Two types of Accusative Subjects in Japanese

Issue and Proposal: As exemplified in (1), the lexical subject in the complement clause can be optionally marked with Accusative Case in Japanese. I call such subjects as "Accusative Subject" (AS) in the paper.

(1) John-wa   Mary-ga/-o   baka-da   to   omotteiru/danteisita/sinjiteiru.
      J-Top.   M-Nom/-Acc   stupid-is   Comp   thinks/concluded/believes
      "John thinks/concluded/believes Mary to be stupid."

In previous studies, it is controversial whether ASs are base-generated within the embedded clause as in (2a) (Raising to Object analysis: Kuno 1976, a.o/ECM analysis: Hiraiwa 2001, a.o) or base-generated directly in the matrix clause as in (2b) (Control analysis: Saito 1983/Prolepsis analysis: Takano 2003, a.o).

 (2) a. [… [$_{vP}$ [$_{CP}$ DP-$_{ACC}$ …   to]   V-v]-T]   : (Raising to Object/ECM analysis)
        b. [… [$_{vP}$ DP$_i$-$_{ACC}$ [$_{CP}$ pro$_i$ …   to]   V-v]-T] : (Control/Prolepsis analysis)

Which analysis is correct has been a long debate in Japanese syntax. Some empirical evidences show that the former analysis should be correct, and others show that the latter should be correct. Thus, there has been a conflict between the two types of the analyses.

    In this paper, I show that this conflict can be solved by assuming that i) the both of the claims are correct in part and ii) the position in which the ASs are base-generated should differ in predicates. More concretely, applying different types of predicates to each test conducted in previous studies, I show that ASs are base-generated in the embedded clause with predicates such as *omou* "think", whereas they are base-generated in the matrix clause with predicates such as *danteisuru* "conclude", as illustrated in (3).

(3) a. *omou* "think" :   [… [$_{vP}$ DP$_i$-$_{ACC}$ [$_{CP}$ DP$_i$-$_{ACC}$ …   to]   V-v]-T]
                                                    ⤴_____⌐Optional movement
      b. *danteisuru* "conclude" :   [… [$_{vP}$ DP$_i$-$_{ACC}$ [$_{CP}$ pro$_i$ …   to]   V-v]-T]

CP fronting and Proper Binding Condition (PBC): As firstly observed by Kuno (1976), the embedded clause cannot be fronted over the AS, as exemplified in (4). The ungrammaticality of (4) can be captured if the AS is base-generated in the embedded clause; a trace of the AS in the embedded clause causes a violation of the PBC. Thus, the unacceptability of (4) has been assumed to be an evidence for the hypothesis (2a).

(4) *[Sono-jiken-no hannin da   to]   keisatu-ga   sannin-no otoko-o   <u>omotta</u>.
       the-case-Gen culprit is   that police-Nom three-Gen man-Acc   thought
       "The police thought three men to be culprits of the case."

    The new observation in this paper is that the sentence is improved if the matrix predicate is changed to *danteisuru* "conclude".

(5) ?[Sono jiken-no hannin da   to]   keisatu-ga   sannin-no otoko-o   <u>danteisita</u>.
         the case-Gen culprit is   Com police-Nom three-Gen man-Acc   concluded

The acceptable sentence (5), contrasted to the unacceptable one (4), suggests that whether the fronted embedded clause contains a trace of the As or not is different in predicates. The acceptable contrast between (4) and (5) can be captured with the present analysis.

***De re/ de dicto* reading:** Takano (2003) observes that contrasted to the Nominative subjects, the ASs must have a wide scope with regard to the matrix predicate (i.e, they must be interpreted as *de re*). The observation suggests that ASs cannot stay in the embedded clause, which is incompatible with the hypothesis (2a). Note, however, that Takano's example uses *danteisuru* "conclude", and a new observation here is that *de dicto* reading, as well as *de re* reading, is available for some speakers when the matrix verb is *omou* "think". For these speakers, the sentence (7a) cannot be true under the scenario (6), which is compatible with Takano's observation, but the sentence (7b) can be true under the same scenario.

(6) *Scenario*: One day Taro went to a pasture. There were only cows in the pasture then. Taro could not distinguish cows from hoses, and he thought, in the mistaken belief, that the

animals in the pasture were horses. Then, he found that three of the animals ran very fast.

(7) a. Taro-wa   san-tou-no   uma-o   asi-ga   hayai to   <u>danteisita</u>.
       T-Top   3-cl-Gen   horses-Acc foot-Nom fast   Comp concluded
       "Taro concluded that three horses were swift of foot." (*de re, *de dicto*)

   b. Taro-wa   san-tou-no   uma-o   asi-ga   hayai to   <u>omotta</u>.
       T-Top   3-cl-Gen   horses-Acc foot-Nom fast   Comp thought
       "Taro thought that three horses were swift of foot." (*de re, ?de dicto*)

The unavailability of *de dicto* reading in (7a) is problematic for the hypothesis (2a), while the availability of *de dicto* reading in (7b) is problematic for the hypothesis (2b). This conflict can be solved with the present analysis. Note that for some speakers, *de dicto* reading is unavailable even in (7b), which is similarly observed in English ECM sentences; Hong and Lasnik (2010) reports that some English speakers marginally allow *de dicto* reading in the sentence (8), but some speakers do not. Therefore, the acceptability of the sentence (7b) is parallel with the one of English ECM sentences.

(8)   I believe someone to have insulted Arthur.   (*de re, ?de dicto*)

Position of embedded Adverbs: The present analysis is confirmed by the following contrast. As shown in (9), the adverb in the embedded clause can precede the AS when the matrix predicate is *omou* "think", while it cannot when the matrix predicate is *danteisuru* "conclude".

(9)a. John-ga   mada Mary-o   kodomo-da to   <u>omotta</u>.
        J-Nom   still M-Acc   child-is   Comp thought
        "John thought that Mary was still a child."   (Hiraiwa 2001: 72)

   b.*John-ga   mada Mary-o   kodomo-da to   <u>danteisita</u>.
        J-Nom   still M-Acc   child-is   Comp concluded
        "John concluded that Mary was still a child."   (Tanaka 2002: 647)

The acceptability of (9a) is problematic for the hypothesis (2b) (given that adverbs cannot undergo long-distance scrambling (Saito 1985)), while the unacceptability of (9b) is problematic for the hypothesis (2a). The conflict can be straightforwardly solved by the present analysis: Because the AS in (9a) is base-generated in the embedded clause, it can follow the embedded adverb. On the other hand, because the AS in (9b) is base-generated in the matrix clause, it can never follow the embedded adverb.

Indefinite *wh*-phrase + *mo*: Observing that indefinite *wh*-phrases behave like NPIs if it is c-commanded by the particle *mo*, Sakai (1998) argues that the grammaticality of (10) suggests that ASs originate from the embedded clause assuming that *mo* attaches to the embedded C^0, which is incompatible with the present analysis for *danteisuru* "conclude".

(10) Hanako-wa orokanimo dare-o   baka-da   to-mo   omowa/danteisi-nakat-ta.
      H-Top   foolishly   who-Acc stupid-is   Comp-Prt   think/conclude-not-past
      "Hanako foolishly did not think/conclude that anybody is stupid."

Note, however, that as Takano (2010) points out, such data are not crucial for showing that ASs in the data can never be in the matrix clause because as exemplified in (11), the matrix object can be an NPI with the particle *mo* attaching to the embedded complementizer.

(11) ?Watasi-wa dare-ni   sono sigoto-o   suru to   mo   yakusokusite-inai.
      I-Top   who-Dat   that job-Acc   do   that Prt   promised-have.not
      "I haven't promised anyone to do the job."   (Takano 2003: 803)

The acceptability of (11) suggests that the AS in (10) can be in the matrix clause, which is compatible with the present analysis.

Selected References: Kuno, S. 1976. "Subject Raising." In M. Shibatani (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* 5: *Japanese Generative Grammar*, 17–49. New York: Academic Press. Takano, Y. 2003. "Nominative Objects in Japanese Complex Predicate Constructions: a Prolepsis Analysis," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 779-834.