Mary"

    b. John-ga ø kisusita
       "John kissed ø"

(4) a. [John-no hahaoya]-ga Mary-o kiratteiru
    GEN mother NOM   ACC hates
    "John's mother hates Mary"
The missing elements doesn't seem really missing in the examples (1)-(4). Our intuition is that there do exist some elements which assume the missing functions and denote some entities whose existence is established in the proceeding discourse. The latter behavior is the one that an overt pronoun would show if inserted in the null position. Therefore, it seems to us that it costs the least to assume that an empty pronoun occupies the position that is phonologically null in the examples above.

The empty pronoun can have an antecedent in its sentence as well. Consider the following:

(5) a. Bill-ga [ John-ga Tom-o nagutta ]-to itta  
    NOM   NOM   ACC hit   COMP said  
    "Bill said that John hit Tom"

b. Bill-ga [ John-ga e nagutta ]-to itta

The empty pronoun e in (5b) can be interpreted as having some discourse antecedent or referring to Bill. This is again the property shared with the overt pronoun. A difference between the overt pronoun and the empty one is that the former subserves a 'deictic' use while the latter does not. Another difference is that the empty pronoun, unlike the overt pronouns, can serve as a bound pronoun, as observed in Saito (1985) and others. In this respect the Japanese empty pronoun is similar to the English overt pronoun.

1.2. Resumptive Empty Pronouns.

In this section we will provide further evidence to confirm that there exist empty categories which constitute a subclass of the pronoun. Specifically, we will argue that some empty categories behave as a resumptive pronouns. In section 1.2.1, we will, in essence, reproduce the argument by Saito (1985) and Hoji (1985) that empty pronouns are involved in the topic construction. In section 1.2.2. and 1.2.3, we will argue further that an empty resumptive pronoun can appear in the ECM construction and the relative construction as well.
1.2.1. The Topic Construction.

First consider the following topic construction:

(6) Marȳ-wa [ John-ga e1 aisiteiru ]
    TOP    NOM    loves
    "(As for) Mary, John loves (her)"

Saito (1985) and Hoji (1985) argue that the topic construction involves no movement and that the empty category associated to the topic phrase is an empty pronoun. To support this, they show that there is no subjacency effect observed in the topic construction. Consider the following:

(7) a. Marȳ-wa [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e1 aisiteiru ]-to omotteiru ]
    TOP    NOM    NOM    loves COMP    thinks
    "(As for) Mary, Bill thinks that John loves (her)"

b. Marȳ-wa [ John-ga [[ e2 e1 nagutta ]toko]-o ketobasita ]
    TOP    NOM    hit    man    ACC    kicked
    "(As for) Mary, John kicked the man who hit (her)"

The empty category in question appears within the complement of a bridge verb in (7a) and within a complex NP in (7b), making no grammatical difference. The example (7b) is in contrast in grammaticality with the corresponding scrambling construction (8b):

(8) a. Marȳ-o [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e1 aisiteiru ]-to omotteiru ]
    ACC
    "Mary Bill thinks that John loves"

b. *Marȳ-o [ John-ga [[ e2 e1 nagutta ]toko]-o ketobasita ]
    ACC
    "Mary John kicked the man who hit"

The ungrammaticality of the example (8) is attributed to the subjacency violation on the Saito's (1985) assumption that a scrambling is derived by syntactic movement.

Hoji (1985) further argues that the contrastive wa-phrase, unlike the topic wa-phrase, is subject to syntactic movement. As expected, we can
observe subjacency effects in the case of the contrastive wa:

(9) a. Mary₁-wa [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e₁ aisiteiru ]-to omotteiru ]
   CNTR
   "Mary (as opposed to ...), Bill thinks that John loves"

b. *Mary₁-wa [ John-ga [[ e₁ e₁ nagutta ]otoko]-o ketobasita ]
   CNTR
   "Mary (as opposed to ...), John kicked the man who hit"

It seems reasonable from the observations above to assume that while the scrambled phrase and the contrastive phrase are preposited by movement, the topic phrase is base-generated in the sentence-initial phrase and associated with an empty pronoun serving as a resumptive pronoun. Hoji further assumes that the topic phrase is adjoined to S' whereas the contrastive phrase is adjoined to S (S'=CP and S=IP, adopting Chomsky's (1986b) system of phrase structure). As for the scrambled phrase, he assumes with Saito (1985) that it is adjoined to IP as well as VP. We will henceforth follow these assumptions, although it seems that our discussion below will not be seriously affected exactly in whatever position the topic phrase turns out to be generated.

Further evidence is provided by Hoji (1985) to support the assumption that the topic phrase is base-generated while the contrastive phrase is subject to movement. Consider the following:

(10) a. *[e₁ e₁ nagutta ]hito₁]-wa [ daremo₁-ga e₁ uttaeta ]
    hit person TOP everyone-NOM sued
    "As for the person who e₁ hit e₁, everyone sued e₁"

b. [[ e₁ e₁ nagutta ]hito₁]-wa [ daremo₁-ga e₁ uttaeta ]
   CNTR
   "[The person who e₁ hit e₁] (as opposed to ...), everyone sued e₁"

The empty category e₁, which we assume to be an empty pronoun, resists the bound pronoun reading in the topic construction, but not in the contrastive construction.
The contrast above is pararell to the following contrast:

(11) a. *[[ e₁ e₂ nagutta ] hito₁]·· ga daremo₁·o uttaeta
   "[ The person who e₁ hit e₂ ]₁ sued everyone₁"
   NOM        ACC

   b. [[ e₂ e₁ nagutta ] hito₁]··o [ daremo₁·ga e₁ uttaeta ]
   ACC
   "[ The person who e₂ hit e₁ ]₁ everyone₁ sued e₁"

The example (11a) is an instance of 'weak crossover'. Hoji assumes with Saito and Hoji (1983) and Saito (1985) that the ungrammaticality of (11a) is attributed to the violation of Reinhart's (1976) condition (12):

(12) A variable cannot be the antecedent of a pronoun that it does not c-command.

In (11a) the quantifier phrase daremo is quantifier raised in LF, leaving a trace which functions as a variable. Under the condition (12) this variable cannot serve as the antecedent of the empty pronoun e₁, which it does not c-command. The raised quantifier phrase cannot be the antecedent either, given Saito's condition (13):

(13) An NP with the feature [+pronominal] cannot have a quantified NP in A'-position as its antecedent

The example (11b), on the other hand, is an instance of 'reconstruction'. On the assumption that a category moved to A'-position in syntax can be moved in LF back to its D-structure position, the scrambled phrase in (11b) is back to the position of e₂ at LF. The empty pronoun e₁ takes as its antecedent the variable bound by daremo at LF, which c-commands e₁ after reconstruction, observing the condition (12).

Let us turn to the examples in (10). The contrast here is explained along the same line. In (10) the empty pronoun e₁ is not c-commanded from the S-structure position of daremo. Therefore, the condition (12) is violated unless the wa-phrase is back to the position of e₁. The grammatical difference between (10a) and (10b) indicates that the
contrastive wa-phrase is subject to reconstruction while the topic wa-phrase is not. That is, the former has undergone the movement rule and the latter is base-generated in the S-structure position. It is not unreasonable to assume the empty category associated to the topic phrase is an empty pronoun, since it cannot be a trace. Incidentally, the fact that some empty categories are, as just observe, subject to the condition (12) provide another piece of evidence to support our assumption that there exist empty pronouns.

1.2.2. The ECM Construction.

We will show in this subsection that an empty pronoun appears as a resumptive pronoun in the ECM construction induced by such a verb as (think).

Let us begin by observing that the topic construction as well as the scrambling construction can be embedded as the complement of the verb omow:

(14) a. Bill-ga [ Maryi-ni [ John-ga e1 horeteiru ]]to omotteiru
     NOM    DAT  NOM    is-in-love   COMP thinks
     "Bill thinks that Mary1 John is in love with e1"

b. Bill-ga [ Maryi-wa [ John-ga e1 horeteiru ]]to omotteiru
     TOP
     "Bill thinks that as for Mary1, John is in love with e1"

This suggests that the complementizer to selects CP in addition to IP, under the assumption that the topic phrase is adjoined to CP. Alternatively, we can assume that to is not a complementizer but a particle which is attached to CP just as a case particle is attached to NP.

We have the corresponding ECM construction:

(15) Bill-ga [ Maryi-o [ John-ga e1 horeteiru ]]to omotteiru
     ACC
     "Bill thinks of Mary1 that John is in love with e1"

Here Mary is not a scrambled phrase, since the embedded verb horeiru
assigns dative Case, which is morphologically realized by *ni as shown in (14a). We tentatively assume that Mary is exceptionally Case-marked by the matrix verb *omote in (15). Let us further assume that the exceptionally Case-marked phrase is base-generated in the S-structure position and associated with an empty resumptive pronoun. If so, the ECM construction is expected to behave in some respects in the same manner as the topic construction rather than the scrambling construction (and the contrastive construction). We will see immediately that our prediction is actually borne out.

First consider the effects of subjacency and reconstruction. Observe the following:

(16) a. *Bill-ga [ Mary,-ni [ Tom-ga [[ e, e, horeteiru ] otoko,-o ]-o 
      NOM      DAT      NOM    is-in-love man    ACC
      kiratteiru ]-to omotteiru ]
      hates    COMP thinks
      "Bill thinks that Mary, Tom hates the man who is in love
      with e,"

b. Bill-ga [ Mary,-wa [ Tom-ga [[ e, e, horeteiru ] otoko,-o ]-o 
      TOP
      kiratteiru ]-to omotteiru ]

c. Bill-ga [ Mary,-o [ Tom-ga [[ e, e, horeteiru ] otoko,-o ]-o 
      ACC
      kiratteiru ]-to omotteiru ]

(17) a. John-ga [[ e, sensei ],-ni [ daremoi-ga e, sittositeiru ]] 
      NOM     teacher    DAT everyone-NOM    is-jealous
      -to omotteiru
      COMP thinks
      "John thinks that[ e, teacher ], everyone, is jealous of e,"

b *John-ga [[ e, sensei ],-wa [ daremoi-ga e, sittositeiru ]] 
      TOP
      -to omotteiru
c. *John-ga [[ e, sensei ]]-o [ daremo1-ga e, sittositeiru ]] 
   ACC 
   -to omotteiru

As expected, the ECM construction reveals neither the sujacency effect nor the reconstruction effect, just as not the scrambling construction but the topic construction.

We would like to introduce two more syntactic tests to arrive at the same point. The first has to do with pronoun coreference. Consider the following:

(18) a. [ John1-no hahao [ ga kare1-o aiseiru 
   GEN mother     NOM he-ACC loves
   "John's mother loves him"
   b. *[ John1-no hahao ]]-o [ kare1-ga e, aiseiru ] 
   ACC     NOM
   "[ John's mother ], he, loves e_1"

The example (18b) is an instance of 'crossover', concerning which Saito (1985) states as follows:

(19) When a pronoun c-commands its antecedent at D-structure but this c-command relation does not obtain at S-structure due to movement to an A'-position, the sentence is grammatical only if the antecedent is embedded 'deeply enough' in the move phrase.

In (18b) the pronoun kare c-commands its antecedent John at D-structure but not at S-structure, whereas kare does not c-command John throughout in (18a). Next observe the following:

(20) a. *John-ga [[ Mary1-no sensei ]]-ni [ kanoyo1-ga e, 
   NOM     GEN teacher   DAT she-NOM 
   sittositeiru ]]]-to omotteiru
   is-jealous     COMP thinks
   "John thinks that[ Mary's teacher ], she, is jealous of e_1,"
b. John-ga [[ Mary₁-no sensei ]₁-wa [ kanozyo₁-ga e₁
TOP
sittositeiru ]] to omotteiru

c. John-ga [[ Mary₁-no sensei ]₁-o [ kanozyo₁-ga e₁
ACC
sittositeiru ]] to omotteiru

The paradigm seen in (20) again support our assumption that the exceptionally Case-marked phrase is, like the topic phrase, base-generated in its S-structure position, whereas the scrambled phrase has passed through movement.

The second test has to do with quantifier scope. Consider the following:

(21) a. dareka-ga daremo-o nagutta
   someone-NOM everyone-ACC hit
   "Someone hit everyone"

b. dareka₁-o [ daremo-ga e₁ nagutta ]
   someone-ACC everyone-NOM hit
   "Someone₁ everyone hit e₁"

Kuroda (1970) observes that the scope relation of the two quantifier phrases is unambiguous in (21a) while it is ambiguous in (21b). That is, in (21a) the scope of dareka (someone) is wider than the one of daremo (everyone), while both dareka and daremo can have the wide scope with respect to each other in (21b). Kuroda reduces this observation to the following generalization:

(22) If a predicate corresponds to a sentence frame with the 'preferred' word order, the semantic order of quantifiers is given by their linear order. If a predicate corresponds to a sentence frame with 'inverted word order, the semantic order of quantifiers is ambiguous.

We can restate (22) as (23) within the current framework:
(23) Given quantifier phrases \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) at S-structure, \( \alpha \) can have the wide scope with respect to \( \beta \) if and only if
(i) \( \alpha \) c-commands \( \beta \) at D-structure, or
(ii) \( \alpha \) is moved crossing over the D-structure position of \( \beta \)

Although (23) is at most descriptive, it is enough for our present purpose. See Huang (1982), Hoji (1985) and Tada (in preparation) for further examination of the relevant phenomena and possible paths to explanation of the effect of (23).

Turning to the ECM construction, observe the following:

(24) a. John-ga [ dareka1-ni [ daremo-ga e1 sittositeiru ]] -to
   Nom everyone-DAT everyone-NOM is-jealous COMP
   omotteiru
   thinks
   "John thinks that everyone, everyone is jealous of e1"

b. John-ga [ dareka1-o [ daremo-ga e1 sittositeiru ]] -to
   Acc
   omotteiru
   "John thinks of someone, that everyone is jealous of e1"

As expected, the scope relation is ambiguous in (24a), and unambiguous in (24b), \textit{dareka} having the wider scope. This again provides empirical support for our base-generation analysis of the ECM construction.

So far we have been successfully arguing that a category which is exceptionally Case-marked by \textit{omow (think)} is base-generated in its S-structure position, binding an empty pronoun. Although this is our chief purpose in this section, let us a bit further discuss exactly what structure the ECM complement have. A possibility is that the ECM complement has the same structure as the topic construction. If Hoji's (1985) assumption that the topic phrase is adjoined to S'(=CP) is adopted, the ECM construction (15), for example, will contain a CP-adjunction structure, as shown in (25):
(15) Bill-ga [Mary₁-o [John-ga e₁ horeteiru]]-to omotteiru
    NOM         ACC       NOM    COMP    thinks
    "Bill thinks of Mary₁ that John is in love with e₁"
(25) ...[vp [cp NP₁-o [cp ... e₁ ... ]] omow] ...

If we assume, essentially following Chomsky (1977) and Koster (1978), that the topic phrase is dominated a category larger than CP, which we tentatively call TP, then the example (15) has the following structure:

(26) ...[vp [tp NP₁-o [cp ... e₁ ... ]] omow] ...

We might be able to assume further that TP is the maximal projection of 'topicalizer', an empty zero-level category which takes CP as complement and NP as specifier in the sense of Chomsky (1986b). Both in (25) and in (26) the topic NP is licensed by predication, having CP as its predicate.

Another possibility is to regard the ECM construction under consideration as a 'small clause' construction. Takezawa (1987) observes that omow can take a small clause complement:

(27) John-ga [[Mary-no yokogao] -o [totoemo utukusiku]] omotta
    NOM          GEN       profile   ACC        very       beautiful    thought
    "John thought Mary's profile very beautiful"

Schematically, a small clause construction has the following structure, unless it contains a covert INFL:

(28) ...[vp [e· NP₁-o [e ... ]] omow] ...

Here θ' is a category of the same type as θ, although it should be a 'larger' projection in the sense that θ functions as the head of θ'. The NP functions as the specifier of θ, and θ not only behave as the predicate of the NP but also assigns a 7h role to it. If θ = CP, we will have an ECM construction such as (15). In this case we have to consider CP to 7h-mark the exceptionally Case-marked NP, assuming that a category which can function as a predicate is a potential 7h-marker.
Compare the following with (15):

(29) Bill-ga [ Mary₁-o [ kanozyo₁-wa [ John-ga e₁ horeteiru]]]-to
    she-TOP
    omotteiru
    "Bill thinks of Mary₁ that as for her₁, John is in love with
    e₁"

The example (29) indicates that an exceptionally Case-marked category can
appear in a higher position than the topic position. This seems difficult
to account for under the first approach. Under the small clause
approach, on the contrary, we can account for this fact by assuming that @
in (28) corresponds to TP (or CP, following Hoji (1985)) in (29), which
is the predicate of and assigns a Th-role to the exceptionally Case-marked
NP. It does not seem unreasonable to assume that @ in (28) can be any
category, so far as it can be a predicate with capacity of Th-marking.

There arises a question whether or not omow (think) allows an
'S'-deletion' type of complement as well such as the English example (30):

(30) John considers [₁p Mary [₁ to [ be a fool ]]]

Consider the following:

(31) a. John-ga [ Mary-ga baka-da ]-to omotteiru
    NOM NOM fool-is COMP thinks
    "John thinks that Mary is a fool"

b. John-ga [ Mary-o baka-da ]-to omotteiru
    ACC
    "John thinks Mary to be a fool"

It might be that (31b) has the structure (32b) in addition to (32a), if
tensed INFL does not obligatorily assigns nominative Case in Japanese, as
has often been suggested in the literature:
(32) a. ... [cp NP₁-o [cp [ip e₁ 1']-to ... 
b. ... [ip NP-o 1'-]to ...

Here we are tentatively assuming that \textit{to} is a particle attached to
categories of a clausal type, including IP, CP, and TP, as suggested
before. The structure in (32a) is of the small clause type just
discussed. The construction (32b) has the same structure as the English
example (30). However, we will directly argue that \textit{omow} does not take IP
complement.

Let us begin by showing that although it has been generally assumed
that the crossover effect of quantifier scope is restricted to A'-movement,
it is observed in the case of A-movement as well (see also Oka (1988, to
appear)). First consider the following:

(33) a. Bill-ga Mary-ni John-o shoukaisi-ta
   NOM DAT ACC introduced
   "Bill introduced John to Mary"

b. John-ga Mary-ni shoukais-are-ta
   NOM DAT was-introduced
   "John was introduced to Mary"

If we follow Oka's (1988, to appear) assumption that a passive
construction such as (33a) is derived by A-movement, the examples in (33)
are represented at S-structure as follows:

(34) a. [ip Bill-ga [i: [vp Mary-ni [v: John-o V ]] I]]

b. [ip John-ga [i: [vp Mary-ni [v: e₁ V ]] rare ]] I]]

What is important here is the relative positions of \textit{John} and \textit{Mary}: In
(34a) \textit{John} has not been moved from the position c-commanded by \textit{Mary},
whereas in (34b) \textit{John} has passed through A-movement to c-command \textit{Mary} at
S-structure.

Observe the following:
The contrast seen in (35) indicates that the crossover effect of quantifier scope is brought about in the case of A-movement. (See Oka (1988, to appear) for evidence to support that the NP-\text{ga} NP-\text{ni} sequence in (35b) is not the result of scrambling.)

Turning to the ECM verb \text{omow}, consider the following examples, where a passive construction is embedded in the complement of \text{omow}:

(36) a. John-\text{ga} \text{[ dareka-\text{ga} daremo-\text{ni} shoukaisareta]}-\text{to omotteiru}
   NOM
   
   "John thinks that someone was introduced to everyone"

b. John-\text{ga} \text{[ dareka-o daremo-\text{ni} shoukaisareta]}-\text{to omotteiru}
   ACC
   
   "John thinks someone to have been introduced to everyone"

The fact is that (36a) is ambiguous while (36b) is unambiguous. The ambiguity of (36a) indicates that in this construction an A-movement has applied to dareka within the complement clause, as expected. On the other hand, the ambiguity of (36b) suggests that dareka here is not a derived subject but a base-generated one. This follows automatically in the case where (36b) has the structure of (32a). However, if (36b) has the structure of (32b), it remains a mistery why dareka cannot be subject to A-movement, since a complement IP does not require its subject position to be a \text{Th}-position, as shown by the following English examples:

(37) a. John considers there to be many girls in the next room

b. John considers advantage to have been taken of Mary

Furthermore, (36b) is in contrast with the following causative construction:
(38) John-ga dareka-o daremo-ni shoukais-are-sase-ta
     NOM someone-ACC everyone-DAT caused-to-be-introduced
     "John caused someone to be introduced to everyone"

This example produces the scope ambiguity in question. These observations reasonably lead us to conclude that omow, unlike the causative verb, cannot have a S'-deletion type complement, although it takes a small clause type complement, as already argued.

There is an alternative analysis of the small clause construction, which we have been ignoring so far. Williams (1980, 1983) argues that a small clause is not really a syntactic constituent. Rather, the subject of a small clause is an argument of the 'ECM' verb, whereas the remainder of the small clause is licensed by being the predicate of its subject in a certain configuration. A piece of evidence for the non-constituency of the small clause comes from the consideration of quantifier scope. Consider the following:

(39) a. Mary-ga [ John-dake-ga kakkoi ]-to omotta
     NOM only NOM is-stylish COMP thought
     "Mary thought that only John was stylish"

b. Mary-ga [ John-dake-o kakkoi ]-to omotta
     ACC
     "Mary thought of only John that he was stylish"

c. Mary-ga [ John-dake-o kakkoyoku ] omotta
     ACC stylish
     "Mary thought only John stylish"

While the quantifier phrase John-dake (only John) takes the complement clause as its scope in (39a), it takes the matrix clause as its scope in (39b, c). The example (39b, c) are in contrast in this respect with an S'-deletion type ECM construction such as follows:

(40) John-ga [ Mary-dake-o hatarak ]-ase-ta
     only ACC work caused
     "John caused only Mary to work"
Here *Mary-dake (only Mary)* can takes as its scope not only the matrix clause but also the complement clause. This difference is immediately accounted for if we assume that the small clause is, unlike the S'-deletion type complement, is not a syntactic constituent.  

Although we have long been pointing out possibilities concerning the structure of the ECM construction induced by *omof*, we will not be unfavorably affected whatever it turns out to be like, so far as the construction involves empty pronouns. For the main purpose of this paper is to argue for the existence of empty pronouns in Japanese and deduce a condition on them from general considerations.

1.2.3. The Relative Construction.

Let us now turn to another construction which involves an empty pronoun. The relative construction seems to show no subjacency effect:

(41) a. [Bill-ga [John-ga e, nagutta]-to omotteiru]onna,
    \[NOM] [NOM hit] \[COMP thinks] \[woman\]
    "the woman Bill thinks that John hit"

b. [Bill-ga [John-ga e, nagutta]-kadouka shitteiru]onna,
    \[whether-or-not knows\]
    "the woman Bill knows whether or not John hit"

c. [Bill-ga [John-ga e, nagutta]-node okotteiru]onna,
    \[because is-angry\]
    "the woman Bill is angry because John hit"

d. [Bill-ga [[e, e, nagutta]-otoko]-o ketobasita]onna,
    \[man \[ACC kicked\]
    "the woman Bill kicked the man who hit"

The empty categories associated with the relative heads in (41a-d) are inside a bridge verb complement, a WH complement, an adjunct clause and a complex NP, respectively. The behavior of the relative construction seen in (41) is in sharp contrast with the one of the scrambling construction seen in (42):
(42) a. Mary₁-o [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e₁ nagutta ]-to omotteiru ]
   ACC
   "Mary Bill thinks that John hit"
   b. ?Mary₁-o [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e₁ nagutta ]-kadouka shitteiru ]
   "Mary Bill knows whether or not John hit"
   c. Mary₁-o [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e₁ nagutta ]-node okotteiru ]
   "Mary Bill is angry because John hit"
   d. Mary₁-o [ John-ga [[ e₁ e₁ nagutta ]otoko]-o ketobasita ]
   "Mary Bill kicked the man who hit"

The paradigm in (42) is just as we expect, assuming that the scrambling
obeys the subjacency condition. The immunity of the relative construction
from the subjacency condition suggests that the construction can be, at
least, derived in some other device than syntactic movement. There are
two possibility: one is to make use of empty pronouns as resumptive
pronouns, and the other, which we have been ignoring, is to make resort to
LF-movement on the assumption that the subjacency condition does not work
in LF. We will directly argue against the latter possibility.

To examine whether LF-movement can play a role in the relative
construction, we are able to set a stage where no empty category can act
as a resumptive pronoun. Chao and Sells (1983) observe that an English
resumptive pronoun cannot have a bound pronoun reading:

(43) a. I'd like to meet [ the linguist₁ [ that Mary couldn't
    remember if she had seen him₁ before ]]
   b. *I'd like to meet [ every linguist₁ [ that Mary couldn't
    remember if she had seen him₁ before ]]

Saito (1985) accounts for this observation by proposing the condition
(13):

(13) An NP with the feature [+pronominal] cannot have a quantified
    NP in A'-position as its antecedent

He argues that in (43b) not the relative head alone but the whole complex
NP containing it is quantifier raised in LF, giving the following LF
representation:

(44) [[ every linguist [ that Mary couldn't remember if she had seen him before ]], [ I'd like to meet e, ]]

At LF every linguist is in an A'-position, independent from the controversy about whether the S-structure position of the relative head is an A-position or an A'-position. Therefore, him cannot take every linguist as its antecedent, given the condition (13). Saito further argues that an empty pronoun in Japanese obeys the condition (13) by examining the weak crossover effect, as we saw in the previous subsections.

Let us now turn to the relative construction in Japanese. Placing a quantifier phrase in the position of the relative head eliminates the possibility of using an empty pronoun as a resumptive pronoun under the condition (13). If the relative heads in (41) are replaced by a quantifier phrase dono-onna-mo (every woman), we have the following results:

(45) a. [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e, nagutta]-to omotteiru ] dono-onna-mo, 
    every-woman
    "every woman Bill thinks that John hit"

b. ![Bill-ga [ John-ga e, nagutta ]-kadouka shitteiru ]
    dono-onna-mo,
    "every woman Bill knows whether or not John hit"

c. ![Bill-ga [ John-ga e, nagutta ]-node okotteiru ]
    dono-onna-mo,
    "every woman Bill is angry because John hit"

d. ![John-ga [[ e, e, nagutta ] otoko, ]-o ketobasita ]
    dono-onna-mo,
    "every woman Bill kicked the man who hit"

If LF-movement is a possible device for deriving the relative construction, then all the examples in (45) should be grammatical just as in (41), contrary to the fact. Therefore, it should be not LF-movement but the empty pronoun that makes the relative construction free from the
subjacency effect. The fact that we can see the paradigm of (42) in (45) shows the relative construction can involves syntactic movement (presumably, empty operator movement) as well.

We have argued that there exist empty pronouns in Japanese. In the next section we will derive a condition on the empty pronoun.


2.1. The assignment of agreement features.

It is well known that there are 'null subject' languages, languages where the subject of a tensed clause can be missing. In a language with a rich inflectional system, such as Italian, the subject can be missing, whereas it cannot in a language such as English. The missing subject is considered to be an empty category which is called pro. We might assume as follows (see Taraldsen (1978), Chomsky (1981, 1982)):

(46) Pro must be identified by INFL with overt agreement features

Agreement features include person, number, gender and Case. It is not unreasonable to assume that empty pronouns in Japanese are instances of pro. If so, the condition (46) should not be applicable since Japanese reveals no overt agreement. Furthermore, the position where pro can appear is, as has been seen, not restricted to the subject position in Japanese. We might instead impose the following condition on pro in Japanese:

(47) Pro must be identified by a category which Case-marks it

We would like to consider for a while how (46) and (47) could be derived in a unified way.

First suppose that every nominal element contains agreement features. Let us further assume as follows:

(48) At D-structure pro is a complex of the agreement features with unspecified values

That is, we regard pro as a category base-generated with agreement
features alone. Next suppose as follows:

(49) A category containing a feature whose value is unspecified is invisible at LF

To be interpreted at LF pro must have its agreement features assigned a specific value under the condition (49). How are the features assigned a value? As for the feature of Case, we assume that Case-assignment entails value assignment of the Case feature. We might be able to reduce Chomsky's (1986a) Case visibility condition to the more general condition (49) by assuming that the value of the Case feature is necessarily unspecified at D-structure. The immunity of PRO from the Case visibility condition is accounted for if PRO lacks the Case feature itself or contains the Case feature with a specified value at D-structure. It is possible to discuss the other agreement features along the same line. Suppose that the checking of agreement is done by the feature assignment. INFL assigns feature F with value V to a category C. If C inherently contains F with a value different from V, a conflict occurs, ruling out the construction. If C contains F with an unspecified value, the value assignment is done without a conflict.

Let us suppose that pro appears in the object position in English or Italian, for example. Pro is assigned Case by a lexical head, and therefore the value of the Case feature is specified. However, the other features remains with unspecified values, since a lexical head has no agreement feature to assign (but see Jaeggli (1986)). Consequently, pro is uninterpretable at LF under the condition (49), ultimately leading to a violation of a principle, if any, that forces pro to be interpreted in some way at LF. Next suppose that pro appears in the subject position of a tensed finite clause. As for the Case feature, its value is specified by nominative Case-assignment. What differentiate Italian from English is the assignment of other features. A possibility is that the assignment of the features other than Case is applied in syntax in Italian, while it is applied in PF in English. If so, at LF pro in Italian has its features with fully specified values, whereas pro in English contains features with unspecified values. We might be able to reduce the difference concerning the level of the feature assignment to the one concerning the
level of V-raising in the sense of Chomsky (1986b), assuming that INFL can assign the relevant features only through assistance of verbal features, which are acquired by amalgamation with a verb as a consequence of V-raising. Thus, in Italian V-raising applies in syntax while it applies in PF in English, a reminiscence of 'rule R' proposed in Chomsky (1981).

Turning to Japanese, let us suppose that the agreement features other than the Case feature do not exist in the first place in the grammar of Japanese, a language which has no overt marker of the features other than Case. Then pro in Japanese contains only the Case feature with an unspecified value. Therefore, Case-assignment is sufficient to make pro visible at LF. Thus, we have achieved the effect of (47) that pro must be in a Case-marked position. Note that the differentiation of the Case-feature from the other agreement features could be considered to be not unreasonable, if we assume the Case visibility condition to be an independent one, rejecting the suggestion above that it might be reduced to the more general condition (49).

We have proposed a possibility to derive language-specific conditions (46) and (47) from general considerations (48) and (49) and properties of particular languages. In the following subsections, we will examine the consequences of adopting the condition (47), which we believe is, at least, descriptively adequate for Japanese, whatever it is ultimately reduced to.

2.2. Abstract Case.
2.2.1. The Case visibility condition and Inherent Case-marking.

To begin with, let us introduce the Case visibility condition (50) proposed in Chomsky (1986a):

(50) A CHAIN is Case-marked if it contains exactly one Case-marked position; a position in a Case-marked CHAIN is visible for Th-marking.

In Oka (1986a, b), where the properties of categorial selection are reduced to the properties of semantic selection and Case-marking, it was argued that (50) does not see the categorial features of elements in a CHAIN. Therefore, any argument must be associated with Th-role and hence
associated with Case under (50), whether it is NP or any one of other categories, including CP, PP, IP, AP, etc. Thus, a CP or PP complement of a verb is assigned inherent Case by the verb, assuming that any lexical category is a potential inherent Case-marker. Concerning inherent Case-marking, the following condition was proposed:

(51) Inherent Case \( \alpha \) is linked with Th-role \( \beta \) in the lexical representation if and only if \( \alpha \) is assigned to a category which is a member of the chain associated with \( \beta \)

Thus, an English verb, say, introduce assigns inherent dative Case to a PP, for example, if and only if the verb assigns the PP a Th-role linked with dative Case in the lexical representation of the verb.

2.2.2. Arguments and Adjuncts.

Now we have an apparatus to distinguish between arguments and adjuncts. Let us consider the following examples:

(52) a. kin-medaru-ga sono-kuni-kara de-ta
gold-medal-NOM that-country-from has-come-out
"A gold medal has come out from that country (A gold medal has been won by that country)"

b. John-ga sono-mura-kara ki-ta
NOM that-village-from has-come
"John has come from that village"

At first glance, we do not know whether NP-kara is an argument Th-marked by the verb or an adjunct modifying it.\(^5\) Suppose that in (52a) der (come out) Th-marks NP-kara while kur (come) does not in (52b). Then der, unlike kur, assigns NP-kara a particular inherent Case. As for kara, it is of no importance whether it is a case particle or a postposition under Oka's (1986a, b) approach above mentioned.

Given the condition (47), it is expected that der permits pro while kur does not. This prediction is borne out.\(^6\)
(53) a. sono-kuni₁-wa [ kin-medaru₁-ga e₁ deta ]
   TOP
   "As for that country, a gold medal has come out"
b. Bill-ga [ sono-kuni₁-o [ kin-medaru₁-ga e₁ deta ]-to
   NOM      ACC                        COMP
   omotteiru
   thinks
   "Bill thinks of that country that a gold medal has come out"
c. [ kin-medal₁-ga e₁ deta ] kuni₁
   "the country that a gold medal has come out"

(54) a. *sono-mura₁-wa [ John-ga e₁ kita ]
   TOP
   "As for that village, John has come"
b. *Bill-ga [ sono-mura₁-o [ John-ga e₁ kita ]]-to omotteiru
   NOM      ACC                        COMP think
   "Bill thinks of that village that John has come"
c. [ John-ga e₁ kita ] mura₁
   "the village that John has come"

The fact that the topic construction and the ECM construction are acceptable in (53) while they are not in (54) indicates that the empty category ε₁ can be pro in (53), but not in (54). As for the relative construction, the possibility to use syntactic movement to derive it makes it unclear whether pro is allowed to occur or not. However, consider the following:

(55) a. [ Bill-ga [ kin-medal₁-ga e₁ deta ]-to omotteiru ] kuni₁
   NOM                       COMP thinks
   "the country that Bill thinks a gold medal has come out"
b. [ Bill-ga [[ e₁ e₁ deta ] medaru₁]-o kazoeiteiru ] kuni₁
   NOM    -medal '_ACC is-counting
   "the country that Bill is counting the medals that has come"

(56) a. [ Bill-ga [ John-ga e₁ kita ]-to omotteiru ] mura₁
   NOM                       COMP thinks
   "the village that Bill thinks that John has come"
b. *[ Bill-ga [[ [ e1 e1 kita ] otoko1 ]-o sagasiteiru ] mura, \\
    NOM man   ACC is-seeking-for \\
"the village that Bill is seeking for the man who has come"

This contrast with respect to the subjacency effect again shows the same difference concerning whether pro can appear or not.

These observations show that we should maintain our initial supposition that der Th-marks NP-kara while kur does not. A question that immediately arises is why an adjunct can be assigned structural Case by the verb it modifies, since structural Case is independent of Th-marking. If in (56b), for example, kur assigns structural accusative Case to e1, it could be pro, making the construction grammatical. Suppose that an adjunct is invisible in syntax, then it fails to undergo Case-marking, which is applied in syntax. This assumption does not seem to us definitely unreasonable in consideration of the nature of the adjunct. It is neither licensed by the X-bar theory, nor forced to appear by the projection principle.

The assumption that an adjunct cannot be assigned structural Case by a verb could be falsified by the following example:

(57) Mary-ga hamabe-o aruita  
    NOM beach-ACC walked  
"Mary walked (along) the beach"

It is difficult to show directly whether NP-o in (57) is an adjunct or not. However, we might be able to argue that the accusative Case realized on hamabe is not structural Case. It has been pointed out that an accusative NP such as in (57) only superficially observes the 'double-o' constraint when embedded in an o-causative construction (see Harada (1973), Kuroda (1978), Shibatani (1978), Poser (1981)):

(58) a. ?John-ga Mary-o sono-hamabe-o arukase-ta  
    NOM ACC that-beach-ACC walk-CAUSE-PAST  
"John caused Mary to walk that beach"

b. [ John-ga Mary-o e1 arukasete ]-no-wa hamabe1-o da  
    NOMINALIZER-TOP
"What John Caused Mary to walk is the beach"

c. [John-ga e₁ hamabe-o arukaseta]-no-wa Mary₁-o da
"What John caused to walk the beach is Mary"

(59) a. *[John-ga Mary-o sono-hon-o yomase-ta]
    NOM  ACC that-book-ACC read-CAUSE-PAST
"John caused Mary to read that book"

b. *[John-ga Mary-o e₁ yomaseta]-no-wa hon₁-o da
"What John caused Mary to read is a book"

c. *[John-ga e₁ hon-o yomaseta]-no-wa Mary₁-o da
"What John caused to read a book is Mary"

Although the acceptability of (58a) varies from speaker to speaker, (58a, b) seems to be fully acceptable to every speaker. The contrast between (58) and (59) suggests that the Case assigned by aruk (walk) is different from the one assigned by yomu (read).

To account for the contrast in question, let us assume that the o-causative construction has the following structure:

(60) [IP John [IP Mary [VP [VP NP V I]] sase ta]]

As argued in section 1.2.2., the causative verb sase takes IP as its complement to give an o-causative construction. We assume that the INFL of the complement IP has no features and hence serves as just a 'place-holder'. The internal verb is V-raised to sase through the covert INFL, giving an amalgamated verb V-sase (, which is successively V-raised to the matrix INFL). The two instances of the feature assigning structural Case, [\-N] if we follows Chomsky (1981) and others, are fused to one inside the amalgamated verb V-sase. Consequently, V-sase can assign just one instance of structural Case. In (60) Mary have to be assigned Case since it is an argument, and the Case can be assigned to it is only the Case exceptionally assigned by V-sase. If V-sase assigns structural Case to Mary, the NP in the embedded VP cannot be assigned structural Case. Note that inherent Case is different from structural Case in that the former is, by virtue of the condition (51), assigned to a category only as an inseparable appendix to a particular Th-role, while the latter is assigned independently of Th-marking in a certain
configuration by a category containing a certain syntactic feature. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that in (60) the embedded verb can assign inherent Case to its object from the D-structure position. We leave open here whether Case is assigned by the verb itself at D-structure or by the trace of the verb at S-structure, although we argued in Oka (1986a, b) that in Japanese Inherent Case-assignment applies at S-structure.

Under these considerations the contrast between (58) and (59) is accounted for by assuming that aruk assigns inherent accusative Case while yom does not. Now we know not only that the NP expressing a path in (57) is not assigned structural Case but also that it is not an adjunct but an argument since it is assigned inherent Case by aruk and therefore should be assigned the Th-role specified in the lexical representation of aruk. Since aruk assigns Case, it should permit pro since it assigns Case. This prediction is borne out:  

(61) a. sono-hamabe-wa [John-ga Mary-o e1 arukaset] that-beach-TOP NOW ACC caused-to-walk
"As for that beach, John caused Mary to walk"

b. Bill-ga [sono-hamabe-o [John-ga Mary-o e1 arukaset] NOW ACC
-to omotteiru COMP thinks
"Bill thinks of that beach that John has caused Mary to walk"

c. [Bill-ga [[e, Mary-o e1 arukaset] otoko, i-o NOW ACC sitteiru ] hamabe, know
"the beach that John caused Mary to walk"

Under the condition (47), the fact that aruk permits pro denies the possibility that NP-o in question is an adjunct and therefore not Case-marked, the attached o being a postposition or merely a realization of some morphological case rather than abstract Case.

Note that a condition to the effect that pro must be an argument does
not seem to be inferior to the condition (47), at least, in the empirical coverage, however it could be reduced to more general considerations. In the next subsection we will suggest that the condition (47) is superior even descriptively.

2.2.3. Case-marked nonarguments.

In this subsection we will see possible cases where a nonargument is Case-marked. Needless to say, it is impossible to distinguish between arguments and nonarguments independently of a specific theory, or analysis. Furthermore, the derivation of the constructions discussed here could not be considered beyond controversy at present and, what is worse, could not be expected to be shortly brought to a peaceful settlement. In these considerations the larger half of our argumentations here hold only within our own framework, a framework developed in Oka (1987, 1988, to appear).

To begin with, note that it is generally assumed that in Italian, for example, pro functions as an expletive element which is linked to an argument in a Th-position. This is direct evidence against a condition on pro in terms of argumenthood. We can also find an instance of expletive pro in Japanese. Consider the following ergative construction:

(62) John-ni nihongo-ga wakaru
      DAT Japanese-NOM understands
     "John understands Japanese"

It is argued in Oka (1987, 1988, to appear) that the example (62) has the following structure:

(63) [IP εi[VP John-ni [v: nihongo-ga wakar ]] I ]] ]

Here εi is pro, which creates an expletive-argument pair in the sense of Chomsky (1986a) by linking to NP-ga in VP. So far as our analysis is supported, we can maintain that the condition (47) is descriptively more adequate a condition requiring that pro must be an argument.

Let us next consider an instance of the multiple subject
constructionas in (64):

(64) sono-kagami-ga [ futotta-onnanoko-ga yasete mieru ]
that-mirror-NOM fat-girl-NOM slender looks
"It is (in) that mirror that a fat girl looks slender"

In Oka (1987, to appear) it is argued that the outer nominative NP was
generated as an adjunct in VP and has passed through movement into the
SPEC position of IP. It is cannot be an argument, since it is not a
member of a Th-chain. However, it is assigned nominative Case by INFL,
assuming that it is visible at S-structure, since it, unlike a VP adjunct
for example, occupies a position licensed by the X-bar theory. Under
these assumptions, we can decide which is descriptively adequate, the
condition (47) or the condition in terms of the argument-nonargument
distinction. Observe the following:

(65) a. sono-kagami,-wa [ John-ga [[ e₁ [ e₃ yasete mieta ]
that-mirror-TOP NOM slender looked
onnanoko, ]-to kekkonsita ]
girl with got-married
"As for that mirror, John got married with the girl who
looked slender"

b. John-ga [ sono-kagami,-o [ Mary-ga [ e₁ [ onnanoko-ga
NOM that-mirror-ACC NOM girl-NOM
yasete mieru ]]-noni okotteiru ]
slender looks though is-angry
"John thinks of that mirror that though a girl looks slender
Mary is angry"

c. [ John-ga [[ e₁ [ onnanoko-ga yasete mieru ]]-toyuu
NOM COMP
uwasa ]-o hiteisita ] kagami;
rumor ACC denied mirror
"the mirror that John denied the rumor that a girl looks
slender"

All of the examples in (65) show that e₁ can be pro, supporting our
position that the occurrence of *pro* is conditioned in terms of Case-marking rather than argumenthood.

Now let us turn to the topic position. If we identify this position as the SPEC position of the maximal proposition of the topicalizer, one of the possibilities suggested before, then it is not unreasonable to assume that it can be Case-marked by the topicalizer, just as the subject position can be Case-marked by INFL. However, it seems difficult to decide whether the topic position is Case-marked or not, since an occurrence of *pro* in the commenting clause makes it obscure whether *pro* can appear in the topic position. We can, nevertheless, find a gapless topic construction, which we have been ignoring:

(66) Reagan-wa [ Nancy-ga byouki-da ]
    TOP       NOM illness-COPULA(is)
    "As for Reagan, Nancy is ill in bed"

The topic phrase requires neither a trace nor an empty, or overt, resumptive pronoun in its commenting clause, so long as the pedication between them is maintained in some way. The same is true of the ECM construction and the relative construction (see note 2):

    NOM       ACC            COMP thought
    "John thought of Reagan that Nancy was ill in bed"

b. [ Nancy-ga byouki-no ] Reagan
    NOMINALIZER(is)
    "Reagan that Nancy is ill"

Interestingly, a gapless topic construction has no corresponding multipul subject construction:

(68) *Reagan-ga [ Nancy-ga byouki-da ]
    NOM
    "It is Reagan that Nancy is ill in bed"

We might be able to account for the ungrammaticality of (68) by assuming
that a multiple subject construction is only derived by movement.\textsuperscript{12}

In any way, now we are able to examine the occurrence of \textit{pro} in the topic position. First observe that a gapless topic construction can be embedded in the verb/noun complement:\textsuperscript{13}


\hspace{1cm} NOM \hspace{1cm} TOP \hspace{1cm} NOM is-ill \hspace{1cm} COMP thinks

"John thinks that as for Reagan, Nancy is ill in bed"

\hspace{1cm}\hspace{1cm} b. John-ga [[ Reagan-wa [ Nancy-ga byouki-da ]] -toyuu uwasaj-o

\hspace{1cm} COMP rumor ACC

hiteisita
denied

"John denied the rumor that as for Reagan, Nancy is ill in bed"

What we examine next is \textit{pro} can appear in the position occupied by \textit{Reagan} in (69). If it does, then the subjacency effect should not be found when the topic \textit{Reagan} is the target of relativization. But this prediction seems to be not borne out:

(70) a. [ John-ga [ \ e, [ Nancy-ga byouki-da]] -to omotteiru ] Reagan,

"Reagan that John thinks that Nancy is ill in bed"

\hspace{1cm} b. ?[ John-ga [[ \ e, [ Nancy-ga byouki-da]] -toyuu uwasaj-o

\hspace{1cm} hiteisita ] Reagan,

"Reagan that John denied the rumor that Nancy is ill in bed"

The fact that (70b) is not definitely bad though it is far worse than (65c) might be attributed to the weak islandhood of the noun-complement structure or to the fact that the multiple subject condition (68) becomes a little more acceptable when it embedded in a noun complement, as shown in (71):
(71) John-ga [[Reagan-ga [Nancy-ga byoukida]]-toyuu uwasao]-o
   hiteisita
   "John denied the rumor that it is Reagan that Nancy is ill in
   bed"

The contrast between (68) and (71) might be due to the fact that the outer
subject is forced to be interpreted as a focus, as has been pointed out in
the literature.

In any case, we could not seem to disregard the acceptability
difference between the example (70b) on the one hand and (65c) and (70a).
If this difference is a real one, we are led to conclude that the topic
position is not a Case-marked position. In other words the topic marker
wa is not a realization of abstract Case but a postposition or a
morphological case realization, contrasting with the nominative marker ga,
which is really a realization of structural Case assigned by INFL.

Interestingly, we have another derivation for the sentence
concerning to (70a), where the underlying form corresponds to the
following ECM construction:

(72) John-ga [Reagan-o [Nancy-ga byoukida]]-to omotteiru
   NOM ACC NOM is-ill COMP thinks
   "John thinks of Reagan that Nancy is ill in bed"

The position of Reagan in (72) is exceptionally Case-marked by omou
(think). We suggested in section 1.2.2. two possibility concerning the
internal structure of the ECM complement: one is that it is a small
clause and the other is that it has the structure of the topic
construction, namely the structure of TP or the adjunction structure of
CP. If the former is the case, the condition (47) in terms of Case and
the condition in terms of argumenthood both predict that pro can replace
Reagan in (72), since the subject of small clause is exceptionally
Case-marked and Th-marked by its predicate. If the latter is the case,
our condition makes the same prediction while the condition in terms of
argumenthood predicts that pro cannot appear in the position under
consideration. That is, if pro actually appear, then we are justified on
the assumption that the ECM complement has the structure of the topic construction. To decide which is right, let us now consider the following pair:

(73) a. [ Mary-ga [[ e, [ Nancy-ga byoukida ]]-to omotteiru ]
      NOM
      hito, ]-o sagasiteiru ] Reagan
person ACC is-seeking-for
"Reagan that Mary is seeking for the person who thinks that
Nancy is ill in bed"

b. [ Mary-ga [[[ e, [ Nancy-ga byoukida ]]-toyuu uwasu ]]-o
      NOM
      NOR is-ill COMP rumor ACC
      hiteisita ] hito, ]-o sagasiteiru ] Reagan,
denied person ACC is-looking-for
"Reagan that Mary is seeking for the person who denied the
rumor that Nancy is ill in bed"

If we are right, it is expected that (73a) is acceptable while (73b) is no more acceptable than (70b). Unfortunately, or fortunately, our intuition fails here.

Lastly let us consider a problem with our position the occurrence of pro is conditioned in terms of Case rather than aargumenthood. It has to do with genitive Case assigned in the prenominal position. Suppose that genitive Case is an instance of abstract Case assigned by some zero-level category, then we should expect under the condition (47) that pro can appear in the prenominal position, whether it is an argument or not. Consider the following pair:

(74) a. [ John-no musuko ]-ga byouki-da
       GEN son   NOM illness-COPULA(is)
"John’s son is ill in bed"

b. [ chuugoku-(kara)-no kyaku ]-ga byouki-da
       China-(from)-GEN visitor NOM
"a visitor from China is ill in bed"

Suppose that in (74b) John is an argument. Th-marked by the kinship word
musuko (son) while in (74b) chuugoku (China) is a nonargument modifying kyaku (visitor). Then the condition on pro in terms of argumenthood, unlike our condition (47), predicts that John in (74a) can be replaced by pro while chuugoku in (74b) cannot. This prediction is borne out:

(75) a. Johni-wa [[ e1 musuko ]-ga byouki-da ]
   TOP
   "As for John, a son is ill in bed"

b. Bill-ga [ Johni-o [[ e1 musuko ]-ga byouki-da ]]-to
   NOM   ACC
   omotteiru
   thinks
   "Bill thinks of John that a son is ill in bed"

c. [[ e1 musuko ]-ga byouki-no ] Johni
   GEN(is)
   "John, who a son is ill in bed"

(76) a. *chuugoku1-wa [[ e1 kyaku ]-ga byouki-da
   "As for China, a visitor is ill in bed"

b. *Bill-ga [ chuugoku1-o [[ e1 kyaku ]-ga byouki-da ]]-to
   omotteiru
   "Bill thinks of China that a visitor is ill in bed"

c. *[ [ e1 kyaku ]-ga byouki-no ] chuugoku1,
   "China, which a visitor is ill in bed"

Unless we can rule out (76) independently, our position is weakened, although not falsified in a strict sense. Our hypothetical opponent also have a task to do, since the extraction from NP also display an argument/nonargument assymmetry:

(78) a. Johni-wa [[ e1 musuko ]-ga byouki-da ]
   CNTR
   "John (as opposed to ...), a son is ill in bed"

b. *chuugoku1-wa [[ e1 kyaku ]-ga byouki-da
   "China (as opposed to ...), a visitor is ill in bed"
(79) a. John, ga [[ e1 musuko ]-ga byouki-da ]

"It is John that a son is ill in bed"

b. *chuugoku, ga [[ e1 kyaku ]-ga byouki-da

"It is China that a visitor is ill in bed"

In (78) the empty category in NP is not pro but a trace of the contrastive phrase, as already argued. As for the multiple subject construction of a type as seen in (79), it is argued in Oka (1987, to appear) that its derivation involves movement out of NP to the SPEC of IP. So long as our opponent can explain the asymmetry found in (78) and (79), he cannot claim strongly for his justis. If it is the case that (77) and (78)–(79) is accounted for by a single condition to the effect that a prenominal position should not be occupied by an empty nonargument, then neither of the two competing approach is rated higher than the other.

To conclude, we would like to emphasize that the condition (47) along with the condition (46) could be reduced to the more general considerations (48) and (49). While the condition in terms fo argumenthood rather than Case, keeps it being a mistery how it is related to the condition (46). This is our decided advantage from the viewpoint of explanatory adequacy. Under our approach a child learns in what position his language allows pro to appear from the richness or absense of overt agreement features.

NOTES

* I owe much to a collaborative research with Shinji Saito, Shinsuke Homma and Manabu Hashimoto, the result of which was reported at the 8th annual meeting of the Tsukuba English Linguistic Society held at University of Tsukuba on November 7, 1987. I am also thankful to Jun Abe, Hiroto Ohnishi, Yuji Takano and Mihoko Zushi for helpful comments and suggestions.

1 Notice that the ni-causative construction behaves differntly from theo-causative constructions. Consider the following:
(i) John-ga Mary-dake-ni hatarak-ase-ta  
  only DAT caused-to-work  
  "John caused (allowed) only Mary to work"

In (i) Mary-dake can take only the matrix clause as its scope. This suggests that NP-ni is not in the position of NP-o, which is further supported by the following example:

(ii) John-ga dareka-ni daremo-ni shoukais-are-sase-ta  
  NOW someone-DAT everyone-DAT caused-to-be-introduced  
  "John caused (allowed) someone to be introduced to everyone"

The scope relation between dareka and daremo is not ambiguous, the former assigned the wider scope. These facts follow directly if we assume that NP-ni is an argument of the causative verb, a reasonable assumption since it is generally held that dative Case is, unlike accusative Case, not assigned exceptionally. The ni-causative construction presumably has an object control structure. As for the o-causative construction, we further discuss its structure in section 2.2.1.

2 Whether the small clause is a constituent or not, the subject of the small clause is in predication with the remainder in it. However, consider again an ECM construction such as (15), reproduced as (i) below:

(i) Bill-ga [ Mary1-o [ John-ga e1, horeteiru ]]-to omotteiru  
  NOW ACC NOW is-in-love COMP thinks  
  "Bill thinks of Mary1 that John is in love with e1"

We have been assuming so far that the clause following the accusative NP functions as the predicate of the NP. Although this assumption is not unreasonable, there seems to be nothing to force it on us. If what follows the accusative NP is an AP, for example, predication is obligatory since an AP can function as nothing other than a predicate. However, a clause can be an argument as well as a predicate. Therefore, it might be possible that in (i), as suggested by its English translation suggests, omow Th-marks both the accusative NP and the following clause, although in
section 2.2.3. we will observe an example where the predication seems obligatory.

3 The example (41d) seems to sound odd to some speakers in the intended reading. We might be able to attribute the oddness to an 'crossover' effect. We can dissolve the crossing to give (i):

(i) [ Bill-ga [[ e₁ e₂ nagutta ] otoko]-o ketobasita ] onna;

The example (i) does not seem to sound odd to any speaker. Note that the grammaticality of (i) is enough for our present purpose.

4 The definition of the Case visibility condition is given below in (50)

5 In Japanese the extraction from islands cannot be considered to be an effective test for adjunctness, since an adjunct which has a particle or postposition displays no ECP effect, perhaps by virtue of P-stranding, and reconstruction in the case of syntactic movement, at LF.

6 The observations (54a, c) are due to Kuno (1973).

7 The tense marker *ta is ambiguous in that it is interpretable as the marker of the past tense or the one of the present perfect. If 'de-ta' in (53) is interpreted as referring to the past event irrelevant to the present, where it is translated into 'came' rather than 'has come', then the example (53b) sounds odd to us. This might be attributed to the selectional properties of *omow: it selects a 'stative', rather than 'eventive', proposition when it induces the exceptional Case-marking. The English verb consider seems to have the same property. Consider the following:

(i) a. John considered Mary to have come to the party
    b. John considered Mary to come to the party

(ia) is good, the complement proposition describing a present state. (ib) seems to sound odd, since its complement is usually interpreted as referring to a future event irrelevant to the present situation. The sentence becomes more acceptable if its complement is interpreted as describing a plan or expectation at present, a habit, or any other stative situation.
Alternatively, we might say that an adjunct is invisible at S-structure, since it is certainly subject to syntactic movement. The assumption made by Lasnik and Saitio (1984) and Chomsky (1986b) that an adjunct is \( \gamma \)-marked not at S-structure but at LF follows from our assumption. At the same time, however, the \( \gamma \)-marking by an adjunct becomes impossible at S-structure. This is serious problem, particularly in the case of the subject extraction. We might be able to overcome this difficulty by reducing proper government to lexical government. Another way to exclude adjuncts from Case-marking is to impose a condition that Case-marking requires coindexiation, which guarantees that only objects and subjects can be Case-marked, if we assume that Th-marking and SPEC-head agreement entail index-sharing.

Poser (1981) also distinguishes the Case assigned by a verb such as \textit{aruk} from other instances of accusative Case and call it 'oblique accusative case'. Note also that we could find another instance of inherent accusative Case on an experiencer NP of psychological verb in Japanese and other languages (see Besten (1985), Belletti and Rizzi (1986) and Oka (1988, to appear) among others).

The example of (61a) is due to Poser (1981).

It seems that the predication is pragmatically constrained: the object referred to by the topic phrase must have in its commenting clause a phrase whose referent is believed to be in a close enough relation with it. Thus, the sentence (66) is good since everyone knows that the President and Nancy are a couple, while a sentence such as \textit{Reagan-wa Madonna-ga byouki da} (As for Reagan, Madonna is ill in bed) sounds strange unless we believe that the President have some relation with Madonna, a famous singer.

The gapless topic construction also seems to be different in that the former is subject to a semantic condition which the latter does not obey. Consider the following unacceptable example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] \*Reagan-wa [ Nancy-ga bizin-da ]
  \begin{itemize}
    \item TOP \ \ \ NOM beauty-COPULA(is)
  \end{itemize}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item "As for Reagan, Nancy is beautiful"
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

The grammatical difference between (i) and (66) might be attributed to the
difference in the nature of the predicate in the commenting clause. It has been pointed out in the literature that the same contrast is found in other constructions not only in Japanese but also in English:

(ii) a. onna-ga byouki-da
    woman-NOM is-ill
    "A woman is ill in bed"
b. *onna-ga bizin-da
    is-beautiful
    "A woman is beautiful"
(iii) a. A man is angry
    b. *A man is handsome
(iv) a. There is a man angry
    b. *There is a man handsome

The differences observed above are, as often argued, accounted for by distinguishing between the stage level and object level predicate to use the terminology of Carlson (1980).

13 We cannot have a topic construction embedded in a relative clause, whether it is a gapless one or not:

(i) a. Maryi-wa [ John-ga e, sono-hon-o ageta ]
    TOP NOM that-book-ACC gave
    "As for Mary, John gave that book (to her)"
b. *[ Maryi-wa [ John-ga e, e, ageta ]] hon,
    book
    "the book that as for Mary, john gave"
(ii) a. Reagan-wa [ Nancy-ga Madonna-o butta ]
    TOP NOM ACC hit
    "As for Reagan, Nancy hit Waddonna"
b. *[ Reagan-wa [ Nancy-ga e, butta ]] kashu,
    singer
    "the singer that as for Reagan, Nancy hit"

This immediately follows on the assumption a topic construction is larger than IP. The fact that a topic construction can be embedded in a verb/noun complement provide no problem, if to/toi is not a
complementizer but a particle attached to any category of a clausal type, as suggested before.
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