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1 Grammar Profile

1.1 Morpho-Syntax

1.1.1 Head position
Head final: Attribute adjectives and relative clauses must precede nouns. Argument precedes predicates. Intensifiers precede adjectives, etc.

1.1.2 Morphological type
agglutinating

1.1.3 Case system
Nom/Acc

1.1.4 Verbal Agreement
Subject agreement: honorific, animacy. Object agreement: honorific.

1.1.5 Transitivity Patterns
Direct and indirect passive, direct and indirect causative, and middle-like construction (Miyagawa 1989, Matsumoto 1996)

1.1.6 Null Arguments
Any argument can be null, with subject being the most frequent (Nakayama 1996)

1.1.7 Non-Finite Categories
Bare form of a verb is the only form that cannot be used as finite.
1.2 Matrix Clause

1.2.1 Basic word order
SOV

1.2.2 Alternate word orders
Scrambling and topicalization are very common; thus, basically any order is possible.

1.2.3 Ordering of nominal and pronominal arguments
Personal pronouns are used for somewhat special purposes (i.e. kare ‘he’ means ‘someone special, i.e. a boy friend). When they are used, however, their ordering is the same as lexical nouns.

1.3 Embedded Clause

1.3.1 Basic word order
SOV

1.3.2 Verbal agreement
Honorific agreement can show up in embedded contexts.

1.3.3 Restrictions on tense, aspect, mood
Some verbs require its embedded verb to have a particular verbal morphology. Many of them are discussed in the data presented in this questionnaire.

1.3.4 Possible morphological categories of embedded clause
-ru and –ta form have been called as present (or non-past) and past, respectively.
-te form has been called gerundive or participial.

Deverbalized nominals look just like bare form of verbs. If a verb ends in a vowel, it doesn’t change; if it ends in a consonant, the vowel ‘i’ is found word-finally. Nominalized adjectives either end in –mi or –sa (Sugioka 1984).

1.3.5 Non-control complements
Finite complementation:

(1) Ken-ga [Hanako-wa kashikoi]-to iw -ta
    K-Nom [H-Top cleaver]-Comp think -Pst
    ‘Ken said that Hanako was clever.’

Passive and causative are considered to involve non-finite complementation.

There are a number of combinations of two verbs that are considered to be morphologically single words (Kageyama 1993, 1999, Matsumoto 1996).

Subject–to-subject raising (Nakau 1973, Uchibori 2001):

(2) Ken,-ga [ti benkyo-su -ru -yooni] nar -ta
    K,-Nom [ti study-do- -Prs -Mod] become -Pst
    ‘Ken has become studious.’

Subject-to-object raising (Kuno 1976, Tanaka 2002, but see Dubinsky and Davies 2003 for a discussion of different views about this construction):
2 Control Profile

2.1 forward subject control into bare (infinitival) complements

2.1.1 Example structure

(4) Ken-ga [rombun-o kaki] oe -ta
    K-Nom [paper-Acc write] finish -Pst
    ‘Ken finished writing the paper.’

(5) Ken-ga [rombun-o kaki] wasure -ta
    K-Nom [paper-Acc write] forget -Pst
    ‘Ken forgot to write the paper.’


2.1.2 Predicates participating in the construction
verb, aspectual, oe ‘finish’
verb, implicative, wasure ‘forget’

2.1.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure
There is some evidence which suggests that sentences with these verbs are mono-clausal:
These verbs allow long passive, a commonly assumed sign of mono-clausality (Kageyama 1993, 1999, Nishigauchi 1993).
Nothing can intervene between the embedded verb and the matrix verb.

2.1.4 Evidence of empty category
Kageyama (1993, 1999) claims that the complement of these verbs is subject-less.

2.1.5 Selectional restrictions
Non-volitional subjects are incompatible with these verbs (Shibatani 1973, Nishigauchi 1993)

2.1.6 Control type
Aoshima (2000), based on her judgments upon applying several diagnostics listed below to sentences with these verbs, concludes that these are obligatory control verbs.

- Local & c-commanding antecedent required
- No split antecedent
- Only sloppy reading available with ellipsis
- Interpretation of only + NP
2.2 forward subject/object control into –te complement

2.2.1 Example structure

(6) Ken-ga [rombun-o kai -te] mi -ta
K-Nom [paper-Acc write -TE] try -Pst
‘Ken tried to write a paper.’

(7) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [rombun-o kai -te] moraw -ta
K-Nom H-Dat [paper-Acc write -TE] receive -Pst
‘Ken had Hanako write a paper (for him).’

(8) Ken-wa Hanako-ni [rombun-o kai -te] hoshi -i
K-Top H-Dat [paper-Acc write -TE] desirebel -Prs
‘Ken would like Hanako to write a paper.’

(9) Ken-ga [kuruma-o naoshi -te] ok -ta
K-Nom [car-Acc repair -TE] put -Prs
‘Ken has repaired the car (before some anticipated event).’

2.2.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, implicative, *mi* ‘try’
verb, giving/receiving, *moraw* ‘receive’
adjective, desiderative, *hoshi* ‘desirable’
verb, aspectual, *ok* ‘have V-ed in advance of an anticipated event’

2.2.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

There are pieces of evidence which suggest that this may be a mixed group:

Some of these verbs, such as *mi* ‘try’ and *ok* ‘have V-ed’, allow long passive, a sign of mono-clausality (Kageyama 1993).

With all the verbs, an NPI, *shika* ‘only’, can be licensed by negation on the matrix even when it is inside of the complement, unlike the clear cases of finite complement (McCawley and Momoi 1986):

(10) Ken-ga [aka-wain-shika nom -te] mi na -katta
K-Nom [red-wine-only drink -TE] try neg -Pst
‘Ken only tried to drink the red wine.’

However, Matsumoto (1996) argues for a bi-clausal analysis of sentences with *hoshi* ‘desirable’ with the same NPI, *shika* ‘only’:

(11) Boku-wa Mary-ni [Tokyo-e Bill-to-shika ik anai -de] hoshi -i
I-Top M-Dat [Tokyo-to B-with-only go Neg -TE] want -Prs
‘I want Mary to go to Tokyo with Bill only.’

(12) *Boku-wa Bill-to-shika Mary-ni [Tokyo-e ik anai -de] hoshi -i
I-Top B-with-only M-Dat [Tokyo-to go NEG -TE] want -IMP
‘I want Mary to go to Tokyo with Bill only.’

In Matsumoto’s 2nd example, however, one may argue that the negation fails to c-command the NPI. Thus, the example may not show that the sentence is bi-clausal. Therefore, licensing of the NPI does seem to suggest that there appears to be a difference in the degree of transparency between the finite complementation and *te* complement. With a finite complement, the negation fails to license the NPI
in the complement even when it c-commands it. With te complement, the negation in the matrix can license the NPI in the complement, as long as it c-commands it.

2.2.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Overt subject is never possible with these verbs.

With object control verbs in this class (i.e. moraw and hoshi), the binding of the reflexive jibun ‘self’ has been used to argue for presence of a covert embedded subject, assuming that jibun is subject-oriented (Nakau 1973, Matsumoto 1996):

(13) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [jibun-no-koe-o rokuonshi-te] moraw-ta
     K-Nom H-Dat [self-Gen-voice-Acc record -TE] receive -Pst
     ‘Ken, had Hanako record his/her own voice.’

2.2.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subjects/dative objects are not possible.

2.2.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000), based on the same diagnostics discussed above, concludes that these verbs are obligatory control verbs.

2.3 forward subject control into a complement

The complement is introduced by to with a ‘volitional’ marker on the embedded verb.

2.3.1 Example structure

(14) Ken-ga [kawa-o booto-de water -oo]-to shi-ta
     K-Nom [river-Acc boat-Ins cross -Vol]-Comp try -Pst
     ‘Ken tried to cross the river on a boat.’


2.3.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, implicative, sur ‘try’
verb, desiderative, kuwadate ‘plan, plot’

2.3.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

Despite the presence of the complementizer-like element to, which suggests that the complement may be a CP, the complement shows a high degree of transparency.

An NPI inside to complement can be licensed by negation in the matrix.

(15) Ken-ga [niku-shika tabe -yoo]-to shi na-katta
     K-Nom [meat-only eat -Vol]-Comp try neg -Pst
     ‘Ken only tried to eat meat.’

In fact, having the only negation-like element allowed in this environment, mai, makes the sentence awkward:

(16) ?Ken-ga [niku-shika tabe mai]-to shi -ta
     K-Nom [meat-only eat neg]-Comp try -Pst
     ‘Ken tried to eat only meat.’

Nemoto (1991) claims that scrambling out of –to complements is A-movement, based on reciprocal anaphor binding:
(17) [John-to-Bob, o] otagai-no-chichioya-ga [ t̄j rikaishi -yoo]-to kokoromi -ta [J-and-B, Acc] each other, Gen-father-Nom [ t̄j understand -Vol]-Comp attempt -Pst ‘John and Bob, each other’s father attempted to understand.’

One way to account for this binding fact is to assume that the control structure with a –to complement is mono-clausal (i.e. to complement is not a CP). Alternatively, one can maintain that to complement is a CP, thus the entire sentence is structurally bi-clausal, but it is transparent due tot the nature of the embedded CP (Uchibori 1999).

2.3.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument
Hasegawa (1984) notes that the reflexive jibun is marginally possible for some speakers:

(18) Ken-wa [jibun]-wa Hanako-o bengo-shi -yoo]-to -shi -ta
‘John tried to defend Hanako himself.’

If one assumes that a sentence with this verb is bi-clausal, interpretation of a stranded numeral quantifier phrase in the complement argues for presence of an empty category, since a numeral quantifier phrase is clause-bound:

(19) Shuujuin-ga [kangoku-kara 3-nin nige -yoo]-to shi -ta
inmate-Nom [jail-from 3-Cl escape -Vol]-Comp try -Per
‘Inmates, from the jail, 3 of them, tried to escape’

However, if one assumes mono-clausal structure, the interpretation the numeral quantifier phrase offers another piece of evidence for such position.

2.3.5 Selectional restrictions
Non-volitional subject is impossible.

2.3.6 Control type
Aoshima (2000) concludes that this verb is not an obligatory control verb.

However, if it involves pro subject, the following contrast is mysterious:

(20) Ken-no-otosan-ga [pro\i/j kyo yasumu]-to iw -ta
K-Gen-father,N Nom [pro\i/j today be_absent]-Comp say -Pst
‘Ken’s father said that pro\i/j will be absent today.’

(21) Ken-no-otosan-ga [ec\i/j kyo yasum -oo]-to shi -ta
K-Gen-father,N Nom [ec\i/j today be_absebt -Vol]-Comp try -Pst
‘Ken’s father tried to be absent (=take a day off) today.’

2.4 forward subject/object control into a complement
Complement is introduced by to with the subjunctive mood marker on the embedded verb.

2.4.1 Example structure
(22) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [Tokyo-e ik -e]-to susume -ta
K-Nom H-Dat [Tokyo-Goal go -Sub]-Comp advise -Pst
‘Ken advised Hanako that she should go to Tokyo.’

(23) Ken-ga Hanako-ni [Bill-o suisenshi -ro]-to meiji -ta
K-Nom H-Dat [B-Acc recommend -Sub]-Comp order -Pst
‘Ken ordered Hanako to recommend Bill.’
(Uchibori 1996)
2.4.2 Predicates participating in the construction verb, manipulative, *susume* ‘suggest’
verb, manipulative, *meiji* ‘order’

2.4.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure
The complement of these verbs also shows a high degree of transparency:

Uchibori (1996) claims that scrambling out of this complement can be A-movement, just like the case with *to* complement under *sur* ‘try’:

(24) \[\text{Karera}_t\text{-o koochoo-ga [otagai,-no-sensei-ni [ t\_t suisenshi -ro ] ] }\]
\[\text{Them, Acc principle-Nom [each other,-Gen-teacher-Dat [ t\_t recommend -Sub]]}\]
-Comp meiji -ta
-Comp order -Pst

‘Them, the principle ordered each other’s teacher to recommend.’

She also shows that a locally bound anaphors, *X-jishin* (i.e. *jibun-jishin* ‘self-self’, *kare-jishin* ‘he-self’) can be bound by an antecedent that is in the matrix:

(25) \[\text{Taro}_j\text{-ga iin’kai j\_ni [ec\_j jibun-jishin\_j-\_o suisenshi -ro ] -to meiji -ta}\]
\[\text{T\_Nom committee,Dat [ec\_j self-self,\_j-\_Acc recommend -Sub] -Comp order -Pst}\]
‘Taro ordered the committee to recommend self.’

2.4.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument
An overt subject is at best marginal with *meiji* - ‘order’ and *susume* - ‘suggest’ (Uchibori 1996: footnote 16).

(26) \[\text{Taro}_j\text{-ga Jiro\_ni [?jibun/??kare\_ga Tokyo-e ik -e]-to meiji -ta}\]
\[\text{T\_Nom J-Dat [self/he-Nom Tokyo-Goal go-Sub]-Comp order -Pst}\]
‘Taro ordered Jiro to go to Tokyo.’

Since the reflexive cannot be interpreted to have the dative argument as its antecedent, there is no evidence that suggests that there is a covert subject.

2.4.5 Selectional restrictions
Uchibori (1996) shows that with verb such as *meiji* - ‘order’, the dative argument must be a sentient being:

(27) \[??Shacho-ga kojo-ni [heisashi-ro]-to meiji -ta}\]
\[\text{president-Nom factory-Dat [close -Sub]-Comp order -Pst}\]
‘The president ordered the factory to close.’

2.4.6 Control type
The standard diagnostics (local & c-commanding antecedent, no split antecedent, sloppy reading under ellipsis) suggest that it is obligatory control.

(28) \[\text{Ken}_j\text{-ga Hanako\_k-no-oototo\_k-ni [ ec\_j\_k motto benkyoshi -ro]}\]
\[\text{K\_Nom H\_j-Gen-brother\_k-Dat [ ec\_j\_k more study -Sub]}\]
-Comp meiji -ta
-Comp order -Pst

‘Ken ordered Hanako’s brother to study harder.’
(29) Ken\textsubscript{g}a Hanako\textsubscript{n}i \[\text{[ec}_{\text{gj}}j\textsubscript{j}k} \text{isshoni benkyoshi} -\text{ro}]\text{-to} \\
K\textsubscript{g}-Nom H\textsubscript{j}-Dat \[\text{[ec}_{\text{gj}}j\textsubscript{j}k} \text{together study} -\text{Sub}]\text{-Comp} \\
meiji -ta \\
order -Pst \\
‘Ken ordered Hanako to study together.’

(30) Ken\textsubscript{g}a Hanako-ni \[\text{[kare}_{\text{g}j}o \text{shijishi} -\text{ro}]\text{-to} \text{meiji} -\text{ru} -\text{yooni} \\
K\textsubscript{g}-Nom H-Dat \[\text{[he}_{\text{j}}\text{-Acc support} -\text{Sub}]\text{-Comp order} -\text{Prs} -\text{yooni} \\
to Satoshi-mo so shi -ta \\
and S-also so do -Pst \\
‘Ken ordered Hanako to support him, and so did Satoshi (Satoshi ordered Hanako to support Ken too).

2.5 forward subject/object control into a complement

The embedded verb is marked with \textit{yooni} (which is optionally introduced by \textit{to}, a presumed complementizer).

2.5.1 Example structure

(31) Ken-ga Hanako-ni \[\text{Tokyo-e ik -u} -\text{yooni} \text{susume} -\text{ta} \\
K-Nom H-Dat \[\text{Tokyo-Goal go} -\text{Prs} -\text{Mod}] \text{advise} -\text{Pst} \\
‘Ken advised to Hanako that she should go to Tokyo.’

(32) Ken-ga [musuko-o rikaisu -ru -\text{yooni}] \text{tsutome} -\text{ta} \\
K-Top [son-Acc understand -\text{Prs} -\text{Mod}] \text{endeavor} -\text{Pst} \\
‘Ken tried to understand (his) son.’


2.5.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, manipulative, \textit{susume}- ‘suggest’

verb, desiderative, \textit{tsutome}- ‘endeavor’

2.5.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The complement of these verbs also shows transparency:

Nemoto (1991) claims that scrambling out of this complement can be A-movement, and Uchibori (1996) shows that a locally bound X-\textit{jishin} anaphora can be bound by an element in the matrix:

(33) Karera-ga kookchoo-ga \[\text{otagai-no-sensei-ni} \text{[t\textsubscript{i1} sui} -\text{yooni}] \text{meiji} -\text{ta} \\
Them\textsubscript{1}-Acc principle-Nom \[\text{[each other- Gen-teacher-Dat} \text{[t\textsubscript{i1} recommend} \\
-\text{ru} -\text{yooni}] \text{-Prs} -\text{Mod}] \text{order} -\text{Pst} \\
‘Them, the principle ordered to each other’s teacher to recommend.’

(34) Taro-ga iin’kai-ni \[\text{[ec}_{\text{j}}\text{jibun-jishin}_{\text{j}}\text{j}o} \text{suisensu} -\text{ru} -\text{yooni} \text{meiji} -\text{ta} \\
T\textsubscript{1}-Nom committee\textsubscript{2}-Dat \[\text{[ec}_{\text{j}}\text{ self-self}_{\text{j}}\text{j}o} -\text{Acc recommend} -\text{Prs} -\text{Mod}] \text{order} -\text{Pst} \\
‘Taro, ordered the committee to recommend self.’

However, the NPI licensing from the matrix is not as natural:
2.5.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

With *susume* ‘suggest’, an alleged object control verb, Nakau (1973) offers the reflexive pronoun *jibun* as an argument for assuming a covert embedded subject.

(36) Ken,ga Hanako,ni [jibun,,-no,,-heya,-e, ik,-u,-yooni] susume,-ta
K-Nom H-Dat [self-Gen,room,to go,-Prs,-Mod] advise,-Pst
‘Ken advised Hanako to go to self’s room.’

As with the case with –to complement, there have been discussions of the possibility of having an overt subject with *yooni* complement. It appears that the alleged object control verbs allow an overt embedded subject, while the alleged subject control verb like *tsutome* does not (Saito 1982, Hasegawa 1984):

(37) Ken,ga Hanako,ni [kanojo,,-ga, Tokyo,-e, ik,-u,-yooni] susume,-ta
K-Nom H-Dat [she-Nom Tokyo,goal go,-Prs,-Mod] advise,-Pst
‘Ken advised Hanako that she should go to Tokyo.’

(38) Ken,ga [?jubun,/?kare,,-ga, musuko,-o, rikaisu,-ru,-yooni] tsutome,-ta
K-Top [self/he,Nom,son,Acc understand,-Prs,-Mod] endeavor,-Pst.
‘Ken, tried himself/he, understand (his) son.’

2.5.5 Selectional restrictions
Non-volitional subjects/dative arguments not allowed.

2.5.6 Control type
Aoshima (2000) claims that the same diagnostics discussed above show that the verbs in this group are also obligatory control verbs.

2.6 forward subject/object control into complex NP/subjunctive complements

2.6.1 Example structure

(39) Ken,-wa Hanako,-ni [hon,-o, kaes,-u,-koto,-o, yakusokush,-ta
K-Nom H-Dat [book,Acc,return,-Prs,-fact,Acc,promise,-Pst
‘Ken promised Hanako that he will return the book.’

(40) Ken,-ga [tegami,-o, das,-u,-koto,-o, wasure,-te,-i,-ta
K-Nom [letter,Acc,send,-Prs,-fact,Acc,forget,-TE,-be,-Pst
‘Ken had forgotten sending the letter.’

(41) Ken,-ga [hon,-o, kaes,-ana,-i], -tsumori,-da
K-Nom [book,Acc,return,-Neg,-Prs]-intend,-Cop,-Prs
‘Ken intends not to return the book.’

(42) Ken,-ga Hanako,-ni [shiawaseni, nar,-u,-koto,-o, nozom,-da
K-Nom M-Dat [happily, become,-Prs,-fact,Acc, hope,-Cop,-Prs
‘Ken hoped Hanako to become happy.’

2.6.2 Predicates participating in the construction
verb, communication, *yakusokus-* ‘promise’
verb, implicative, *wasure-* ‘forget’
noun, desiderative, *tsumori* ‘intend’

verb, desiderative, *nozomi* ‘hope’

2.6.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The complement of these verbs also shows some transparency:

Scrambling out of this complement can also be A-movement, and a locally bound X-*jishin* anaphora can also be bound by an element in the matrix (Nemoto 1991, Uchibori 1996):

(43) **John-to-Bob**-o  **otagai**-no-chichioya-ga  [ tō rikaishisu ]-u-koto-o
J-and-B,-Acc [each other,-Gen-father-Nom [ tō understand ]-Prs]-fact-Acc
kotoromi -ta
tempt -Pst

‘John and Bob, each other’s father attempted to understand.’

(44) **Taro**-ga  **iinkai**-ni  **jibun-jishin**-o  suisensu -ru  -koto-o
T-Nom committee-Dat [self-self-Acc recommend -Prs] -fact-Acc
nozom -da
hope -Pst

‘Taro hoped the committee, to recommend self.’

However, licensing of an embedded NPI from the matrix does not seem possible:

(45) ??Sensei-ga  **sento-ni**  kyoukasho-kara-*shika*  monda-o  dasu
Teacher-Nom student-Dat [textbook-from-only problems present]
-koto-o  yakkusokushi na  -katta
-fact-Acc promise neg -Pst

‘The teacher promised the students that he make the exam based sorely on the textbook.’
(intended)

2.6.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Saitio (1982) as well as Uchibori (1996) show that this complement can have an overt subject which can be either the reflexive or a pronoun.

(46) Ken-ga  **zibun**/kare,-ga erab are ru]-koto-o  nozom -da
K-Nom [self/he-Nom choose -Pass Prs]-fact-Acc hope -Pst

‘Ken, hoped self/he, would be chosen.’

2.6.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-volitional subjects/dative arguments not allowed.

2.6.6 Control type

Aoshima (2000) argues that complements with *koto/no* do not involve obligatory control, based on the same diagnostics introduced above. However, as the ambiguity in the following sentence suggests, it is likely to be *pro.*
Ken’s father had forgotten to send the letter.

However, *tsumori*, ‘intend’, appears to be a case of obligatory control:

Ken’s father intends not to return the book.

2.7 forward subject/object control with verbal nouns (light verb constructions)

2.7.1 Example structure

Ken traveled to Tokyo.

Ken began sending goods to Tokyo.

Ken tried to contact that spy.

2.7.2 Predicates participating in the construction

verb, light verb, *sur*- ‘do’

verb, aspectual, *hajime*- ‘begin’

verb, desiderative, *kokoromi*- ‘attempt’

2.7.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

In Miyamoto (2001), the light verb constructions are argued to be ‘bi-predicational’. He presents the possibility of honorification on both the verbal noun and the light verb as a piece of evidence for such analysis.

The teacher taught English to the students.

The teacher retired.

Thus, it is not clear what the double honorification shows in terms of clausality.
2.7.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

Miyamoto (2001) presents several arguments for the presence of a covert subject in the phrase headed by a verbal noun: a) kata ‘way’ gerund formation, b) honirification, c) jibun binding, and d) interpretation of an external argument of a verbal noun phrase. However, all of these are compatible with an analysis in which the light verb construction is mono-clausal (i.e. no embedded subject).

2.7.5 Selectional restrictions

Non-agent subjects are not allowed (Terada 1990).

(54) *Kono-deta-ga atarashii-mondai-no shisa-o shi -te -i -ru
This-data-Nom new-problem-Gen suggestion-Acc do -TE be -Prs
‘This data suggests a new problem.’

(55) *Ya-ga mato-ni meichu-o shi -ta
arrow-Nom target-to strike-Acc do -Pst
‘The arrow struck the target.’

2.7.6 Control type

Miyamoto (2001) applies the same diagnostics that Aoshima (2000) uses (local and c-commanding antecedent, no split antecedent, and sloppy interpretation) and concludes the light verb construction is obligatory control (Miyamoto assumes the light verb constructions are bi-clausal). Matsumoto (1996) also claims that the external argument of the verbal noun is obligatorily null with the light verb constructions, unlike cases with a non-light verb, such as enki-sur ‘postpone’ (with a non-light verb enki-sur ‘postpone’, an argument of the noun mikkai ‘secret meeting’, the spy, must be marked with genitive case).

(56) John-ga spy-to (*Bill-no) mikkai-o shi/kokoromi -ta
J-Nom spy-Com (*B-Gen) secret_meeting-Acc do/attempt -Pst
‘John did/attempted to have a/*Bill’s secret meeting with the spy.’

(57) John-ga spy-to-no (Bill-no)mikkai-o enkishi -ta
J-Nom spy-Com-Gen (B-Gen) secret_meeting-Acc postpone -Pst
‘John postponed Bill’s meeting with the spy.’

2.8 backward object control into an adjunct

2.8.1 Example structure

(58) Keikan-ga [dorobo-ga nige -ru tokoro]-o tsukam ae -ta
Police_officer-Nom [burglar-Nom run_away -Prs scene]-Acc capture -Pst
‘The police officer captured ∆i whole the burglar, is running away.’

2.8.2 Predicates participating in the construction

adjunct clause headed by tokoro ‘scene’

2.8.3 Evidence in support bi-clausal structure

The clause headed by tokoro seems to possess many of the characteristics of finite complement: it has its own nominative marked subject, its verb bears finite morphology, i.e. -ru.

2.8.4 Evidence of structural position for unexpressed argument

The object of the matrix verb cannot be overt, presumably due to Double-o constraint (Harada 1979).
Harada presents several arguments for the existence of an empty category in the matrix.

First, verbs such as *tsukamae* ‘capture’ subcategorizes for an object, which is absent from sentences with the *tokoro*-clause. However, the object argument may show up in cleft sentences:

Harada also shows that while passivization of an entire *tokoro*-clause is not possible, the passivization of the subject in a *tokoro*-clause is possible.

Assuming that passivization from a finite embedded clause is not possible, Harada takes the grammaticality of the above example to be a piece of evidence for the existence of the matrix object.

### 2.8.5 Selectional restrictions

The subject of a *tokoro* clause must be compatible with the matrix verb (Harada 1973).

### 2.8.6 Control type

*Tokoro* clause has been analyzed to involve *pro* (Hale and Kitagawa 1977). However, Fujii (2004) presents arguments against such analysis.

**Condition B effect**

*Kare*, or he, is subject to Condition B:

2.8.6 Control type

*Tokoro* clause has been analyzed to involve *pro* (Hale and Kitagawa 1977). However, Fujii (2004) presents arguments against such analysis.

**Condition B effect**

*Kare*, or he, is subject to Condition B:

(K) *Keikan-ga* dorobo-o *ec* i -ru tokoro-o police officer-Nom burglar-Acc *ec* i run-away -Prs scene-Acc

tsu kamae -ta
capture -Pst

‘The police officer captured the whole burglar, is running away.’

Assuming that passivization from a finite embedded clause is not possible, Harada takes the grammaticality of the above example to be a piece of evidence for the existence of the matrix object.
(65)  \[
\text{Ken, ga } \Delta_i [\text{kare}-\text{u}-\text{ga}] \quad \text{ochikon -de } i \quad \text{-ru } \text{-tokoro]-o}
\]
\[
\text{K}_r-\text{Nom } \Delta_i [\text{he}-\text{u}-\text{Nom}] \quad \text{depress -TE be -Prs -scene]-Acc}
\]
\[
\text{hagemashi -ta}
\]
\[
\text{cheer_up -Pst}
\]

‘Ken, cheered \(\Delta_i\) up [when \he\text{-u\text{-Nom}} was depressed]’

In contrast, the reflexive \text{jibun} is the subject position of \text{tokoro} clause is grammatical.

(66)  \[
\text{Ken, ga } \Delta_i [\text{jibun}-\text{ga}] \quad \text{ochikon -de } i \quad \text{-ru } \text{-tokoro]-o}
\]
\[
\text{K}_r-\text{Nom } \Delta_i [\text{self}-\text{Nom}] \quad \text{depress -TE be -Prs -scene]-Acc}
\]
\[
\text{hagemashi -ta}
\]
\[
\text{cheer_up -Pst}
\]

‘Ken, cheered \(\Delta_i\) up [when \text{self\text{-Nom}} was depressed]’

Fujii argues that if the empty category is \text{pro}, and \text{pro} is subject to Condition B, both examples should be ungrammatical. If the empty category is anaphoric (i.e. trace), then both of them should be grammatical. Thus, he concludes that subjects of \text{tokoro} clauses behave like they belong to the matrix w.r.t. Condition B.

Quantifier scope

A sentence with a transitive verb and an object with a quantifier yields ambiguity.

(67)  \[
\text{Keikan-ga } \text{san-nin-no-doroboo-o } \text{tsukamae -ta}
\]

Police-officer-Nom 3-Cl-Gen-burgler-Acc capture -Pst

‘The police officer arrested three burglars.’

a) capture > 3 thieves: There is an arresting event in which three thieves were caught.

b) 3 thieves > capture: There thieves were caught in three different capturing events.

Such ambiguity does not obtain over a clause boundary:

(68)  \[
\text{Taro-ga } [\text{Jiro-ga san-nin-no-doroboo-ni } \text{aw -ta}-\text{to}
\]

T-Nom [J-Nom 3-Cl-Gen-burglar-Dat mee -Pst]-Comp

\[
\text{kanchigaish -ta}
\]

misunderstand -Pst

‘Taro misunderstood that Jiro met three burglars.

a) Misunderstand > 3 : Taro misunderstood that there were three thieves that Jiro met (in either single or three arresting event(s)).

b) *3 > misunderstand: There were three thieves that Taro misunderstood that Jiro met.

A \text{tokoro} clause also does not allow the ambiguity.

(69)  \[
\text{Keikan-ga } \Delta_i [\text{san-nin-no-doroboo}-\text{ga } \text{nige -ru } \text{-tokoro]-o}
\]

Police-officer-Nom 3-Cl-Gen-burglar,Nom escape -Prs -scene]-Acc

\[
\text{tsukamae -ta}
\]

capture -Pst

‘The police officer arrested \(\Delta_i\) [when three burglars (were trying to) escape].’

a) capture > 3: there is an arresting event in which three burglars were caught by the officer.
b) *3 > capture: There are three thieves which were arrested by the officer as each of them was trying to escape.

However, when passivized, ambiguity obtains.

(70) San-nin-no-doroboo ga Keikan-ni [ec, nige -ru -tokoro]-o
3-Cl-Gen-burglar-Nom Police-officer-By [ec, escape -Prs -Scene]-Acc

tskamae -rare -ta
capture -Pass -Pst

‘Three burglars were arrested [when e (were trying to) escape].’

a) capture > 3: there is an arresting event in which three burglars were caught by the officer.

b) 3 > capture: There are three thieves which were arrested by the officer as each of them were trying to escape.

Subjects of adverbial tokoro clauses behave like they belong to the adverbial phrase w.r.t. quantifier scope.

Fujii (2004)’s analysis assumes that theta-roles are features (Hornstein 1999) and included in [D]-features, which also include a categorical feature, and a selectional feature. Fujii also assumes that theta-features are “weak” in Japanese (= only features can move). Given these assumptions, he argues that [D]-feature of the subject DP of a tokoro clause moves to the matrix clause to check theta feature of the matrix verb (which would remain unchecked otherwise). Thematic relation between the subject DP and the matrix verb is established.

Condition B effect:

- [± pronominal] is one of the features included in [D]-features.
- [D]-features move to the matrix due to the theta-role feature checking, and that takes [± pronominal] as well.
- The subject DP of a tokoro-clause behaves like it belongs to the matrix w.r.t. Condition B.

Quantifier Scope:

- Unlike [D]-features, the feature relevant to quantifier, [Quant], does not move to the matrix. There is no reason to believe lexical verbs have the feature [Quant].
- The subject DP of a tokoro-clause behaves like it belongs to the tokoro-clause w.r.t. quantifier scope.
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