

## Case without $\phi$ -feature agreement: Nominative case in Japanese

Akaso, Naoyuki (Nagoya Gakuin University)

In minimalist theorizing case is regarded as a reflex of  $\phi$ -feature agreement, but it is still not clear how to deal with agreement-LESS languages like Japanese. Detail investigation on Japanese, however, reveals that Focus-head in the CP-periphery has significant bearing upon nominative case. Our goal is to claim that Japanese Nominative is licensed by  $\text{Foc}^0$ , contra the obstinate hypothesis of Licensing by T-head and Baker's (2015) dependent case assignment.

Our claim is supported by the observation on *KARA* Reason Clauses (KRC).

- (1) Taro-wa ame-ga yanda-kara Ken-ga/-no asonde-iru  
Taro-Top rain-Nom stopped-becauseKen-Nom/-Gen play-be  
*koen*-ni itta.  
park-to went

“Taro went to the park where Ken was playing because it stopped raining.”

In the pre-nominal clause (PNC) with Nominative subject, the sentence is ambiguous (either SEE > BECAUSE or PLAY > BECAUSE), while in the PNC with Genitive subject only the one interpretation (SEE > BECAUSE) is possible. This is because PNCs with Genitive subjects lack  $\text{Foc}^0$ , which means RCs must be licensed by  $\text{Foc}^0$ . (See Miyagawa (2011) and Akaso & Haraguchi (2011) on the clause-sizes of PNC, and Kawamura (2008) on the connection between  $\text{Foc}^0$  and RCs in English.) On the other hand, PNCs with Nominative subjects are equipped with  $\text{Foc}^0$ , which makes the other interpretation possible: the association of KRCs to them. It follows that  $\text{Foc}^0$  is responsible for Nominative.

Further evidence can be observed in Japanese long-distance scrambling to post-subject position (LSPS). Saito (1985) claims that LSPS shows different grammaticality between out of finite clauses and out of non-finite clauses, as in (2).

- (2) a. ??John-ga sono hon<sub>i</sub>-o minna-ni Mary-ga  $t_i$ motteiru to itta.  
John-Nom the book-Acc everyone-Dat Mary-Nom have that told  
“John told everyone that Mary has the book.”  
b. Mary-ga sono hon<sub>i</sub>-o Bill-ni PRO  $t_i$  yomu yooni itta.  
Mary-Nom the book-Acc Bill-Dat read to told.  
“Mary, the book, told Bill to read.”

In addition, Hasegawa (1984) argues that a lexical subject may appear in a control construction, such as (3a). But LSPS makes the sentence worse, as illustrated in (3b).

- (3) a. ? Taro-ga Hanako-ni [ryoosin-ga okane-o siharau yooni] meijita.  
Taro-Nom Hanako-Dat parents-Nom money-Acc pay to ordered  
“Taro told Hanako that her parents should pay the money.”  
b. ??/\*Taro-ga okane-o<sub>i</sub> Hanako-ni [ryoosin-ga  $t_i$  siharau yooni] meijita.  
Taro-Nom money-Acc Hanako-Dat parents-Nom pay to ordered

These observations lead us to the generalization that LSPS depends on the presence/absence of a lexical subject, which is nominative case-marked.

Assuming that scrambling is focus-driven (cf. Nakamura (2008) etc.), we propose that scrambled phrases containing [+focus] should be attracted by the nearest  $Foc^0$  to satisfy the Focus Criterion in Spec, FocP. Given that the categorial status of -*YOONI* clause to be a FinP, scrambled phrases in (2a) and (3b) are to be licensed at Spec, FocP, and they cannot move further because of Criterial Freezing. On the other hand, typical control clauses such as (2b) are FinP without higher heads including  $Foc^0$ . Then scrambled phrases are licensed not at the periphery of the control clause, but at the next focus site: the post-subject position. If Nominative case were licensed by T, instead of  $Foc^0$ , it would be hard to explain the contrast between (2b) and (3b).

## References

- Akaso, N. and T. Haraguchi (2011) "On the Categorial Status of Japanese Relative Clauses," *English Linguistics* 28, vol 1. 91-106.
- Baker, M. (2015) *Case: Its Principles and Its parameters*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hasegawa, N. (1984) "On the so-called of 'Empty Pronoun' in Japanese," *The Linguistic Review*, Vol. 4, 289-341.
- Kawamura T. (2008) "Adverbial Because-Clauses as Focus Elements," *Nanzan Linguistics: Special Issue 3*, Vol. 2, 103–122.
- Miyagawa, S. (2011) "Genitive subjects in Atlantic and specification of phases," *Lingua*, Vol. 121, 1265-1282.
- Nakamura, K. "Topic-focus Articulation and DP Scrambling as a Focus Movement in Japanese," *Western Conference on Linguistics 2008 Online Proceedings*, 231-240.
- Nemoto, N. (1993) *Chains and Case Positions: A Study from Scrambling in Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation, UConn.
- Saito, M. (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Implications*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Saito, M. (2003) "A Derivational Approach to the Interpretation of Scrambling Chains," *Lingua* 113.