

CASE, TENSE, AND SUBJECT RAISING IN JAPANESE *

Hideki Kishimoto
Kobe University

1. Introduction

One long-standing issue in Japanese generative grammar concerns the question of where subjects are located in clause structure. Since the introduction of the predicate-internal subject hypothesis (see Koopman and Sportiche 1991, Sportiche 1988, Fukui 1986, Kitagawa 1986, Kuroda 1988, McCloskey 1996, 1997), this issue has figured prominently. This is precisely because the predicate-internal subject hypothesis makes two subject positions available—one is a vP-internal position, where a subject receives its theta role from the verb, and the other, Spec-TP, which is the landing site of a subject (when it undergoes subject raising).

Theoretically subjects can appear in either Spec-vP or Spec-TP, but in Japanese, no general consensus has been reached as to which position subjects should occupy. Some researchers, such as Fukui (1986, 1995) and Kuroda (1988), hold that subjects appear in vP-internal position without subject raising.

(1) [TP [vP SUBJ [vP V] v] T]

On the other hand, it is held by other researchers, such as Miyagawa (1989a, 1989b) and Kishimoto (2001), that subjects are raised to Spec-TP by virtue of the EPP requirement imposed on T.

(2) [TP SUBJ [vP ~~SUBJ~~ [vP V] v] T]

The discussion of the structural position of subjects is often confined to cases involving nominative subjects, but more recently, a different claim has been advanced in Kishimoto (2012) to the effect that the structural position that subjects occupy varies depending on their marking; that is, nominative subjects are raised to Spec-TP, whereas source subjects marked with ablative case—the oblique *kara* ‘from’—remain within vP (cf. Ueda 2003).

In Japanese, there is at least one way of measuring whether or not a subject undergoes raising to Spec-TP. In this paper, it is shown that one species of raising construction where the main predicate is combined with the aspectual verb *iru* ‘be’ allows us to confirm the

* Part of the material in this paper was presented at 2nd York Workshop on East Asian Syntax (August, 2012). I would like to thank Mamoru Saito, Keiko Murasugi, Hidekazu Tanaka, Mika Kizu, Peter Sells, Ryosuke Shibagaki, John Whitman, and the audience at the workshop for comments and discussions. Needless to say, the author is solely responsible for any remaining errors and inadequacies.

constituent position of subjects.

In the raising construction formed with the aspectual verb *iru*, a negator may either precede or follow the aspectual verb. As I will discuss at length below, when the negator precedes the aspectual verb, negative scope does not extend over the matrix TP, but is limited to the embedded TP: the limited extent of negative scope allows us to assess whether a subject is raised to Spec-TP or not. A close inspection of the data reveals that the possibility of subject raising is determined by the property of tense. It is suggested that when T bears a case feature to license a nominative argument, it carries an EPP feature, and hence, subject raising is instantiated.

The discussion proceeds as follows. In section 2, I first discuss the structure of the aspectual construction. It is shown then that crucial evidence that allows us to diagnose the presence or absence of subject raising can be drawn from the aspectual construction. In section 3, I argue that when tense bears a case feature to value the case feature of a nominative argument, the EPP requirement is imposed on the clause. In section 4, the nominative-case constraint is seen to emerge when tense has an uninterpretable case feature. A conclusion is presented in section 5.

2. Subject Raising in the Aspectual Construction

The grammatical requirement for filling Spec-TP—the EPP requirement—motivates the raising of subjects to TP from the base-generated position within vP. Since the EPP was formulated by Chomsky (1982), a number of different theoretical implementations have been proposed (see Landau 2007), but it is commonly held that whether or not subject raising to Spec-TP takes place is determined by the property of T.¹

The EPP requirement is often taken to work in tandem with, or closely to, some grammatical features such as case and agreement. Researchers such as Bošković (2002) and Martin (1999) propose that the EPP should be motivated by case. In contrast, Kuroda (1988), Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), and Miyagawa (2010) provide a view to the effect that agreement dictates the EPP requirement, and hence, the possibility of subject raising.² The non-raising view of subjects in Japanese is often motivated by the fact that the language lacks agreement, as discussed by Fukui (1986, 1995) and Kuroda (1988). For Kuroda (1988), for

¹ There are a number of different grammatical views for the EPP: Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1988) claim that the EPP holds universally, and this requirement could be met via XP or X⁰ movement; McCloskey (1996) argues that the EPP holds in some languages, but not in others, or that languages may differ in the specifier requirement on T. While I assume that the EPP is a grammatical requirement (imposed on T), some proposals attempt to reduce the EPP requirement to a phonological constraint, stating that T needs its specifier (subject) for phonological reasons (e.g. Holmberg 2000). There are also views taking this requirement to be semantic in nature (see, e.g., Rothstein 2001).

² In Miyagawa's analysis, topic/focus features are construed as counterparts of agreement in languages like Japanese.

instance, subjects remain in vP-internal position, due to the absence of agreement. If the EPP works in tandem with agreement, this view might be plausible. Nevertheless, as I will discuss below, there is good reason to believe that in Japanese, the EPP requirement is conditioned by case rather than agreement.

In the following discussion, I will argue that, at least in Japanese, the EPP is correlated with the question of whether T licenses the most prominent structural case of the clause—i.e. nominative case. Data from the subject-raising construction with the aspectual verb *iru* suggest that the specifier requirement (i.e. the EPP requirement) of T is derived when tense carries an uninterpretable case feature to value the case feature of a nominative argument.

2.1. The Raising Constructions

Prior to going into the illustration of how subject raising is implemented in Japanese, let us discuss some notable properties of the aspectual construction (3) where the main verb is combined with the aspectual verb *iru* ‘be’, which plays a key role in the discussion of subject raising.

- (3) John-ga hon-o yon-de ir-u.
John-Nom book-Acc read be-Pres

‘John is reading the book.’

First, in the aspectual construction headed by the aspectual verb *iru* ‘be’, a negator *nai* ‘not’ can appear in two different syntactic positions. As shown in (4), *nai* can either precede or follow the aspectual verb (but must always follow the main verb).

- (4) a. John-ga hon-o yon-de i-na-i.
John-Nom book-Acc read be-Neg-Pres

‘John is not reading the book.’

V-BE-NOT

- b. John-ga hon-o yoma-nai-de ir-u.
John-Nom book-Acc read-Neg be-Pres

‘John is not reading the book.’

V-NEG-BE

The aspectual verb *iru* occurring with the main verb expresses an aspectual meaning, and constructs a raising construction. This can be confirmed by restoring to two heuristics standardly used for distinguishing raising from control structures.

To be concrete, the fact that inanimate subjects are allowed, as well as the fact that clausal idioms can be embedded with no loss of their idiomatic meanings, confirms that the construction formed with the aspectual verb *iru* ‘be’ has a raising structure. The examples in (5) represent a case where the negator occurs to the right of the main verb.

- (5) a. Sora-ga mada hare-te i-na-i.
 sky-Nom still clear be-Pres
 ‘The sky is not clearing yet.’ (Inanimate subject)
- b. Kono mise-de-wa mada kankodori-ga nai-te i-na-i.
 this shop-at-Top still cuckoo-Nom sing be-Neg-Pres
 ‘There are still almost no customers shopping at this shop.’ (Clausal idiom)

The same fact that is observed for (5) obtains in cases where the negator follows the aspectual verb, as in (6).

- (6) a. Sora-ga mada hare-nai-de i-ru.
 sky-Nom still clear-Neg be-Pres
 ‘The sky has not cleared yet.’ (Inanimate subject)
- b. Kono mise-de-wa mada kankodori-ga naka-nai-de i-ru.
 this shop-at-Top still cuckoo-Nom sing-Neg be-Pres
 ‘There are still almost no customers shopping at this shop.’ (Clausal idiom)

The data illustrate that the aspectual verb *iru* does not impose any selectional restriction on the subject, which is characteristic of raising verbs, and thus, any type of subject is allowed in the aspectual construction as long as it satisfies the sectional requirement of the main verb.

This pattern of distribution is not found in control constructions. The aspectual verb *oku* ‘put’ selects a *te*-clause as its complement, just like the aspectual verb *iru* ‘be’. Nevertheless, the verb *oku* takes a control complement. This is readily confirmed by the fact that neither inanimate subjects nor clausal idioms can be embedded under *oku*, as shown in (7).

- (7) a. *Sora-ga hare-te oka-nakat-ta.
 sky-Nom clear put-Neg-Past
 ‘The sky was not cleared.’ (Inanimate subject)
- b. *Kono mise-de-wa kankodori-ga nai-te oka-nakat-ta.
 this shop-at-Top cuckoo-Nom sing put-Neg-Past
 ‘There were almost no customers shopping at this shop.’ (Clausal idiom)

The data (5) through (7) suggest therefore that the aspectual construction where the verb *iru* is used should have a raising structure.³ The variant of the aspectual construction in (4b), where

³ To be more precise, the raising construction is formed when the subject is raised to Spec-TP. If it does not undergo raising, the resulting structure only involves embedding. As I will discuss below, the subject is moved to Spec-TP when T bears a feature [+Nom] to value the case feature of a nominative argument. In such a case, the aspectual construction involves raising rather than control. Japanese has

nai precedes the aspectual verb *iru*, has an agentive implication semantically, on the basis of which Takezawa (2004) argues that it should have a control structure. Nevertheless, the pattern of distribution observed above suggests that (4b), as well as (4a), should be counted as a raising construction.

2.2. Clause Structure and Negative Scope

In this section, I first delineate some assumptions about clause structure in Japanese. I postulate that Japanese has a clause structure like (8b), where a tense head *-ru* or *-ta* occupies the Fin-head position of FinP—projected in a higher position than TP.

- (8) a. [_{FinP} [_{TP} SUBJ [_{VP} V-v] *-ru/-ta*] Fin]
 b. [_{FinP} [_{TP} SUBJ [_{VP} V-v] ~~*-ru/-ta*~~] *-ru/-ta*]

I assume that in Japanese, a tense element is merged in the T-head position, as in (8a), but is head-raised to Fin, as in (8b), for the purpose of identifying the finiteness of the clause (see Rizzi 1997, Radford 2009). As a consequence of head raising, which places tense in the Fin-head position, the structure where tense takes scope over TP is created in overt syntax.

In this connection, note that in Romance and Germanic languages, complementizers often have the morphological manifestation of finiteness/infiniteness, suggesting that FinP is associated with the C-system, as discussed by Rizzi (1977). This applies to English as well, since the finiteness of an embedded clause is signalled by the type of complementizer.

Rizzi (1997) suggests that the two sorts of complementizers *di* and *che* in Italian should occupy distinct head positions, on the basis of the facts given in (9) and (10).

- (9) a. Credo che il tuo libro, loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.
 ‘I believe that your book, they would appreciate it a lot.’
 b. *Credo, il tuo libro, che loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.
 ‘I believe, your book, that they would appreciate it a lot.’ Rizzi (1997:218)
- (10) a. *Credo di il tuo libro, apprezzarlo molto.
 ‘I believe ‘of’ your book, to appreciate it a lot.’
 b. Credo, il tuo libro, di apprezzarlo molto.
 ‘I believe, your book, ‘of’ to appreciate it a lot.’ Rizzi (1997: 218)

The complementizer *di* is construed as the non-finite counterpart of the finite complementizer

a number of auxiliary verbs taking *te*-complements. These verbs are divided into two classes; while verbs like *kuru* ‘come’ and *iku* ‘go’ take raising structures, verbs like *ageru* ‘give’ and *miru* ‘try’ take control structures.

che. On the basis of the fact that *che* precedes, and *di* follows, a left-dislocated phrase appearing in TopP in Italian, as in (9) and (10), Rizzi claims that *che* appears in the head position of ForceP and *di* the head position of FinP.

The fact regarding the complementizers *that* and *for* in English is comparable to what is observed for the two complementizers *che* ‘that’ and *di* ‘of’ in Italian. Rizzi (1997) in fact argues that in English, the two types of complementizers *that* and *for* occur in distinct head positions above TP, in the light of the contrast observed in (11) and (12).

- (11) a. He is anxious that John will leave tomorrow.
 b. He is anxious that, tomorrow, John will leave. Radford (2009: 335)
- (12) a. He is anxious for John to leave tomorrow.
 b. *He is anxious for, tomorrow, John to leave. Radford (2009: 335)

The finite complementizer *that* fills in the head position of ForceP, so that a topic accommodated in TopP can follow it.⁴ This ordering is impossible with *for*, because it occurs in the head position of FinP. The data suggest that in English (and Italian), FinP is associated with a non-finite complementizer rather than tense itself.

In Japanese, by contrast, no distinction between finite versus non-finite clauses is drawn by the kind of complementizer, i.e. finiteness is not signalled by a complementizer morphologically, and tense can be distinguished only by way of its morphology. In the light of this fact, I surmise that in Japanese, unlike English/Italian, the T-head is associated with finiteness, and that since T is located below Fin, head raising of tense to Fin is instantiated. Under the view held here, FinP plays a different role in English/Italian and Japanese.

Let us now turn to the question of how negative scope is determined. It is well-observed that in Japanese, the scope of negation extends over TP in a simple clause (see Kato 1985, and many others), so that no subject-object asymmetry is observed in licensing NPIs, as illustrated in (13).

- (13) a. John-ga *hon-sika* yoma-na-i.
 John-Nom book-only read-Neg-Pres
 ‘John reads only books.’

⁴ In Rizzi’s (1997) analysis, the C-system is comprised of several distinct projections, as in (i).

- (i) Force ... (Topic)...(Focus)... Fin

The crucial point is that ForceP is projected above the Topic-Focus field, but FinP is located below it, so that a topic appearing in the left periphery is ordered differently, depending on what type of complementizer appears in the clause.

- b. *John-sika* hon-o yoma-na-i.
John-only book-Acc read-Neg-Pres

‘Only John reads books.’

The NPI *sika* (attached to DP/PP) is licensed by falling under the scope of negation (see Aoyagi and Ishii 1994). In (13), both subject and object NPIs are licensed, on the grounds that the scope of *nai* extends over the entire clause. Needless to say, DP/PP-*sika* is not licensed if it does not appear in the negative context.

- (14) a. **John-ga hon-sika* yom-u.
John-Nom book-only read-Pres

‘John reads only books.’

- b. **John-sika* hon-o yom-u.
John-only book-Acc read-Pres

‘Only John reads books.’

- c. **John-sika* [Mary-ga naka-nakat-ta to] it-ta.
John-only Mary-Nom cry-Neg-Past that say-Past

‘Only John said that Mary did not cry.’

In both (14a) and (14b), the NPI *sika* is not licensed due to the absence of a negator, i.e. negative scope is not projected which can license an NPI. In (14c), the NPI *sika* appears in the matrix clause, but the negator is located in the embedded clause. Thus, (14c) is ruled out on the grounds that the NPI falls outside the scope domain of the negator.

Negative scope can be assumed to be fixed structurally. The clause-wide scope of negation can be attributed to the presence of Neg-raising, which raises a Neg-head to T (and further to Fin), as depicted in (15).

- (15) [_{FinP} [_{TP} SUBJ [_{NegP} [_{VP} [_{VP} OBJ V] v] Neg] Neg-T] Neg-T-Fin]

In Japanese, T attracts a Neg-head to form a complex head, and further, since the finiteness of T needs to be licensed via head-raising to Fin, the entire head complex including Neg occurs in the Fin-head position. The complex head has TP in its c-commanding domain, and the scope of negation extends over TP accordingly.

In English, the negator *not* takes narrower scope, and a subject-object asymmetry obtains with regard to NPI licensing, as exemplified in (16).

- (16) a. John did not read *anything*.

- b. **Anyone* did not read the book.

This shows that the extent of negative scope differs between Japanese and English.⁵ Arguably, no Neg-raising takes place in English.

(17) [_{FinP} [_{TP} SUBJ T [_{NegP} *not* [_{vP} v-V [_{vP} OBJ]]]]]

In English, the negator resides in NegP, as illustrated in (16), and as such, negative scope does not extend over TP.

Japanese is similar to English, in that a negator looks like occupying a lower position than tense (at least morphologically). Nevertheless, Japanese, unlike English, takes clause-wide negative scope. In Japanese, T is combined with Neg to form a complex head, and this complex head is raised to Fin, with the result that Neg takes scope over TP.⁶ TP falls under the scope of *nai*, as a result of head raising, so the negative *nai* can license both subject and object (even if the subject undergoes raising to the clause-subject position of Spec-TP).

The existence of Neg-raising in Japanese, which leads to the formation of a complex head, is evidenced by (18).

(18) *John-ga hasit-te i-naku-**mo** ar-u.
John-Nom run be-Neg-also be-Pres

‘John is also not running.’

The example in (18) illustrates that the negative *nai* resists the suffixation of an adverbial particle on its right. As discussed by Kishimoto (2007, 2008), this is indicative of the fact that *nai* and the tense form a complex head syntactically.

When tense is separated from the adjectivally-inflecting negator by virtue of an emphatic particle, the supportive verb *aru* ‘be’ is inserted to the left of the stranded tense, in the same way that the supportive verb *aru* is inserted when tense is separated from its host adjective, as in (19).

⁵ In English, the negator *not* takes scope over subjects (located in Spec-TP) if it is raised to a higher position. Thus, an asymmetry in NPI interpretation obtains in the sentences in (i).

- (i) a. What did anyone not buy?
b. What didn’t anyone buy?

In (ia), *anyone* has a free-choice interpretation, and does not serve as an NPI. This is due to the fact that the subject is located in the position which falls outside the scope of *not*. In (ib), in contrast, *anyone* can serve as an NPI. The difference accrues from the fact in (ia), but not in (ib), *not* is located in a position where its scope extends over the subject.

⁶ The peculiarity of negation in Japanese lies in the fact that the sentential negator *nai* is combined with tense to form a complex head. In English, and also in other European languages, sentential negators, even if they are realized as heads, function as elements independent of tense, and normally do not interact with it (see Haegeman 1995, Zanuttini 1997, and others).

- (19) John-wa kanasiku-**mo** ar-u.
 John-Top sad-also be-Pres
 ‘John is also sad.’

In (18), in opposition to (19), the predicative sequence is not well-formed even with this morphological adjustment, i.e., (18) is not acceptable even if an appropriate supportive verb is inserted to the left of the stranded tense, which suggests that the negative *nai* be raised and adjoined to the tense to form a complex head syntactically.

This analysis is based on the assumption that a complex head cannot comprise a particle inside even if there is a morphological boundary. This view gains support from the examples in (20).

- (20) a. *kaigai-**mo** ryokoo b. kaigai-ryokoo-**mo**
 overseas-also travel overseas-travel-also
 ‘overseas as well travel’ ‘overseas travel as well’

The entire sequence of a compound noun like *kaigai ryokoo* ‘overseas travel’ forms a complex head, despite the fact that it consists of two elements *kaigai* ‘overseas’ and *ryokoo* ‘travel’ morphologically. With this compound noun, a particle can be added to the right of the entire complex, as in (20b), but cannot intervene between the morphological boundary of the two elements, as in (20a). Since an adverbial particle cannot be inserted unless there is a syntactic break, it is reasonable to state that the impossibility of inserting a particle to the right of the negative *nai* in (18) gives us a sign that the head *nai* is raised to a higher head to derive a complex head.

While a particle is prevented from occurring to the right of a negator, as in (18), a particle can be added to the right of the aspectual verb *iru*.

- (21) John-ga hasit-te i-**mo** si-na-i.
 John-Nom run be-also do-Neg-Pres
 ‘John is also not running.’

When a bound element is separated from the verb, as in (21), the supportive verb *suru* ‘do’ is used for morphological support. The acceptability of (21) shows that the aspectual verb does not form a syntactically tight unit with a higher predicative head, i.e. no head raising takes place.

Given the facts noted above, the verbal sequences in (22) can be posited for the two variants of the aspectual construction; (22a) represents a case where the negator appears in the matrix clause, and (22b) is a case where the negator is in the complement clause.

- (22) a. [_{FinP} [_{TP} [_{NegP} [[_{FinP} [_{TP} [_{vP} V-V] $\bar{\text{T}}$] T-Fin] Be] Neg] Neg-T] NEG-T-Fin]

- b. [_{FinP} [_{TP} [[_{FinP} [_{TP} [_{NegP} [_{vP} V-v] **Neg**] **Neg-T**] **NEG-T-Fin**] **Be**] **⊕**] T-FIN]

In the aspectual construction, the morpheme *-te*, which occurs with the main verb, has an infinitival (or gerundive) character semantically, and occurs in the head position where a finite tense is placed. In view of this fact, it is reasonable to assume that *-te* heads a TP projection that constitutes a non-finite complement (Kishimoto 2012).

Under the view taking the finiteness of a clause to be determined by *Fin*, which is placed just above T, head raising of a tense head to *Fin* takes place even in the complement clause, because the non-finite nature of *-te* needs to be determined within the projection of *FinP*. Therefore, when a negator is embedded inside the aspectual verb, it should undergo Neg-raising to T filled by the affix *-te* (or *-de*), and subsequently to the embedded *Fin*. In effect, the examples in (23) suggest that Neg-head raising takes place in the complement clause of the aspectual construction.

- (23) a. *John-ga hasira-naku-**mo** at-te i-ru.
John-Nom run-Neg-also be be-Pres

‘John is also not running.’

- b. John-ga hasira-nai-de-**mo** i-ru.
John-Nom run-Neg-also be-Pres

‘John is also not running.’

The unacceptability of (23a) shows that the negative head is raised to *-te* to derive a complex head. On the other hand, (23b) shows that *-te* is not syntactically combined with a higher head by head raising. This being the case, it can be stated that a complex head comprised of Neg and T (*-te/-de*) resides in the embedded *Fin*-head position, as (22b) illustrates.

The aspectual construction has a bi-clausal structure, and thus, the extent to which the scope of the negative *nai* extends should differ depending on where it appears. This is in fact the case. To be concrete, when *nai* intervenes between the main and the aspectual verbs, a difference in the possibility of NPI licensing is observed, as seen in (24).

- (24) a. Zutto John-ga *hon-sika* yoma-nai-de i-ru.
all.the.time John-Nom book-only read-Neg be-Pres

‘John has been reading only books all the time.’

- b. *Zutto *John-sika* hon-o yoma-nai-de i-ru.
all.the.time John-only book-Acc read-Neg be-Pres

‘Only John has been reading books all the time.’

While the NPI object in (24b) is licensed, the NPI subject in (24a) is not, showing that the

negative scope does not extend over the matrix clause.⁷ If the negative *nai* is placed in the matrix clause, it takes scope over the matrix clause, and there is no subject-object asymmetry found in NPI licensing, as shown in (25).

- (25) a. Saikin John-ga *hon-sika* yon-de i-na-i.
 Recently John-Nom book-only read be-Neg-Pres
 ‘Recently, John has been reading only books.’
- b. Saikin *John-sika* hon-o yon-de i-na-i.
 Recently John-only book-Acc read be-Neg-Pres
 ‘Recently, only John has been reading books.’

Importantly, the difference in acceptability observed between (24) and (25) suggests that the nominative subject is moved to Spec-TP from within vP by virtue of the EPP requirement imposed on T, as illustrated in (26).

- (26) a. [_{FinP} [_{TP} SUBJ [_{NegP} [[_{FinP} [_{TP} [_{VP} OBJ V-v]]T-Fin]Be]]] NEG-T-Fin]
- b. [_{FinP} [_{TP} SUBJ [[_{FinP} [_{TP} [_{NegP} [_{VP} OBJ V-v]]]NEG-T-Fin]Be]]T-Fin]

In (26a), where *nai* follows the aspectual verb *iru*, *nai* is raised to the matrix Fin, and thus, its scope domain extends over the entire clause. Consequently, the subject as well as the object of the main verb falls under the scope of negation. (In (26a), the subject has undergone raising to the matrix Spec-TP, and yet it falls under scope of negation.) On the other hand, in (26b), where *nai* precedes the aspectual verb, its scope extends only over the embedded clause. In this case, the object falls under scope of negation, which is placed in the embedded clause, but the subject does not. In (24), a subject-object asymmetry is observed in regard to NPI licensing, since the subject is extracted from the scope domain of *nai*. (Note that in the aspectual construction, two TP projections are present, but the lower non-finite TP is not relevant for the present discussion of the EPP.)

⁷ An NPI object scrambled across the subject is not licensed by the negator *nai* that precedes the aspectual verb, as shown in (ia).

- (i) a. ??? Zutto *hon-sika*_i John-ga *t*_i yoma-nai-de ir-u.
 all.the.time book-only John-Nom read-Neg be-Pres
 ‘John has been reading only books all the time.’
- b. *Zutto hon-o_i *John-sika* *t*_i yoma-nai-de ir-u.
 all.the.time book-Acc John-only read-Neg be-Pres
 ‘Only John has been reading books all the time.’

In (ia) both subject and object are located in the matrix clause, and thus, the subject NPI is not licensed by *nai*, either, as shown in (ib). Miyagawa (2001) claims that the subject may remain in vP-position when an object is scrambled across it, but the examples in (i) suggest that this is not case.

It is worth noting at this point that a similar pattern of distribution is found in (27), which involve adjunct NPIs.

- (27) a. *John-wa *kinoo-made-sika* hataraka-nai-de i-ta.
 John-Top yesterday-until-only work-Neg be-Past
 ‘John was working only until yesterday.’
- b. Zutto John-wa *koko-de-sika* hataraka-nai-de i-ta.
 all.the.time John-Top here-in-only work-Neg be-Past
 ‘John was working only here all the time.’

The temporal adverb in (27a) should be located in the matrix clause, because it is associated with the matrix tense. On the other hand, the locative PP in (27b) specifies the place where the event described by the main verb takes place, which suggests that it is located in the embedded clause. The contrast in acceptability between (27a) and (27b) shows that the temporal adjunct appears in the matrix clause, which is outside the scope of *nai* embedded under *iru*, but the locative adjunct appears in the embedded clause.

Again, no difference in acceptability is observed between the two types of NPI adjuncts with *sika* if the negator follows the aspectual verb, as shown in (28).

- (28) a. John-wa *kinoo-made-sika* hatarai-te i-nakat-ta.
 John-Top yesterday-until-only work-Neg be-Neg-Past
 ‘John was working only until yesterday.’
- b. Zutto John-wa *koko-de-sika* hatarai-te i-nakat-ta.
 all.the.time John-Top here-in-only work-Neg be-Neg-Past
 ‘John was working only here all the time.’

When *nai* appears in the matrix clause, as in (28), it takes scope over the entire clause. Consequently, both types of NPI adjuncts in (28) are licensed under the scope of negation. In (27), in contrast, the negator that appears in the complement clause takes scope over the embedded TP, but not beyond, so a difference in acceptability shows up there.

Note also that the subjects of unergative and unaccusative predicates fall outside the scope of negation in the aspectual construction where *nai* precedes the aspectual verb *iru*.

- (29) a. *Zutto *John-sika* hasira-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time John-only run-Neg be-Pres
 ‘Only John has been running all the time.’ (Unergative)

- b. *Zutto *John-sika* taore-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time John-only fall-Neg be-Pres

‘Only John has been falling down all the time.’ (Unaccusative)

The fact shows that not merely unergative predicates but also unaccusative predicates instantiate the raising of their subjects to the matrix Spec-TP. It goes without saying that when the negative *nai* follows the aspectual verb, both types of sentences are acceptable, because the scope of negation extends over the matrix TP.

- (30) a. Saikin *John-sika* hasit-te i-na-i.
 recently John-only run be-Neg-Pres

‘Only John has been running recently.’ (Unergative)

- b. Saikin *John-sika* taore-te i-na-i.
 recently John-only fall be-Neg-Pres

‘Only John has been falling down recently.’ (Unaccusative)

Some researchers, such as Kageyama (1993) and Nishigauchi (1992), claim that the subjects of unaccusative predicates, as opposed to those of unergative predicates, do not undergo raising. On the contrary, since both the subjects fall outside the scope of negation in (29), where the negator is placed in the complement clause, it must be the case that the subjects undergo raising to Spec-TP regardless of whether the predicates are unergative or unaccusative.

In the aspectual construction where the negator appears to the left of the aspectual verb, the matrix clause falls outside the scope of negation, so that a subject-object asymmetry is observed with regard to NPI licensing. In the next section, I will turn to the discussion of evidence suggesting that the possibility of subject raising in Japanese should be conditioned by case.

3. Canonical and Non-canonical Case Marking of Subjects

In this section, it is shown that when T is specified for [+Nom], the EPP requirement is imposed on it. I argue that nominative and dative subjects undergo subject raising, but obliquely-marked subjects do not (provided that no nominative argument appears in the clause).

3.1. Subject Raising in the Raising Construction

In the literature on Japanese, it is a locus of debate where subjects are located in clause structure (see, e.g., Fukui 1986, 1990, Kuroda 1988, Ueda 1990, Nishigauchi and Ishii 2003). This discussion is often confined to cases where subjects receive nominative case, but subjects can bear some other case markings, e.g. the dative *ni*, ablative *kara* ‘from’, and

instrumental *de* ‘with’, as illustrated in (31).

- (31) a. John-ga ronbun-o kai-ta.
 John-Nom paper-ACC write-Past
 ‘John wrote a paper.’ (Nominative subject)
- b. John-ni sore-ga mie-ta.
 John-Dat that-Nom see-Past
 ‘John saw that.’ (Dative subject, mainly for stative predicates)
- c. Watasi-kara sono koto-o hanasi-ta.
 I-from that fact-Acc speak-Past
 ‘I talked about that matter.’ (Ablative subject, marks a source)
- d. Kodomo-tati-de atumat-ta.
 child-Pl-with get.together-Past
 ‘The children got together.’ (Instrumental subject, marks a plural agent)

In Japanese, at least four distinct types of marking are available for subjects.⁸ The subject is marked with nominative case in (31a), and dative case in (31b). In (31c), the subject bears the ablative *kara* ‘from’, since it is thematically conceived as a source, as well as an agent, i.e. the ablative case *kara* can be assigned to the subject which is identified as a source (Kishimoto 2009, 2010).⁹ In (31d), the subject is assigned *de* ‘with’, for it is an agent argument which has a plural referent, i.e. the argument refers to a group of people (Kishimoto 2005, Takubo 2010).

The thematic relations of arguments are uniquely identifiable by *kara* and *de*, which shows that they are construed as inherent (or semantic) cases. On the other hand, nominative and dative cases are structural ones, and hence do not specify the thematic relations of arguments which they occur with.¹⁰ In the following discussion, making crucial use of the aspectual construction, I will show that subject raising is instantiated in (31a-b), where the subjects bear structural case, but not in (31c-d), where the subjects carry inherent case.

⁸ The discussion in this paper is limited to cases where subjects appear in main clauses, but it is worth noting that some other markings are available in embedding contexts; for instance, subjects is marked with accusative case when they appear in the embedded clause of the ECM construction, and they can bear genitive case when they appear inside relative or noun complement clauses.

⁹ When a DP marked with *kara* specifies ordering, it behaves like an adjunct. Thus, this type of DP is not discussed here (see Kishimoto 2012).

¹⁰ Although there are a number of different views on dative case, I assume that it falls into the class of structural case. See, e.g. Butt (2006) for discussion on this point.

To begin, the underlined arguments bearing different markings in the four clauses in (31) are all counted as subjects syntactically. This can be confirmed by the fact that they can be the antecedents of the subject-oriented *zibun*.

- (32) a. John_i-ga zibun_i-no ronbun-o kai-ta.
 John-Nom self-Gen paper-ACC write-Past
 ‘John wrote his own paper.’
- b. John_i-ni zibun_i-no ie-ga mie-ta.
 John-Dat self-Gen house-Nom see-Past
 ‘John saw his own house.’
- c. John_i-kara-wa zibun_i-no koto-o hanasa-nakat-ta.
 John-from-Top self-Gen fact-ACC speak-Neg-Past
 ‘John did not talk about his own matter.’
- d. Kodomo_i-tati_i-de zibun_i-no nimotu-o hakon-da.¹¹
 child-PL-with self-Gen luggage-ACC carry-Past
 ‘The children carried their own luggage.’

Subject honorification provides another type of corroboration for the adequacy of the present view. The examples in (33) show that the underlined arguments in (31) can be targeted by subject honorification.

- (33) a. Sensei-ga ronbun-o o-kaki-ni-nat-ta.
 teacher-Nom paper-ACC write-Hon-Past
 ‘The teacher wrote a paper.’
- b. Sensei-ni sore-ga o-mie-ni-nat-ta.
 teacher-Dat that-Nom see-Hon-Past
 ‘The teacher saw that.’
- c. Sensei-kara sono koto-o o-hanasi-ni-nat-ta.
 teacher-from that fact-ACC speak-Hon-Past
 ‘The teacher talked about that matter.’

¹¹ In this example, *zibun* can have either a group or a distributive reading. The two readings are available for *zibun* in cases where a subject refers to more than one individual.

- d. Sensei-tati-de o-atumari-ni-nat-ta.
 teacher-Pl-with get.together-Hon-Past

‘The teachers got together.’

Given that the underlined arguments in (31) can be the targets of subject honorification, and the antecedents of the reflexive *zibun*, both of which have subject orientation, it is safe to state that they serve as subjects.¹²

Next, let us confirm that nominative subjects undergo raising to the matrix Spec-TP in the aspectual construction. This can be seen by the fact that nominative subjects lie outside the scope of negation when *nai* is embedded under *iru*.

- (34) a. *Zutto John-sika gohan-o tabe-nai-de i-ta.
 all.the.time John-only rice-Acc eat-Neg be-Past

‘Only John has been eating rice all the time.’

- b. Zutto John-ga gohan-sika tabe-nai-de i-ta.
 all.the.time John-Nom rice-only eat-Neg be-Past

‘John has been eating only rice all the time.’

In (34), the subject, but not the object, is allowed to occur with *sika*. Since the negative scope extends over the complement clause, but not the matrix clause, the fact shows that the nominative subject is raised to the matrix Spec-TP.

Similarly, in the dative-subject construction, the dative subject is raised to Spec-TP, whereas an object is not even if it is marked with nominative case. The contrast in acceptability observed between (35a) and (35b) with regard to the licensing of the NPI *sika* provides a confirmation of this fact.

- (35) a. *Zutto John-ni-sika sonna undoo-ga deki-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time John-Dat-only that exercise-Nom can.do-Neg be-Pres

‘Only John has been able to do that exercise all the time.’

- b. Zutto John-ni-wa sonna undoo-sika deki-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time John-Dat-Top that exercise-only can.do-Neg be-Pres

‘John has been able to do only that exercise all the time.’

Since the dative subject cannot occur with *sika*, as shown in (35a), it must be located in Spec-TP in the main clause, i.e. the dative subject is moved to the matrix Spec-TP by virtue of subject raising.

¹² Subject honorification is subject-oriented, as often discussed (see e.g. Harada 1976, Hasegawa 2006), but in some cases, speaker variation might arise with regard to its possible targets.

In the dative-subject construction, just like the nominative-subject construction, the subject-object asymmetry in NPI licensing observed in (35a-b) does not obtain when the negator appears in the matrix clause. This is shown in (36).

- (36) a. *John-ni-sika sono undoo-ga deki-te i-na-i.*
 John-Dat-only that exercise-Nom can.do be-Neg-Pres
 ‘Only John can do that exercise.’
- b. *John-ni-wa sono undoo-sika deki-te i-na-i.*
 John-Dat-Top that exercise-only can.do be-Neg-Pres
 ‘John can do only that exercise.’

The absence of subject-object asymmetry in NPI licensing is naturally expected: since the negative *nai* that follows the aspectual verb takes scope over the matrix clause, an NPI is licensed regardless of whether it appears in the matrix subject position or in the embedded object position.

Let us continue to consider how NPIs with *sika* behave in cases where the subject is marked with *de* ‘with’ or *kara* ‘from’. First, in the aspectual construction where *nai* is located in the complement clause (37), the NPI subject marked with the oblique *de* ‘with’, as well as the NPI object, is licensed by *nai*.

- (37) a. *Zutto kodomo-tati-de-sika asobi-no keikaku-o tate-nai-de i-ru.*
 all.the.time child-PI-Instr-only play-Gen plan-Acc make-Neg be-Pres
 ‘Only the children have been making plans for their play all the time.’
- b. *Zutto kodomo-tati-de asobi-no keikaku-sika tate-nai-de i-ru.*
 all.the.time child-PI-Instr play-Gen plan-only make-Neg be-Pres
 ‘The children have been making only plans for their play all the time.’

In (37), the subject and the object fall under the scope of negation, and therefore, an NPI can appear in either the subject or the object position.¹³ Since the negative scope does not extend

¹³ In a sentence like (38b), even when the object is scrambled across the *de*-marked subject, the sentence is acceptable, as in (i).

- (i) *Zutto asobi-no keikaku-sika_i kodomo-tati-de t_i tate-nai-de i-ru.*
 all.the.time play-Gen plan-only child-PI-Instr make-Neg be-Pres
 ‘The children have been making only plans for their play all the time.’

This is obviously a reflection of the fact that the *de*-marked subject remains in the base position without raising to TP. In (i), since the subject remains in the embedded clause, the scrambled object can appear in the embedded clause, over which the negative *nai* extends its scope. The same fact obtains in a clause where the subject is marked with *kara* ‘from’.

over the matrix clause, it must be the case that the obliquely-marked subject remains in situ without raising to the matrix Spec-TP.

In the ablative-subject construction in (38) as well, the oblique NPI subject, alongside an accusative NPI object, is licensed by falling under the scope of *nai* located in the subordinate clause.

- (38) a. Zutto *hahaoya-kara-sika* hanasi-o si-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time mother-from-only talk-Acc do-Neg be-Pres
 ‘Only the mother has been talking all the time.’
- b. Zutto *hahaoya-kara-wa sonna hanasi-sika* si-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time mother-from-Top that talk-only do-Neg be-Pres
 ‘The mother has been giving only that kind of talk all the time.’

The fact that both NPI subject and object are licensed suggests that the *kara*-marked subject as well does not undergo raising to the matrix TP.¹⁴

The data discussed thus far indicate that dative and nominative subjects undergo raising to Spec-TP, while oblique subjects do not. The question to be addressed at this point is why it is that the nominative and the dative subjects undergo raising to Spec-TP. As well observed (see Takezawa 1997, Tada 1992, and many others), the availability or unavailability of nominative case in Japanese is correlated with the question of whether the clause has (finite) tense. In the light of the fact that both nominative-subject and dative-subject constructions comprise nominative arguments, whose case feature is valued by tense, I suggest that when tense carries the uninterpretable case feature [+Nom], the EPP requirement is imposed on T, i.e. an EPP feature is assigned to it.

If subject raising is implemented in cases where tense has [+Nom] to value the case feature of a nominative argument, sentences which do not comprise any nominative arguments are not expected to instantiate subject raising. Note, however, that Japanese has the case requirement that a tensed clause has at least one nominative argument, which is often referred to as the ‘nominative-case’ constraint (Shibatani 1978). The nominative-case constraint applies fairly persistently, but still, there are a number of syntactic contexts where the nominative-case constraint does not apply. One such context is found in the oblique-subject constructions where the nominative case on the subject, which needs to be licensed by T, is replaced by an oblique marker *kara* or *de*. The data regarding the oblique-subject constructions in (37) and (38) confirm that no subject raising takes place when the clause

¹⁴ It goes without saying that the obliquely-marked NPI subject raised remaining in the base position is licensed by the negator *nai* that follows the aspectual verb.

does not comprise any nominative argument.¹⁵

Note that the dative-subject construction is subject to the nominative-case constraint. Thus, the variant of the dative-subject clause that marks the object with accusative case in (39) is not acceptable.

- (39) John-ni {sore-ga/*sore-o} deki-ru.
 John-Dat that-Nom/that-Acc can.do-Pres
 ‘John can do that.’

Owing to the fact that the nominative-case constraint applies to the dative-subject construction, the syntactic construal which does not have a nominative argument cannot be constructed from the dative-subject construction (see section 4).

Under the present analysis taking tense to be responsible for determining the possibility of subject raising, it is further predicted that the raising of an oblique-marked subject to Spec-TP is instantiated if the clause has a nominative argument. This prediction is in fact borne out, since oblique subjects are susceptible to subject raising when they occur in clauses that contain nominative objects, as I will discuss below. (40) is a case where the subject is marked with *kara* ‘from’.

- (40) a. *Zutto *hahaoya-kara-sika* hanasi-ga deki-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time mother-from-only talk-Nom can.do-Neg be-Pre
 ‘Only the mother has been able to talk all the time.’
 b. Zutto *hahaoya-kara-wa sonna hanasi-sika* deki-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time mother-from-Top that talk-only can.do-Neg be-Pres
 ‘The mother has been able to give only that kind of talk all the time.’

The examples in (40) differ from those in (38) in the choice of predicate. In (40), the object is marked with nominative case, since the predicate is *dekiru* ‘can do’. (Note that *dekiru*, which can sanction nominative case on its object, is a suppletive potential form of *suru* ‘do’.) The examples in (40) show that while the NPI object, which is marked with nominative case, is licensed by *nai*, the NPI subject does not, owing to its raising to Spec-TP.

The same holds true for the construction whose subject is *de*-marked. As can be seen from (41), the subject marked with *de* is amenable to subject raising if the clause contains a nominative object.

¹⁵ In matrix clauses, the subjects of unaccusative verbs cannot be marked with accusative case, even though they initially appear in object position. It should also be noted that no semantic markers substituting the nominative case on the subjects of unaccusative verbs are available in Japanese.

- (41) a. *Zutto *kodomo-tati-de-sika* hanasi-ga deki-nai-de i-ru.
 all.the.time child-Pl-with-only talk-Nom can.do-Neg be-Pres
 ‘Only the children have been able to talk all the time.’
- b. Zutto *kodomo-tati-de-wa sonna hanasi-sika* deki-nai-de i-ta.
 all.the.time child-Pl-with-Top that talk-Nom can.do-Neg be-Past
 ‘The children have been able to give only that kind of talk all the time.’

In (41), the subject marked with *de*, but not the nominative object, falls outside the scope of negation. This stands in contrast with the *de*-marked subject appearing in the clause which has an accusative object, as in (37).

The negative *nai*'s failure to license the oblique subject NPIs in the aspectual construction where the negative takes scope only over its complement clause gives us a clear indication that oblique subjects are raised to the matrix Spec-TP when the EPP requirement is obtained, as illustrated in (42b).

- (42) a. [TP [TP [VP SUBJ-kara/de OBJ-ACC Vv]] T]
 b. [TP SUBJ-kara/de [TP SUBJ-kara/de [VP SUBJ-kara/de OBJ-NOM Vv]] T]

Subject raising is not implemented when an object is marked with accusative rather than nominative case. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that subject raising is induced when tense bears a case feature to value the case feature on a nominative argument.

3.2. Control Construction

The raising construction where the negator is located in the complement clause, no subject-object asymmetry in NPI licensing is observed when the subject does not undergo raising to the matrix Spec-TP, as seen above. In the aspectual construction where the main verb is combined with an aspectual verb like *oku* ‘put’ (see section 2.1), the subject is selected by *oku*, and thus, it is base-generated in the matrix clause, while PRO appears in the complement clause, as (43) illustrates.

- (43) [FinP [TP [VP SUBJ [FinP [TP PRO [NegP [VP V-v]]] NEG-T-FIN] PUT]] T-FIN]

This leads to another predication. In the control construction where the negator is located to the left of the verb *oku* ‘put’, as in (43), it is predicated that NPI subjects will not be licensed even in a case where the EPP is not imposed on the clause. This prediction is in fact borne out, as we can see from (44).

- (44) a. *Zutto *kodomo-tati-de-sika* asobi-no keikaku-o tate-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time child-Pl-Instr-only play-Gen plan-Acc make-Neg put-Past
 ‘Only the children made a plan for their play all the time.’

- b. Zutto kodomo-tati-de *asobi-no keikaku-sika* tate-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time child-Pl-Instr play-Gen plan-only make-Neg put-Past

‘The children made a plan only for their play all the time.’

In (44), the subject marked with *de* should not be raised to the matrix Spec-TP in the absence of a nominative argument. Nevertheless, the subject lies outside the scope of negation, since the negative scope extends only over the complement clause. Hence, (44a) is unacceptable. The same fact obtains even when the subject is marked with *kara*, as seen in (45).

- (45) a. *Zutto *hahaoya-kara-sika* hanasi-o si-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time mother-from-only talk-Acc do-Neg put-Past

‘Only the mother talked all the time.’

- b. Zutto *hahaoya-kara-wa sonna hanasi-sika* si-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time mother-from-Top that talk-only do-Neg put-Past

‘The mother talked about only that kind of thing all the time.’

The difference in acceptability between (44a) and (45a), on the one hand, versus (44b) and (45b), on the other hand, is naturally expected, given the configuration (43). In (43), the subject remaining in the base-generated position of the matrix clause falls outside the scope of *nai*, which resides in the embedded clause. On the other hand, the object lies inside the scope of negation. Accordingly, a subject-object asymmetry is observed with regard to NPI licensing.¹⁶

This pattern of distribution is found in a case where the subject is marked with nominative case, as seen in (46).¹⁷

- (46) a. *Zutto *Ken-sika* hanasi-o si-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time Ken-only talk-Acc do-Neg put-Past

‘Only Ken talked all the time.’

- b. Zutto *Ken-wa sonna hanasi-sika* si-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time Ken-Top that talk-only do-Neg put-Past

‘Ken gave only that kind of talk all the time.’

¹⁶ In Hornstein’s analysis (1999), which dispenses with PRO, the controller undergoes movement starting from the position where PRO is base-generated. Even if this analysis adopted, no problem arises, because only the overt position of the controller is relevant for NPI licensing.

¹⁷ The dative-subject construction is not discussed here. This is because the aspectual construction with the verb *oku* ‘put’ is not acceptable when a dative-subject clause, which does not describe an event performed by the subject, is embedded.

The nominative subject in (46), unlike the oblique subjects in (44) and (45), should be moved to the matrix Spec-TP. Nevertheless, these subjects share the property that they are located in the matrix clause, and hence the subject NPIs are not licensed by *nai* regardless of their marking in the control construction where the negator precedes the verb *oku* ‘put’.

On the other hand, when the negator follows the verb *oku* ‘put’, the subject NPIs are licensed under the scope of negation, as shown in (47).

- (47) a. *Kodomo-tati-de-sika* asobi-no keikaku-o tate-te oka-nakat-ta.
 child-PI-Instr-only play-Gen plan-Acc make put-Neg-Past
 ‘Only the children made a plan for their play.’
- b. *Hahaoya-kara-sika* hanasi-o si-te oka-nakat-ta.
 mother-from-only talk-Acc do put-Neg-Past
 ‘Only the mother talked.’
- c. *Ken-sika* hanasi-o si-te oka-nakat-ta.
 Ken-only talk-Acc do put-Neg-Past
 ‘Only Ken talked.’

What is more, there is an asymmetry in NPI licensing of temporal and locative adjuncts, as shown in (48).

- (48) a. **John-wa kinoo-made-sika* hataraka-nai-de oi-ta.
 John-Top yesterday-until-only work-Neg put-Past
 ‘John worked only until yesterday.’
- b. *Zutto John-wa koko-de-sika* hataraka-nai-de oi-ta.
 all.the.time John-Top here-in-only work-Neg put-Past
 ‘John worked only here all the time.’

This distribution observed in (48) falls into place, if the temporal adjunct appears in the matrix clause, which is outside the scope of *nai* embedded under *iru*, but the locative adjunct does not.

The data indicate that in the control construction with the aspectual verb *oku*, all types of subjects appear in the matrix clause.

3.3. Summary

The overall patterns of subject raising that we have observed for the raising construction headed by the aspectual verb *iru* ‘be’ are shown in (49).

- (49) a. [TP SUBJ-NOM [TP ~~SUBJ-NOM~~ [VP ~~SUBJ-NOM~~ (OBJ-ACC) V-v]]]
 b. [TP SUBJ-DAT [TP ~~SUBJ-NOM~~ [VP ~~SUBJ-DAT~~ OBJ-NOM V-v]]]
 c. [TP [TP [VP SUBJ-INSTR/-ABL V-v]]] (No Raising)

It should be apparent from (49) that the presence or absence of subject raising is correlated with the question of whether T has the case feature [+Nom], i.e. wherever T enters into a case relation with a nominative argument, i.e. T values the case feature of a nominative argument, subject raising is instantiated.

If the EPP is tied to nominative case, subject raising is instantiated in the nominative-subject construction as well as in the dative-subject construction, due to the fact that they need to contain a nominative argument, by virtue of the nominative-case constraint. The oblique subject constructions offer cases where subject raising may not be applicable, because the nominative case on the subjects can be replaced by oblique markers without affecting their acceptability if certain semantic criteria are met. (In the instrumental-subject construction, the subject needs to represent a plural agent, and in the ablative-subject construction, the subject needs to be construed as a source.)

In essence, the EPP requirement is not always imposed on T in Japanese; in ordinary clauses, subjects undergo A-movement to Spec-TP, because they are associated with the T that values the case feature on a nominative argument. Oblique subjects are not raised to Spec-TP when it is possible for the clause to be exempt from the nominative-case constraint via semantic-case replacement. Nevertheless, when nominative arguments are included elsewhere in the clauses, even the oblique subjects undergo raising to Spec-TP. The fact points to the conclusion that the EPP requirement on T is motivated when tense bears the case feature [+Nom] to value the case feature of a nominative argument. Since the EPP requirement is imposed on the T-head that values case features, the EPP should be tied to case (rather than agreement).

4. What Derives the Nominative-Case Constraint?

In the oblique-subject constructions, subject raising is not implemented if the clauses do not comprise any nominative argument. As noted earlier, Japanese has the nominative-case constraint, and the oblique-subject constructions, where semantic-case replacement takes place, constitute exceptions to this constraint (Inoue 1998, 2007).¹⁸ This might give us the impression that semantic-case replacement always provides a way of voiding the nominative-case constraint. This is not the case, however. In (50a), the nominative case on the locative argument can be replaced by *kara* without affecting acceptability, but in (50b), the same

¹⁸ Inoue (1998, 2007) observes that when subjects are marked with oblique case, the clause is exempt from the nominative-case constraint, but does not provide any explanation as to why this constraint does not apply in this case.

replacement results in unacceptability.

- (50) a. Kodomo-ga kono heya-ga/-kara de-rare-nakat-ta.
 child-Nom this room-Nom/-Abl leave-can-Neg-Past

‘The child was unable to leave this room.’

- b. Kodomo-ni kono heya-ga/*-kara de-rare-nakat-ta.
 child-Dat this room-Nom/-Abl leave-Past

‘The child was unable to leave this room.’

The sole difference between the two examples lies in the fact that whereas the subject is marked with nominative case in (50a), it is marked with dative case in (50b). The grammatical status of (50b) is comparable to that found in (51).

- (51) Kodomo-ni kono heya-ga/*-o de-rare-nakat-ta.
 child-Dat this room-Nom/-Acc leave-can-Neg-Past

‘The child was unable to leave this room.’

Since the oblique *kara* cannot replace the nominative case in (50b), it should be apparent that owing to the nominative-case constraint, the dative-subject construction (50b) is ruled out as ungrammatical.

The data show that clauses with no nominative argument derived by replacing nominative case with a semantic case are not always legitimate (due to the nominative-case constraint). If this is the case, we are faced with a paradox: the nominative-case constraint does not apply when semantic-case replacement takes place on subjects, as demonstrated in section 3, but in (50b) the same semantic-case replacement cannot void the nominative-case constraint. Why is this the case?

The difference emerges depending on the property of tense. The crucial fact is that (50b) falls into a type of dative-subject construction. Since the dative case on the subject is licensed by T when the predicate (or to be more precise, the tense associated with the predicate) is stative (Kuno 1973), I suggest that the nominative-case constraint is enforced when T bears an uninterpretable case feature, but it is not when T does not carry any case feature to be used for deleting case features on arguments. Note that in Japanese, finite T does not always value the case feature on a nominative argument, which suggests that T can optionally bear the case feature [+Nom]. In the light of this fact, I propose that Japanese makes two kinds of T’s available, which are distinguished according to whether or not they carry uninterpretable case features, and that when T bears case features, it always includes the most prominent case feature of [+Nom], which I claim is responsible for the nominative-case constraint.

An ordinary type of T is equipped with case features, and in the nominative-subject

construction, T comprises [+Nom], as in $T_{[+NOM]}$.¹⁹ In the nominative-subject construction, the case feature on T is deleted via agreement with the case feature on the nominative subject. If there is an object, its case feature as well as the case feature on v is deleted by agreement. (If all the uninterpretable features are deleted, the derivation converges.)

- (52) a. [SUBJ_[+NOM] OBJ_[+ACC] v_[+ACC] T_[+NOM]]
 b. [SUBJ_{ABL/INSTR} OBJ_[+ACC] v_[+ACC] T_φ]

The nominative-case constraint applies to (52a), for T carries a case feature. Thus, the derivation does not converge if the clause does not have a nominative argument. On the other hand, the oblique markers *de* and *kara* do not require an external licenser, and if the nominative case on the subject is replaced by an oblique marker, T can appear without any case feature, as in (52b). In (52b), the derivation is legitimate, because the case feature on v is deleted in agreement with the case feature on the accusative object. Since T does not include any case features that need to be deleted in the derivation, (52b) is exempt from the nominative-case constraint, and hence the sentence is acceptable even if it does not comprise any nominative argument.

The nominative-case constraint cannot be voided in the dative-subject construction, where the subject is marked with dative case. The fact naturally falls out if tense is responsible for case licensing of dative case, as well as nominative case in the dative-subject construction, i.e. T is furnished with [+Dat] alongside [+Nom], as in $T_{[+DAT], [+NOM]}$. In (53a), the dative case feature is deleted in agreement with the case feature on the dative subject, and the nominative case feature can be deleted by the case feature on the nominative object.

- (53) a. [SUBJ_[+DAT] OBJ_[+NOM] v T_{[+DAT], [+NOM]}]
 b. *[SUBJ_[+DAT] OBJ_[+ACC] v_[+ACC] T_{[+DAT], [+NOM]}]
 c. *[SUBJ_[+DAT] OBJ_{-ABL} v T_{[+DAT], [+NOM]}]

Note, however, that even if nominative case on an object is replaced by an oblique marker, as in (53c), T needs to bear the case feature [+Dat] to license the dative subject, which means that T must participate in a case-licensing relation with an argument. In this case, [+Nom] appears on T, which needs to be deleted for the derivation to converge. In (53b-c), the derivation is not legitimate, because [+Nom] on T remains undeleted in the absence of a nominative argument. When T bears [+Nom], a violation of the nominative-case constraint is

¹⁹ Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) suggests nominative case should be an unvalued tense feature on D, so that it is deleted in association with tense. In Chomsky (2000, 2001), manifestation of structural Case depends on the probe, and T values the case feature on an argument as nominative, and v as accusative, etc. But the Japanese facts illustrate that tense does not necessarily value the case feature of a nominative argument. Thus, the present analysis assumes that a case feature contained in the probe determines the case value of an argument, and that T and v contain [+Nom] and [+Acc], respectively.

incurred if nominative case is replaced by accusative case or the ablative *kara*. Thus, sentences where T contains a case feature cannot be well-formed unless they include nominative arguments.

Incidentally, if the dative case is replaced by *kara* in the dative-subject construction, the resulting clause does not result in unacceptability.

- (54) Kodomo-ni/-kara kono heya-ga mie-nakat-ta.
 child-Dat/-Abl this room-Nom see-Neg-Past

‘The child was unable to see this room.’

In (54), when the dative case is replaced by the ablative *kara*, T comprising [+Nom] (but not [+Dat]) is merged. In this case, the sentence is not excluded as unacceptable, due to the presence of a nominative argument.

The present analysis taking tense to be responsible for the nominative-case constraint crucially draws on the assumption that the case feature of the dative subject is valued by T (Chomsky 2001, 2004, 2008). It is sometimes assumed (see e.g. Ura 1999), however, that dative case is construed as inherent case, which does not require the presence of an external licenser. Nevertheless, there is good reason to believe that the case feature on the dative subject is valued by T. To make this point, first consider (55).

- (55) a. [PRO_{arb} kodomo-o home-ru] koto-wa ii koto da.
 child-Acc praise-Pres fact-Top good thing Cop

‘It is a good thing [PRO_{arb} to praise children].’

- b. *[John-ga PRO_{arb} home-ru] koko-wa ii koto da.
 John-Nom praise-Pres fact-Top good thing Cop

(Lit.) ‘It is a good thing [for John to praise PRO_{arb}].’

The examples in (55) show that with a non-stative predicate, its nominative subject, but not an accusative object, can be turned into PRO_{arb}. In contrast, in the dative-subject construction, it is the dative rather than the nominative argument that can serve as PRO_{arb}, as seen in (56).

- (56) a. [PRO_{arb} kodomo-ga home-rare-ru] koto-wa ii koto da.
 child-Nom praise-can-Pres fact-Top good thing Cop

‘It is a good thing [PRO_{arb} to be able to praise children].’

- b. *[John-ni PRO_{arb} home-rare-ru] koko-wa ii koto da.
 John-Dat praise-can-Pres fact-Top good thing Cop

(Lit.) ‘It is a good thing [for John to be able to praise PRO_{arb}].’

According to Chomsky and Lasnik (1993), PRO is licensed by receiving null case from

infinitival T. In Japanese, a verb in the present form can be associated with infinitival T, and thus, (55a) and (56a) can have PRO_{arb} interpretation (see Kuroda 1983).²⁰ Given that PRO_{arb} occurs by replacing an argument appearing in subject position whose case feature is valued by finite T, it is reasonable to say that T is the case licenser of subjects in the dative-subject construction.²¹

There are cases where a dative argument is valued by the verb, rather than T. When a dative argument does not enter into an agreement relation with T, nominative case can be replaced by an oblique marker without affecting acceptability, as exemplified in (57).

- (57) Haha-ga/-kara kodomo-ni hon-o atae-ta.
 mother-Nom/-Abl child-Dat book-Acc give-Past

‘The mother gave her child a book.’

The ditransitive predicate *ataeru* ‘give’ allows the nominative case marking of the source subject to be replaced by *kara* even in the presence of the dative argument. When the subject receives the oblique *kara*, no nominative argument shows up in the clause, but still, the sentence is acceptable. This is obviously due to the fact that the dative case of the indirect object in (57) is not valued by T. Empirical evidence in support of this view can be adduced from (58).

- (58) a. Hon-ga kodomo-ni atae-rare-ta.
 book-Nom child-Nom give-Pass-Past

‘The book was given to the child.’

- b. Kodomo-ga hon-o atae-rare-ta.
 child-Nom book-Acc give-Pass-Past

‘The child was given the book.’

The examples in (58) show that the dative object of the verb *ataeru* can be promoted to a passive subject via (direct) passivization, in the same way as the accusative object whose case feature is valued by v.²² This fact suggests that the case feature of the dative argument

²⁰ Needless to say, no PRO_{arb} interpretation is available if the verb appears in the past form.

²¹ The occurrence of PRO is restricted to a subject position, so that the nominative argument cannot be replaced by PRO even though T values its case feature.

²² In this case, since the case feature of the dative argument is not valued by T, this argument cannot be turned into PRO_{arb}, as shown in (i).

- (i) *[Hahaoya-ga PRO_{arb} hon-o atae-ru] koto-wa ii koto da.
 mother-Nom book-Acc give-Pres fact-Top good thing Cop

‘It is a good thing [for mothers to give books to PRO_{arb}].’

selected by the verb *ageru* is not valued by T. Thus, when the nominative case on the subject is replaced by *kara*, the T-head without a case feature can be merged. In this case, the nominative-case constraint does not apply to (57).

In a nutshell, the nominative-case constraint emerges from the property of tense. In unmarked cases, T bears [+Nom], and the clause needs at least one nominative argument, which carries a case feature that can delete [+Nom]. The derivation is legitimate when [+Nom] is successfully deleted in agreement with the case feature of a nominative argument. On the other hand, if nominative case on an argument is replaced by a semantic marker, T can appear without [+Nom]. In such a case, the nominative-case constraint is not implemented, as T does not contain [+Nom], and the sentence can be legitimate even without a nominative argument. In the dative-subject construction, T contains [+Dat] to be deleted in agreement with the case feature of the dative subject. Since this kind of T must carry [+Nom] as well, the nominative-case constraint cannot be rendered inapplicable, even if nominative case on a non-subject argument is replaced by an oblique marker.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, on the basis of the aspectual construction where a negator precedes the aspectual verb *iru*, it has been shown that nominative and dative subjects undergo raising to Spec-TP, while obliquely-marked subjects remain in the base position without subject raising (provided no nominative arguments are included in the clause). In Japanese, subject raising to Spec-TP is motivated when tense has an uninterpretable case feature [+Nom] to value the case feature on a nominative argument. Japanese makes two kinds of T available—one with an uninterpretable case feature, and the other without. When tense does not carry any case features, the EPP requirement is suspended, because the T that does not require a specifier can be merged to the clause. This analysis provides a ready account for the fact that even obliquely-marked subjects undergo raising to Spec-TP, in cases where T carries a case feature to value the case feature of a nominative argument. The overall conclusion is that in Japanese, when T has the case feature [+Nom], it carries [+EPP] as well, which suggests that the EPP is tied to case rather than agreement (in Japanese).

References

- Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou (1988) “Parametrizing Agr: Word Order, Verb Movement and EPP-checking,” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 491–539.
- Aoyagi, H. and T. Ishii (1994) “On NPI Licensing in Japanese.” In N. Akatsuka ed., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 295–311.
- Bošković, Ž. (2002) “A-movement and the EPP,” *Syntax* 5, 167–218.
- Butt, M. (2006) *Theories of Case*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, N. (1982) *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

- Chomsky, N. (2000) “Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework.” In R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka eds., *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 89–155.
- Chomsky, N. (2001) “Derivation by Phase.” In M. Kenstowicz ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1–52.
- Chomsky, N. (2004) “Beyond Explanatory Adequacy.” In A. Belletti ed., *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures: Volume 3*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 104–131.
- Chomsky, N. (2008) “On Phases.” In R. Freidin, C. P. Otero and M. L. Zubizarreta eds., *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 133–166.
- Chomsky, N. and H. Lasnik (1993) “The Theory of Principles and Parameters.” In J. Jacobs, A. Von Stechow and W. Sternefeld eds., *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research, Volume 1*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 506–569.
- Fukui, N. (1986) *A Theory of Category Projection and Its Application*, Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Fukui, N. (1995) *Theory of Projection in Syntax*, CSLI and Kurocio, Stanford and Tokyo.
- Harada, S-I. (1976) “Honorifics.” In M. Shibatani ed., *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese Generative Grammar*, Academic Press, New York, 499–561.
- Haegeman, L. (1995) *The Syntax of Negation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hasegawa, N. (2006) “Honorifics.” In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax Volume II*, Blackwell, Oxford, 493–543.
- Holmberg, A. (2000) “Scandinavian Stylistic Fronting: How Any Category Can Become an Expletive,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, 445–483.
- Hornstein, N. (1999) “Movement and Control,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 69–96.
- Inoue, K. (1998) “Sentences without Nominative Subjects in Japanese,” *Grant-in-Aid for COE Research Report (2A): Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language*, Kanda University of International Studies, 1–34.
- Inoue, K. (2007) “Case (With Special Reference to Japanese).” In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax Volume I*, Blackwell, Oxford, 295–373.
- Kageyama, T. (1993) *Bunpoo-to Gokeisei*, Hituzi Shyobo, Tokyo.
- Kato, Y. (1985) *Negative Sentences in Japanese: Sophia Linguistica XIX*, Sophia University.
- Kishimoto, H. (2001) “Binding of Indeterminate Pronouns and Clause Structure in Japanese,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 597–633.
- Kishimoto, H. (2005) *Toogokoozoo-to Bunpookankei*, Kurocio, Tokyo.
- Kishimoto, H. (2007) “Negative Scope and Head Raising in Japanese,” *Lingua* 117, 247–288.
- Kishimoto, H. (2008) “On the Variability of Negative Scope in Japanese,” *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 379–435.
- Kishimoto, H. (2009) “Subject Raising in Japanese.” In R. Vermeulen and R. Shibagaki eds., *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 58, MITWPL, Cambridge, Mass., 225–240.
- Kishimoto, H. (2010) “Subjects and Constituent Structure in Japanese,” *Linguistics* 48, 629–670.
- Kishimoto, H. (2012). “Subject Honorification and the Position of Subjects in Japanese,” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 21, 1–41.
- Kitagawa, Y. (1986) *Subjects in Japanese and English*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Koizumi, M. (1999) *Phrase Structure in Minimalist Syntax*, Hituzi Shyobo, Tokyo.
- Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1991) “The Position of Subjects,” *Lingua* 85, 211–258.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kuroda, S-Y. (1983) “What Can Japanese Say about Government and Binding,” *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 2, 153–164.

- Kuroda, S-Y. (1988) “Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese,” *Linguisticae Invesitgationes* 12, 1–47.
- Landau, I. (2007) “EPP Extensions,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 38, 445–523.
- Martin, R. (1999) “Case, the EPP, and Minimalism.” In S. D. Epstein and N. Hornstein, eds., *Working Minimalism*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1–25.
- McCloskey, J. (1996) “Subjects and Subject Positions in Irish.” In R. Borsely and I. Roberts eds., *The Syntax of Celtic Languages: A Comparative Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 241–283.
- McCloskey, J. (1997) “Subjecthood and Subject Positions.” In L. Haegeman ed., *Elements of Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 197–235.
- Miyagawa, S. (1989a) “Light Verbs and the Ergative Hypothesis,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 659–668.
- Miyagawa, S. (1989b) *Syntax and Semantics 22: Structure and Case Marking in Japanese*, Academic Press, San Diego.
- Miyagawa, S. (2001) “The EPP, Scrambling and *Wh*-in-situ.” In M. Kenstowicz ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 293–338.
- Miyagawa, S. (2010) *Why Agree? Why Move?: Unifying Agreement-based and Discourse-Configurational Languages*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Nishigauchi, T. (1992) “Nihongo-no Hi-taikaku-koobun to Seeta Riron,” *Osaka Daigaku Gengobunka-gaku* 1, Osaka University, 41–52.
- Nishigacuhi, T. and Y. Ishii (2003) *Eigo-kara Nihongo-o Miru*, Kenkyusha, Tokyo.
- Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego (2001) “T-to-C movement: Causes and Consequences.” In M. Kenstowicz ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 355–426.
- Radford, A. (2009) *Analysing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery.” In L. Haegeman ed., *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281–337.
- Rothstein, S. (2001) *Predicates and Their Subjects*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Shibatani, M. (1978) *Nihongo-no Bunseki*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Sportiche, D. (1988) “A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and Its Corollaries for Constituent Structure,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 429–449.
- Tada, H. (1992) “Nominative Objects in Japanese,” *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 14, 91–108.
- Takezawa, K. (1987) *A Configurational Approach to Case Marking in Japanese*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington.
- Takezawa, K. (2004) “Nihogo-hukugoozyutugo-ni-okeru Hiteizi-no Iti-to Setu-koozoo,” *Nihongo Bunpoo Gakkai Dai-Go-Kai Happyoo Ronbun Shuu*, 175–184.
- Takubo, Y. (2010) *Nihongo-no Koozoo: Suiiron-to Tisiki-Kanri*, Kurosio, Tokyo.
- Ueda, M. (1990) *Japanese Phrase Structure and Parameter Setting*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Ueda, Y. (2003) “Subject Positions in Japanese.” In P. M. Clancy ed., *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 11, 529–542.
- Ura, H. (1999) *Checking Theory and Grammatical Functions in Universal Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997) “Negation and Verb Movement.” In L. Haegeman ed., *The New Comparative Syntax*, Longman, London, 214–245.