Nominative Case and AGREE(ment)

Masashi Nomura, Ph.D

University of Connecticut, 2005

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to understand the nature of Case marking and agreement through the detailed study of Icelandic and Japanese. My investigation focuses especially on nominative Case on certain objects and on non-finite subjects.

This dissertation addresses the question of how nominative case can surface on NPs other than finite subjects. In addressing this question, I develop a new theory of Case and agreement based on Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2004) recent theory of long distance agreement. I propose that AGREE by a single Probe with multiple Goals can take place sequentially (Sequential AGREE).

Under the theory of Sequential AGREE, I make two significant assumptions: nominative is uniformly licensed by T and the size of infinitival complement clauses varies (Wurmbrand (2001b)).

By investigating Icelandic, I show that not only finite T but also non-finite T licenses nominative. Evidence comes from the person restrictions in dative-nominative constructions, Case-marked PRO, and intervention effects in Icelandic. Adopting Wurmbrand's (2001b) idea, I give a unified account for the distribution of embedded nominative NPs and optional agreement facts between such NPs and the finite verb in bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic. I propose that the optionality comes from whether the infinitival complement is TP or smaller than TP in Icelandic.

Based on Japanese facts of scope interactions among the nominative object, potential verb, and negation, I argue that nominative is licensed only by T and not by any other category between T and the nominative argument licenses nominative. Case alternation in potential constructions in Japanese derives from Wurmbrand's (2001b) idea: when the complement clause is larger than v^*P , accusative is licensed on the object by v^* , when the complement clause is smaller than v^*P , nominative is licensed by the matrix T via Sequential AGREE.

Providing relevant data from Icelandic and Japanese, I attempt to argue that nominative NPs in finite clauses are all licensed by the same T and that nominative NPs in non-finite clauses can be licensed exactly in the same way as the ones in finite clauses. Throughout the dissertation, I solidify the claim that regardless of its finiteness, only T licenses nominative Case.

Nominative Case and AGREE(ment)

Masashi Nomura

B.A., Kyoto University of Foreign Studies, 1995M.A., Kyoto University of Foreign Studies, 1997M.A., University of Connecticut, 2003

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the

University of Connecticut

2005

UMI Number: 3180238

Copyright 2005 by Nomura, Masashi

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform 3180238

Copyright 2005 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company. All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

> ProQuest Information and Learning Company 300 North Zeeb Road P.O. Box 1346 Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Copyright by

Masashi Nomura

2005

APPROVAL PAGE

Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation

Nominative Case and AGREE(ment)

Presented by

Masashi Nomura, B.A., M.A.

Co-Major Advisør Jonathan David Bobaljik Co-Major Advisor Howard Lasnik Associate Advisor Željko Bošković

Associate Advisor

William Snyder

Associate Advisor

Susanne Wurmbrand

University of Connecticut

2005

Acknowledgments

There are so many people who have contributed to this dissertation. This thesis could not have been done without their support and encouragement.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of my committee: co-major advisors Jonathan Bobaljik and Howard Lasnik, and associate advisors Željko Bošković, William Snyder, and Susi Wurmbrand, for their patience, advice, and guidance. Howard was originally my major advisor from the beginning of my linguistics life in Storrs. When he left UConn to Maryland, I deeply felt unfortunate because I lost an opportunity to meet him regularly. However, I have been fortunate to have had the opportunity to meet more incredible linguists. Later, UConn acquired Jonathan and Susi and even I could have them in my committee.

Among the members of my committee, I must acknowledge a very deep debt to Howard Lasnik. I have benefited greatly from his keen intuitions about language and linguistics. Although he was driving from Boston every week, Howard always stayed late in the department when he was in Storrs. His door was always open and he listened to my trivial ideas whenever I jumped in his office. My presentation and writing were normally messy but he always finds the direction I am heading to and my predictions that I should make long before I do (I have often thought that he seems to know my topic more than I do). His habit of saying, "Is the logic clear?" has been my important guiding force throughout the development of my linguistics knowledge.

An equally substantial debt is also due to another my co-major advisor. Jonathan Bobaljik generously accepted to be my co-major advisor in the first year when he arrived at UConn. Jonathan has been always very encouraging and kept telling me how important my work is. I would not say too much even though I say that the dissertation was born during the regularly based meeting with him. In fact, the major idea of the dissertation came up in my mind when I was defending something else in the discussion with him. His critical examination and challenge to every single idea I have ever come up with have benefited me enormously.

Željko Bošković has been teacher and basketball playmate. I always respect Željko's attitude towards linguistics. I am still amazed the way he explained *barriers* to us in his class. He taught me how to organize and simplify my understanding and how important to do so. I really appreciated that he read the very last draft even when he was unimaginably busy. I hope I can play basketball with him again in the near future.

I am thankful to William Snyder who has taught me how important the study of child language acquisition is. William has extraordinarily supported me in various aspects since I came to the department.

Susi Wurmbrand has always acted as if she were my third co-major advisor. I have been really fortunate to have had her as a member of my committee. Susi was always willing to listen to my ideas at every stage, to get lost with me in confusions due to my unorganized presentations and writings. It was one of the happiest moments when she showed me how clearly she understood my idea and how she was convinced by it. Without her continuous help, patience, and encouragement, this dissertation could not have had this shape. I also thank her that she managed to come to my defense although she was extremely busy to baby-sit her newborn baby, Leo. Actually, the same thanks go to Jonathan, who is the father of Leo that he was also busy to take care of Leo.

Besides my committee members, I am indebted to Takahiro Ono (Kyoto University of Foreign Studies), who introduced me to the fascinating field of syntax and taught me how interesting to work on language. There are too many things for which I would like to thank Ono-sensei. The most important thing he did was to have guided me to make right decision, by encouraging me to study abroad. I am sure that I would not be a linguist if I did not meet him in Japan. It goes without saying that I would not have written the dissertation without him. Whenever I went back to Japan, he managed to have time to meet with me no matter how short notice I gave to him and listened to my ideas and what I experienced in Storrs.

I am very grateful to the other faculty members at UConn: Diane Lillo-Martin, David Michaels, Yael Sharvit, Andrea Calabrese, Harry van der Hulst, Eva Bar-Shalom, Mona Anderson, and especially, Sigrid Beck, who recently left UConn. A big thanks goes also to Judy Marcus, the departmental secretary, for her administrative assistance. Although they were temporarily at UConn, Jairo Nunes, Chris Wilder, Barbara Citko, and Kimiko Nakanishi, who were Visiting Professors at UConn, had an indispensable impact on my development as a linguist. I am very grateful for their interest in my research and their encouragement. I also had the opportunity to be acquainted with some visiting scholars during my time at UConn: Yoshihisa Goto, Yoichi Miyamoto, Myung-Kwan Park, Uri Sauerland, and Kazuko Yatsushiro. I want to thank them for their friendship.

I would also like to thank teachers at Kyoto University of Foreign Studies (KUFS) in Japan, where I started linguistics: Ichiro Akano, Kazuo Araki, Makoto Kurata, Koichi Tateishi, and Hiroaki Yanagida, who taught me English as well as English linguistics. They taught me how interesting to study English deeply as a learned language and a research topic in linguistics.

This work benefited greatly from Masa Koizumi, Mamoru Saito, and Yuji Takano for their helpful comments and suggestions regarding the Japanese syntax, and for the Icelandic syntax, I am indebted to Dianne Jonas, Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson, and especially Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson who was very patiently providing me judgments even when I asked him to do so in a rush. I was very fortunate to work with Halldór. I started from email discussions with him and fortunately could meet him when he was visiting the US. Without him, I could not have worked on Icelandic. Without his help and judgments of Icelandic, this dissertation could not have been done at all. I cannot thank him more...

I am very grateful that I had great years at UConn with the following colleagues: Klaus Abels, Masahiko Aihara, Duk-Ho An, Adolfo Ausín, Ana Claudia Bastos, Stephanie Berk, Cedric Boeckx, Carlos Buesa García, Debbie Chen, Liang Chen, Inkie Chung, Norman Clarke, Marcela Depiante, Abderrahim El Younoussi, Sarah Felber, Natasha Fitzgibbons, Tomohiro Fuji, John Graham, Lydia Grebenyova, Elaine Grolla, Simona Herdan, Kazuko Hiramatsu, Kelly Inman, Takako Iseda, Keiko Ishii, Bosook Kang, Yutaka Kudo, Pei-Jung Kuo, Mariana Lambova, Jill Magee, Luisa Marti, Nobu Miyoshi, Fumikazu Niinuma, Karen O'Brien, Masao Ochi, Toshiko Oda, Sei-Rang Oh,

vi

Nazaret Palacin-Mencia, Bum-Sik Park, Jong-Un Park, Ognjen Radic, Natasha Rakhlin, Lara Reglero, Miguel Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, Laura Sabadini, Tsuyoshi Sawada, Nilufer Şener, Serkan Şener, Eric Shortt, Penka Stateva, Authur Stepanov, Sandra Stjepanović, Koji Sugisaki, Shigeki Taguchi, Takuro Tanaka, Oksana Tarasenkova, Emma Ticio, Douglas Wharram, Sandra Wood, Maki Yamane, and Cynthia Levart Zocca. I also thank Sachie Kotani and Yuko (Maki) Hashimoto who were studying at UConn as visiting students.

Outside of linguistics world during my time at UConn, I thank Ed Benson, Jessica Chavez, Dana & Naomi Green, Philip McConnell, Kristi Newgarden, Alexandre Sene, and especially Tony Girasoli, who has been my best friend in the US since I came to UConn and Walter Simson, who is also my best friend and the landlord of my last residence in the US. They both love telling jokes a lot and I love theirs desperately!

I profited very much from the following people outside of UConn for discussions, comments, and encouragement: Susana Béjar, Ken Hiraiwa, Hisa Kitahara, Norvin Richards, Shoichi Takahashi, and Masaya Yoshida.

My gratitude extends to the following people for their friendship: Klaus Abels – I don't have Vaio any more and I'm now a Mac user!, Natasha Rakhlin – Are you gonna be at Starbucks or Huskybean today?, Miguel Rodríguez-Mondoñedo – Thank you for inviting me to open a Google mail account!, Nilufer and Serkan Şener – Thank you for being my great customers (I hope you know why). Serkan is going to print out and take this thesis to file it at the Graduate School. I owe him a lot for doing all this, and also being such a good friend. Friendship with him helped me stay (in?)sane in Storrs.

vii

My thanks also go to the Japanese gang I was always hanging out with during my time in New England: Masahiko Aihara, Tomohiro Fujii, Hitomi Fukui, Ken Hiraiwa, Sachie Kotani, Yuko (Maki) Hashimoto, Yasutaka Maruki, Sachiko Miyahara, Kimiko Nakanishi, Shoichi Takahashi and especially Koji Sugisaki who is my substantial linguistics teacher, colleague and friend. Koji is the one who encouraged me to get into the UConn Linguistics program. Without his advice, I would not have been here now. Discussing issues in linguistics with him over meals was my most valuable time in Storrs.

I would also like to thank the people at Chukyo University, Japan, for warm encouragements to complete the dissertation: Genichiro Itakura, Kyung-Mook Kim, Masako Tsuzuki, to name a few.

I have more friends who have helped me see the light from Japan: Akiko Harada, Chika (Higashi) Saito, Yuka Makita, Kaori Oide, and Saori Tatsuoka (KUFS Graduate School alumni); Kaz Maeshima and Naoshi Nomura (KUFS alumni); Hiroshi Goto, Akiko Hirano, Koko Hirotsu, Miwa Isobe, and Ryo Takano. My particular thanks go to Miwa Isobe. Miwa helped me deal with kids when I was working on the first generals in acquisition. I just don't know how to thank Koko for helping me keep doing my research in Storrs from Japan. I appreciated every care package that she sent almost every week, every call whenever I must get up early, and her patience to listen to my complaints whenever I was clumsy at my research. Without her, this thesis would not have been completed.

I have more others who I could/should thank for all they have done to me to have brought me up to this stage but these acknowledgments must be wrapped up at some point and I would like to do so now. My final and deepest gratitude goes to my parents, Tamao and Shinko Nomura, to my brother, Naoshi, and to our other family member, Betty, Vivi, and Vivi II, for their constant encouragement and support. This thesis is dedicated to my great-grandmother, Toyoko Terashima, who will be a hundred and three years old next July. She had a cerebral infarction last summer and she is undergoing rehabilitation now. I cannot help admiring her determination to see things through.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	X
Abbreviations	xii
Chapter one	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Discrepancies1.2 Overview	1 7
Chapter two	13
2. Theoretical framework	13
 2.1 Mechanisms of Long Distance Agreement (LDA) 2.2 Sequential AGREE 	13
2.2.1 Sequence of AGREE 2.2.2 Locality for AGREE	19
2.2.3 Case Futer 2.2.4 Multiple Case checking	39 45
Appendix: (Non-)obligatory movement out of expletive passive construction	47
Chapter three	55
3. Nominative Case licensed by non-finite T	55
3.1 Overview of dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic	56
3.2 The Person restrictions in Icelandic	65
3.2.1 The person restrictions and nominative "objects"	65
3.2.2 Previous analyses	68
3.2.2.1 laraldsen (1995) and Sigurosson (1996)	69 71
3.2.2.3 Anagnostopoulou (2003), Béjar (2003), and Béjar and Rezac (2003)	
3.2.2.4 Boeckx (2003)	74

3.2.3 The generalization on person restrictions	77
3.2.4 Proposal	80
3.3 PRO in Icelandic	83
3.4 Intervention effect	
3.4.1 Defective Intervention is not defective	
3.4.2 No intervention but still default agreement	
3.4.3 Generalization on agreement with an embedded nominative NP	
3.5 Movement and agreement	103
3.6 The sizes of infinitival complements in Icelandic	114
3.6.1 Restructuring infinitives and non-restructuring infinitives	114
3.6.2 Seem-type ECM	
3.6.3 Seem-type raising	
3.6.4 Believe-type ECM	
3.7 Conclusion	145
Appendix I: Wh-movement in Icelandic	146
Appendix II: Varieties of Raising	152
	1 F F
Chapter lour	13/
4. Nominative Case licensed only by T	157
4.1 Potential constructions in Japanese	158
4.1.1 Previous approaches	
4.1.1.1 Tada (1992)	
4.1.1.2 Kolzann (1994)	
4.1.1.4 Problem in previous approaches	
4.1.2 Scope of nominative objects in Japanese	174
4.1.3 Scope of nominative objects with negation	177
4.1.4 Claim	
4.1.5 Truth value judgments	
4.1.0 Implications	
4.1.7 Scope freezing effect	
4.1.8 Two types of complement clauses in the potential constructions. VI and VI	202
4.7 V-te ar- constructions in Iananese	203
4.2 $\sqrt{-1}$ t_{r}	203
4.2.1 Is a nominative marked argument in Nominative Transitive te ar- construction a su	biect? . 205
4.2.3 Two types of complement clauses in the V-te ar- constructions: VP and vP	
Appendix: VP-complementation v.s. Complex Predicate	
Chapter five	220
5. Conclusion	220
5.1 Summary	220
5.2 Remaining issues	235
5.2.1 Wh-movement in Icelandic revisited	
5.2.2 Phrase-structural differences among Icelandic infinitives	

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in the examples in this dissertation:

ACC	accusative	N	neuter
CONJ	conjunct	NEG	negation
CPL	copula	NOM	nominative
DAT	dative	NOMINL	nominalizer
DFLT	default	OBJ	object
EXPL	expletive	PASS	passive
F	feminine	PL	plural
GEN	genitive	POT	potential
GER	gerund	PRES	present tense
INF	infinitive	PST	past tense
INSTR	instrumental	REFL	reflexive
LOC	locative	SG	singular
М	masculine	ТОР	topic marker

1, 2, 3 first, second, third person

Chapter one

1. Introduction

This study attempts to understand the nature of Case marking and agreement through the detailed study of two languages: Icelandic and Japanese. My investigation focuses especially on nominative Case on objects in particular constructions and on some non-finite subjects.

1.1 Discrepancies

There appears to be a correlation between nominative Case, agreement, subject, and finiteness. Chomsky (1981, 1986) has argued that these are all manifestations of the same relation. The idea is that nominative Case, agreement and other subject-hood tests generally converge on the same NP. In English, for example, in a finite clause, we

observe that only the subject bears nominative Case and triggers agreement with the finite verb as shown in (1) below.

(1) a. **They** *has/have hired him.

b. **He has**/*have been hired (by them).

Contrary to finite clauses, as illustrated in (2), a nominative Case bearing argument does not appear in a non-finite clause.

(2) Mary believes him/*he to be a genius.

Thus, this may suggest that nominative Case and agreement are properties of subjects and that they co-vary with finiteness.

There are, however, discrepancies among these manifestations. For example, Icelandic, which is a nominative-accusative language as example (3) shows, has nominative non-subjects that control finite verb agreement as in (4).¹

¹ I present some diagnostics in order to show these nominatives are in fact non-subjects in chapter 3.

(3) Ég hef lesið þessa bók.
I.NOM have.1SG read this book.ACC²
'I have read this book.'

(Sigurðsson 2000:67)

(4) Honum mundu alltaf líka þeir.him.DAT would.3PL always like they.NOM.M.PL[i.e. 'He would always like them.']

(Sigurðsson 2002:115)

Icelandic has all the familiar properties of nominative-accusative languages, while also having numerous so-called quirky (or lexically selected non-nominative) subjects with certain verbs. For instance, the subject in (4) is a dative NP *honum* and the object is a nominative NP *peir* (See section 3.1 for arguments that quirky subjects are indeed subjects and that nominative non-subjects are objects in Icelandic). Thus, the example in (4) shows that nominative Case and finite verb agreement are not necessarily linked to the subject. This clearly shows that bearing nominative Case and triggering agreement are not properties of subjects. However, we still observe that there seems to be a correlation between nominative Case and agreement with finiteness because the nominative non-subject agrees with a finite verb in (4). Notice, however, that nominative non-subjects can appear in a position where they are not related to finiteness or agreement (they appear in non-finite clause).

 $^{^{2}}$ I use a uniform format for glosses throughout the dissertation. Therefore, some glosses have different formats from the original reference sources. Some translations are added by me.

(5) Ég taldi [henni ekki hafa leiðst þeir/*þá].
I.NOM believed.1sg her.DAT not have bored they.NOM/*them.ACC
'I believed her not to have found them boring' (Sigurðsson 2000:97)

Thus, although there is much overlap between nominative Case and agreement, it appears that nominative Case is not always tied to agreement or finiteness. As we have seen above, Icelandic examples that challenge the claim that nominative Case is tied to subject also raise questions about the idea that nominative Case is tied to agreement/finiteness.

Japanese is a nominative-accusative language as the example in (6) shows but it also has nominative non-subjects with a stative verb as in (7).³

- (6) Taro-ga kono hon-wo yom-da (koto)Taro-NOM this book-ACC read-PAST fact'Taro read this book.'
- (7) a. Taro-ni/ga eigo-ga waka-ru (koto)
 Taro-DAT/NOM English-NOM understand-PRES fact
 'Taro understands English.'
 - b. Taro-ni/ga konohon-ga yom-e-ru (koto)
 Taro-DAT/NOM this book-NOM read-POT-PRES fact
 'Taro can read this book.'

³ Not all stative verbs in Japanese induce nominative non-subjects.

In a language like Japanese, which does not morphologically exhibit finite verb agreement, we observe nominative non-subjects in both finite and non-finite clauses as we have seen in Icelandic.

- (8) a. Hanako-ga takkyuu-ga/*wo uma-i
 Hanako.NOM ping-pong.NOM/*ACC good.at-PRES
 'Hanako is good at ping-pong.'
 - b. Taro-ga [Hanako-wo takkyuu-ga/*wo uma-ku] omow-ta⁴
 Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC pingpong-NOM/*ACC good.at-INF think-PAST
 'Taro thought that Hanako was good at ping-pong.' (Tanaka 2000)

In both Icelandic and Japanese, it is also the case that a nominative subject can appear in a non-finite clause as illustrated in (9). The Icelandic example clearly shows that such a nominative subject does not have to have agreement relation with the finite verb.⁵

What is important in the discussion above is that it is possible to have nominative argument, which does not show agreement with finite verb, in the non-finite clause.

⁴ The source of accusative Case on "Hanako" in (8b) is the matrix verb 'omow-ta'.

⁵ It is possible to have agreement in an example like (9a) as in (i).

⁽i) Mér hafa sýnst [mennirnir vera gagnrýndir ómaklega] me.DAT have.3PL seemed the.men.NOM.PL to.be criticized.NOM.PL unjustly 'It has seemed to me that the men are criticized unjustly.' (Jónsson 1996:171)

 (9) a. Mér hefur sýnst [mennirnir vera me.DAT have.3SG seemed the.men.NOM.PL to.be gagnrýndir ómaklega]
 criticized.NOM.PL unjustly

'It has seemed to me that the men are criticized unjustly.'

(Jónsson 1996:171)

b. Taro-ni/ga [mada Hanako-ga kodomo-ni] omow-e-ta
Taro-DAT/NOM still Hanako-NOM child-CPL.INF think-POT-PST
'It seemed to Taro that Hanako is still a child.'

Thus, appearance of the nominative in a non-finite clause is unexpected if nominative Case is tied to finiteness.

Despite the fact that we observe that there are some discrepancies between Case and agreement, the theory that I will develop will accommodate the attested variation, while as much as possible, making predictions about excluded configurations. With this much as background, I would like to address the following research question in this dissertation:

(10) How is it that nominative Case can surface on NPs other than finite subjects?

In addressing this question, I will develop a new theory of Case and agreement. Although a survey of the literature reveals a wide range of possible analyses as to the source of the morphological nominative case on noun phrases other than finite subjects, I will show that a unified analysis of nominative Case licensing is possible if it is assumed that nominative Case is always licensed as an instance of structural Case, namely by T, in syntax.

Providing additional relevant data from Icelandic and Japanese, I will argue that regardless of their grammatical functions, nominative NPs in finite clauses are all licensed by the same T and that nominative NPs in non-finite clauses can be licensed exactly in the same way as the ones in finite clauses. Namely, when the complement clause contains non-finite T, it licenses the nominative NP in the embedded clause. Throughout the dissertation, I will solidify the claim that regardless of its finiteness, only T licenses nominative Case.

1.2 Overview

The following ((11)-(15)) are the data that I focus especially on in this dissertation in order to understand the nature of Case marking and agreement. Finite verb agreement with a nominative NP is obligatory in mono-clausal dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic as shown in (11), while finite verb agreement with a nominative NP is optional in bi-clausal dative nominative constructions as in (12).

(11) Mono-clausal dative nominative constructions in Icelandic:

a.	Henni	voru	gefnir	hattarnir.
	her.DAT	were.3PL	given	the.hats.NOM.PL

b. * Henni var gefið hattarnir.
her.DAT was.3SG given the.hats.NOM.PL
'she was given the hats.' (Sigurðsson 1996)

(12) Bi-clausal dative nominative constructions in Icelandic:

a.	Mér	mundu	þá	virðast		þeir	vera	hérna.
	me.DAT	would.3pl	then	seem		they.NOM.PL	be	here
b.	Mér	mundi	þá	virðast	Į	þeir	vera	hérna].
	me.DAT	would.3sg	then	seem		they.NOM.PL	be	here
	'It would	t then seem t	o me t	hat they a	are	e here.'	(Si	gurðsson 2002)

In bi-clausal constructions, when there is a dative NP between the finite verb and nominative NP, intervention is observed as in (13a), while it is not when there is no intervening dative NP as in (13b). An intervention effect is only observed in bi-clausal contexts. Plural agreement obtains (and is obligatory) even though the dative occurs in the intervention configuration as in (13c).

(13) Intervention effect in bi-clausal constructions in Icelandic:

a. Mér hefur/*hafa alltaf virst honum líka bækur
me.DAT has.3sG/*3PL often seem him.DAT like books.NOM.PL
'It has often seemed to me that he likes books.' (Schütze 1997:108)

b. Mér virðist/virðast [hafa verið seldir
me.DAT seem.3SG/3PL [to.have been sold.NOM
margir hestar]
many horses.NOM.PL]

'It seems to me that many horses have been sold.' (Jonas 2004 and p.c.)

c. Það ??mundi/mundu <u>einhverjum</u> líka þessir sokkar
EXPL would.3sG/3PL <u>someone.DAT</u> like these socks.NOM.M.PL
'Someone would like these socks.'

The object NP in the dative subject construction is marked nominative in the complement clause of *believe*-type ECM verbs as in (14a), while it is marked accusative when there is no dative NP in the embedded clause as in (14b).

(14) **Believe-type ECM in Icelandic:**

a.	Ég	taldi	[henni	leiðast	Haraldur]	
	I.NOM	believed.	lsg her.dat	to.bore	Harold.NOM	
	'I beli	eved her be	e bored by Ha	arold.'	(Maling and S	Sprouse 1995:178)
b.	Ég	tel []	hafa veri	ið selda		
	I.NOM	believe	to.have bee	n sold.A	CC.M.PL	
	marga	ł	hesta.]		
	many.	ACC.M.PL	horses.ACC	5]		
	'I beli	eve that ma	old.'	(Jonas 2004)		

Case alternation of an object NP (ACC - NOM) is possible in potential constructions in Japanese. This alternation is partially correlated with scope possibilities.

(15) **Potential constructions in Japanese:**

a.	Taro-ga	kono	hon-wo	yom-e-ru	(koto)		
	Taro-NOM	this	book-ACC	read-POT-PRES	s fact		
b.	Taro-ga	kono	hon-ga	yom-e-ru	(koto)		
	Taro-NOM	this	book-NOM	read-POT-PRES	fact		
	'Taro can read this book.'						

In order to give accounts for obligatory/optional agreement facts in Icelandic and Case alternation of an object NP in Japanese, I develop a new theory of Case and agreement (I call it Sequential AGREE) based on Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2004) recent theory of long distance agreement. Under the theory of Sequential AGREE, I make two significant assumptions.

(16) Two major assumptions in this dissertation:

- a. Nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T.
- b. The size of infinitival complement clauses varies (Wurmbrand (2001b)).

With these assumptions, all the data in Icelandic and Japanese that I present in this dissertation are succinctly accounted for under the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE.

In chapter 2, I will present some background of the theory of AGREE proposed by Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004). Then I will extend the theory of AGREE in the following ways: (1) I propose that the operation AGREE by a single Probe with multiple Goals can take place sequentially (Sequential AGREE), (2) I argue that the operation Sequential AGREE respects locality (closest-c-command), and (3) I claim that Sequential AGREE allows/restricts multiple Case checking.

In chapter 3, I show that not only finite T but also non-finite T licenses nominative Case by investigating Icelandic. Evidence will come from the person restrictions in dative-nominative constructions, Case-marked PRO, and the intervention effect in Icelandic. Then, I will introduce Wurmbrand's (2001b) view of selectional differences among complement clauses. I will propose that the optionality of finite agreement with embedded nominative arguments in the bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions is a result of the selectional differences among the complement clauses of the verb 'seem'. I will claim that finite verb agreement with the embedded subject is observed when the complement clause is smaller than TP, and no agreement is observed when the complement facts in mono-clausal dative-nominative constructions, bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (*seem*-type ECM) and some other related constructions (*seem*-type raising, *believe*-type ECM) under the theory of Sequential AGREE.

In chapter 4, I will provide arguments that show nominative Case is licensed only by T and not by any other functional head. In the first half, I will provide some new data for the discussion of the scope of nominative objects in Japanese with respect to the scope interactions among the nominative object, the potential verb, and negation. The scope facts in Japanese will show that a nominative object can be interpreted lower than the potential verb ($\neg > can > NOMOBJ$), higher than negation (NOMOBJ $> \neg > can$), but not between negation and potential verb ($*\neg$ > NOMOBJ > can). This fact will shed light on the approach that the Case of the nominative objects is licensed by T and cast doubt on the approach that nominative is licensed by verbs like the potential verb in Japanese if we assume that NP can move to the Spec of Case-licensing heads and/or the edges of phases. Then I will give an analysis of scope data of nominative objects, following Wurmbrand (2001b) that a sentence with a nominative object involves a restructuring verb which combines with a VP-complement, while one with an accusative object is a non-restructuring verb which combines with a vP-complement. In the second half, I will establish the syntax of the so-called "V-te ar- constructions" in Japanese, which are similar to the potential constructions in Japanese, and argue that this construction also involves restructuring vs. non-restructuring. Importantly, both potential and V-te arconstructions are interesting with respect to nominative Case licensing of the object of the embedded verbs. I will show that facts in both constructions are succinctly accounted for under the assumption that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T in Japanese.

Chapter 5 summarizes the dissertation and discusses some remaining issues.

Chapter two

2. Theoretical framework

The theory that I will assume in this dissertation is a theory of AGREE. In this chapter I will present some background of the theory of AGREE proposed by Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004). Then I will extend the theory of AGREE in the following ways: (1) I propose that the operation AGREE can take place sequentially (Sequential AGREE), (2) I argue that the operation Sequential AGREE respects locality (closest-c-command), and (3) I claim that Sequential AGREE allows/restricts multiple Case checking.

2.1 Mechanisms of Long Distance Agreement (LDA)

In the Minimalist Program, Chomsky made significant conceptual shifts from early minimalism (Chomsky 1991, 1993, 1995) to recent minimalism (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004) in terms of agreement phenomena. In early minimalism, agreement had been established under the Spec-Head relation. Namely, the controller (trigger) of agreement had to move to the Spec of the agreement target and the Spec-Head configuration induced agreement. In recent minimalism, however, agreement is established under a c-command relation. Namely, the controller of agreement has to be c-commanded by the agreement target and agreement takes place without movement of the controller into the Spec of the agreement target. Therefore, it is assumed that the direct merge of a controller of agreement to the Spec of the agreement target does not induce agreement because the required c-command relation is not established.

Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004) argues that feature checking, the mechanism of syntactic licensing and movement, takes place via an abstract operation called AGREE. In Chomsky's system, syntactic elements enter the derivation with uninterpretable features, which must be deleted prior to the derivation being sent to the interfaces. Under the theory of AGREE, an agreement relation holds between two linguistic expressions: the *Probe* and the *Goal*. For instance, an agreement relation holds between a functional category that contains uninterpretable ϕ -features and an argument NP that contains interpretable ϕ -features and uninterpretable structural Case-feature. Uninterpretable features of a probe α and a goal β are valued under the structural relation (17), based on the assumptions for the probe-goal system in (18).

(17) AGREE (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004)

 $\alpha > \beta$

AGREE (α , β), where α is a probe P and β is a matching goal G, '>' is a c-command relation: α c-commands β .

(18) Probe-Goal System (Chomsky 2000:122)

- a. Matching is non-distinctness.
- b. D(P) is the sister of P.⁶
- c. Locality reduces to 'closest c-command'.⁷
- d. Probe and Goal must be active.⁸

Matching is a relation that holds of a probe P and a goal G. To induce AGREE, G must be in the domain of P and satisfy locality conditions. Thus, D(P) is the c-command domain of P, and a matching feature G is *closest to* P if there is no G' in D(P) matching P such that G is in D(G'). For the Case/agreement systems, the uninterpretable features are ϕ -features of the probe P and structural Case of the goal G. For instance, a functional head which possesses uninterpretable ϕ -features (specifications for person, number, gender, etc.), must check against the ϕ -features of a noun phrase (NP). In order to check

⁷ Closest c-command is basically the same as Minimal Link Condition (MLC).

(i) Minimal Link Condition (MLC) (cf. Chomsky 1995:311)
 K > β > α
 K attracts α only if there is no β, β closer to K than α, such that K attracts β.

Thus, under AGREE, K AGREEs with α only if there is no β , β closer to K than α , such that K AGREEs with β .

⁶ This condition excludes an AGREE relation between a head H and an element in the Spec of HP.

⁸ Active is defined as having uninterpretable features. If the element does not contain uninterpretable features, or the uninterpretable features are deleted by Spell-Out/Transfer, AGREE does not take place. If Probe and Goal bear uninterpretable features, they are active until they are Spelled-Out/Transferred to the interfaces. (This is reminiscent of deletion vs. erasure of earlier Minimalist Program.)

its features, the head must find an NP with suitable features within its c-command domain. By this operation, the ϕ -features of the functional head are valued by the ϕ features of the NP it AGREEs with. In the same way, an NP that possesses uninterpretable features (Case-feature) must check them against a functional head via AGREE. For instance, nominative Case of NP and ϕ -features of T are valued under AGREE (T, NP) and accusative Case of NP (and ϕ -features of v^* (transitive v)) are valued under AGREE (v^* , NP). Under the theory of AGREE, the driving force for movement is no longer Case or agreement since all licensing is done via AGREE. Unless there is another reason that requires an element to leave its base position (such as the EPP), movement will not occur.

In Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2004) series of works, he develops a theory of phases, where the output of the syntax is sent to the interfaces (the conceptual-intentional interface (LF) and the perceptual-articulatory interface (PF)) not all at once, but rather in stages. Each such stage is called a phase; at least CP and vP are the phases of the syntactic derivation (where CP is the highest projection of the clause and vP is the level at which all arguments of the verb have been introduced), while TP and VP are not. Once a phase has been sent to the interfaces, its contents are no longer accessible to the syntactic derivation. One part of phase theory requires successive cyclic movement through phase edges (a Spec of each phase head). Such successive cyclicity is derived from the operation *Transfer*.

(19) Cyclic Multiple Spell-Out/Transfer⁹

TRANSFER hands the narrow-syntactic derivation D_{NS} over to PF and to LF phase-by-phase cyclically. (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004)



Chomsky proposes that elements are shipped to PF and LF at each phase level and that those *Spell-Out* domains are the complement domains of the head H of Phase P.

(21) Spell-Out domain = the complement domain of the head H of Phase P.

(cf. Nissenbaum 2000, Chomsky 2001, 2004)

⁹ Uriagereka (1999) first introduces the notion of Multiple Spell-Out into the Minimalist Program.



As we can see in (22), the operation *Cyclic Multiple Spell-Out/Transfer* Spells-Out/Transfers the complement domain of the head H to the interfaces and therefore, once this operation happens, elements in the complement domain of H are no longer accessible for operations outside the phase of H. However, the phase head and its specifier are still accessible since they are not shipped yet. Thus, the effect of the *Phase Impenetrability Condition* follows largely from the *Cyclic Multiple Spell-Out/Transfer*.

(23) Phase-Impenetrability Condition (PIC) (Chomsky 2000:108)
 In phase α with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside α, only H and its edge are accessible to such operations

Under the theory of AGREE, NPs can move to limited positions (the Spec of the heads that check EPP). For instance, (i) NPs can A-move to phase edges (Specs of phase heads).¹⁰ (ii) NPs can A-move to the Spec of their Case-licensing heads (T, v^*). I assume

¹⁰ See Bošković (1997a) who provides evidence that accusative *wh*-phrases undergoing syntactic *wh*-movement must move to Spec of AgrOP (edge of *vP* in Agr-less theory) on

that MOVE to the Spec of the Case-licensing heads is preconditioned by AGREE.¹¹ Namely, if there are features that can be checked between a Probe and a Goal, they must check as many features as possible. I also assume that only Case-licensing/phase heads have optional EPP. Thus, under this approach, NPs do not A-move to the Spec of any other heads (non-Case-licensing, non-phase heads).^{12, 13}

2.2 Sequential AGREE

2.2.1 Sequence of AGREE

In this section, I propose a refinement of the theory of AGREE in order to give an account for multiple Case phenomena that pose two significant challenges for the theory of AGREE, namely the problem of multiplicity and the problem of locality. Chomsky (2000) addresses the Icelandic fact in (24) where the nominative object shows agreement

their way to Spec of CP. But as I will discuss in appendix I in chapter 3, *wh*-movement in Icelandic seems to skip A-movement to the edge of *v*P on the way to Spec of CP.

¹¹ Availability of MOVE to the Spec of TP should be parameterized. For instance, it can be argued that English has obligatory EPP, German has no EPP, and Icelandic has optional EPP to the Spec of TP. For an argument that German has no EPP to the Spec of TP, see Wurmbrand (2004a). For an argument for optional EPP to the Spec of TP in Icelandic, see the following section.

¹² There can be other move-driving heads with EPP that are not phase heads such as Top/Foc, which are A'-move-driving heads.

¹³ Under this approach, Successive Cyclic A-movement is through the edges of phases and the Spec of Case-licensing heads.
with the finite verb, by assuming that AGREE can take place with nominative element after the dative quirky element moves.¹⁴

(24)	a.	Jóni	líkuðu	þessir	sokkar		
		John.DAT	liked.3PL	these	sock.NO	M.PL	
		'John like	(Jónsson 1996:143)				
	b.	Jóni	voru	gefnir	þessir	sokkar	
		John.DAT	were.3PL	given	these	sock.NOM.PL	

'John was given these socks.' (Jónsson 1996:144)

Icelandic has so-called quirky (or lexically selected non-nominative) subjects with certain verbs. As we will see in chapter 3 in more detail, quirky subjects behave like nominative subjects with respect to various syntactic phenomena. Cowper (1988) and Freidin and Sprouse (1991), for example, present some arguments that quirky subjects must have abstract structural Case in addition to (θ -related) inherent Case (see also Belletti 1988 who first raises the possibility of combining inherent and structural Case.). Given the assumption that quirky arguments have inherent Case and an additional structural Case, Chomsky claims that quirky subjects are assigned abstract nominative Case in (24). Then he argues that the subsequent AGREE by T is possible only because the quirky element is defective in a sense that it cannot specify any ϕ -features. The ϕ -features of T still need to

¹⁴ The agreement with a nominative argument is obligatory in Dative Nominative Constructions in mono-clausal contexts but not in bi-clausal contexts. In chapter 3, I will address these differences in detail.

be checked so it looks for another Goal. As in (25), according to Chomsky, AGREE (T, OBJ) must happen after MOVE (T, $SUBJ_{DAT}$). By assumption the head of an A-chain blocks AGREE but the trace of the A-chain does not by the locality condition.



I follow Chomsky's essential idea of this but departing from Chomsky, I claim that it is not the defective nature of the quirky element that drives the subsequent AGREE but it is simply the existence of an unvalued Goal that drives it. Suppose that, as Chomsky assumes, the subsequent AGREE takes place because the primary AGREE does not satisfy the ϕ -features of Probe. Further suppose that Probe enters into another AGREE relation with another target in order to fully satisfy its ϕ -features due to the principle called Suicidal Greed (what Lasnik (1995a, 1995b) calls Enlightened Self-Interest). If this is the case, we might expect that there always has to be a non-quirky argument when the subject of the sentence is quirky in Icelandic because quirky argument cannot make the Probe satisfied due to its defective nature. However, sentences with only quirky subjects and no other NP are perfectly grammatical as shown in (26).

(26) a. Ferðunum seinkaði the journeys.DAT was-delayed.3sG 'The journeys (were) delayed.'

- b. Stelpunum var hjálpað.
 the girls.DAT.F.PL was.3SG helped.N.SG
 'The girls were helped.'
- c. Þeim virðist hafa verið hjálpað.
 them.DAT seems.3SG have been helped.N.SG
 'They seem to have been helped.'

(Sigurðsson 1992:3)

Thus, these examples show that the reason why the subsequent AGREE takes place is not because ϕ -features of Probe needs to be fully valued. Therefore, I claim that the subsequent AGREE takes place not because Probe needs to be fully satisfied but simply because an unvalued Goal needs to be checked and that failure to find a suitable goal does not yield crash. Given this, I will argue that examples like (27) are also derived via multiple application of AGREE by a single head, namely, both a dative/nominative subject and a nominative object are licensed by a single head T.^{15, 16}

¹⁵ As in Icelandic, I assume that dative subjects in Japanese also have abstract Casefeature. Although dative subjects appear as dative, I simply assume that such dative elements are also valued nominative by T. However, Jonathan David Bobaljik (p.c.) points out that Marantz's (1991) morphological approach can rule out multiple appearance of nominative NPs in Icelandic, which I rule out by stipulation. Marantz's (1991) system does not derive the cases like Japanese in (27), where multiple appearance of nominative NPs is possible. Possible ways to accommodate Japanese facts under a Marantzian system would be to assume either that nominative objects have lexical Case or that they are in a separate case domain.

- (27) a. Taro-ni/ga eigo-ga waka-ru (koto)
 Taro-DAT/NOM English-NOM understand-PRES fact
 'Taro understands English.'
 - b. Taro-ni/ga kono hon-ga yom-e-ru (koto)
 Taro-DAT/NOM this book-NOM read-POT-PRES fact
 'Taro can read this book.'

I propose that multiple application of AGREE takes place sequentially (Sequential AGREE) and argue that AGREE never takes place crossing a potential closer Goal to Probe that can enter into AGREE relation as in (28).

(28) * P >
$$G_1 > G_2$$

AGREE (P, G_2) ('>' is the c-command relation)

I will also argue that no simultaneous multiple AGREE operation as proposed by Hiraiwa (2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2004) occurs (cf. (29)).¹⁷

¹⁶ See Béjar (2003) for the similar proposal.

(i) MULTIPLE AGREE (multiple feature checking) with a single probe is a single simultaneous syntactic operation; AGREE applies to all the matched goals at the same derivational point derivationally simultaneously. (Hiraiwa 2001a:69-70)

¹⁷ Hiraiwa (2001a) proposes MULTIPLE AGREE to introduce derivational simultaneity into syntactic operations as shown in (i).

(29) * P >
$$G_1 > G_2$$

MULTIPLE AGREE (P, G_1, G_2) ('>' is a c-command relation)

Following Chomsky (2000), I assume that the unavailability of such AGREE relations comes from Locality (closest c-command).¹⁸

(30) Locality for AGREE

 $P > G_1 > G_2$

P AGREEs with G_2 only if there is no G_1 , G_1 closer to P than G_2 , such that P AGREEs with G_1 .

 G_1 is closer to P than G_2 is and hence G_2 cannot have AGREE relation with P due to the presence of G_1 . Thus, I propose that multiple application of AGREE takes place step-by-step as in (31).

(31) a.

$$P > G_1 > G_2 \quad AGREE(P, G_1)$$
b.

$$G_1 > P > t_{G_1} > G_2 \quad MOVE(P, G_1)$$
c.

$$G_1 > P > t_{G_1} > G_2 \quad AGREE(P, G_2)$$

¹⁸ I will discuss locality issues in the following sections.

First AGREE (P, G₁) takes place. Locality does not allow AGREE (P, G₂). Second, MOVE (P, G_1) takes place. Third, AGREE (P, G_2) takes place. In (31c) a phrase with ϕ features intervenes between matrix T and G_2 , namely, the trace of G_1 . As Chomsky argues, I assume that it is only the head of an A-chain but not the trace of the A-chain that blocks AGREE under the locality condition. Hence, if the intervener displaces to a position locally related to the Probe, its trace is rendered invisible, and a subsequent AGREE by the same Probe may be established with another target. As Chomsky (2001) proposes, I claim that an element is active as long as it is not Spelled-Out/Transferred to the interfaces. Therefore, the Probe will not become inactive until it is Spelled-Out/Transferred and hence it can in principle AGREE with multiple Goals. Therefore, I argue that active Probe searches down and finds active Goals to have AGREE relation. I propose that (the primary sequence of) AGREE obligatorily takes place with the closest Goal (cf. G₁) if possible. Namely, if there is a Goal, AGREE must take place (to check uninterpretable features of Probe) but if there is no Goal, AGREE will not take place. In such a case, ϕ -features of Probe are not valued but still the derivation converges, resulting in default agreement (3rd person singular).¹⁹ On the other hand, the subsequent AGREE

(i) a. Laghdaigh ar a neart decreased on his strength 'His strength decreased.'
b. Mhéadaigh ar a neart increased on his strength

'His strength increased.'

¹⁹ Irish, for instance, possesses a large class of verbs which only take a prepositional phrase and entirely lack a structural subject. Some examples are presented in (i). Examples are from McCloskey (1996).

takes place only when it is necessary. Namely if G_2 has not entered into AGREE relation, the subsequent AGREE must take place (otherwise, the derivation violates the Case Filter²⁰) but if G_2 has already entered into an AGREE relation, the subsequent AGREE does not take place (Last resort). I propose the following:

(32) Sequential AGREE:

a. Primary AGREE must take place if there is an active Goal.

 b. Subsequent AGREE (if any) takes place if there is an unvalued active Goal.²¹

c.	Bhreisigh	ar an ghluaiseacht.							
	increased	on the movement							
	'The move	ment increased.'							
d.	Chuir	ar an stoirm							
	put	on the storm							
	'The storm	'The storm increased (in fury).'							

McCloskey (1996) states that the verbs in (i) appear in the finite forms which encode no information about person, number or gender, namely, default forms. Thus, this grammaticality of (i) indicates that Probe does not need to have AGREE relation, if there is no Goal, resulting in default agreement. Notice that even in Icelandic we observe sentences that contain no subject as in (ii).

(ii) Það var dansað í kringum jólatréð. EXPL was.3SG danced.N.SG around the.Christmas.tree 'People danced around the Christmas tree.'

(Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir 2002:98)

As illustrated in (ii), an agentive intransitive verb may form a morphological passive; this is the so-called 'impersonal passive.' The expletive $pa\delta$ is used to satisfy the V2 requirement; hence it is inserted in the Spec of CP. This example is also an instance of no Goal, resulting default agreement.

²⁰ I will discuss Case Filter in section 2.2.3.

²¹ Different from Primary AGREE, Subsequent AGREE takes place only with an unvalued active Goal. This distinction is important and will be discussed in section 3.6.

c. AGREE respects Locality.

d. Cyclicity is based on highest head-by-head.²²

(33) Locality of AGREE (= (30))
P > G₁ > G₂
P AGREEs with G₂ only if there is no G₁, G₁ closer to P than G₂, such that P AGREEs with G₁.

Let us consider the standard transitive sentence NOM.SUBJ - V - ACC.OBJ. The schematic derivation of the standard transitive sentence is illustrated in (34).

(34) a. [TP NOM T [
$$v*P$$
 NP₁ $v*$ [vP V NP₂]]
b. [TP NOM T [$v*P$ NP₁ $v*$ [vP V NP_{2.acc}]]
c. [TP NOM T [$v*P$ NP₁ $v*$ [vP V NP_{2.acc}]] [] = Transferred
d. [TP NOM T [$v*P$ NP_{1.nom} $v*$ [vP V NP_{2.acc}]]
e. [TP NP_{1.nom}T [$v*P$ NP_{1.nom} $v*$ [vP V NP_{2.acc}]]
AGREE (T, NP₁)
e. [TP NP_{1.nom}T [$v*P$ t_{NP1.nom} $v*$ [vP V NP_{2.acc}]]
MOVE (T, NP₁)

²² This means that as long as a Probe is the highest head in the derivation, subsequent AGREE is not a counter cyclic operation.

Under the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE, when v^*P is complete, the complement of v^*P is Spelled-Out/Transferred and hence if NP₂ has not been moved out of the Spell-Out domain, its Case-value is determined (accusative Case). In (34d), AGREE (T, NP₁) takes place and NP₁ then may undergo MOVE to the Spec of TP (by EPP). Since there is no other Goal that Probe T can AGREE with, the subsequent AGREE does not take place.

Under the proposed theory, it is important to assume that NP_1 always precedes NP_2 when NP_1 enters into an AGREE relation.²³ Under the proposed theory, if MOVE

²³ Jonathan David Bobaljik (p.c.) points out that under the proposed mechanism, it is not clear how we can capture the examples that Bobaljik and Jonas (1993) and Jonas (1996) observed, that is that quantified or quantificational transitive subjects may appear lower than the position of the (shifted) objects as in (i) and (ii), while examples such as (iii) are ungrammatical even with quantificational subjects.

(i) .	a.	Það stingur [smjörinu [einhver í vasann]]
		EXPL put the butter someone in the pocket
		'Someone put the butter in the pocket.'
	b.	Það sagði [Sveini [einhver sögu]]
		EXPL told Sveinn somebody a.story
		'Somebody told Sveinn a story.' (Bobaljik and Jonas 1993:93)
(ii)	a.	Það stungu [smjörinu [stundum [einhverjir stúdentar í
		EXPL put the.butter sometimes [some students in
		vasann]]]
		the.pocket
		'Sometimes some students put the butter in their pockets.'
	h	Það stungu í smjörinu í aldrei í neinir stúdentar í
	0.	EXPL put the butter never [any students in
		Vasann III
		Some students never put the butter in their pockets. (Jonas 1996:38)
<i>////</i>	* T. X	
(111)	* Pao	lauk [verkefninu; [alveg [einnver t _i]]]
	EXPL	tinished the assignment completely somebody (Jonas 1996:35)

The examples are uniformly bad when non-quantificational subjects appear lower than the objects.

 (v^*, NP_2) takes place, NP₂ (which is base-generated lower than NP₁) must move below NP₁. Let us consider the scenario where NP₂ moves over the base-generated position of NP₁. Under the proposed theory, as long as Probe and Goal are active, AGREE can take

(iv) Það setti [smjörið [strákur í vasann 111 a. the butter a boy in the pocket EXPL put Það sagði [Sveini [stúdent sögu **b**. 111 EXPL told Sveinn a.student a.story (Bobaljik and Jonas 1993:93)

Bobaljik and Jonas (1993) note that for many speakers the examples with quantified subjects are completely unacceptable, with the same distributional restrictions holding for both quantified and non-quantified subjects. Putting aside why non-quantified subjects cannot remain in their base-generated positions, Jonas (1996) claims that the ungrammaticality of (iii) is because adverbs like 'alveg' prefer to come at the end of the clause. But I believe that this account is not tenable given that there are grammatical cases where 'alveg' is not at the end of the clause.

(v) Það luku sennilega einhverjir stúdentar alveg verkefninu
 EXPL finished probably some students completely the assignment
 'Some students probably completely finished the assignment.'

(Bobaljik and Jonas 1996:212)

Thus, I strongly suspect that subjects in general must precede objects. However, only in the very limited circumstances quantificational subjects may follow the objects. I suppose that Object Shift in Icelandic is movement into the Spec of a certain projection between T and v. Thus movement should take place as in (vi).



I assume that the definiteness/specificity restrictions on shifted objects are tied to the structural position (cf. Diesing 1996, 1997, Bobaljik 2002). In this way, we can maintain the analysis that movement takes place in *Tucking-in* fashion. Under this view, in some cases where quantificational subjects follow the objects (to the extent that they are grammatical), I suspect that the copy of the subjects are pronounced and interpreted in their base-generated position (See Bobaljik 2002 for some relevant discussions). I have no speculation as to why this is possible. The exact nature of Object Shift is not uncontroversial and must be addressed. However, since Object Shift shows no relation with agreement (see Section 3.5), I will not discuss the nature of Object Shift in the dissertation. See Thráinsson (2001) and references sited there in for detailed discussions of Object Shift.

place. In principle, an element can enter into multiple AGREE relations as long as it is dislocated out of a Spell-Out/Transfer domain. Therefore, if NP₂ can move above NP₁ in the Spec of v^*P , the first Goal that T finds would be NP₂. Nothing would prevent NP₂ from AGREEing with T and moving to the Spec of TP. Moreover, the subsequent AGREE would also take place with NP₁ because NP₁ has not entered into an AGREE relation. Hence, the sentence would be $NOM.NP_2 - V - NOM.NP_1$, which is not what we expect to generate. Furthermore, under the assumption that the first Goal which enters into an AGREE relation with T functions as a subject of the clause, the NP that is base-generated lower would become a subject if the lower NP can move across the higher NP before entering into an AGREE relation with T.²⁴ Again, this is not what we expect. Because of this, I propose that internal Merge follows the Shortest Move (Tucking-in: Richards 1997). Now let us consider the case of MOVE (v^* , NP₂) in this view.



²⁴ There is a case in German that the NP that is base-generated lower becomes a subject. I will discuss such a case in section 2.2.2.

f. [TP NP1.nom T [
$$v*P$$
 t_{NP1.nom} NP2.acc $v*$ [vP V t_{NP2.acc}]]]
MOVE (T, NP1)

In (35c), the object tucks-in under the subject position. In (35e), T AGREEs with the subject NP₁ and then NP₁ moves to the Spec of TP as in (35f). Although NP₂ is active, our theory does not allow T to AGREE with NP₂ because NP₂ has already been valued and hence the secondary cycle of AGREE does not take place. The above derivation correctly generates (36a) but excludes (36b), as expected.

- (36) a. Hún elskar þáshe.NOM love.3sG them.ACC'She loves them.'
 - b. * Hún elska/elskar þeir
 she.NOM love.3PL/3SG they.NOM
 'She loves them.'

(Taraldsen 1995:318)

Now let us come back to see how we can handle multiple Case in Japanese and Dative Nominative Constructions in Icelandic. Examples are repeated below.

(37) Hanako-ga takkyuu-ga/*wo uma-i (koto)
Hanako.NOM ping-pong.NOM/*ACC good.at-PRES fact
'Hanako is good at ping-pong.'

31

(38) Henni leiðist Haraldur/*Haraldher.DAT bored Harold.NOM/*ACC'She is bored by Harold.'

(Maling and Sprouse 1995:177)

Under Sequential AGREE, nominative Case licensing is not a simultaneous operation, but rather it has several steps as illustrated in (39).



First, T AGREEs with NP₁ as a primary AGREE and NP₁ moves to the Spec of TP. As we have discussed, the subsequent AGREE only takes place if there is an unvalued Goal available. Here, since NP₂ has not been valued, the subsequent AGREE takes place. I assume that accusative Case licensing head v^* is not present in these constructions. Icelandic dative nominative constructions may contain v but such a v only takes an external argument but does not license accusative Case. Hence, T AGREEs with NP₂. Under our proposed theory, it is crucial that locality is respected, that is, AGREE (T, NP₂) never happens unless NP₁ is displaced. In the next section, I address this locality issue.

2.2.2 Locality for AGREE²⁵

One might think that under the proposed theory, AGREE (T, NP₂) may take place after AGREE (T, NP₁) even though NP₁ does not move, given that the subsequent AGREE simply looks for an unvalued active Goal (see (40)).

(40) Subsequent AGREE without displacement (to be rejected)

a.	Т	NP_1	NP_2
	$u\phi[valued]$	iφ	iφ
		uCase[valued]	uCase[valued]
	^	1	
	AGREE (T, N	$\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{I}}$)	
b.	Т	NP_1	NP_2
	$u\phi[v_{ALUED}]$	iφ	iφ
		uCase[valued]	uCase[valued]
	↑		↑
	AGREE (T, N	(P_2)	

The uninterpretable Case-feature of NP₁ has been valued by the primary AGREE. Thus it may not participate the subsequent AGREE and T may look for an unvalued active Goal other than NP₁. However, although NP₁ has been valued, it still bears an uninterpretable Case-feature (though valued) because it has not been deleted by sending off to the interfaces. It is important to assume that Probe always finds Goal that bears an uninterpretable Case-feature and cannot ignore it. Hence, locality will always be violated

²⁵ I have benefited here in particular from discussion with Susanne Wurmbrand.

if AGREE (T, NP₂) occurs across NP₁. If this is the case, then we should predict that AGREE (T, NP₂) is possible if NP₁ does not bear uninterpretable Case-feature.



This prediction is in fact borne out in German.

In the dative nominative constructions in Icelandic, it is the dative argument that is the subject of the constructions. German also has constructions that are strikingly similar to Icelandic quirky constructions. However, the German dative argument does not behave as a subject.²⁶ One question is what determines "subject". One might argue that the thematic hierarchy (base-generated positions) determines it. If so, then it should be the case that the nominative argument is structurally higher than the dative argument with respect to their base-generated positions in dative nominative constructions in German. However, as I will discuss below, the German dative argument is base-generated higher than the nominative argument in a certain unaccusative construction and nevertheless the nominative argument behaves as a subject.

I claim that the primary AGREEd Goal is the one that functions as subject in the sentence. This means that in German the dative NP must not enter into an AGREE relation with T at all even when it is base-generated higher than the nominative NP. This

²⁶ I will discuss these differences in detail in chapter 3.

can be easily accounted for if we assume that in German the dative NP does not bear an uninterpretable structural Case-feature.

Wurmbrand (2001a, 2003, 2004a) argues that the nominative argument originates in a position lower than the dative argument in a certain unaccusative construction in German. One piece of evidence for this claim comes from variable binding. She compares the variable binding properties in unaccusative nominative/dative constructions with those in transitive nominative/dative constructions (e.g., constructions with verbs like *help*). Her conclusion is that the dative argument is generated in a position higher than the nominative argument in unaccusative constructions, whereas the nominative argument is the higher argument in transitive constructions. Relevant examples are given in (42) and (43). All examples involve a bound variable embedded in the first argument and a quantified NP as the second argument (in the linear order). In (42), the verb is an unaccusative verb, while in (43) the verb is a transitive verb. In (42a) and (43a), the nominative precedes the dative. As can be seen in (42a) and (43a), a bound variable interpretation is only possible in this configuration when the verb is an unaccusative verb; the structure is ungrammatical when the verb is a transitive verb. In contrast, if the dative precedes the nominative as in (42b) and (43b), a bound variable interpretation is possible in the transitive construction and prohibited in the unaccusative construction.

(42) Unaccusative verb

a.	weil	seinei	Enkelinnen	jedem	Grossvater _i	gefallen				
	since	his _i .nor	M grand daughters	every.DAT	grand father _i	please.3PL				
	'since	'since every grandfather likes his granddaughters'								

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

b. ?* weil *ihrem_i* Grossvater jede Enkelin_i gefällt
 since *her_i*.DAT grandfather every.NOM grand daughter, pleases
 'since her grandfather likes every granddaughter' (Wurmbrand 2004a)

(43) Transitive verb

a.	?*	weil	seine _i	Eltern	jedem	Sohn _i	vertrauen/helfen
		since	his _i .nom	parents	every.DAT	soni	trust/help
		'since	his parent	ts help/trust eve	ery son'		
b.		weil	seinem _i	Sohn	jeder	Vaterveri	traut/hilft
		since	his _i .DAT	son	every.NOM	t father	trusts/helps
		'since	every fatł	()	Wurmbrand 2004a)		

Wurmbrand argues that a standard account explains asymmetries of this sort, which is that in the orders that allow a bound variable interpretation, the arguments embedding the bound pronouns do not occur in their base positions but have been moved to their surface position from a position lower than the quantified arguments. Assuming that the nominative NP in (44a) and the dative NP in (45b) reconstruct to their base positions at LF, they end up in positions where they are c-commanded by the quantifiers, and hence bound variable interpretations are licensed in (44a) and (45b).²⁷ In (44b) and (45a), on the other hand, the arguments appear in their base positions, and hence no reconstruction sites are available for the NPs embedding the pronouns. Since the pronouns are not in the

²⁷ Another possible assumption is that bound variable interpretations are licensed derivationally (on line).

scope of a quantifier (neither in their surface positions nor at LF), bound variable interpretations are impossible in (44b) and (45a).



Thus, Wurmbrand concludes that in this type of unaccusative construction, the base position of the dative argument is higher than the base position of the nominative argument, whereas the nominative argument is the higher argument in transitive constructions.

In order to show that the dative NP in fact does not block AGREE relation between T and the nominative NP, we need to look at an example where both NPs are in VP. The following example shows that both dative NP and nominative NP can remain in VP for example, when the VP undergoes topicalization.²⁸

²⁸ See Wurmbrand (2001a, 2004a) for arguments against a TP fronting analysis.

(46) [vp Einem Kritiker amerikanische Filme gefallen] haben hier noch nie
 a.DAT critic American movies liked have.PL here yet never
 'It never happened here that a critic liked American movies.'

Susanne Wurmbrand (p.c.)

In (46), it is possible for the nominative NP to AGREE with finite verb even when the dative NP has not been displaced. Notice also that agreement on the finite verb is matched with the nominative NP and hence the dative NP does not block agreement between the finite verb and the nominative NP. This fact supports the claim that German dative argument does not block AGREE relation between T and the nominative NP and hence the dative NP never enters into AGREE relation with T in German. Moreover, Sequential AGREE correctly captures the difference between Icelandic and German in the dative nominative constructions. Sequential AGREE also gives us a uniform way to determine "subject".²⁹

²⁹ William B. Snyder (p.c.) raises the question how the child will/can learn whether their dative NP is Icelandic-like or German-like. Syntactically, the difference between Icelandic dative NP and German dative NP is whether it has an abstract structural Case-feature or not: Icelandic dative has one but German dative does not. One key type of evidence that the child may rely on are the data related to subject-hood tests (see section 3.1). For example, in Icelandic but not German the child will hear sentences of the form in (i):

 ⁽i) Ég vonast til að verða hjálpað t.DAT
 I.NOM hope for to PRO.DAT be helped
 'I hope to be helped'

cf. * Ich hoffe _____ geholfen zu werden (German) I.NOM hope PRO.DAT helped to be 'I hope to be helped.'

2.2.3 Case Filter

We have a good reason to assume that AGREE has sequential applications when a single Probe AGREEs with multiple Goals. However, I have not addressed why MOVE of the higher Goal must take place prior to AGREE with the lower Goal, as a matter of observation. If the proposed theory is correct, then we should observe that the higher Goal must not stay in between Probe and the lower Goal. Double object passive expletive constructions in Icelandic is an instance of obligatory displacement of the higher Goal for the subsequent AGREE. The examples in (47) illustrate that the dative NP must move out of its base-generated position. The example in (47a) where the dative NP moves out of its base-generated position is grammatical, while the example in (47b) where the dative NP remains in the base-generated position is not grammatical.

(47) a. Það höfðu einhverjum stúdent verið gefnar tölvurnar
EXPL had.3PL some student.DAT been given the.computers.NOM
'Some student had been given the computers.'

If the default is for languages to lack true non-nominative subjects, then the child acquiring German will simply never posit them. The Icelandic-learning child will posit them only on hearing positive evidence such as (i). When the child gets an input that dative NP can function as a subject in the relevant data, they will learn that it is Icelandic-like dative. But if not, they will learn that their dative does not have structural Case (German dative).

b. * Það höfðu/hafði verið gefnar einhverjum stúdent tölvurnar
EXPL had.3PL/3SG been given some student.DAT the.computers.NOM
'Some student had been given the computers.'

(cf. Sigurðsson 2002:141-142)

It is controversial in which position the expletive $pa\delta$ in Icelandic is inserted. It has been analyzed as being in the Spec of CP (see, for instance, Thráinsson 1979, Sigurðsson 1989, Holmberg and Platzack 1995). On the other hand it has been argued that $pa\delta$ occupies the Spec of TP (see, for instance, Rögnvaldsson 1990, Hornstein 1991).³⁰ Since Thráinsson (1979) it has been observed that $pa\delta$ does not undergo subjectaux inversion when there is XP-fronting as in (48a), nor can it undergo raising to object as shown in (48b).

(48) a. Á bókasafninu hafa (*það) verið skildar eftir margar bækur.
in the.library have (EXPL) been left many books
b. Ég tel (*það) hafa verið skildar eftir margar bækur á bókasafninu.
I believe(EXPL) have been left many books in the.library (Jonas 1996:30)

 $^{^{30}}$ This approach assumes that V2 can also be established in TP (a verb moves to T) without having obligatory movement of a verb to C.

Under the analysis that $pa\partial$ is inserted in the Spec of CP, it can be analyzed that *einhverjum stúdent* is in the Spec of TP. For instance, the example in (47a) may have the structure shown in (49).

Given that Icelandic is a Verb 2nd language, the finite verb $h\ddot{o}f\partial u$ moves to C for the V2 requirement. In the derivation prior to (49), when T merges, T AGREEs with DAT and DAT moves to the Spec of TP. Prior to the movement of the finite verb to C, T AGREEs with NOM. One might argue that the ungrammaticality of (47b) is due to obligatory EPP in Icelandic and hence the Spec of TP must be filled. If this is the case, then it may be that displacement of the higher argument is not a necessary condition for the subsequent AGREE and hence the obligatory movement is not due to subsequent AGREE. However, as Sigurðsson (1996) shows, Icelandic does not exhibit obligatory movement to the Spec of TP as exemplified in (50).³¹

(50) a. Það mundu **fjórir bílar** hafa verið seldir EXPL would four cars.NOM have been sold

³¹ One might argue that the expletive $pa\delta$ is inserted in the Spec of TP and then moved to the Spec of CP in (50b), in which case we would not have here evidence for nonobligatory EPP on T in Icelandic. As in (50c), however, an adverbial expression can be in the sentence initial position and still the nominative NP can stay below. Since adverbs are never in the Spec of TP, this shows that EPP is not obligatory in Icelandic.

b. Það mundu hafa verið seldir fjórir bílar EXPL would have been sold four cars.NOM 'Four cars would have been sold.' (Sigurðsson 1996:4) c. Þess vegna hafa ekki verið margir nemendur hér therefore have not been many students here

'Therefore, not many students have been here.' (Wurmbrand 2004a)

As in (50b), when there is only one NP in a sentence, a subject NP can remain in its basegenerated position. Notice also that obligatory movement of the dative NP out of its basegenerated position in (47) is nothing special about quirky subjects. A quirky subject can also be located in the same positions as a nominative subject if that is the only NP in the sentence. This is illustrated in (51).

(51)	a.	Það mundi	fjórum	bílum	hafa verið	stolið		
		EXPL would	four	cars.DAT	have been	stolen		
	b.	Það mundi			hafa verið	stolið	fjórum	bílum
		EXPL would			have been	stolen	four	cars.DAT
		'Four cars would have been stolen.'				(Sigurðsso	on 1996:4)

Thus these facts clearly show that movement of the NP out of its base-generated position is not obligatory in Icelandic. Therefore, we cannot claim that the ungrammaticality of (47b) is due to the obligatory EPP, given that Icelandic does not show obligatory EPP in (50) and (51). Hence, the displacement of the first NP in (47) must be forced for some

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

other reason.³² It is important to note that MULTIPLE AGREE (cf. (29)) does not predict the ungrammaticality of sentences like (47b). According to MULTIPLE AGREE, both dative NP and nominative NP are licensed by T simultaneously. Given that Icelandic does not have obligatory movement of a subject NP out of its base-generated position, the ungrammaticality of (47b) is mystery under MULTIPLE AGREE. On the other hand, the fact in (47) can be explained if we assume that the dative NP that AGREEs with T must be displaced in order for T to have another AGREE relation with a lower target. Under the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE, due to the locality condition, the lower NP gets a Case via subsequent AGREE only if displacement of the higher NP takes place. Thus it can be claimed that the sentence in (47b) is ungrammatical because the Case of the lower NP is not valued due to the presence of the NP intervening between T and the lower NP, namely, the violation of the Case Filter.

³² Maling (1988) argues that only the theme argument can remain VP internal in the expletive passive/unaccusative construction in Icelandic. Maling points out that the argument cannot be a goal or experiencer.

(i)	a.	?*	Það	var			hjálpað	gamalli	manni	yfir	götuna
			EXPL	was			helped	old	man.DA	Г across	the.street
	b.		Það	var	gamalli	manni	hjálpað			yfir	götuna
			EXPL	was	old	man.DA	T helped			across	the.street
									(M	faling 19	988:180)

There are some cases where arguments need to move out of the base-generated positions and some cases where arguments need to remain in the base-generated positions. See Jónsson (1996:184ff) for those cases. Under Maling's theta-theoretic approach, the obligatory movement in (47) is due to the fact that the dative NP is a goal. One interesting question that we should ask is whether all the goal/experiencer arguments must move out of VP, regardless of their Cases. Icelandic has nominative and accusative goal/experiencer argument in addition to dative one. Although I do not know the facts here, it is important to explore these facts. But what is important here is that there is no obligatory movement into the Spec of TP required by EPP in Icelandic. (52) Case Filter: Every NP needs Case.³³

Thus, under Sequential AGREE, we can maintain the idea that Icelandic does not have obligatory EPP. In (47), EPP is optional but the derivation that does not have EPP on T causes a violation of Case Filter and hence only the derivation that has EPP on T converges. Therefore, the example in (47) supports the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE.³⁴ Schematic derivations of (47) are illustrated below:

(53) A schematic derivation of (47a) (EPP on T):

a.

$$T[\dots NP_{1.dat} NP_{2}]$$

$$AGREE (T, NP_{1})$$
b.

$$[TP NP_{1.dat} T[\dots t_{NP1.dat} NP_{2}]]$$

$$MOVE (T, NP_{1})$$

³³ The original Case Filter was the following:

(i) *NP, where NP has a phonetic matrix but no Case.

As one can see, "having a phonetic matrix" is not in the definition of my version of the Case Filter. I will argue later that even PRO, which is a phonologically null element, needs to have Case. Hence, PRO must also satisfy the Case Filter. See the appendix of this chapter for further discussion of the Case Filter.

³⁴ Susanne Wurmbrand (p.c.) points out that I might predict locality violation in ditransitive. If the displacement of the higher NP is obligatory to have an AGREE relation between a Probe and the lower NP, the indirect object (the higher NP) should block an AGREE relation between v^* and the direct object (lower NP). As is obvious, this is not a welcome result because under non-Object Shift context, AGREE between v^* and the direct object (accusative licensing) is possible. I assume two layered vPs in ditransitive constructions. Then, the lower v licenses accusative Case to the lower object, so that blocking by the indirect object does not occur.

$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & NP_{1.dat} & T[\dots & t_{NP1.dat} & NP_{2.nom} \end{bmatrix} \\ \uparrow \\ AGREE (T, NP_2) \end{bmatrix}$$

d. $[_{CP} EXPL C[_{TP} NP_{1.dat} T[... t_{NP1.dat} NP_{2.nom}]]]$

(54) A schematic derivation of (47b) (no EPP on T):

2.2.4 Multiple Case checking

c.

Under the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE, uninterpretable features do not become inactive immediately after they are valued. Probe can enter into AGREE relation with multiple Goals because Probe is active, even when it is valued. An immediate question is what happens to valued Goals which are still active. Given the assumption that both Probe and Goal are active until they ship to the interfaces, the system should allow a Goal to have an AGREE relation with multiple Probes. The proposed theory in fact allows multiple Case marking if the conditions are met. Namely, the primary AGREE with a valued active Goal is possible, while the subsequent AGREE is not. Since the primary AGREE takes place with an active Goal (by assumption), it does not matter whether the Goal has been valued or not. On the other hand, a valued active Goal is never multiply Case marked via subsequent AGREE since subsequent AGREE is an instance of a last resort operation.

Let us consider schematic derivations in (55) step-by-step.

(55) a.

$$\begin{bmatrix} zP NP_1 & Z & [\dots NP_2 &] \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AGREE (Z, NP_2)$$
b.

$$\begin{bmatrix} zP NP_1 & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &] \end{bmatrix}$$
c.

$$Y & [zP NP_1 & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &] \end{bmatrix}$$
d.

$$Y & [zP NP_1 & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &] \end{bmatrix}$$
d.

$$Y & [zP NP_1 & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &] \end{bmatrix}$$
f.

$$\begin{bmatrix} xP \dots & X & [YP NP_1 & Y & [zP & t_{NP1} & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &]] \end{bmatrix}$$
f.

$$\begin{bmatrix} xP \dots & X & [YP NP_1 & Y & [zP & t_{NP1} & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &]] \end{bmatrix}$$
f.

$$\begin{bmatrix} xP \dots & X & [YP NP_1 & Y & [zP & t_{NP1} & NP_2 & Z & [\dots & t_{NP2} &]] \end{bmatrix}$$
(where X, Y and Z are Case licensers and X and Z are phases)

In (55a), NP₁ does not AGREE with Z because it is in the Spec of ZP. In (55b), NP₂ moves to the Spec of ZP (Tucking-in). In (55c), Y merges with ZP. In (55d), Y AGREEs with NP₁. In (55e), NP₁ moves into the Spec of YP but the subsequent AGREE does not take place with NP₂ given that the subsequent AGREE does not happen with valued Goal. In (55f), X merges and X AGREEs with NP₁. Under the proposed theory this is possible because the primary AGREE takes place as long as Goal is active and it does not matter whether the Goal has been valued or not. Hence under the situation in (55), NP₁ can

multiply AGREE with X and Y. This will give us a new approach to *believe*-type ECM in Icelandic by virtue of Sequential AGREE and solves a long-standing puzzle of nominative objects in ECM in Icelandic. I will discuss this in detail in chapter 3.

Appendix: (Non-)obligatory movement out of expletive passive construction

In this appendix, I discuss a possible counterexample for the argument that the higher Goal must be displaced for the subsequent AGREE with the lower Goal and give a possible solution for it.

It is well-known that Icelandic shows relatively fixed word order. For instance, the following double object verbs do not allow inversion of IO DO order as shown in (56)-(58).

- (56) a. Mannræninginn skilaði foreldrunum börnunum.
 the.kidnapper returned the.parents.DAT the.kids.DAT
 'The kidnapper returned the kids to the parents.'
 - b. * Mannræninginn skilaði börnunum foreldrunum.
 the.kidnapper returned the.kids.DAT the.parents.DAT
 (Intended meaning: 'The kidnapper returned the kids to the parents.')
 (Collins and Thráinsson 1996:417)

47

- (57) a. Ég lofaði Ólafi bilnum.
 I.NOM promised Olaf.DAT the.car.DAT
 'I promised Olaf the car.'
 - b. * Ég lofaði bilnum Ólafi. I.NOM promised the.car.DAT Olaf.DAT (Ura 2000:138)
- (58) a. Forstjórinn svipti manninn vinnunni.the.boss deprived the.man.ACC the.work.DAT'The boss deprived the man of the work.'
 - b. * Forstjórinn svipti vinnunni manninn. the.boss deprived the.work.DAT the.man.ACC

(Collins and Thráinsson 1996:416)

Under the proposed theory, we predict that only the closer NP can move to the Spec of TP when the examples like (56), (57), and (58) are passivized, because subsequent AGREE takes place only when the closer NP is displaced. Without the displacement of the closer NP, there is no AGREE relation with the lower NP. Hence, MOVE of the lower NP cannot take place.³⁵ This is shown in (59)-(61).

³⁵ Remember that MOVE of an NP to the Spec of a Case-licensing head requires AGREE relation between the head and the NP. See section 2.1.

- (59) a. Ég skilaði henni peningunum.
 I.NOM returned.1sG her.DAT the.money.DAT
 'I returned her the money.'
 - b. Henni, var skilað t_i peningunum.
 her.DAT was.DFLT returned the.money.DAT
 'She was returned the money.'
 - c. * Peningunum_j hefur verið skilað henni. t_j
 the.money.DAT has.DFLT been returned her.DAT
 'The money was returned to her.' (Van Valin 1991:151)
- (60) a. Henni_i var lofað t_i bilnum. her.DAT was promised the.car.DAT 'She was promised the car.'
 - b. * Bilnum_j var lofað henni t_j.
 the.car.DAT was promised her.DAT
 Lit. 'The car was promised her.' (Andrews 1982:480)
- (61) a. Forstjórinn svipti manninn vinnunni. (=(58a))
 the.boss deprived the.man.ACC the.work.DAT
 'The boss deprived the man of the work.'
 - b.Maðurinnivarsvipturtivinnunnithe.man.NOM.SG was.3SGdeprived.NOM.M.SGthe.work.DAT'The man was deprived of the work (by the boss).'

49

c. * Vinnunni_j var sviptur **maðurinn** t_j the.work.DAT was.3SG deprived.NOM.M.SG the.man.NOM.SG (Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

Interestingly, however, either the direct or indirect object can be moved into subject position with a verb such as 'give' or 'show' as in (62) and (63).

(62) a. Konunginum voru gefnar ambáttir.
the.king.DAT were given.F.PL maidservants.NOM.F.PL
'The king was given maidservants.'

b.Ambáttinvargefinkonunginum.the.maidservant.NOM.SGwasgiven.F.SGthe.king.DAT'The maidservant was given to the king.'

(Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson 1985:460)

Henni bílarnir. (63) a. voru sýndir her.DAT shown.NOM.PL the.cars.NOM were 'She was shown the cars.' b. Bílarnir sýndir henni. voru the.cars.NOM were shown.N.PL her.DAT (Van Valin 1991:183) 'The cars were shown to her.'

50

Different from the verbs that we have seen above, it has been observed (see for instance, Collins and Thráinsson 1996) that these Icelandic double object verbs allow both the (normal) order *IO DO* and the (exceptional) order *DO IO* as in (64) and (65).³⁶

(64)	a.	Hann	gaf	konunginum	ambáttina.
		he	gave	the.king.DAT	the.maidservant.ACC
		'He ga	we the	king the maidservant.'	

b. Hann gaf ambáttina konunginum.

he gave the.maidservant.ACC the.king.DAT

'He gave the maidservant to the king.'

(Collins and Thráinsson 1996:415)

(65) a. Þau sýndu foreldrunum krakkana.they showed the.parents.DAT the.kids.ACC'They showed the parents the kids.'

³⁶ Inversion is not dependent on verb movement to T. The examples in (i) indicate that both the non-inverted order DAT-ACC and the inverted order ACC-DAT are possible, even if the verb has not moved to T.

(i)	a.	Ég hafði gefið	konunginum _i	ambáttina	sína _i .				
		I had given	the.king	the.maidserv	ant his.REFL				
		'I had given the king his maidservant.'							
	b.	Ég hafði gefið	ambáttina _i	konungi sín	ım _i .				
		I had given	the.maidservant	king her	REFL				
		'I had given the	maidservant to h	er king.'					
	(Collins and Thráinss								

See Collins and Thráinsson (1996) for detailed discussion that inversion does not involve object shift.

b. Þau sýndu krakkana foreldrunum.
they showed the kids.ACC the.parents.DAT
'They showed the kids to the parents.'

(Collins and Thráinsson 1996:416)

Given these, let us consider the double object passive expletive constructions again. We have observed in the example in (47) that dative NP cannot stay in its base-generated position and must move out of it. The examples are repeated here in (66).

- (66) a. Það höfðu einhverjum stúdent verið gefnar tölvurnar
 EXPL had.3PL some student.DAT been given the.computers.NOM
 'Some student had been given the computers.'
 - b. * Það höfðu/hafði verið gefnar einhverjum stúdent tölvurnar
 EXPL had.3PL/3SG been given some student.DAT the.computers.NOM
 'Some student had been given the computers.'

(cf. Sigurðsson 2002:141-142)

The verb in these examples is a verb 'give' which allows both the (normal) order *IO DO* and the (exceptional) order *DO IO*. The examples in (66) are the expletive constructions of passives of IO DO order (cf. (62a) and (63a)). Now the question is what happens in the expletive constructions of passives of DO IO order (cf. (62b) and (63b)). If the reason why the dative NP has to be displaced is due to the subsequent AGREE, we should predict that both arguments cannot stay in their base-generated positions in the expletive

constructions of passives of DO IO order. The prediction is not borne out as shown in (67).

(67) Það voru gefnar gjafir öllum litlu krökkunum
EXPL were given gifts.NOM all little the.kids.DAT
'All the little kids were given gifts.' (Holmberg 2002:98)

The example in (67) is grammatical. Under the proposed theory, AGREE takes place between T and the higher NP gjafir. When the NP does not move out of its basegenerated position, subsequent AGREE will not take place due to Locality. In the case of (66b), the sentence becomes ungrammatical due to a Case Filter violation (no Case on the lower NP). The question is why (67) is possible. Remember that an Icelandic quirky argument has structural Case and inherent Case. If we assume that the Case Filter is not only for structural Case but for any Case, then we may expect that a quirky argument can appear where structural Case cannot be licensed because it bears at least inherent Case and will not violate such Case Filter. Therefore, a sentence will be grammatical even if quirky elements fail to be Case-licensed. In (67), the lower NP is a quirky NP, which has inherent Case. Case Filter will only filter out NPs that have no Case. Although the lower quirky NP does not get a structural Case valued, it still has inherent Case. Therefore, if this analysis is on the right track, the example in (67) is not an instance of a Case Filter violation. Importantly, this is not possible with a nominative NP in (66b). Different from a quirky NP, a nominative NP must be licensed by T. In (66b), the lower NP is not a quirky NP but a nominative NP. Therefore, it must be licensed by T, which in turn

53

requires displacement of the higher quirky NP. Such an explanation is available under the assumption that AGREE takes place sequentially. If multiple application of AGREE takes place simultaneously, it is not clear how we can implement the difference between (66b) and (67).

To summarize, there are five possible scenarios for NPs with respect to structural Case and inherent Case. Whether these NPs violate or do not violate the Case Filter is summarized below:

- (68) a. NP (valued structural Case): tölvurnar in (66a), gjafir in (67)
 - b. NP (valued structural Case, inherent Case): einhverjum stüdent in (66a,b)
 - c. * NP (unvalued structural Case): tölvurnar in (66b)
 - d. NP (unvalued structural Case, <u>inherent Case</u>): *öllum litlu krökkunum* in
 (67)
 - e. NP (inherent Case): Einem Kritiker in (46) (dative NPs in German)

More generally, assuming that inherent Case is valued Case, we can conclude that NPs that have no valued Case at the end of the derivation cause the Case Filter violation.

Chapter three

Nominative Case licensed by non-finite T

In the following two chapters, I present evidence that supports the idea that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T via AGREE. In this chapter, I show that not only finite T but also non-finite T licenses nominative Case by investigating Icelandic. In doing so, I introduce Wurmbrand's (2001b) view of selectional differences of complement clauses and give a unified account for Icelandic Case and agreement facts in mono-clausal dative-nominative constructions, bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (*seem*-type ECM) and some other related constructions (*seem*-type raising, *believe*-type ECM) under the theory of Sequential AGREE.
3.1 Overview of dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic

Icelandic has all the familiar properties of nominative-accusative languages, while also having numerous so-called quirky (or lexically selected non-nominative) subjects with certain verbs. This can be illustrated with dative subjects as in (69).

(69)	a.	Jóni	líkuðu	þessir	sokkar		
		John.DAT	liked.3PL	these	sock.NO	M.PL	
		'John like	d these socl	ks.'			(Jónsson 1996:143)
	b.	Jóni	voru	gefnir	þessir	sokkar	
		John.DAT	were.3PL	given	these	sock.NOM.PL	
		'John was	given these	e socks.	,		(Jónsson 1996:144)
	c.	Stelpunun	n va	r	hjálpað.		
		the girls.D	AT.F.PL wa	s.38G	helped.N	I.SG	
		'The girls	were helpe	d.'			(Sigurðsson 1992:3)

Andrews (1990b, originally published in 1976) first argued that Icelandic had nonnominative subjects, and this conclusion was accepted and the arguments improved and extended by Thráinsson (1979:462-476). Since then, it has been shown in detail by many authors (e.g. Zaenen, Maling, and Thráinsson 1985, Sigurðsson 1989) that Icelandic quirky subjects behave like nominative subjects with respect to various syntactic phenomena including familiar subject-hood diagnostics. The literature has extensively established that quirky dative subjects are indeed subjects. Representative diagnostics are

Raising-to-Object (ECM), Reflexivization, Subject-Verb Inversion, Indefinite Subject Postposing, Subject Ellipsis (Conjunction Reduction), Control, and Raising-to-Subject (Raising) (Examples are from Zaenen, Maling, and Thráinsson 1985:452-453, Sigurðsson 1992:5-6). These diagnostics pick out nominative subjects in "normal" clauses ('a' examples), but quirky elements (here, datives) are picked out in quirky subject constructions ('b' examples).

(70) Raising-to-Object (ECM)

- a. Ég tel [hanna hafa séð myndina]
 I believe her.ACC have seen picture
 'I believe her to have seen the picture'
- b. Ég tel [henni hafa leiðst bókin]
 I believe her.DAT have bored book
 'I believe she found the book boring'

(71) Reflexivization

- a. Hún_i sá myndina sína_i
 she.NOM saw picture self's
 'She saw her own picture'
- b. Henni_i leiðist bókin sín_i
 her.DAT bores book self's
 'She finds her own book boring'

57

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(72) Subject-Verb Inversion

- a. Hefur hún séð myndina?
 Has she.NOM seen picture
 'Has she seen the picture?'
- b. Hefur henni leiðst bókin?
 Has her.DAT bored book
 'Has she found the book boring?'

(73) Indefinite Subject Postposing

- a. Það hefur þjófur stolið hjólinu mínu
 EXPL has a-thief.NOM stolen bicycle.DAT mine.DAT
 'A thief stole my bicycle'
- b. Það hefur einhverjum þótt Ólafur leiðinlegur
 EXPL has someone.DAT thought Ofaf.NOM boring.NOM
 'Someone found Olaf boring'

(74) Subject Ellipsis (Conjunction Reduction)

- a. Hún horfði og (hún) sá myndina
 She.NOM looked and (she.NOM) saw picture
 'She looked and saw the picture'
- b. Hún var syfjuð og (henni) leiddist bókin
 She.NOM was sleepy and (her.DAT) bore book
 'She was sleepy and found the book boring'

(75) *Control*

- a. Hún vonast til [að PRO sjá myndina]
 She.NOM hopes for to PRO.NOM see picture
 'She hopes to see the picture'
- b. Hún vonast til [að PRO leiðast ekki bókin]
 She.NOM hopes for to PRO.DAT bore not book
 'She hopes not to find the book boring'

Note that Icelandic is a V2 language. Therefore, the fact that the datives occur before the verb in (69) does not establish that they are subjects, because initial/pre-verbal position cannot be a subject-hood diagnostic.³⁷

German has constructions that are strikingly similar to Icelandic quirky constructions, for example, certain passives.

(76) a. Uns wurde geholfen (German)
b. Okkur var hjálpað (Icelandic)
us.DAT was.3SG helped
'We were helped (by someone).'

(Sigurðsson 1992:11)

³⁷ In particular, it does not distinguish these datives from topicalized non-subject datives. This was the main point of Zaenen, Maling, and Thráinsson (1985).

As argued by Zaenen, Maling, and Thráinsson (1985), however, German "quirky-like" constructions crucially differ from Icelandic quirky constructions: while the non-nominative argument is a subject in Icelandic, it is not in German.

Remember that German is also a V2 language. Bobaljik (2005) shows that German allows word-for-word translations of (69a-c) [up to the OV word order in the VP in (69b)] but in which the datives systematically fail all applicable subject-hood diagnostics. A representative minimal contrast set is given from Control. Compare (77: Icelandic) and (78: German). In control infinitivals, the subject is replaced by PRO. Nonsubjects cannot be replaced by PRO. In Icelandic, the NP that is replaced by PRO in a control infinitive is the NP that would have (quirky) dative in a finite clause. In addition, the nominative NP is not eligible to become PRO and remains overt in the control infinitive. In German on the other hand, the NP that is replaced by PRO is the NP that would have nominative in a finite clause and the dative NP is not eligible to become PRO and remains overt in the control infinitive.

- (77) a. Ég vonast til [að _____ verða hjálpað t.DAT]
 I.NOM hope for to PRO.DAT be helped
 'I hope to be helped'
 - b. Jón vonast til [að _____ líka þessi bók]
 J.NOM hopes for to PRO.DAT like this book.NOM
 'Jon hopes to like this book.' (Jónsson 1996:115)

c. * María vonast til [að _____ líka Jóni]
M.NOM hopes for to PRO.NOM like Jon.DAT
'Maria hopes that John likes her.' (Jónsson 1996:116)

- b. * Ich hoffe [_____ der Peter zu gefallen]
 I.NOM hope PRO.DAT the.NOM Peter to like
 'I hope to like Peter.'
- c. Ich hoffe [_____ dem Peter zu gefallen]
 I.NOM hope PRO.NOM the.DAT Peter to like
 'I hope that Peter likes me / to be liked by Peter.' (Bobaljik 2005)

The examples in (77) and (78) also show that nominative NPs in this construction are not subjects in Icelandic while they are in German since nominatives in Icelandic do not pass this subject-hood test but nominatives in German do. Harley (1995) and Jónsson (1996) have carefully established that the nominative objects in this construction in Icelandic are indeed objects, and systematically fail the corresponding subject-hood diagnostics. For example, the nominative argument of *lika* 'like' can undergo Object Shift as other objects if there is no auxiliary or modal in the clause.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

³⁸ Notice that German is a head final language with the verb second phenomenon. In the embedded clause, verbs in German appear at the right edge.

(79)	a.		Jón	las		ekki		bækurnar
			John.NOM	read		not		the.books.ACC
	b.		Jón	las	bækurnar	ekki		
			John.NOM	read	the.books.ACC	not		
	c.	*	Jón	hefur	bækurnar	(ekki)	lesið	
			John.NOM	has	the.books.ACC	(not)	read	
							(Collins	s and Thráinsson 1996)
(80)	a.		Jóni	líkaði	bókin	ekki		
			John.DAT	liked	the.book.NOM	not		
	b.	*	Jóni	hafði	bókin	(ekki)	líkað	
			John.DAT	had	the.book.NOM	(not)	liked	(Jónsson 1996:118)

Thus, we can conclude that such quirky elements are subjects, while nominative nonsubjects are objects in Icelandic.

Two interrelated facts make Icelandic quirky subject constructions particularly interesting:

- (81) a. Quirky subjects never control finite verb agreement as in (83), whereas nominative subjects obligatorily do so as in (82).
 - b. Icelandic has nominative non-subjects that control verb agreement as shown in (84).

(82)	a.	Strákarnir	voru	ekki	kosnir.
		the.boys.NOM.3PL.M	were.3PL	not	elected.NOM.PL.M
	b. *	Strákarnir	var	ekki	kosið.
		the.boys.NOM.3PL.M	was.3sg	not	elected.SG.N
					(Sigurðsson 1993:38)
(83)	a.	Strákunum	var	ekki	hjálpað.
		the.boys.DAT.3PL.M	was.3sg	not	helped.SG.N
	b. *	Strákunum	voru	ekki	hjálpuðum.
		the.boys.DAT.3PL.M	were.3PL	not	helped.DAT.PL.M
					(Sigurðsson 1993:38)
(84)	Henni	mundu alltaf	líka þe	ir.	
	her.DA	T would.3PL always	s like the	y.NOM.	M.PL
	ſi.e. 'S	he would always like t	them.']		(Sigurðsson 2002:115)

Given the Icelandic facts in (81), Sigurðsson (1996) describes the following for an inherent relationship between nominative case and agreement in Icelandic:³⁹

(i) Jóni_i virðast [t_i hafa líkað þessir sokkar]
 John.DAT seem.3PL to.have liked these sock.NOM.PL
 'John seems to have liked these socks.' (Jónsson 1996:157)

Later, I will argue that Sigurðsson's descriptive generalization is correct as long as the domain of T is defined relative to whether the clause contains T or not. Thus I will argue that the embedded nominative NP in (i) is in the domain of the finite T (hence there is no (non-finite) T in the embedded clause) when it shows agreement with the finite T.

 $^{^{39}}$ The example in (i) seems to be a counterexample to assert (85) as a matter of observation, given the agreement between the finite T and the nominative NP that seems to be outside of the domain of T.

(85) The finite T, which controls finite verb agreement, only agrees with nominative NP; if there is no nominative NP in the domain of T, a default non-agreeing form is triggered.
 (Sigurðsson 1996)

If the domain of T is based on a clause, then this descriptive generalization seems to be confirmed in (86), where there is a nominative NP that is in the embedded clause and does not agree.

(86) Mér hefur/*hafa alltaf virst honum líka bækur
me.DAT has.3SG/3PL often seemed him.DAT to.like books.NOM.PL
'It has seemed to me that he likes books' (Schütze 1997:108)

This descriptive generalization will be important when we discuss the difference between mono-clausal dative-nominative constructions (MDNCs) and bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (BDNCs). As we will see in a later section, many prior analyses have glossed over these differences and were not successful in extending to both MDNCs and BDNCs.

3.2 The Person restrictions in Icelandic

3.2.1 The person restrictions and nominative "objects"

One piece of evidence that supports the idea that AGREE takes place even with non-finite T comes from a person restriction in Icelandic. In mono-clausal dative-nominative constructions (MDNCs) in Icelandic, there is a restriction on nominative objects to 3rd person (1st and 2nd person objects are impossible). Data illustrating the person restriction are given in (87). (Examples are from Sigurðsson 2002:117.)

- (87) a. Honum mundu alltaf líka þeir.
 him.DAT would.3PL always like they.NOM.M.PL
 'He would always like them.'
 - b. * Henni mundum alltaf líka við.
 her.DAT would.1PL always like we.NOM.PL
 'She would always like us.'
 - c. * Henni munduð alltaf líka við/þið.
 her.DAT would.2PL always like you.NOM.PL
 'She would always like you.'
 - d. ?* Henni mundi alltaf líka við/þið.
 her.DAT would.3sG always like we.NOM.PL/you.NOM.PL
 'She would always like us/you.'

Sigurðsson (1996, 2002) observes that the same restriction on nominative NPs to 3^{rd} person applies in the bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (BDNCs) as shown in (88).

- (88) a. * Henni mundum þá virðast [<u>við</u> vera hérna].
 her.DAT would.1PL then seem we.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to her that we are here.'
 - b. * Mér munduð þá virðast [<u>þið</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.2PL then seem you.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that you are here.'
 - c. Mér mundu þá virðast <u>þeir</u> vera hérna.
 me.DAT would.3PL then seem they.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that they are here.'

Interestingly, however, this restriction appears to be tied to agreement in BDNCs. As shown in (89), 1^{st} and 2^{nd} person nominatives are fully grammatical in BDNCs if the finite verb bears the default non-agreeing (=unspecified) form.

(89) a. Mér mundi þá virðast [<u>við</u> vera hérna].
me.DAT would.3sG then seem we.NOM.PL be here
'It would then seem to me that we are here.'

- b. Mér mundi þá virðast [<u>þið</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.3sG then seem you.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that you are here.'
- c. Mér mundi þá virðast [<u>þeir</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.3sG then seem they.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that they are here.'

As Sigurðsson (2002) summarized, the agreement pattern for first or second person nominatives and third person plural nominatives in MDNCs and BDNCs is as follows:

(90)

	MDNC: DAT-	·V(AGR)-NOM	BDNC: DAT-V(A	agr)-[NOM-pred]
V(AGR)	NOM.1/2	NOM.3pl	NOM.1/2	NOM.3pl
FULL AGR	*	\checkmark	*	4
dflt (3sg)	?*	?*	×	1

Thus, while 1st and 2nd person nominatives are unacceptable in MDNCs, they are allowed in BDNCs if the finite verb bears the default non-agreeing form.

3.2.2 Previous analyses

The purpose of this section is to briefly review previous analyses on the person restrictions in Icelandic. I will review Taraldsen (1995), Sigurðsson (1996) and Schütze (1997) as representatives from early Minimalist accounts. Their works are important in a sense that they are the first attempts to account for the person restrictions in Icelandic. Importantly, I will adopt their basic insights that nominative Case is licensed in the nonfinite clause in this dissertation, as we will see in this chapter. Then I introduce Anagnostopoulou (2003), Béjar (2003), and Béjar and Rezac (2003) from recent Minimalist accounts for the person restrictions in Icelandic. It is important to introduce them because their approach is compatible with my Sequential AGREE and as we will see later in this chapter, blending the early minimalist analysis and the recent minimalist analysis will give us a nice view on the person restrictions in Icelandic. I also review Boeckx (2003) as a representative view that not T but *v* licenses nominative Case in the dative nominative constructions in Icelandic in the recent Minimalist framework and point out some problems.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Watanabe (1993) is the first who argues that verbal functional projection (Agro in his theory as in Sigurðsson (1996)) licenses nominative Case. I will review Watanabe's theory in section 3.4, where I discuss intervention effects in Icelandic.

3.2.2.1 Taraldsen (1995) and Sigurðsson (1996)

In the framework of early Minimalism, Taraldsen (1995) and Sigurðsson (1996) account for the Dative Nominative Constructions in Icelandic, under Spec-Head agreement (e.g., Chomsky 1991).⁴¹ They propose that two different functional categories are in charge of checking number (#) features and person-features. Taraldsen claims that the functional head commonly represented as AgrS should be split into two autonomous heads AgrN (#-agreement) and AgrP (person-agreement) and that the nominative object moves into the Spec of AgrNP, which is the lower AgrP.⁴²



⁴¹ Under the early minimalist approach, Case and agreement are not dependent upon each other, given that separate functional heads are responsible for Case and agreement (e.g. Agr for agreement, T for nominative Case).

⁴² Taraldsen (1995) is not fully analyzing the Dative Nominative Constructions under Spec-Head agreement. He proposes his own Case-licensing system K/k-licensing and argues that nominative Case can also be licensed by government by AgrN. See Taraldsen (1995) for the detailed analysis.

By hypothesis, person-features cannot be represented on AgrN and the Spec of AgrPP is taken by the dative subject; person-agreement with the nominative object is excluded (hence, it has to be unspecified for person value: 3rd person). Sigurðsson, on the other hand, assumes that AgrO licenses #-feature and the nominative object checks its #-feature in the Spec of AgrOP. Hence, he basically derives the same result that Taraldsen does.



They give an account for the contrast between MDNCs and BDNCs, assuming that the movement of the nominative argument into the Spec of AgrNP/AgrOP in BDNCs is not obligatory. This means that there is no person restriction when the dative NP and the nominative NP are not in the same clause and hence no # agreement with NOM in such a case. This approach requires the additional assumption that person features on a nominative must be checked. Without this assumption, we will expect partial agreement, contrary to fact.⁴³ Now, the structure of BDNCs with respect to the person restriction is roughly as follows:

⁴³ Sigurðsson (1996) discusses that partial agreement is not fully unacceptable. See also footnote 49.



One question for their approaches is how the non-agreeing embedded NP gets licensed for nominative Case. Sigurðsson (1996) hinted that infinitives in the relevant examples can be activated as a nominative Case assigner. Therefore, under his approach, the nominative NP in MDNCs must be checked by only the finite infl (and has a person restriction), while the nominative NP in BDNCs can be checked by the nonfinite infl (no restriction) and when it moves to the higher clause it is checked by the finite infl (the restriction). Although I believe that the basic insight that non-finite infl (ex. T) licenses nominative Case is on the right track, the movement based approach to derive the optionality of agreement in BDNCs is not tenable as I will argue shortly. Thus, in section 3.5, I will show that there is no correlation between agreement and movement of the embedded subject to the higher clause.

3.2.2.2 Schütze (1997)

Schütze (1997) has a similar idea that nonfinite T must be able to check nominative Case (which I will also pursue in this dissertation). Schütze argues that there is a single syntactic relationship between a pair of elements that has case and/or agreement as its reflection and proposes that this relationship involves the checking of particular features in a local (Spec-Head or Head-Head) configuration. He called this relationship *Accord* and proposes a principle called *Accord Maximization Principle* (*AMP*).⁴⁴ This principle basically says that as many case and agreement features should be put into a sentence as possible. Given the fact that agreement is not possible when the embedded nominative NP is 1st or 2nd person, he argues that checking with the matrix T cannot be strictly obligatory, but rather, it can fail to occur if its occurrence would violate the 3rd person constraint on such a checking configuration. Since he claims that *Accord* is maximized only up to what other constraints allow, the fact can be considered as a supporting evidence of his approach. However, his theory allows 1st and 2nd person nominative objects in MDNCs with default agreement under the same line of reasoning. Moreover, his theory does not predict that the sentence in (89c) is grammatical due to AMP. Whatever relation the nominative argument has in the embedded clause, AMP forces feature-checking to be maximized as long as it does not violate any constraints. Therefore, AMP never derives sentences like (89c).⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Schütze (1997) defines *Accord* as follows:

⁽i) Accord is a local feature-checking relationship in which both case and ϕ -features of a nominal projection are checked against those of a predicate-related head.

⁴⁵ Schütze (1997) in fact judges the BDNCs with default agreement as ungrammatical. Therefore, his theory correctly captures the facts he presents. Although he presents the BDNCs with default agreement as ungrammatical, the original datum in Sigurðsson (1989:99) where he cites is not judged as ungrammatical. I do not know why he cites it as ungrammatical but this is enough to disagree with the judgments that he presents. Although it is generally the case that many speakers prefer agreement cases to default agreement in the relevant examples, there is a robust difference between obligatory agreement in MDNCs and optional agreement in BDNCs for these speakers. Therefore, I will propose an alternative approach in order to explain the difference between MDNCs and BDNCs with respect to the optionality of agreement, while maintaining Schütze's proposal that non-finite T licenses nominative Case.

3.2.2.3 Anagnostopoulou (2003), Béjar (2003), and Béjar and Rezac (2003)

Anagnostopoulou (2003), Béjar (2003), and Béjar and Rezac (2003) propose that a single functional head T checks verbal ϕ -features separately: the person-feature is checked followed by the checking of the #-feature.⁴⁶ The basic idea is that dative argument first gets a relation with T and checks person-feature. After the displacement of the dative NP, the lower argument (nominative) enters into the relation with T and checks #-feature. In other words, the subsequent relation with T is limited to the #-feature checking.



Béjar (2003) and Béjar and Rezac (2003), however, have no discussion of the difference between mono-clausal and bi-clausal contexts with respect to the person restriction. Anagnostopoulou (2003), on the other hand, concludes that even in mono-clausal constructions, just as in bi-clausal constructions, the person restriction is canceled when the nominative does not enter agreement with the verb. This means that she claims

⁴⁶ Note that they also need to assume that person-feature $(1^{st}/2^{nd} \text{ person-feature})$ of NPs must be licensed. They call such a condition *Person Licensing Condition* axiom: An interpretable $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person-feature must be licensed by entering into an AGREE relation with a functional category (cf. Nichols 2001).

that there is no person restriction in MDNCs if the finite verb appears as default. Namely she argues that 1^{st} and 2^{nd} person nominative NPs can appear if the finite verb shows default agreement (3^{rd} person singular) in MDNCs. As Anagnostopulou herself notes, Sigurðsson (1996) reports that lack of agreement is exceptional and largely limited to clauses with either *leiðast* (bored) or *líka* (like). As we have seen in the above examples, Sigurðsson (2002) uses *mundi* (would) and indicates a clear grammatical difference between monoclausal and biclausal examples with respect to the default 'agreement.' Default agreement in MDNCs is considerably worse than default agreement in BDNCs. I suspect that the marginal acceptance of the default agreement in MDNCs is a result of syncretism. See footnote 49 for the discussion on syncretism.

3.2.2.4 Boeckx (2003)

Boeckx (2003) tries to account for the contrast between MDNCs and BDNCs with respect to the person restriction. Boeckx (2003) argues that v assigns nominative Case to its object only if it assigns a theta-role realized as quirky case to an NP in its specifier (he calls v in such contexts vQ).

(95) a. νP NP_1 V VP VP



Boeckx also assumes that agreement in the "v"-domain in Icelandic is limited to #, to the exclusion of person. Hence, his account is basically the same as Sigurðsson (1996), who claims that AgroP licenses # and AgrsP licenses person.

As can be seen in (96), the experiencer in raising constructions is optional in Icelandic.

(96)	a.	Hafði	Olafur _i	virst	[t _i	vera	gáfaður]?
		had	Olaf.NOM	seemed		be	intelligent	
		'Did C	laf seem in					
	b.	Hafði	þeim	virst	[Ólafur	vera	gáfaður]?
		had	them.DAT	seemed	Olaf.NOM	be	intelligent	

'Did it seem to them that Olaf was intelligent?'

(Sigurðsson 1996:29)

In order to account for the optional agreement in BDNCs, Boeckx (2003) formulates the following hypothesis:

(97) Since Quirky θ is optionally assigned, nominative Case (and concomitant agreement) on vQ is also optionally present.

Once he assumes such a hypothesis, however, he needs to adopt (and he does adopt) the existence of default nominative case assignment in order to explain why nominative argument can appear in the non-finite clause without agreeing the finite verb. I believe this is not a desired direction because it seems that he claims that it is default since it cannot be explained. Moreover, it is not clear why vQ obligatorily assigns nominative Case in MDNCs. It is true that the experiencer in the raising constructions is optional in Icelandic. However, what he needs here is that nominative Case and concomitant agreement on vQ is optional even when the experiencer is in a sentence. The only way to capture the facts in Icelandic that I can think of under his analysis is that there are at least two different vQs in Icelandic: vQ in MDNCs (Case and agreement obligatory) and vQ in BDNCs (Case and agreement optional). This is merely a descriptive generalization but not an explanation. As I will argue later, there is a good reason to believe that nominative objects in Japanese are in fact licensed by T but not any other projection.⁴⁷ Thus, I will not pursue the account that non-T projection licenses nominative Case in Icelandic either.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ There are some literatures that argue that the Case of nominative objects in Japanese is licensed by Agro /v as Boeckx proposes for Icelandic (See the references in chapter 4). However, my findings show that there should not be any Case licensing heads in between T and the nominative object in Japanese. I will discuss this in chapter 4.

⁴⁸ Although I do not accept Boeckx's account for how the Case of nominative objects is licensed in Icelandic, I will follow his insight that defective intervention is inadequate in capturing intervention effects in Icelandic. See section 3.4 for more detailed discussion on intervention effects in Icelandic.

3.2.3 The generalization on person restrictions

In section 3.2.1, we observed person restrictions when a nominative argument is in an agreement relation with a finite predicate (monoclausal, biclausal), while there is no restriction when the embedded nominative subject is not in the agreement relation with finite predicate (biclausal). In this section, I will give the generalization on person restrictions in Icelandic adding some data relevant to person restrictions.

It has been well known in the Icelandic literature that one class of ditranstive verbs allows two passives: either internal argument can become the structural subject. This fact is evidenced by all the standard subject-hood tests for Icelandic (See, for instance, Zaenen, Maling and Thráinsson 1985). Now let us consider the examples in (98). As in (98), a person restriction is also attested in Double Object Passives. This fact is observed in Sigurðsson (1996).

(98)	a.	*	Honum	var/varst	gefinn	þú.	
			him.DAT	was.3sg/2sg	given	you.NOM.SG	
	b.		Þú	varst	gefinn	honum.	
			you.NOM.SG	were.2sg	given	him.DAT	(Schütze 1997:117)

Interestingly, the nominative argument that is promoted from the direct object of the ditransitive verb to the subject does not show the person restriction as in (98b), while the nominative object shows the restriction as in (98a). Notice that no such restriction is attested with accusatives in Icelandic as shown in (99).

(99) Ég gaf honum þig i jólagjöf I.NOM gave him.DAT you.ACC as Christmas-gift 'I gave him you as a Christmas present' (Schütze 1997:117)

Thus these facts strongly indicate that the person restriction in Icelandic is limited to **nominative** "objects".

We have observed that a nominative argument in the infinitival clause does not show a person restriction if it is not in an agreement relation with a finite predicate. The examples are repeated here as in (100).

- (100) a. Henni mundu þá virðast <u>þeir</u> vera hérna.
 her.DAT would.3PL then seem they.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to her that they are here.'
 - b. * Henni mundum þá virðast [<u>við</u> vera hérna].
 her.DAT would.1PL then seem we.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to her that we are here.'
 - c. * Mér munduð þá virðast [<u>þið</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.2PL then seem you.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that you are here.'
 - d. Mér mundi þá virðast [<u>við</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.3sG then seem we.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that we/you are here.'

78

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

e. Mér **mundi** þá virðast [<u>þið</u> vera hérna]. me.DAT **would.3sg** then seem you.NOM.PL be here 'It would then seem to me that we/you are here.'

Strikingly, however, a person restriction is observed even in infinitival clauses if the nominative element is in the object position as shown in (101).⁴⁹

(101) a. *Raising infinitives*

- * Jóni virtist [Bjarna hafa líkað ég/við/þið]
 John.DAT seemed Bjarni.DAT have liked I/we/you.NOM.PL
 'It seems to John that Bjarni likes me/us/you' (Boeckx 2003)
- b. *Control infinitives*

Við	vonumst	til [að	leiðast	hún/*þið	ekki]
we.NOM	hope.PL	for [to	bore.INF	she.NOM/you.NOM.PL	not]
'We hop	e not to be	bored wit	th her/*vou	.' (Bobaljik 20	04 lect	ure)

⁴⁹ Schütze (2003) discusses that this is "weaker" unacceptability. He follows Sigurðsson's (1996) observation that as long as all three singular forms (1st, 2nd, 3rd) of the verb are syncretic they are essentially fine. That is that when the 1st plural form sounds nothing like the 3rd singular form, the sentence is completely out, while it will be marginally possible if the 2nd plural verb form is partially syncretic to the 3rd singular form. It seems that there is some kind of morphological salvation effect when all three singular forms of the verb are syncretic. Thus, I will put aside this effect and treat the examples in (101) as ungrammatical.

c. *ECM infinitives*

Ég	taldi	ľ.	Jóni	líka	*ég/*við/*?þið]
I.NOM	believed		John.DAT	to.like	I.NOM/we.NOM/you.NOM.PL	
'I belie	eved John	to	o like me/u	s/you.'	(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson	p.c.)

Notice that the verb in (101b) is a control verb and it never licenses any case to the argument in the embedded clause so that there is no matrix verb that can ever agree with the embedded nominative object in this construction. Now, the generalization on person restrictions seems to be as follows:

- (102) a. There is a person restriction on embedded nominative subjects that agree with the matrix predicate.
 - b. There is a person restriction on nominative objects (agreeing and non-agreeing).

Thus, the agreement relation with a finite predicate is not crucial to the person restrictions but some Case-licensing limited to nominative is crucially relevant.

3.2.4 Proposal

The fact that there is a person restriction on nominative objects in infinitives suggests that even in a non-finite clause the same mechanism is required to account for the person restriction, namely, the same AGREE operation works for non-finite verbs if this person restriction derives from the operation AGREE. In order to capture the generalization in (102), I propose the following:

(103) (Non-finite) T licenses nominative Case via AGREE.⁵⁰

Contrary to the theory that nominative Case is always licensed by finite T (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004, Ura 2000, Hiraiwa 2001a), I propose that regardless of finiteness, not only finite T but also non-finite T licenses nominative Case via AGREE.⁵¹

Now, let us consider the following schemas.



⁵⁰ I hope this could be the case for any language. If it cannot be, I must say that there is a parametric variation here. As far as Icelandic is concerned, whenever there is a non-finite T, it licenses nominative Case via AGREE. In Appendix II of this chapter, I will discuss some speculation for other languages with respect to raising constructions, maintaining the assumption that non-finite T licenses nominative Case via AGREE.

⁵¹ For arguments that infinitival subjects are licensed Case in infinitives (at least control infinitives), see Sigurðsson (1991), Landau (2000) and references therein.

e. * DAT
$$\inf_{\inf} T$$
 ... t_{DAT} ... NOM_{1/2} cf. (101)

The arrows indicate AGREE relations with T. As I will address later, I assume that there is no non-finite T in the embedded clause in (104c) and hence the argument needs to AGREE with the finite matrix T, while the nominative argument in the embedded clause in (104d) AGREEs with non-finite T in the embedded clause. As the numbers indicated, it seems that we find the person restriction whenever an NP enters into subsequent AGREE relation with T but there is no restriction when the NP has Primary AGREE with T.



(105) a.

Person Restriction

As we have seen in this section, DAT plays some role in restricting person agreement of NOM when they are in the same clause (when they share the same T for AGREE). If we adopt the basic idea of Béjar (2003) and Béjar and Rezac (2003), this fact is straightforward. They argue that when T has two cycles (sequences) to have relations with arguments, the subsequent relation with T always has a restriction on person. While such a restriction never happens when T AGREEs with a single Goal. Now if we assume that non-finite T licenses nominative Case and that there is no T in the embedded clause when the embedded nominative argument AGREEs with the matrix T, their analyses can capture the fact provided above. Namely, the subsequent AGREE has a restriction on person. Since the exploration of detailed mechanism of the person restriction is not core aim of this section, I will leave it as it is. More important is that we observe binary patterns with respect to the person restriction in (105), under the assumption that nonfinite T licenses nominative Case. Hence, the facts of the person restriction support the assumption that non-finite T licenses nominative Case.

3.3 **PRO in Icelandic**

In addition to the fact that nominatives can appear in non-finite clauses and that the same person restriction on nominative objects can be observed in non-finite clauses as well as in finite clauses, the fact that Icelandic PRO is case-marked supports the idea that AGREE takes place with non-finite T (cf. Landau 2000). Sigurðsson (1991) has argued that the evidence that Icelandic PRO is case-marked comes from morphological case chains in infinitives. Icelandic lexical NPs head morphological case chains, for instance, involving floating quantifiers, as shown in (106).

(106) a. Strákarnir komust allir í skóla the.boys.NOM got all.NOM.PL.M to school
'The boys all managed to get to school.'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

b. Strákunum leiddist öllum í skóla
the.boys.DAT bored all.DAT.PL.M in school
'The boys were all bored in school'

As we see in (107), the quantifier must show up in exactly the same form in the infinitives as in the corresponding finite clauses. Thus, Icelandic PRO heads morphological case chains in the same way as lexical subjects do. It seems obvious that it does so by virtue of being case-marked.

- (107) a. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO komast allir í the.boys.NOM hope for to NOM get all.NOM.PL.M to skóla]
 school
 - b. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO leiðast ekki öllum í the.boys.NOM hope for to DAT bore not all.DAT.PL.M in skóla]
 school (Sigurðsson 1991:331)

It is important to note that agreement of participles is controlled by a nominative NP in a finite clause in Icelandic. Therefore, when the nominative NP is absent in a finite clause, the participle shows up in a non-agreeing default form. The examples are given in (108).

(108) a. Strákarnir voru aðstoðaðir/*aðstoðað
the.boys.NOM were aided.NOM.PL.M/*DFLT
'The boys were aided.'

b. Strákunum var hjálpað/*hjálpaðir/*hljálpuðum
the.boys.DAT was helped.DFLT/*NOM.PL.M/*DAT.PL.M
'The boys were helped.' (Sigurðsson 1991:335)

Now we should expect that predicate agreement behaves exactly the same in control infinitives as it does in the corresponding finite clauses. As Sigurðsson (1991) observes, this is borne out.

- (109) a. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO verða aðstoðaðir/*aðstoðað]
 the.boys.NOM hope for to NOM be aided.NOM.PL.M/*DFLT
 'The boys hope to be aided (by somebody).' (Sigurðsson 1991:335)
 - b. Strákarnir vonast til [að PRO verða the.boys.NOM hope for to DAT be hjálpað/*hjálpaðir/*hjálpuðum] helped.DFLT/*NOM.PL.M/*DAT.PL.M
 'The boys hope to be helped (by somebody).' (Sigurðsson 1991:336)

If non-finite T does not license nominative Case and there is no nominative NP, we should expect that the participle in the non-finite clause in (109a) shows up in a non-agreeing default form as the one in (108b).

Thus, it is natural to conclude that non-finite T licenses nominative Case, in exactly the same way as corresponding finite T does.⁵² One immediate question is what happens in English. Let us consider (110).

(110) a. * It was believed [John to be smart].

- b. * [John to be smart] was believed.
- c. * [John to park there] is illegal.

First, I assume that an expletive *it* takes CP clause(s) as its associate(s).⁵³ I also assume that a non-finite C head assigns Null Case and hence when there is a non-finite C, an NP

- (i) a. No solutions <u>exist</u> for this problem.
 - b. There <u>exist</u> no solutions for this problem.
 - c. * There exists no solutions for this problem. (cf. McCloskey 1991:563)
- (ii) a. <u>That he'll resign</u> and that he'll stay in office seem at this point equally possible
 - b. * It <u>seem</u> at this point equally possible that he'll resign and that he'll stay in office
 - c. It <u>seems</u> at this point equally possible that he'll resign and that he'll stay in office (cf. McCloskey 1991:564-565)

The contrast is not conclusive given that, as argued by Bošković (1997b), the grammaticality of (iic) (and its contrast with (iib)) may be due to first conjunct agreement. In fact, as is well-known, *there* also exhibits first conjunct agreement. This is shown in (iii).

(iii) a. A man and a woman $\frac{are}{*is}$ in the house

⁵² See Sigurðsson (1991) for additional compelling arguments that PRO is case-marked in Icelandic.

⁵³ One might appeal to McCloskey's (1991) observation that, in contrast to the associate of *there* (cf. (i)), the putative associate of *it* does not agree with T, as illustrated by the contrast between (iia) and (iib-c).

in the Spec of non-finite TP must be PRO.⁵⁴ This gives an appearance of Inverse Case Filter effects for Null Case. Notice, however, that under my analysis, it is assumed that a Probe must AGREE with a Goal only when there is a Goal. Thus, if there is an NP governed by the non-finite C, it must be PRO but it does not mean that a Probe must always enter into AGREE relation with a Goal. Now, given these assumptions, we can account for the examples in (110). It has been argued that believe takes non-finite TP or finite CP but not non-finite CP as its complement (see for instance Bošković (1997b) for detailed discussions.). In (110a), the verb believe takes non-finite TP. However, it requires a CP associate. Therefore, the example in (110a) is ungrammatical. In (110b), the fronted phrase has to be TP but not CP given that believe takes non-finite TP but not non-finite CP. However, it is standardly assumed that TP fronting is not possible (see for instance Abels (2003) and Wurmbrand (2004b) for discussion of immovability of TP). As for (110c), as standardly assumed, *illegal* takes a CP complement, so there is no problem with the ban on moving TPs in (110c). However, (110c) is ungrammatical due to the failure of the non-finite C to assign null Case to the NP in its Spec of TP. This obligatory licensing is predicted under my analysis: Primary AGREE must take place if there is an active Goal. If this is the case, then it is not surprising why a lexical NP cannot appear in

(cf. Bošković 1997b)

⁵⁴ Note that "for" complementizer, which in some cases may be deleted in PF, takes a lexical NP, but not PRO.

b. * There are a man and a woman in the house

c. There is a man and a woman in the house

In light of this, following Bošković (1997b) I conclude that McCloskey's data are not strong counterexamples to the claim that *it* takes a CP as its associate. See Bošković (1997b) for discussion why for some speakers first conjunct agreement is optional with *there*.

the Spec of the non-finite TP in examples like (110c). Most importantly, we can now allow non-finite T to (in principle) assign nominative in English as well as Icelandic.

(111) a.
$$\begin{bmatrix} CP \ C & [TP \ John \ T [\nu P \ t_{John} \ \nu \dots] \end{bmatrix} \text{ is } \dots$$
*Null Case NOM
b.
$$\begin{bmatrix} CP \ C & [TP \ PRO \ T [\nu P \ t_{PRO} \ \nu \dots]] \end{bmatrix} \text{ is } \dots$$

✓Null Case NOM

3.4 Intervention effect

In this section, we will review a well-known defective intervention effect in Icelandic; that is, the dative NP is inaccessible for agreement, but nevertheless blocks agreement with the nominative NP when it occurs between the finite verb and the nominative NP. Then I will point out that the famous defective intervention is not really defective but merely an instance of a standard locality violation (as we have seen in chapter 2). Moreover, I will show that even in non-intervention contexts, a nominative NP in the embedded clause does not have to be in an agreement relation with finite verb (default agreement is possible). I claim that when we observe default agreement, non-finite T participates in AGREE and licenses nominative Case in the embedded clause. In such a case, the NP that has AGREE relation with non-finite T has no relation with finite T.

3.4.1 Defective Intervention is not defective

It has been claimed in the literature (Taraldsen 1995, Schütze 1997, Boeckx 2000a, 2000b, 2003, Chomsky 2000, 2004, 2001, Frampton and Gutmann 2000, Hiraiwa 2001a, 2002c, 2004 among many others) that the dative NP is inaccessible for agreement, but nevertheless blocks agreement between the finite verb and a lower NP when it occurs between the finite verb and the nominative NP as in (112).

- (112) a. Okkur virtist/*<u>virtust</u> henni hafa líkað <u>þeir</u>
 us.DAT seemed.3SG/3PL her.DAT have liked they.NOM
 'She seemed to us to have liked them' (Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)
 - b. Mér virðist/*?virðast [stráknum líka þessir bílar]
 me.DAT seem.3SG/3PL the.boy.DAT like these cars.NOM
 'It seems to me that the boy likes these cars.' (Watanabe 1993:417-418)
 c. Mér hefur/*hafa alltaf virst honum líka bækur
 - Met herur/<u>hara</u> and virst **horum** fixa <u>bækur</u>
 me.DAT has.3sG/3PL often seemed him.DAT to.like books.NOM.PL
 'It has seemed to me that he likes books' (Schütze 1997:108)

Chomsky (2000, 2004, 2001) has formulated such an intervention effect as in (113).

(113) The Defective Intervention Constraint (DIC)

 $*\alpha > \beta > \gamma$

("> is c-command, β and γ match the probe α , but β is inactive so that the effects of matching are blocked" (Chomsky 2000:123))

This roughly says that an element β blocks the establishment of an AGREE relation between two other elements α and γ even if β itself could not agree with α . Interestingly, movement of the dative NP to clause-initial position bleeds intervention as shown in (114) and (115).^{55, 56}

- (114) Jóni_i <u>virðast</u> t_i hafa líkað <u>þessir sokkar</u>
 John.DAT seem.3PL to.have liked these socks.NOM.PL
 'John seems to have liked these socks.' (Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)
- (115) a. Stráknum virðist líka þessir bílarthe.boy.DAT seem.38G like these cars.NOM

⁵⁵ Unfortunately, I do not have V2 controlled examples here. I take these to be A-movement.

⁵⁶ Not all movement of the dative NP to clause-initial position bleeds intervention. See Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir (2003) for the cases where the trace of the moved dative NP blocks agreement between the finite verb and the nominative NP. Although I am limiting discussion to A-movement paradigms in this dissertation, I will give some speculation why intervention is obligatory in paradigms in A'-movement such as *wh*-movement in chapter 5.

b. Stráknum virðast líka þessir bílar
the.boy.DAT seem.3PL like these cars.NOM
'The boy seems to like these cars.' (Watanabe 1993:414)

Such an intervention effect can be characterized as follows:



As you can see, this is very reminiscent of what we have seen in chapter 2. Namely, the dative NP blocks AGREE between T and the nominative NP if it is not displaced. Moreover, the dative subject in the embedded clause should not be inactive when T searches for its goal(s). Remember that the finite verb can agree with the embedded subject if it is not a quirky argument as in (117).

(117) Mér mundu þá virðast þeir vera hérna me.DAT would.3PL then seem they.NOM.M.PL be here 'It would then seem to me that they are here.'

This means that the embedded subject is active when the matrix T looks for goal(s). If this is the case, the quirky arguments in (112) can also be active at the time the matrix T
looks for goal(s). Therefore, I will consider the intervention effect in Icelandic to be an instance of 'direct' intervention, namely, a standard locality violation (the one that we have seen in chapter 2).

Interestingly, the intervention effect is only observed in bi-clausal contexts. Plural agreement obtains even though the dative occurs in the intervention configuration as in (118) and (119).

- (118) a. Það ??líkaði/<u>líkuðu</u> einhverjum <u>bessir sokkar</u>
 EXPL liked.3sG/3PL someone.DAT these socks.NOM.M.PL
 'Someone liked these socks.'
 - b. Það ??mundi/<u>mundu</u> einhverjum líka <u>bessir sokkar</u>
 EXPL would.3sG/3PL someone.DAT like these socks.NOM.M.PL
 'Someone would like these socks.'
- (119) Það voru einhverjum gefnir <u>þessir sokkar</u>
 EXPL were.PL someone.D given.NOM.M.PL these socks.NOM.M.PL
 'Someone were given these socks.' (Jónsson 1996:153)

At first glance, we cannot distinguish between (112) and (118) & (119) because it looks like an agreement relation with the nominative NP across the dative. Hence, one might conclude that the number agreement between the finite verb and the nominative NP is not expected in (118) and (119). We, however, should not hasten to conclude that Locality constraint does not hold in (118) and (119). Remember that Icelandic is a Verb 2nd

language. If we adopt the analysis that $pa\delta$ is inserted in the Spec of CP and the dative subject is in the Spec of TP, we now can circumvent the Locality problem in (118) and (119). For instance, as we have seen in chapter 2, the example in (119) under the given analysis may thus have the structure illustrated below in (120).

(120) [CP EXPL C [TP **DAT**_i T [
$$\nu$$
P t_i ν ... NOM]]]
Það voru **einhverjum** gefnir þessir sokkar

In (120), T AGREEs with DAT and the DAT moves to the Spec of TP. Then T subsequently AGREEs with NOM. For the V2 requirement, the finite verb *voru* moves to C. Thus this configuration is exactly the same as we have seen in (116b). Intervention occurs only when DAT is between T and NOM. Hence, no intervention occurs in the examples of (118) and (119).

One might wonder why this is not possible for (112a) as well. It is possible for the embedded dative NP to move to the matrix clause (ex. edge of the matrix vP), given that the embedded dative NP can undergo so-called Object Shift as shown in (121) (*ekki* in (121) is a matrix adverb). However, this movement is simply an instance of Object Shift and thus the movement of the embedded dative NP to the Spec of the matrix TP is not possible as shown in (122), which are non-Object Shift contexts.

(121) Mér virðist/*?virðast Jóni ekki [t_i líka hestarnir].
Me.DAT seem.3SG/3PL John NEG to.like the.horses.NOM
'It does not seem to me that John like the horses.' Hiraiwa (2004)

(122) a. Mér hefur/?*hafa ekki virðist [Jóni líka hestarnir]. Me.DAT have.3sG/3PL NEG seem John to.like the.horses.NOM 'It does not seem to me that John like the horses.'

As in (122), when the Object Shift is not possible, the embedded subject cannot move to the matrix clause. Therefore, I assume the embedded subject does not move into the Spec of TP and hence it will always be in between T and the nominative object. I suspect that movement into the Spec of TP is available for only one argument in Icelandic (no multiple specifiers of TP (cf. Japanese)). The experiencer dative is in the Spec of CP but it first moves to the Spec of TP and hence, the embedded dative NP in (112a) cannot move into the Spec of TP.⁵⁷

It is now clear that there is an intervention effect in Icelandic but it is not clear how the Case of the embedded nominative argument is licensed. In the next section, I will show that default agreement facts in (112) are nothing related to the intervention effect.

⁵⁷ There is a case that the embedded subject moves to the Spec of the matrix TP. Such an example is related to *wh*-movement of the dative NP. I will discuss this instance in more details in chapter 5 and give some possible speculation.

3.4.2 No intervention but still default agreement

Number agreement between the finite verb and the lower NP in the embedded clause is possible in (123) - (126).⁵⁸

(123)	a.	Mannin	um _i virðist/ <u>vir</u>	<u>ðast</u>	t _i [<u>hestarni</u>	r vera	seinir.]	
		the.man.I	DAT seem.3sg/	'3pl	[the.hors	ses.NOM be	slow]	
		'The mar	n finds the horse	s slow	.' (Holmbe	erg and Hróar	sdóttir 20	03:1000)
	b.	Mér _i	mundi/ <u>mundu</u>	þá	t _i virðast	<u>þeir</u>	vera	hérna.
		me.DAT	would.3sg/3pl	then	seem	they.NOM.M.	PL be	here
		'It would	then seem to m	e that	they are he	re.'		

⁵⁸ Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir (2003) report that the examples in (i) and (ii) with plural agreement are ungrammatical.

- (i) Það virðist/*virðast <u>einhverjum manni</u> [hestarnir vera seinir.]
 EXPL seem.3SG/*3PL some man.DAT [the.horses.NOM be slow]
 'A man finds the horses slow.' (Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003:1000)
- (ii) * Það finnast mörgum stúdentum tölvan ljót
 EXPL find.3PL many students.DAT the.computer.NOM ugly.NOM
 'Many students find the computer ugly.'
 (Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003:1006, fn6)

However, as we have seen, Icelandic is a V2 language. Thus under my account, the example in (i) is predicted to be good with plural agreement. Note that although Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir treat (i) as another instance of the same intervention effect in (112), this does not seem to be entirely correct, for the simple reason that there are speakers who agree with the judgments in (112), but find no intervention effect (Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.) (or a weaker one (Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson p.c.)) in (i) (see also Sigurðsson 2004, n.39). Although we should look into why number agreement is not acceptable in (i) for some speakers, I will not consider the ungrammaticality of number agreement in (i) to be an instance of the intervention effect.

(124) a. Það virðist/<u>virðast</u> einhverjum manni <u>hestarnir</u>
EXPL seem.3SG/3PL some man.DAT the.horses.NOM
vera seinir
be slow

'The horses seems to some man to be slow.'

b. Það mundi/<u>mundu</u> einhverjum manni virðast <u>hestarnir</u>
 EXPL would.3SG/3PL some man.DAT seem the.horses.NOM vera seinir

be slow

'The horses would seem to some man to be slow.'

- (125) a. Stráknum virðist líka þessir bílar the.boy.DAT seem.3SG like these cars.NOM
 b. Stráknum virðast líka þessir bílar the.boy.DAT seem.3PL like these cars.NOM
 'The boy seems to like these cars.' (Watanabe 1993:414)
- (126) a. Það virðist/virðast einhverjum_i t_i líka þessir sokkar
 EXPL seem.3SG/3PL someone.DAT to.like these socks.NOM.PL
 'Someone seems to like these socks.'
 - b. Það hafði/höfðu einhverjum_i virst t_i líka þessir sokkar
 EXPL had.3SG/PL someone.DAT seemed to-like these socks.NOM.PL
 'Someone had seemed to like these horses'

Under the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE, agreement between the finite verb and the embedded nominative element is predicted if we assume that the dative experiencer of 'seem' verbs moves to the Spec of TP (or higher) and hence the examples in (123) -(126) have the same configuration as (116b). Sequential AGREE further predicts that not only is agreement possible but also agreement is obligatory because the dative NP no longer intervenes between T and the lower NP (nominative NP) and nothing prevents T from AGREEing with the lower NP. In fact, if the lower NP does not enter into an AGREE relation, it will violate the Case Filter. Interestingly, however, all the examples in (123) - (126) also allow default agreement (3rd person singular). This means that the agreement between the finite verb and the lower NP does not obligatorily take place, contrary to what we expect.⁵⁹ Remember that we have observed an intervention effect only when the dative argument is linearly intervening between T and the nominative NP. It is Locality that prevents T from AGREEing with the lower NP in the relevant examples. As far as default agreement is possible even in non-intervention contexts, Locality should play no role. As we have seen in (118) and (119), agreement between the finite verb and the lower NP is obligatory when the dative moves to somewhere above T in mono-clausal contexts. Thus, there is an obvious difference between mono-clausal sentences and biclausal sentences with respect to the default agreement. Therefore, the locality approach

⁵⁹ Watanabe (1993) claims that optionality of agreement with the matrix verb in a matter of PF agreement realization and assumes that the nominative NP always checks with the matrix functional head (the matrix Agro in his theory). In the next section, I will come back to this point and argue against Watanabe's claim.

can tell us nothing about the default agreement in (123) - (126) and the optionality should come from the bi-clausal status.

3.4.3 Generalization on agreement with an embedded nominative NP

First let me summarize what we have observed so far ("L" indicates Locality):⁶⁰

⁶⁰ It is worth mentioning that there are at least three dialectal variations in Icelandic with respect to agreement. In dialect 1, finite verb agreement with nominative non-subjects has completely disappeared. Hence, for dialect 1 speakers, finite verbs always show default form. In dialect 2, finite verb agreement with nominative non-subjects is always optional as far as locality is not violated. In dialect 3, which we are investigating and I am most interested in, optionality is only observed in bi-clausal constructions. As far as I can see, if the theory is based on the data from dialect 1 or 2, it is not easy to accommodate the speaker of dialect 3. This is why I am most concerned with dialect 3. Now the question is how I can accommodate the speakers of other dialects. Remember that a quirky NP AGREEs with a finite verb in the dative-nominative constructions in Icelandic but does not show morphological agreement. This means that even though dative does not show any morphological agreement with the finite verb, the finite verb has AGREE relations with two goals. In dialect 3, I claim that the failure of morphological realization of finite verb agreement can be circumvented by another AGREE relation (with nominative NP). However, in dialect 1, we can assume that although there are another AGREE relation (with nominative NP), the primary AGREE relation is sufficient to determine the morphological realization of finite verb agreement. Therefore, as a syntactic operation, AGREE anyway takes place but this does not immediately mean the finite verb agreement is controlled by the subsequent AGREE. Lastly, we can assume that dialect 2 is simply the mixture of dialect 1 and 2. Unfortunately, at this point, this is merely a speculation. Thus, I do not know what kind of parameter this might be. Another question is whether the deficiency of dative NPs a universal or language particular property. As far as datives in Icelandic or German are concerned, I expect no agreement with datives. But I have no speculation with respect to whether there is a language that allows agreement with datives.

(147)		Mono-clausal Dative Nominative Constructions						DFLT
	a.	XP	V/Aux	DAT	NOM.PL	*	*	*
	b.	DAT	V/Aux	t _{DAT}	NOM.PL	\checkmark	\checkmark	*
(100)		Bi-clausal Dative Nominative Constructions						
(128)		Bi-clau	ısal Dativ	e Nominati	ve Constructions	L	PL	DFLT
(128)	a.	Bi-clau DAT	ısal Dativ V/Aux	e Nominati t _{DAT} [NOM.PL]	L ✓	PL √	DFLT ✓
(128)	a. b.	Bi-clau DAT DAT	ısal Dativ V/Aux V/Aux	ve Nominati t _{DAT} [[t _{DAT} NOM.PL]	L ✓	PL ✓	DFLT ✓

Whether finite verb agreement is possible is corresponding to whether the Locality is violated or not. When the locality is not violated, finite verb agreement is always possible in both mono-clausal constructions and bi-clausal constructions. Moreover, agreement is in fact obligatory in mono-clausal environments. Whether or not the locality is violated, default agreement is always possible in bi-clausal constructions. Thus, the generalization on agreement with a nominative NP in the embedded clause in non-intervention contexts seems to be as follows:

- (129) Under non-intervention contexts (no locality violation),
 - a. finite verbs obligatorily agree with a nominative NP in mono-clausal constructions.
 - b. finite verbs do not obligatorily agree with an embedded nominative NP in bi-clausal constructions.

Watanabe (1993:417ff), who, to my knowledge, first discusses the intervention effect in Icelandic, argues that Agro is in charge of licensing nominative Case in the dative nominative constructions in Icelandic in the early Minimalist approach. He claims that the following generalization seems to hold:

(130) Distribution of Nominative objects (in Icelandic)

Spec of Agro can check nominative iff Spec of AgrsP immediately above it hosts a quirky dative argument in overt syntax. (Watanabe 1993:414)

This says that if a quirky dative argument is in the Spec of AgrsP in overt syntax, then the Spec of AgroP can check nominative Case. The structure is illustrated in (131).



This can explain cases of nominative objects in mono-clausal sentences (cf. (127b)) because nominative Case is licensed by Agro when the sentence contains the dative argument in the Spec of AgrsP. As for bi-clausal sentences in (128a, b), he claims that optionality of agreement with the matrix verb in bi-clausal constructions is a matter of PF realization and that the embedded nominative argument always checks Case in the Spec of the matrix AgroP because nothing is in between (cf. (128a)) or the embedded clause

only has a trace of the dative subject in the Spec of AgrsP (cf. (128b)). Under this approach, he correctly predicts that the embedded nominative object does not move to the Spec of the matrix AgroP in (128c) because the embedded dative subject will be in that position. Therefore, there is no room left in the matrix clause for the nominative object. Since the embedded dative subject will end up in the Spec of the matrix AgroP, the nominative object must check Case in the embedded AgroP, unable to agree with the matrix verb.

Once Watanabe (1993) assumes that the optionality of agreement is a matter of PF realization, he should not expect obligatory agreement in the mono-clausal constructions.⁶¹ Since the nominative Case licenser in Watanabe's system is Agrs in non-dative nominative constructions or Agro in the dative nominative constructions, it is only the matrix Agro that licenses the Case of the embedded nominative subject. Because of this reason, the optionality of agreement has to be a matter of PF realization. If this is the case, however, optionality should also be in mono-clausal dative nominative constructions because the way that the nominative Case is licensed is exactly the same and the PF realization process should also be applicable in mono-clausal constructions. Therefore, Watanabe's analysis cannot capture the generalization in (129).

It is obvious that there is no source to license nominative Case to the lower NP in the mono-clausal intervention contexts as in (127a) because it is ungrammatical. It is also obvious that there must be some source to license nominative Case to the NP in the embedded clause in the bi-clausal intervention contexts as in (128c) because it is

⁶¹ To the best of my recollection, Watanabe did not discuss the obligatory/optionality of agreement in mono-clausal constructions.

grammatical. As we have seen in section 3.2 and 3.3, if the non-finite T can check nominative Case, we have a way to account for the facts of optional agreement in (123) - (126); that is, when the finite T shows default agreement, a nominative NP in the embedded clause is licensed by the non-finite T, while it is licensed by the finite T when the finite T shows agreement with it.⁶² Thus, I here again conclude that AGREE takes place with non-finite T and licenses nominative Case.

(132) (Non-finite) T licenses nominative Case via AGREE. (=(103))

Now the question is how the optionality of agreement derives. One obvious approach is a movement approach, which I will reject. In the next section, I will discuss the relation between movement and agreement and show that movement approach is not tenable. Then in section 3.6, I will present the approach that infinitival complements do not all have the same functional architecture above VP to account for the optional agreement facts in bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (BDNCs) in Icelandic. Claiming that the optionality of agreement in the BDNCs derives from the selectional differences of the complement clauses, we can also correctly account for why agreement is obligatory in mon-clausal dative-nominative constructions.

⁶² Thus, I claim that verbal agreement is not morphologically realized on non-finite predicate in Icelandic. See the appendix in this chapter.

3.5 Movement and agreement

In this section, I will discuss a relation between movement of embedded subjects to the matrix clause and agreement, and show that optional agreement facts that we have seen are not related to the movement of the embedded subjects to the matrix clause. Remember that under the analyses of Taraldsen (1995) and Sigurðsson (1996), the contrast between mono-clausal dative-nominative constructions (MDNCs) and bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (MDNCs) and bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions (BDNCs) with respect to the person restriction is accounted for if we assume that the movement of the embedded nominative argument into the higher clause is not obligatory in BDNCs. This analysis can also capture the obligatory agreement facts in MDNCs and the optional agreement facts in BDNCs in exactly the same way.

Let us assume that the difference between MDNCs and BDNCs is that nominative in MDNCs must be checked by only the finite T (finite verb agreement), while nominative in BDNCs can be checked by the non-finite T (default agreement) and optionally moves to the higher clause and is checked by the finite T (finite verb agreement). The relevant examples are repeated below.

(133) a. Það ??mundi/mundu einhverjum líka þessir sokkar
EXPL would.3SG/3PL someone.DAT like these socks.NOM.M.PL
'Someone would like these socks.'

b. Mér_i mundi/mundu þá t_i virðast þeir vera hérna.
me.DAT would.3SG/3PL then seem they.NOM.M.PL be here
'It would then seem to me that they are here.'

Suppose that the NPs in the embedded clauses are doubly licensed nominative Case by the non-finite T and the finite T when they show morphological agreement with the finite T, while they are licensed only by the non-finite T when the finite verbs bear default agreement because the matrix T fails to agree with an NP other than a quirky NP. If an embedded NP can optionally enter into agreement relation with the higher Case licensing head, we might predict that the same optionality can be observed in the *believe*-type ECM contexts, namely, if an NP is licensed by the non-finite T and the matrix v^* , then the NP should be marked with accusative Case as a result of the relation with v^* , while if the NP is only licensed by the non-finite T, then it should be marked as nominative Case. However, this is not borne out as shown in (134) and (135).

(134) a. Við töldum elska Harald. hana we.NOM believed.1PL her.ACC to.love Harold.ACC 'We believed her to love Harold.' (Taraldsen 1995:323) b. * Við töldum hún elska Harald. we.NOM believed.1PL her.NOM to.love Harold.ACC 'We believed her to love Harold.' (Taraldsen 1995:324)

(135)	a.		Ég	tel	gestina	hafa	tekið	harðfiskinn.
			Ι	believe	the.guests.ACC	to.have	taken	the.dried.fish.ACC
	b.	*	Ég	tel	gestirnir	hafa	tekið	harðfiskinn.
			I	believe	the.guests.NOM	to.have	taken	the.dried.fish.ACC

(Jonas 1996:72, fn20)

Remember that Schütze (1997) assumes that embedded subjects in (133b) and (134) always enter into agreement relation with the higher functional head due to *Accord Maximization Principle (AMP)*. Schütze follows Marantz (1991) that by Case Realization Disjunctive Hierarchy, when an NP is in a relation where it can be realized either nominative or accusative, the NP will be realized with accusative. Hence, he will not face the problem that I am pointing out. However, his theory does not derive the optionality of agreement in BDNCs as we have seen in 3.2.2.2. Therefore, AMP does not give us an account for the obligatory relation with the matrix functional head v in *believe*-type ECM and optional relation with the matrix functional head T in *seem*-type ECM.

One might claim that different from *seem*-type ECM contexts, in the *believe*-type ECM contexts, the NP in the embedded clause obligatorily moves to the higher clause to enter into agreement relation with the higher functional head (v^* in the *believe*-type, T in the *seem*-type). An immediate question is how we can get such a difference. It may be the case that v^* requires an obligatory movement of the agreeing NP, while T does not. Taraldsen (1995) observes that in the *believe*-type ECM contexts, an embedded accusative pronominal subject cannot be coreferential with a matrix nominative subject, while in the *seem*-type ECM contexts, an embedded nominative pronominal subject can

be coreferential with a matrix nominative subject when the matrix verb shows default agreement. These examples are given in (136) and (137).⁶³

- (136) María taldi hana vera gáfaða.
 Mary.NOM believed.3SG her.ACC to.be gifted.ACC.F.SG
 'Mary_i believed her_{j/*i} to be smart.' (Taraldsen 1995:315)
- (137) a. * Konunum fundust þær vera gáfaðar.⁶⁴
 the.women.DAT seemed.3PL they.NOM to.be gifted.NOM.F.PL
 b. Konunum fannst þær vera gáfaðar.
 - the.women.DAT seemed.3SG they.NOM to.be gifted.NOM.F.PL 'The women_i thought they_i were smart.' (Taraldsen 1995:317)

or 'It seemed to the women_i that they_i were smart.'

Thus the difference may be accounted for by claiming that the movement of the embedded subject NP to the matrix clause is obligatory in the *believe*-type ECM contexts, while it is optional in the *seem*-type ECM contexts. The fact that an embedded nominative pronominal subject can be coreferenctial with a matrix dative subject implies

⁶³ It turns out that these binding paradigms did not work out so nicely as reported. Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (p.c.) points out that the binding and agreement correlation is very subtle. He only found a very slight difference that is compatible with what Taraldsen has observed but he does not think that the difference is grammaticality. I suspect that it is merely a preference.

 $^{^{64}}$ (137a) is grammatical if the embedded nominative pronominal subject is non-coreferential.

that the embedded nominative NP does not have to move to the higher clause (no binding condition B violation) and the matrix T does not enter into agreement relation with it (default agreement).⁶⁵ Although the interaction between agreement and binding seems to support this view, I will show that this is not the case.

It has been known since Thráinsson (1979) that the ECM subject of non-finite clauses can be raised overtly to the matrix clause in Icelandic. As illustrated in (138), when adverbial expressions are inside the embedded clause, they modify the embedded clause, while when they are outside the embedded clause, they modify the matrix clause.

(138) a. Jón telur [að ég hafi í barnaskap mínum/*sínum étið
 John believes that I have in foolishness my/*his eaten
 hákarlinn]

the.shark]

'John believes that in my/*his foolishness I have eaten the shark.'

- (i) * Nemandinn las [ekki hana] the.student read not it
- (ii) Nemandinn las hana_i [ekki t_i
 the.student read it not
 'The student didn't read it.'

(Thráinsson 2001:150)

107

⁶⁵ Movement of the embedded NP to the matrix clause in (136) and (137) is in fact obligatory. As I will come back to this point below, Jonas (1996) observes that movement of the embedded subject NP to the matrix clause shows the same characteristics of object shift and it is well-known that pronominal object shift tends to be obligatory in Icelandic (and also in other Scandinavian languages) as shown in (i) and (ii).

b. Jón telur í barnaskap sínum/*mínum [að ég hafi étið
 John believes in foolishness his/*my [that I have eaten hákarlinn]

the.shark]

'John believes in his/*my foolishness that I have eaten the shark.'

(Thráinsson 1979:390-391)

As has been shown by Kuno (1976:24-26) (for Japanese) and Postal (1974:146ff) (for English), Thráinsson also uses the facts of this sort to test the location of clause boundaries.⁶⁶ The prediction is that if the ECM subject of the non-finite clause has been raised, then an adverbial expression immediately following it should be able to modify the matrix clause. This prediction is borne out as shown in (139). The embedded subject *mig* precedes the matrix adverbial expression *i barnaskap sínum*. This clearly indicates that the embedded subject is raised overtly higher than *i barnaskap sínum* and therefore the embedded subject must be in the matrix clause.

(139) Jón telur mig í barnaskap sínum hafa étið hákarlinn John believes me in foolishness his to.have eaten the.shark 'In his foolishness, John believes me to have eaten the shark.'

(Thráinsson 1979:391)

⁶⁶ See also Lasnik and Saito (1991) and Lasnik (1995b, 1995c, 1999a) for discussion on raising of the ECM subject in English.

However, the movement of the embedded subject NP to the matrix clause is not obligatory. If the movement into the matrix clause is necessary for the embedded subject NP to be licensed accusative Case, the Case of the embedded subject NP should not be accusative when it does not move to the matrix clause. Contrary to what one might expect, even when the embedded subject is in the embedded clause, it is licensed accusative Case.

- (140) Ég hafði talið marga stúdenta hafa lesið bækurnar
 - I had believed many students.ACC to have read the books

'I had believed many students to have read the books.' (Jonas 1996:74)

As is well known, Object Shift is dependent on verb movement out of VP (Holmberg's Generalization). In (140), Object Shift is not possible because the verb *believe* does not move so that the object also cannot move. Thus this clearly shows that the embedded subject can be licensed accusative by the matrix v even when the embedded subject does not move to the matrix clause. Thus, the obligatory accusative licensing in the *believe*-type ECM is not corresponding to the movement of the embedded subject NP into the matrix clause.

One might argue that Object Shift may take place covertly even in non-Object Shift environment as Chomsky (1993) assumes and that the embedded subject always needs to move to the higher clause to have a relation with the higher functional head. In order to show the movement of the embedded subject to the higher clause and Case/agreement have no correlation in the relevant examples, we need to find a case that agreement does not occur even when the movement to the higher clause takes place, in addition to the case that agreement does occur even if the movement does not take place.⁶⁷

The *seem*-type ECM demonstrates this point. Namely, if there is a correlation between movement of the embedded subject and the finite verb agreement, we expect that the moved embedded subject NP to the matrix clause shows obligatory agreement with the matrix finite T.

The examples in (141) show that *ekki* is not an adverb for the embedded clause but a matrix adverb.⁶⁸ In (141a), *ekki* appears higher than the matrix verb *virst*. This means that *ekki* is a matrix adverb in (141a) because *ekki* adjoins to the position higher than the matrix predicate. As is (141b) is ungrammatical, *ekki* cannot appear lower than the embedded subject. This means that *ekki* cannot be interpreted as an embedded adverb in (141).

⁶⁷ As I have pointed out in the previous section, a claim that default agreement is a matter of PF realization is not a correct characterization for the optionality of agreement in BDNCs because it cannot explain why the agreement is obligatory in MDNCs. Hence, I take the finite verb agreement as a signal of whether the embedded subject has a relation with the matrix functional head.

 $^{^{68}}$ The judgments are from Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (p.c.) and it is important to note that there are speakers who allow *ekki* to modify an embedded clause. For such speakers, this test is not valid. We should be able to test the correlation between the movement of the embedded subject to the matrix clause and agreement by using an adjunct that only modifies the matrix clause but not the embedded clause.

(141)	a.		Okkur	hafði	ekki	virst	hestarnir		vera	seinir
			us.DAT	had	not	seemed	the.horses.NOM		be	slow
	b.	*	Okkur	hafði		virst	hestarnir	ekki	vera	seinir
			us.DAT	had		seemed	the.horses.NOM	not	be	slow
			'It had not seemed to us that the horses are slow.'							

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

Thus, we can use this to test whether there is a correlation between the movement of the embedded subject to the matrix clause and agreement. If there is a correlation, we predict that overtly moved embedded subject must always agree with the matrix finite T, namely, a sentence should not show the default agreement. However, this prediction is not borne out as shown in (142) and (143).⁶⁹

(142)	a.	Okkur	virtust		ekki	[hestarnir	vera	seinir]
		us.DAT	seemed.3PL		not	the.horses.NOM	be	slow
	b.	Okkur	virtust	hestarniri	ekki	[t _i	vera	seinir]
		us.DAT	seemed.3PL	the.horses.NOM	not		be	slow
		'It did no	ot seem to us	that the horses ar	e slov	w.'		

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

⁶⁹ Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson (p.c.) indicates a preference of agreement over nonagreement. However, this preference is not relevant for the point that I am making here. See footnote 63 for this point.

(143)	a.	?	Okkur	virtist		ekki	[hestarnir	vera	seinir]
			us.DAT	seemed.3sG		not	the.horses.NOM	be	slow
	b.	?	Okkur	virtist	hestarniri	ekki	[t _i	vera	seinir]
			us.DAT	seemed.3sg	the.horses.NOM	not		be	slow
			'It did no	ot seem to us	that the horses ar	e slov	v.'		

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

Interestingly, even when the embedded subject moves to the matrix clause, the default agreement is available, while finite verb agreement with the embedded subject is also available even when it does not move over *ekki*.⁷⁰ Remember that when the object is a pronoun, object shift is obligatory. The same rule applies to the embedded subject here. The pronominal embedded subject must overtly move to the matrix clause as in (144) and (145). However, a shifted embedded subject does not have to agree with the finite T as shown in (145b).

⁷⁰ The examples in (142) may not show that the embedded subject remaining in the embedded clause can agree with the matrix functional head. It may move to the higher clause but simply lower than the adverb *ekki*. However the example in (133b) has already proved that the embedded subject which remains in the embedded clause can agree with the matrix functional head. But again these cases may be simply the cases of covert movement. What is most important here is that the default agreement is possible even when the embedded subject overtly moves to the matrix clause.

(144) a. Okkur virtust ekki [þeir lesa bókina] us.DAT seemed.3PL not they.NOM read the.book b. Okkur virtust ekki [t_i lesa bókina] beir_i read the.book seemed.3PL they.NOM not us.DAT 'It did not seem to us that they read the book.'

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

(145) a. Okkur virtist ekki [beir lesa bókina] us.DAT seemed.3sg not they.NOM read the.book b. Okkur virtist ekki [t_i lesa bókina] þeir_i us.DAT seemed.3sG they.NOM not read the book 'It did not seem to us that they read the book.'

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

I have shown in this section that movement of embedded subjects to the matrix clause and agreement do not show any correlation (ex. Object Shift is not Case/agreementdriven). Therefore, we need a mechanism that does not require movement in order to explain why Case/agreement with a higher functional category is obligatory in some case (*believe*-type ECM) but not obligatory in others (*seem*-type ECM). In the next section, I will argue that sizes of complement clauses play crucial roles for their differences.

3.6 The sizes of infinitival complements in Icelandic

In this section, I will show how the sizes of the complement clauses play an important role in accounting for the existence of default agreement in well-known (non-) intervention effect configurations in Icelandic. First, I introduce Wurmbrand's (2001b) discussion that restructuring infinitives and non-restructuring infinitives have different clausal architectures. Then, I discuss Bhatt (2003) and Boeckx (2004) who both argue that the apparent optionality of long distance (object) agreement (LDA) in Hindi is accounted for, adopting Wurmbrand's view. I will propose to extend Wurmbrand's selectional differences to account for the optionality of agreement in Icelandic: the optionality is ascribed to the different architectures of the infinitival complements in Icelandic.⁷¹

3.6.1 Restructuring infinitives and non-restructuring infinitives

Recently, Wurmbrand (2001b), followed by Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (To appear), has provided evidence in favor of viewing that infinitival complements do not all have the same functional architecture above VP.⁷² For instance, the matrix predicate may select a bare VP, vP, TP, or CP.

⁷¹ A similar proposal has already been made in Sigurðsson (1989).

⁷² I refer the reader to Wurmbrand (2001b) for detailed discussion.

Wurmbrand (2001b) proposes that restructuring infinitives (RIs) are reduced structures which lack their own Case-assigning functional projections and that the Case of the object in RIs depends on properties of the selecting matrix predicate. In German, for instance, the Case of the embedded object depends on the voice properties of the matrix predicate.⁷³ When the matrix restructuring predicate is active, the embedded object obligatorily occurs with accusative Case, while it bears nominative and controls agreement on the matrix predicate when the matrix restructuring predicate is passivized (or unaccusative) and combines with an RI. These are illustrated in (146).⁷⁴

- (146) a. weil er den/*der Traktor versucht hat $[t_{OBJ}$ zu reparieren] since he the.ACC/*the.NOM tractor tried has $[t_{OBJ}$ to repair] 'since he tried to repair the tractor'
 - b. weil die Traktoren zu reparieren versucht wurden since the tractors (NOM) to repair tried were.PL
 'since they tried to repair the tractors.'

(Bobaljik and Wurmbrand To appear)

⁷³ In addition to German, Wurmbrand (2001b) argues that in Dutch, Spanish, Italian, and Japanese, there is no source for the licensing of accusative case within the restructuring infinitive.

⁷⁴ Note that nominative arguments obligatorily agree with the finite verb in German. However, plural noun phrases do not distinguish between nominative and accusative and singular agreement is the default agreement. The fact that nominative case and agreement indeed go together can be shown by using coordinated noun phrases as in (i).

⁽i) dass der Traktor und der Lastwagen zu reparieren versucht wurden that [the tractor and the truck] (nom) to repair tried were 'that they tried to repair the tractor and the truck' Wurmband (2001b:19)

As argued in Wurmbrand (2001b), the fact that the Case of the embedded object is dependent upon the Case-assigning properties of the matrix functional domain suggests that it is that higher functional head that is responsible for Case. RIs, therefore, must be smaller than vP, the functional projection associated with accusative Case, and the embedded NP must be associated with a matrix functional head in order to check Case (v in active clauses, T in passives). The structures of the relevant examples are given in (147).





b. Passive RI: (146b)



Wurmbrand (2001b) also argues that whenever there is reason to assume that the embedded object receives Case in the embedded predicate, the construction does not allow restructuring properties (ex. anti-reconstruction effects) at all and hence has to be considered as a non-restructuring infinitive (NRI).⁷⁵ The following is a minimal pair: the verb *vergessen* 'forget' selects a restructuring infinitive in (148a) and a non-restructuring infinitive in (148b).

(148) a. weil [alle Fenster zu schließen]_{RI} vergessen wurden since all windows (NOM) to close forgotten were 'since they forgot to close all the window' $\forall > forget; * forget > \forall$

⁷⁵ Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (To appear) conclude that anti-reconstruction effects arise in restructuring clauses and not in non-restructuring clauses. They argue that the scope property of RIs is that the VP complement of a lexical verb is an induced agreement domain, blocking the object from an AGREE relation in its base position and forcing movement.

b. weil [alle Fenster zu schließen]_{NRI} vergessen wurde since all windows (ACC) to close forgotten was 'since it was forgotten to close all the window' OK forget > \forall

(Bobaljik and Wurmbrand To appear)

As in (148a), when the verb selects a restructuring infinitive, the argument *alle Fenster* must take wide scope over the verb 'forget' and cannot take narrow scope, while in (148b) the NP *alle Fester* can take narrow scope. Wurmbrand claims that it is the selection of an RI or an NRI complement that is optional. Whereas RIs involve truncated clauses, containing no projections higher than a VP, an NRI is at least a ν P (possibly TP or CP). From the structural difference between RIs and NRIs, it follows that in restructuring configurations, the Case of the embedded object is determined by the properties of the matrix predicate as discussed above. As in (148a), for instance, in contexts with passive matrix predicates, the embedded object agrees with the matrix verb and move to the Spec of TP (high scope). In non-restructuring configurations, on the other hand, the embedded object gets Case inside the infinitive and does not agree with the matrix verb. Since the embedded object satisfies all Case/agreement licensing within the infinitive, it does not move to the matrix predicate (low scope).

Recently, Bhatt (2003) and Boeckx (2004) extend Wurmbrand's selection-based account to long distance (object) agreement (LDA) in Hindi and capture the apparent optionality of LDA. The optionality of LDA is illustrated in (149).

(149) a. LDA:

Raam-ne[roTii khaa-nii] chaah-ii(T is a retroflex t)Ram.M.ERGbread.Feat.INF.Fwant.PFV.F.SG'Ram wanted to eat bread.'

b. Non-LDA:

Raam-ne[roTii khaa-naa] chaah-aaRam.M.ERGbread.Feat.INF.Mwant.PFV.M.SG'Ram wanted to eat bread.'(Mahajan 1989:234)

They claim that when LDA takes place, the infinitival complement is a restructuring VP, which lacks a projection that licenses Case (ex. v-layer) and thus the internal argument enters into AGREE relation with the matrix predicate. On the other hand, when no LDA takes place, the infinitival complement contains a phrase larger than VP (at least vP).

Having discussed this much, I propose to adopt Wurmbrand's (2001b) selectional differences to account for Icelandic optional agreement facts: the optionality is ascribed to the different architectures of the infinitival complements.⁷⁶ The relevant examples are repeated here as in (150) and (153).

(150) a. Manninum_i virðist/virðast t_i [hestarnir vera seinir.]
the.man.DAT seem.3SG/3PL [the.horses.NOM be slow]
'The man finds the horses slow.' (Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003:1000)

⁷⁶ Polinsky (2003) examines several cases of apparent long distance agreement crosslinguistically, concluding that restructuring results in structural locality and creates a canonical agreement configuration.

- b. Mér_i mundi/mundu þá t_i virðast þeir vera hérna. me.DAT would.3SG/3PL then seem they.NOM.M.PL be here 'It would then seem to me that they are here.'
- (151) a. Það virðist/virðast einhverjum manni hestarnir vera seinir
 EXPL seem.3SG/3PL some man.DAT the.horses.NOM be slow
 'The horses seems to some man to be slow.'
 - b. Það mundi/mundu einhverjum manni virðast hestarnir
 EXPL would.3SG/3PL some man.DAT seem the.horses.NOM vera seinir
 be slow

'The horses would seem to some man to be slow.'

- (152) a. Stráknum virðist líka þessir bílar
 the.boy.DAT seem.3SG like these cars.NOM
 b. Stráknum virðast líka þessir bílar
 the.boy.DAT seem.3PL like these cars.NOM
 'The boy seems to like these cars.' (Watanabe 1993:414)
- (153) a. Það virðist/virðast einhverjumi ti líka þessir sokkar
 EXPL seem.3SG/3PL someone.DAT to.like these socks.NOM.PL
 'Someone seems to like these socks.'

120

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

b. Það hafði/höfðu einhverjum_i virst t_i líka þessir sokkar
EXPL had.3SG/PL someone.DAT seemed to-like these socks.NOM.PL
'Someone had seemed to like these horses'

As I have argued in section 3.4, the results of default agreement of the finite verbs is not related to the intervention effect. I have shown that the dative experiencer does not intervene between T and the lower NP even in (151) and (153) (viz. V2 phenomenon) and no locality violation occurs. Thus, finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative arguments is observed as it is expected. Nevertheless, as in the examples of (150) - (153), the default agreement is also observed in bi-clausal dative nominative constructions (BDNCs) even though there is no intervention. The default agreement in BDNCs is always the option, different from mono-clausal dative nominative constructions (MDNCs). Thus I have concluded that the optionality of the finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative argument is related to bi-clausal status.

I propose that the optionality comes from whether the infinitival complement contains TP or not.⁷⁷ Thus, when agreement takes place, the infinitival complement does not contain TP. The embedded subject is Case-licensed via AGREE by the matrix predicate. On the other hand, when no agreement takes place, the infinitival complement does have TP projection, whose head licenses nominative Case, and the embedded subject which agrees with the embedded T does not enter into another AGREE relation with the matrix T. One might immediately say that having TP does not ensure that the

⁷⁷ As Wurmbrand (2001b) correlates presence/absence of TP with tense properties, I also assume that there should be independent evidence for complement selection. See section 5.2.2 with respect to this point.

embedded subject does not enter into AGREE relation with a higher predicate because in principle multiple Case marking is possible in the system that I have proposed (see section 2.2.4). I will explain how the proposed theory and Wurmbrand's (2001b) view of selectional differences live together in the remaining sections of this chapter.

3.6.2 Seem-type ECM

In the previous sections of this chapter, I have been proposing that non-finite T licenses nominative Case. In the following sections, adopting Wurmbrand (2001b), I argue that the sizes of the complement clauses vary. With these assumptions, under the proposed theory of AGREE, we can account for the optional agreement facts in Icelandic.

Let us start to see how the proposed systems work to derive the agreement optionality in Icelandic in (150) and (151). I will call these types *seem*-type ECM. First, let me summarize the proposals.

(154) Sequential AGREE:

- a. Primary AGREE must take place if there is an active Goal.
- b. Subsequent AGREE (if any) takes place if there is an unvalued active Goal.
- c. AGREE respects Locality.
- d. Cyclicity is based on highest head-by-head.

(155) Nominative Case is licensed by (non-)finite T.

(156) The sizes of complement clauses vary.

Given the assumption that the sizes of complement clauses vary, I assume that the complement clause of the verb *seem* can be either TP or smaller than TP (ex. vP/VP). In case that we observe the occurrence of agreement between the embedded nominative argument and the matrix finite verb in *seem*-type ECM, the complement clause is smaller than TP and hence the nominative element in the embedded clause must be licensed by the matrix T. For instance, the derivation of (150a) with finite verb agreement is illustrated as in (158), where V₁ is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and VP₂ is the complement clause [vP2 hestarnir vera seinir].

(157) Finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative argument in (150a)

Manninum _i	virðast	t _i [hestarnir	vera	seinir]
the.man.DAT	seem.3PL	[the.horses.NOM	be	slow]

(158)	a.		[VP2	NP ₂	$V_2]^{78}$
	b.	[vp NP1.dat v [vp1	V1 [vp2	NP ₂	V ₂]]]
	c.	$T[_{\nu P} NP_{1.dat} v [_{VP1}$	V1 [vp2	NP ₂	V ₂]]]
	d.	$T[vP NP_{1.dat} v [vP_1]$ $AGREE (T, NP_1)$	V ₁ [vp2	NP ₂	V ₂]]]

⁷⁸ Note that the lower clause can also be vP and can assign accusative but importantly it must lack the projection that license nominative (TP).

e.
$$[TP \ NP_{1.dat} T [vP \ t_{NP1.dat} v [vP_1 \ V_1 \ [vP_2 \ NP_2 \ V_2 \ ...]]]]$$
f.
$$[TP \ NP_{1.dat} T [vP \ t_{NP1.dat} v \ [vP_1 \ V_1 \ [vP_2 \ NP_{2.nom} \ V_2 \ ...]]]]$$

g. [CP NP_{1.dat} C[TP t_{NP1.dat} T[
$$_{\nu P}$$
 t_{NP1.dat} ν [$_{\nu P1}$ V₁ [$_{\nu P2}$ NP_{2.nom} V₂ ...]]]]]]
MOVE (C, NP₁)

Following Chomsky (2000), I assume that quirky Case is (θ -related) inherent Case with an additional structural Case feature and thus different from dative arguments in other languages such as a dative argument in German (see section 2.2.2 for this point), AGREE takes place and the quirky argument moves to the Spec of TP (via MOVE). However, the quirky elements are assumed to be defective in a sense that they do not trigger morphological agreement with T. In (158d), T AGREEs with NP_{1.dat} and MOVE (T, NP_{1.dat}) takes place as in (158e). Since there is no TP in the embedded clause, NP₂ needs to be licensed by the matrix T (not by the matrix *v* since it is not a Case assigner) and otherwise it violates Case Filter. Via Sequential AGREE, NP₂ can enter into AGREE relation with T, given that NP₂ has not been valued (i.e., its Case). Thus we derive the occurrence of agreement of (150).

Now let us consider non-agreement case in (150). The derivation of nonagreement case of (150) is illustrated in (160), where V_1 is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and the lower TP is the complement clause [TP hestarnir vera seinir].

(159) Default agreement in (150a)

Manninum _i	virðist	ti	[hestarnir	vera	seinir]
the.man.DAT	seem.3sG		[the.horses.NOM	be	slow]

(160) a.

$$[VP2 NP_2 V_2 ...]$$
b.

$$T[VP2 NP_2 V_2 ...]$$
c.

$$T[VP2 NP_2 V_2 ...]$$
c.

$$T[VP2 NP_2 V_2 ...]$$
AGREE (T, NP_2)
d.

$$[TP NP_{2.nom} T[VP2 t_{NP_2.nom} V_2 ...]]$$
e.

$$[vP NP_{1.dat} v [vP1 V_1 [TP NP_{2.nom} T[vP2 t_{NP_2.nom} V_2 ...]]]$$
f.

$$T[vP NP_{1.dat} v [vP1 V_1 [TP NP_{2.nom} T[vP2 t_{NP_2.nom} V_2 ...]]]$$
g.

$$T[vP NP_{1.dat} v [vP1 V_1 [TP NP_{2.nom} T[vP2 t_{NP_2.nom} V_2 ...]]]$$
h.

$$[TP NP_{1.dat} T[vP t_{NP_1.dat} v [vP1 V_1 [TP NP_{2.nom} T[vP2 t_{NP_2.nom} V_2 ...]]]$$

Different from what we have seen in (158), the embedded clause contains TP in (160). Given the assumption that non-finite T licenses nominative Case via AGREE, NP₂ is Case-licensed in the embedded clause. As in (160g), the matrix T AGREEs with NP₁ and then NP₁ MOVEs to the Spec of TP. However, NP₁ is the only argument that can AGREE with T because NP₂ has already been valued and therefore the subsequent AGREE does not take place (cf. (154b)). Therefore, T does not show agreement with NP₂

MOVE (T, NP₁)

because there is no AGREE relation between T and NP₂ in this case, resulting in default agreement.

Remember that we have observed that there is no correlation between movement of the embedded subject and agreement in the seem-type ECM in section 3.5. The relevant examples are repeated here as in (161) and (162).

- (161) a. Okkur virtust ekki [hestarnir vera seinir] seemed.3PL not the.horses.NOM be slow us.DAT b. Okkur virtust hestarnir_i ekki [t_i vera seinir] seemed.3PL the.horses.NOM not slow us.DAT be 'It did not seem to us that the horses are slow.'
- (162) a. ? Okkur virtist ekki [hestarnir vera seinir] seemed.3sg not the.horses.NOM be slow us.DAT b. ? Okkur virtist hestarnir_i ekki [t_i vera seinir] us.DAT seemed.3sg the.horses.NOM not be slow 'It did not seem to us that the horses are slow.'

Under the proposed approach, this is expected, namely Object Shift does not affect agreement at all. We allow the embedded nominative subject to undergo Object Shift even when nominative Case is licensed by the non-finite T (i.e., default agreement) because as long as it has not been Spelled-Out/Transferred, it is still active and it will not be frozen in place. Hence nothing prevents it from moving into the matrix clause.

Remember also that when the object is a pronoun, object shift is obligatory and that the same rule applies to the embedded subject here. As we have seen in section 3.5, the pronominal embedded subject must overtly move to the matrix clause as repeated here in (163). However, a shifted embedded subject does not have to AGREE with the finite T as shown in (164b).

(163)	a.	*	Okkur	virtust		ekki	[þeir	lesa	bókina]
			us.DAT	seemed.3PL		not		they.NOM	read	the.book	C
	b.		Okkur	virtust	þeir _i	ekki	Ľ	t _i	lesa	bókina]
			us.DAT	seemed.3PL	they.NOM	not			read	the.book	Σ
			'It did no	ot seem to us	that they re	ad the	b	ook.'			

(164)	a.	*	Okkur	virtist		ekki	[þeir	lesa	bókina]
			us.DAT	seemed.3sG		not	they.NOM	read	the.book	
	b.		Okkur	virtist	þeir _i	ekki	[t _i	lesa	bókina]
			us.DAT	seemed.38G	they.NOM	not		read	the.book	
			'It did no	ot seem to us	that they re	ad the	book.'			

Under the proposed approach, when the complement clause does not contain T, we observe agreement and when the complement clause contains T, no agreement is involved. Thus, we expect no correlation between movement and agreement and capture the facts correctly.
Now let us consider the well-known intervention example. The proposed theory of Sequential AGREE correctly derives the ungrammaticality in agreement in (165). As I have argued, the complement of the verb *seem* may contain T. If this is the case, then default agreement is expected given that there is no chance for the nominative object to enter AGREE relation with the matrix T (no subsequent AGREE if the Goals have been valued via prior AGREE).

- (165) a. Okkur virtist/*virtust henni hafa líkað þeir
 us.DAT seemed.3sG/3PL her.DAT have liked they.NOM
 'She seemed to us to have liked them'
 - b. Mér hefur/*hafa alltaf virst honum líka bækur
 me.DAT has.3SG/3PL often seemed him.DAT to.like books.NOM.PL
 'It has seemed to me that he likes books' (Schütze 1997:108)
 - c. Mér virðist/?*virðast Jóni vera taldir líka me.DAT seems.3SG/3PL John.DAT to.be believed.NOM.M.PL to.like hestarnir

horses.NOM.M.PL

'It seems to me that John is believed to like horses.' (Schütze 1997:109)

The derivation of (165a) is illustrated in (167), where the higher V is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and the lower TP is the complement clause [TP *henni hafa líkað þeir*].

(166) Default agreement in (165a)

	Okkur	virtist	[henni	hafa	líkað	þeir]	
	us.DAT	seemed.3sG	her.DAT	have	liked	they.NON	М	
(167)	a.					[vP	NP _{2.dat} v [VP V	NP ₃]]
	b.					Τ[νΡ	NP _{2.dat} v [VP V	NP ₃]]
	c.					Τ [_{νP}	NP _{2.dat} v [VP V	NP ₃]]
						AGR	$\overline{\text{EE}}$ (T, NP ₂)	
	d.				TP NP	2.dat T [vP	t _{NP2.dat} v [vP V	NP3]]]
					,	MOV	VE (T, NP_2)	
	e.				[_{TP} NP	2.dat T [vP	$t_{NP2.dat} v [_{VP} V$	NP3]]]
						AGR	EE (T, NP ₃)	
	f.	[vF	NP _{1.dat} v	[vp V	[TP NP	2.dat T [vP	t _{NP2.dat} v [vP V	NP3]]]]
	g.	T [vF	NP _{1.dat} v	[vp V	'{ _{TP} NP	2.dat T [vP	t _{NP2.dat} v [vp V	NP3]]]]
	h.	Τ[νΡ	NP _{1.dat} v	[_{VP} V	'[_{TP} NP	2.dat T [vP	t _{NP2.dat} v [vP V	NP3]]]]]
		L AGI	XEE (T, N	P1)				
	i. [:	TP NP1.dat T [vP	t _{NP1.dat} v	[vp V	'[_{TP} NP	2.dat T[vP	t _{NP2.dat} v [_{VP} V	NP ₃]]]]]
		MO	VE (T, NF	P 1)				

j. $[_{TP} \mathbf{NP}_{1.dat} T[_{vP} t_{NP1.dat} v [_{VP} V[_{TP} \mathbf{NP}_{2.dat} T[_{vP} t_{NP2.dat} v [_{VP} V \mathbf{NP}_{3}]]]]]$

In (167), since there is an embedded T, the Case of NP₃ is licensed by the embedded T (nominative). Due to Sequential AGREE, neither NP₂ nor NP₃ enters into AGREE relation with the matrix T because they have already been valued via prior AGREE with

the embedded T. Hence, agreement between T and the embedded nominative object is not established.

However, as we have seen, we have another option, namely, the case that the complement clause does not contain the projection T. Locality explains that the agreement case is not possible in (165). Remember that subsequent AGREE is possible only when the prior AGREEd element is displaced under the proposed mechanism of Sequential AGREE, given the observation that dative NP and nominative NP cannot stay in their base-generated positions and the dative NP must be displaced in the double object passive expletive constructions. The example is repeated here in (168).

- (168) a. Það höfðu einhverjum stúdent verið gefnar tölvurnar
 EXPL had.3PL some student.DAT been given the.computers.NOM
 'Some student had been given the computers.'
 - b. * Það höfðu/hafði verið gefnar einhverjum stúdent tölvurnar
 EXPL had.3PL/3SG been given some student.DAT the.computers.NOM
 'Some student had been given the computers.'

Under the proposed theory, we will have the same situation in the example (165) when the complement of the verb *seem* does not contain the projection T. Let us consider the derivation of (165a) where the complement clause lacks TP.

(169) Finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative argument in (165a)

* Okkur	virtust	brancered	henni	hafa	líkað	þeir]
us.DAT	seemed.3PL		her.DAT	have	liked	they.NOM	

(170) a.
$$\begin{bmatrix} \nu P & NP_{2.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V & NP_3] \end{bmatrix}$$

b.
$$\begin{bmatrix} \nu P & NP_{1.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V] & P & P_{2.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V & NP_3] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

c.
$$T \begin{bmatrix} \nu P & NP_{1.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V] & P & P_{2.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V & NP_3] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

d.
$$T \begin{bmatrix} \nu P & NP_{1.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V] & P & P_{2.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V & NP_3] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

e.
$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & NP_{1.dat} & T \begin{bmatrix} \nu P & t_{NP1.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V] & P & P_{2.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V & NP_3] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

f.
$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & NP_{1.dat} & T \begin{bmatrix} \nu P & t_{NP1.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V] & P & P_{2.dat} & \nu & [\nu P & V & NP_3] \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

g. * [TP NP_{1.dat} T [$_{\nu P}$ t_{NP1.dat} v [$_{\nu P}$ V[$_{\nu P}$ NP_{2.dat} v [$_{\nu P}$ V NP₃]]]] * AGREE (T, NP₃)

As we have observed in section 3.4.1, NP₂ cannot/must not move to the Spec of TP because NP_{1.dat} occupies the Spec of TP, assuming that Icelandic T does not have multiple specifiers. Therefore, NP₂ intervenes between T and NP₃.⁷⁹ Although NP₃ has not been valued, AGREE (T, NP₃) cannot take place without the displacement of NP₂.

⁷⁹ Remember that I also assume that Object Shift takes place to the edge of a certain projection between TP and ν P. Hence, even when NP₂ undergoes Object Shift, it still intervenes between T and NP₃. See footnote 23 for some discussion regarding position of the shifted object.

Therefore, T does not enter into an AGREE relation with NP₃, and NP₃ will violate Case Filter. Since the derivation involving with non-TP complement clause does not converge, only the derivation with TP complement converges in this type of construction. Hence, we only observe default agreement in (165).

The last optional agreement case in *seem*-type ECM is the case that the Case of the deeply embedded NP in the passive complement clause is nominative. The examples are given in (171).

(171) a. Mér virðast [hafa seldir margir hestar] verið me.DAT seem.3PL [to.have been sold.NOM many horses.NOM.PL]] b. Mér virðist Thafa verið seldir margir hestar me.DAT seem.3sG [to.have been sold.NOM many horses.NOM.PL] 'It seems to me that many horses have been sold.' (Jonas 2004 and p.c.)

In (171), we have two NPs: the matrix dative experiencer NP and the embedded nominative NP. The fact that even the deeply embedded NP can show agreement with the matrix T is accounted for if we assume that there is no T projection (and also no phase) in the embedded clause and the NP *margir hestar* AGREEs with the matrix T via the subsequent AGREE (because the dative NP primary AGREEs with T), resulting in agreement with the nominative NP (cf. (171a)). However, if there is a TP projection in the embedded clause, the embedded T AGREEs with the embedded NP. The matrix T AGREEs with the dative NP but does not AGREE with the embedded NP as a

subsequent AGREE because the embedded NP has already been valued by the embedded T. Therefore, we can also observe the default agreement (cf. (171b)).

As we have seen in this section, the proposal that the complement of the verb *seem* may be TP or non-TP correctly gives us an account for all the paradigms in the *seem*-type ECM.

3.6.3 Seem-type raising

Icelandic *seem* verb does not obligatorily take an experiencer argument and when it does not take an experiencer, the embedded NP subject moves into the matrix subject position. The examples are given in (172) - (174).

- (172) a. Stráknum virðist líka þessir bílar the.boy.DAT seem.3SG like these cars.NOM
 b. Stráknum virðast líka þessir bílar the.boy.DAT seem.3PL like these cars.NOM
 'The boy seems to like these cars.' (Watanabe 1993:414)
- (173) Jóni_i virðast t_i hafa líkað þessir sokkar
 John.DAT seem.3PL to-have liked these socks.NOM.PL
 'John seems to have liked these socks.'

- (174) a. Það virðist/virðast einhverjumi ti líka þessir sokkar
 EXPL seem.3SG/3PL someone.DAT to.like these socks.NOM.PL
 'Someone seems to like these socks.'
 - b. Það hafði/höfðu einhverjum_i virst t_i líka þessir sokkar
 EXPL had.3SG/PL someone.DAT seemed to-like these socks.NOM.PL
 'Someone had seemed to like these horses'

Remember that in the examples of (165), we have observed that the finite verb does not show agreement with the embedded nominative object. However, here in (172) - (174), we observe that such an agreement is possible. Although the embedded nominative object never agrees with the finite verb in (165), we can nicely account for the optional agreement facts in the examples here under the proposed theory without any extra assumptions. Namely, under the proposed theory, we do not have to differentiate *seem* verb of ECM and that of raising. The only difference is whether the matrix v takes a dative experiencer subject in its specifier position or not and the absence of the dative experiencer makes the finite verb agreement with the nominative object possible. Let us first consider the default agreement case. The derivation of (172a) is illustrated in (176), where the higher V is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and the lower TP is the complement clause [TP (*stráknum*) *lika þessir bilar*].

(175) Default agreement in (172a)

Stráknum_i virðist [t_i líka þessir bílar] the.boy.DAT seem.3sG like these cars.NOM

(176)	а.					[vP	NP _{1.dat}	v [_{VP} V	NP ₂]]
	b.					Τ [_{νΡ}	NP _{1.dat}	v [_{VP} V	NP ₂]]
	C.					Τ [_{νP} AGR	NP _{1.dat} EE (T,	ν [_{VP} V NP ₁)	NP ₂]]
	d.			TP[NP _{1.dat}	Τ [_{νΡ}	t _{NP1.dat}	v [vp V	NP ₂]]]
						MOV	/E (T, 1	NP_1)		
	e.			TP[NP _{1.dat}	Τ [_{νP}	t _{NP1.dat}	v [vp V	NP _{2.no}	m]]]
						AGR	EE (T,	NP ₂)		
	f.		$[_{VP} V]$	TP	NP _{1.dat}	Τ [_{νΡ}	t _{NP1.dat}	v [_{VP} V	NP _{2.not}	m]]]]
	g.		T [_{VP} V[ТР	NP _{1.dat}	Τ [_{νΡ}	t _{NP1.dat}	v [_{VP} V	NP _{2.no}	m]]]]
	h.		T [vp V] AGREE	_тр С (Т	$\mathbf{NP}_{1.dat}$	Τ [νΡ	t _{NP1.dat}	v [_{VP} V	NP _{2.no}	m]]]]
	i.	TP NP1.dat	T [_{VP} V[TP	t _{NP1.dat}	Τ [_{νΡ}	t _{NP1.dat}	ν [_{VP} V	NP ₂]]]]]
			MOVE	(T,	NP_1)					
	j.	[TP NP1.dat	T [_{VP} V[♠	TP	t _{NP1.dat}	Τ [νΡ	t _{NP1.dat}	v [_{VP} V	NP₂]]]]]
			*AGRE	Е (T, NP ₂)					

Remember that the operation of Sequential AGREE allows a Goal element to enter into AGREE relations with multiple Probes, namely multiple Case checking. Contrary to the subsequent AGREE, the primary AGREE does not care if the Goal has been valued or not because the Probe has not entered into AGREE relation and simply looks for the closest active Goal (cf. (154a)). In (176h), the matrix T looks for a Goal and since NP₁ is

the closest Goal to AGREE, the matrix T AGREEs with NP₁ (though NP₁ has already been valued). Yet, the subsequent AGREE does not take place with the Goal which has been already valued via prior AGREE (cf. (154b)). NP₂ has been valued by the embedded T, and for the matrix T, agreement with NP₂ is a subsequent AGREE because the matrix T enters into primary AGREE relation with NP₁. Therefore, the matrix T only AGREEs with the dative NP₁ but not with NP₂, resulting in default agreement.

Now, let us consider how we can account for the agreement facts in (172) - (174)under the proposed mechanism. In case of agreement, we assume the complement of the verb *seem* lacks TP projection. Therefore, both arguments in the embedded clause must AGREE with the matrix Probe, otherwise a Case Filter violation occurs. The derivation of (172b) is illustrated in (178), where the higher V is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and the lower vP is the complement clause [_{vP} (*stráknum*) líka þessir bílar].

(177) Finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative object in (172b)
 Stráknum_i virðast [t_i líka þessir bílar]

the.boy.dat seem.3PL like these cars.NOM

(178)	а.	$[\nu P NP_{1.dat}]$	v [_{VP} V	NP ₂]]
	b.	[VP V[vp NP1.dat	v [_{VP} V	NP ₂	
	c.	$T[_{VP} V[_{\nu P} NP_{1.dat}]$	v [_{VP} V	NP ₂]]]]
	d.	$\begin{array}{c} T \begin{bmatrix} VP & V \end{bmatrix} P & NP_{1.dat} \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \\ AGREE (T, NP_{1}) \end{array}$	v [_{VP} V	NP ₂]]]]

e.
$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & \mathbf{NP}_{1.dat} & T \begin{bmatrix} vP & V \end{bmatrix} & v \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} vP & V & NP_2 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$MOVE (T, NP_1)$$
f.
$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & \mathbf{NP}_{1.dat} & T \begin{bmatrix} vP & V \end{bmatrix} & v \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} vP & V & NP_{2.nom} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$AGREE (T, NP_2)$$

In (178d), NP₁ AGREEs with the matrix T and moves to the Spec of TP (cf. (178e)). The subsequent AGREE takes place with NP₂ since NP₂ has not been valued. Thus, the matrix T AGREEs with NP₂ and shows agreement with it, as we expect.

As we have seen in this section, the proposal that the complement of the verb *seem* may be TP or non-TP correctly gives us an account for all the paradigms in the *seem*-type raising. Thus, the proposed mechanism captures all the optional agreement facts in Icelandic. Most importantly, only this proposed theory clearly differentiates mono-clausal dative nominative constructions (MDNCs) and bi-clausal dative nominative constructions (MDNCs) and bi-clausal dative nominative constructions (BDNCs) with respect to the optionality of agreement. Under the proposed Sequential AGREE, the finite verb agreement with a nominative argument is always obligatory in MDNCs (otherwise Case Filter violation) and the finite verb agreement with an embedded nominative argument is always optional in BDNCs due to the selectional differences of complement clauses.

3.6.4 Believe-type ECM

In this section, I discuss and analyze the facts in Icelandic that the embedded subject is never realized as nominative but accusative in *believe*-type ECM and that the embedded nominative object is possible in *believe*-type ECM. Sequential AGREE gives an account for the long-standing issues of the nominative object in Icelandic ECM. Given that the non-finite T can enter into AGREE relation, I claim that multiple Case checking/multiple agreement takes place in the *believe*-type ECM contexts. To answer how the proposed theory rules out nominative Case-marked embedded subject in the *believe*-type ECM is the first task in this section. As we have discussed in chapter 2, multiple Case checking/multiple agreement is possible under the proposed theory. Obligatory accusative marking of the embedded subject derives from the mechanism of Sequential AGREE. As we have discussed in section 3.5, we do not observe nominative embedded subject in the ECM context. The examples are repeated here in (179).

(179)	a.		Við	töldum	hana	elska	Harald.
			we.NOM	believed.1PL	her.ACC	to.love	Harold.ACC
			'We beli	eved her to lov	ve Harold.	(Taraldsen 1995:323)	
	b.	*	Við	/ið töldum hún elska		Harald.	
			we.NOM	believed.1PL	her.NOM	to.love	Harold.ACC
			'We beli	eved her to lov	e Harold.	,	(Taraldsen 1995:324)

The derivation of (179a) is illustrated in (180), where the higher V is corresponding to the verb 'believe' and the lower V is 'love'.

(180) a.

 $\begin{bmatrix} v^*P NP_2 & v^* & [vP V NP_3] \end{bmatrix}$ $AGREE (v^*, NP_3)$

138

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

b.
$$T [_{\nu^*P} NP_2 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]$$
c.
$$T [_{\nu^*P} NP_2 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]$$

$$AGREE (T, NP_2)$$
d.
$$T P NP_2 \ T [_{\nu^*P} NP_2 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]$$
e.
$$[_{\nu^*P} NP_1 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V \ [_{TP} NP_2 \ T \ [_{\nu^*P} t_{NP_2} \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]]$$
f.
$$[_{\nu^*P} NP_1 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V \ [_{TP} NP_2 \ T \ [_{\nu^*P} t_{NP_2} \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]]$$
f.
$$[_{\nu^*P} NP_1 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V \ [_{TP} NP_2 \ T \ [_{\nu^*P} t_{NP_2} \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]]$$
h.
$$T [_{\nu^*P} NP_1 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V \ [_{TP} NP_2 \ T \ [_{\nu^*P} t_{NP_2} \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]]$$
h.
$$T [_{\nu^*P} NP_1 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V \ [_{TP} NP_2 \ T \ [_{\nu^*P} t_{NP_2} \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]]$$
i.
$$T [_{\nu^*P} NP_1 \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V \ [_{TP} NP_2 \ T \ [_{\nu^*P} t_{NP_2} \ \nu^* \ [_{VP} V NP_3 \]]]]]$$

I claim that the verb *believe* takes TP as its complement clause.⁸⁰ At the point where the matrix v^* merges, NP₂ has been valued by the embedded T. However, NP₂ enters into AGREE relation with v^* because NP₂ is the closest NP to v^* and the primary AGREE by v^* takes place with active Goal. It does not matter whether the Goal has been valued or not. Thus, NP₂ is licensed accusative by v^* and never appears as nominative.⁸¹

⁸⁰ We will have the same result even when the complement clause of the verb *believe* does not contain TP. I will come back to why I suppose that the verb *believe* takes TP as its complement clause shortly.

⁸¹ Although I assume that in Icelandic inherent Case always wins over structural Case (ex. quirky elements), I assume that when the competition is between structural Cases, the secondary licensed Case always realizes. However, Željko Bošković (p.c.) points out that

Now, let us consider the case where we observe a nominative object in the complement clause of the *believe* verb (see Andrews 1990a, Sigurðsson 1993, 2000, Maling and Sprouse 1995, Taraldsen 1995, Schütze 1997 for the discussion on nominative objects in *believe*-type ECM). The examples are given in (181).

the obligatoriness of inherent Case realization and that of the secondary licensed Case realization between two structural Cases in Icelandic should not be universal. Bošković (2004b) discusses a difference between Serbo-Croatian (SC) and Russian with respect to their morphological Case realizations. He suggests that when two Cases are assigned to the same NP and for morphological reasons only one can be overtly realized, their morphological realization differs from language to language. For instance, inherent Case must be preserved under passivization in SC (as in Icelandic), but not in Russian as shown in (i) (The verb in (i) assigns instrumental case.).

(i)	a.	Fabrika/*fabrikoj	upravljaet-sja na	ašimi	druz'jam	i (Rus	sian)
		factory.NOM/INSTR	manages.REFL of	ur.INSTR	friends.IN	NSTR	
	b.	Fabrikom/*fabrika	se upravlja o	d strane	naših	drugova	(SC)
		factory.INSTR/NOM	REFL manages by	у	our.GEN	friends.GEN	
		'The factory is man	aged by our frien	ds.'		(Bošković 2	2004b)

Moreover, Bošković also argues that the contrast between (iia) and (iiib) can be accounted for on a par with (i): *these* receives two Cases, genitive and nominative (*these* is generated following *five*, which assigns genitive in SC/Russian, and then moves to a position in front of it, where it becomes accessible for nominative Case assignment by T). As in the case of (i), in SC the first case (genitive) is morphologically realized and in Russian the second Case (nominative).

(ii)	a.	Èti	pjat'	devušek	rabotali/*rabotalo	tam	(Russian)
		these.NOM	five	girls.GEN	worked.PL/SG	there	
	b.	Ovih/*ove	pet	djevojaka	radi	tu	(SC)
		these.GEN/NOM	five	girls.GEN	works	here	
						(Bošk	ović 2004b)

Thus, in this sense, Icelandic is not straightforward when the same NP receives two Cases. I assume that in Icelandic, when two structural Cases are assigned to the same NP, the second Case wins, while when inherent Case and structural Case are assigned to the same NP, inherent Case wins.

- (181) a. Ég taldi [henni leiðast Haraldur/*Harald]
 I.NOM believed.1sG her.DAT to.bore Harold.NOM/*ACC
 'I believed her be bored by Harold.' (Maling and Sprouse 1995:177-178)
 - b. Þeir telja barninu hafa batnað veikin
 they believe the.child.DAT have recovered.from the.disease.NOM
 'They believe the child to have recovered from the disease.'
 - c. Þeir telja honum hafa verið gefnir peningarnir
 they believe him.DAT have been given.NOM.M.PL the.money.NOM.M.PL
 'They believe him to have been given the money.' (Andrews 1990a:211)

It was very puzzling why the object in the embedded clause is marked nominative under the approach that only finite T licenses nominative Case. Frampton and Gutmann (2000) argue that Icelandic has some mechanism of "default nominative Case assignment", while Chomsky (2004) assumes that the embedded object in examples like (181) has inherent Case. To the best of my knowledge, such an exception has been proposed only because under their analyses, finite T is the only nominative Case licenser but since accusative Case licenser v^* is intervening between the finite T and the embedded nominative object, there is no potential Case licenser for the nominative object. Under the approach that non-finite T can license nominative Case, however, it is no longer a significant issue. Remember that under Sequential AGREE, T licenses nominative to the object, following the displacement of the dative subject (cf. (182)) and that v^* of the verb *believe* licenses accusative to the subject in the embedded clause (ECM) as in (179).



One might think that since the matrix v^* is the accusative Case licenser in (181) the object in the embedded clause should be marked accusative following the displacement of the dative subject to the Spec of v^*P in the same way as in (182). This does not happen under the theory of Sequential AGREE. Let us see how exactly the proposed theory works to account for the nominative object in the ECM. The derivation of (181a) is illustrated in (183), where the higher V corresponds to the verb 'believe' and the lower V is 'bored'.

(181) a. Ég taldi [henni leiðast Haraldur/*Harald] I.NOM believed.1sg her.DAT to.bore Harold.NOM/*ACC

(183) a. $\begin{bmatrix} vP & NP_2 & v & [vP & V & NP_3 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$ b. $T\begin{bmatrix} vP & NP_2 & v & [vP & V & NP_3 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$ c. $T\begin{bmatrix} vP & NP_2 & v & [vP & V & NP_3 \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$

d.

$$[TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]$$

$$MOVE (T, NP_2)$$
e.

$$[TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]$$
f.

$$[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]$$
g.

$$[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]$$
h.

$$T[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]$$
h.

$$T[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]$$
i.

$$T[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]$$
i.

$$T[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]$$
j.

$$T[vP NP_1 v* [vP V [TP NP_2 T[vP tNP_2 v [vP V NP_3]]]]]$$

The theory of Sequential AGREE gives us a simple answer here. In (183e), NP₃ AGREEs with the embedded T, by virtue of MOVE (T, NP₂). In (183g), the matrix v^* AGREEs with NP₂. Since the subsequent AGREE does not take place with a valued Goal, v^* does not AGREE with NP₃. Notice that unavailability of AGREE (v^* , NP₃) does not depend on the movement of the NP₂ to the Spec of v^*P because even when NP₂ is displaced, the subsequent AGREE does not take place with NP₃ any way.⁸²

⁸² One question arises why the verb *believe* does not take non-TP (such as vP) as its complement clause like *seem* verb does. It seems that for some speakers, the verb *believe* in fact takes non-TP. Sigurðsson (1993:54) points out that there are some speakers who tend to replace the nominative with accusative, as in (i), while others accept (ii).

⁽i) Ég taldi [henni hafa verið gefna bílana] I believed her.DAT have been given.ACC.M.PL the.cars.ACC.M.PL

The theory of Sequential AGREE correctly captures the fact that the Case of the deeply embedded NP in the passive complement clause is accusative in the *believe*-type ECM as shown in (184).

(184)Égtel[hafaveriðseldamargahesta.]I.NOMbelieveto.havebeensold.ACC.M.PLmany.ACC.M.PLhorses.ACC]'I believe that many horses have been sold.'(Jonas 2004)

Remember that we observe that the Case of the deeply embedded NP in the passive complement clause is nominative in the *seem*-type ECM, repeated here in (185).

(185) Mér virðist [hafa verið seldir margir hestar]
me.DAT seem.3SG [to.have been sold.NOM many horses.NOM.PL]
'It seems to me that many horses have been sold.' (Jonas 2004 and p.c.)

(ii) Ég taldi [henni hafa verið gefnir bílarnir] I believed her.DAT have been given.NOM.M.PL the.cars.NOM.M.PL

This dialectal variation can be accounted for by the parametric view that some speakers in fact take non-TP as a complement clause of *believe*. If that is the case, since the embedded object does not have AGREE relation in the embedded clause, it is eligible to enter into AGREE relation with v^* as a subsequent AGREE. However, a question why we do not observe optionality is not clear and requires more data collections. Here I simply assume this is merely due to a selection of the verb *believe* in Icelandic. Namely, for some speakers, *believe* selects only TP complement, while for others *believe* selects only smaller projection than TP.

Different from (185), the example in (184) contains v^* that values accusative. Here since there is only one argument in the embedded clause, the embedded NP AGREEs with v^* even though it has already AGREEs with the embedded T. Therefore, we observe accusative marked NP in the embedded clause.

3.7 Conclusion

In chapter 3, I showed that non-finite T licenses nominative Case. Some pieces of evidence were from the person restrictions in dative-nominative constructions, Casemarked PRO, and the intervention effect in Icelandic. Then I proposed that optionality of finite agreement with embedded nominative arguments in the bi-clausal dativenominative constructions (BDNCs) is a result of the selectional differences of the complement clauses of the verb 'seem'. Having these proposals, the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE uniformly accounted for all the paradigms in Icelandic that I discussed in this chapter. The proposals are repeated here as in (186) and (187).

(186) Sequential AGREE:

- a. Primary AGREE must take place if there is an active Goal.
- b. Subsequent AGREE (if any) takes place if there is an unvalued active Goal.
- c. AGREE respects Locality.
- d. Cyclicity is based on highest head-by-head.

- (187) a. Nominative Case is licensed by (non-)finite T.
 - b. The sizes of complement clauses vary.

Appendix I: Wh-movement in Icelandic

Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir (2003) observe that a wh-moved (or relativized or topicalized) experiencer of 'seem' blocks agreement in bi-clausal dative-nominative constructions. Compare the examples in (188) which have wh-moved experiencers with the examples in (189) which have non-wh-experiencers.

- (188) a. **Hverjum** mundi hafa virst hestarnir vera seinir? who.DAT would.3sG have seemed horses.the.NOM be slow
 - b. ?? Hverjum mundu hafa virst hestarnir vera seinir?
 who.DAT would.3PL have seemed horses.the.NOM be slow
 'To whom would it have seemed that the horses are slow?'

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

vera hérna. (189) a. Mér mundi virðast þeir þá would.3sG then seem they.NOM.M.PL be here me.DAT b. Mér vera hérna. mundu bá virðast beir me.DAT would.3PL then seem they.NOM.M.PL be here 'It would then seem to me that they are here.'

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

In this appendix, I will address this surprising but interesting puzzle in wh-movement in Icelandic and give a possible account for it. As Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir (2003) argue, the solution to this problem here is also to claim that the wh-NP moves directly to the Spec of CP without moving into the Spec of TP in Icelandic. One supporting argument comes from a relation between Floating Quantifier and Object Shift in Icelandic.

It has been well known in the literature that Floating Quantifier (FQ) is licensed by A-movement (cf. (190)), while it is not by A'-movement (cf. (191)).⁸³

(190) a. The lions_i might **all** have been seen t_i (by the tourists).

b. The lions_i might **all** seem (to you) $[t_i$ to have large teeth].

(Bobaljik 2003)

(191) a. * Which professors will Taylor have **all** met before the end of term?

b. * [NP the professors who Taylor will have **all** met before the end of term]

(Bobaljik 2003)

In Icelandic, the A/A' distinction is observed with respect to Floating Quantifier licensing. As illustrated in (192), Floating Quantifier is observed in passive, while it is not in relativization.

⁸³ The A/A' distinction is robust in many languages. The only exception that I know of is the Irish dialect of English, as reported by McCloskey (2000).

- (192) a. Strákanna var allra getið í ræðunni
 boys.the were all mentioned in speech.the
 'The boys were all mentioned in the speech.' (Sigurðsson 1991:331)
 - b. * [NP bækurnar sem Jón keypti ekki allar]
 books.the which Jon bought not all
 (the books, which Jon didn't buy all of)

(Déprez 1989:202)

Icelandic Object Shift licenses FQ as in (193).

(193) Ég las bækunar alltaf/ekki allar

I read books.the always/not all

(Déprez 1989:202)

Given that Object Shift can license FQ as in (193), let us assume that Object Shift is Amovement.^{84, 85} Notice, however, that this brings an immediate question with respect to the example in (192b). If Object Shift can feed FQ, FQ should be possible in the example in (192b) given that this is an Object Shift context. That is, the argument should be able to be Object Shifted and license FQ from the Object Shift position. Then it can undergo A'-movement. The possible answer for this is to assume that Icelandic A'-movement

⁸⁴ See Thráinsson (2001) and the references there in for discussion on the properties of Object Shift.

⁸⁵ See also Bošković (2004a), who argues that the Object Shift position is A'-position above an A-position (such as the Spec of AgroP). Note that I also assume that Object Shift may be involved with extra movement from the Spec of vP to the Spec of some functional projection between TP and vP (footnote 23).

(such as wh-movement, relativization) takes place without prior A-movement.⁸⁶ If this is the case, the reason why the example in (192b) is ungrammatical is straightforward; FQ is not licensed in (192b). Since the object is wh-element, Object Shift (A-movement) does not take place in (192b).

Now, coming back to the examples in (188), we have a solution to offer. Since the movement involved is wh-movement, the same line of reasoning should hold. That is, when the argument is a wh-element, it does not undergo A-movement. Remember that in section 3.6.2, I argue that the optionality of agreement in the examples like (189) is due to the selectional difference of the complement clause. What we have seen is that we observe agreement when the complement clause does not contain T, and we observe no agreement when the complement clause contains T.

Under the theory that I have developed, the obligatory default agreement can be accounted for with the assumption that I just have made here. Let us consider how agreement is blocked. As we have discussed in 3.6.2, when we observe agreement, the complement clause does not contain T. The derivation of (188) with finite verb agreement (which is not acceptable) is illustrated as in (195), where V₁ is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and VP₂ is the complement clause [$_{VP2}$ hestarnir vera seinir].

(194) Finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative argument in (188)

?? **Hverjum** mundu hafa virst <u>hestarnir</u> vera seinir? who.DAT would.3PL have seemed horses.the.NOM be slow

⁸⁶ I must assume that not all A'-movement skips A-positions. The movement of the subject NP for the V2 requirement for instance should not be the case.



As I have proposed, the wh-element does not move to the A-position, the Spec of TP. Thus, AGREE (T, NP₁) does not take place because the Primary AGREEd Goal (WH_{dat}) has not been displaced. Once C merges with TP, T is no longer able to AGREE with NP₁ even though WH_{dat} is displace to the Spec of CP because this is a violation of Cyclicity (see section 2.2.1). Therefore, NP₁ violates Case Filter and the derivation does not converge.

Now let us consider non-agreement case in (188). The derivation of nonagreement case of (188) is illustrated in (197), where V_1 is corresponding to the verb 'seem' and the lower TP is the complement clause [TP hestarnir vera seinir].

(196) Default agreement in (188)

	Hverjum	<u>mundi</u>	hafa	virst	hestarr	<u>nir</u>	vera	seinir?	
	who.DAT	would.3sg	have	seemed	horses	.the.NOM	be	slow	
(197)	a.							[VP2	NP ₁ V ₂
	b.							T [_{VP2}	NP ₁ V ₂
	с.							T [vp2	NP _{1.nom} V ₂
							A	GREE (Γ , NP ₁)
	d.					[TP]	VP _{1.nor}	n T[_{VP2}	t _{NP1.nom} V ₂
							N	10VE (T	, NP ₁)
	e.		[vI	WH _{dat}	v [vp1		NP _{1.nor}	m T[_{VP2}	$t_{\rm NP1.nom} V_2$
	f.		Τ[νΙ	WH _{dat}	v [vp1		NP _{1.nor}	n T[_{VP2}	$t_{\rm NP1.nom} V_2$
	g.		Τ [_{νΙ} ♠	→ WH _{dat}	τ ν [_{VP1}		P _{1.nor}	n T[_{VP2}	$t_{NP1.nom}V_2$
			AG	REE (T,	WH _{dat})	٠			
	h. [CP	WH _{dat} C[_T	_Р Т [_v	WH _{dat}	v [_{VP1}	V1 [TP]	P _{1.nor}	n T[_{VP2}	$t_{\rm NP1.nom}V_2$

MOVE (C, WH_{dat})

Different from what we have seen in (195), the embedded clause contains TP in (197). Given the assumption that non-finite T licenses nominative Case via AGREE, NP₁ is Case-licensed in the embedded clause. As in (197g), the matrix T AGREEs with WH_{dat} . By assumption, wh-element does not move into the Spec of TP and thus WH_{dat} directly MOVEs to the Spec of CP. Since there is no chance for NP₁ to AGREE with the matrix T

(ex. Locality, subsequent AGREE), T does not show agreement with NP₁ because there is no AGREE relation between T and NP₁, resulting in default agreement.

As we have seen in this appendix, if we assume that wh-element in Icelandic does not move to A-position prior to wh-movement, we can correctly capture the obligatory default agreement in dative-nominative constructions when wh-moved experiencer is involved.

Appendix II: Varieties of Raising

We have observed cases where nominative Case marked NPs appear in non-finite clauses in Icelandic. Pursuing the theory that the source of nominative NPs in nonfinite clauses is non-finite T (when there is no agreement) leads us to conclude that multiple Case/agreement checking occurs when there is upstairs agreement. This idea maintains Chomsky's (2000) proposal that structural Case (nominative/accusative) is associated to ϕ -features (Case and agreement are two sides of the same coin).⁸⁷ Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002), however, argue against treating Case and licensing as the same operation. They claim that if Case and agreement are two sides of the same coin, it is predicted that whenever Case on the lower clause has not been checked, agreement will be impossible. They argue that the prediction is not borne out in Greek. Based on Greek raising out of subjunctive clausal complements, where nominative Case is not checked, yet full agreement is present, they propose that Case is not necessarily linked to

⁸⁷ This idea is originally proposed by George and Kornfilt (1981).

agreement. Their underlying assumption is that Case can be licensed only once. Under the theory that I have proposed, this is no longer the case. Instead, I take the facts in Greek as another piece of evidence that AGREE takes place with non-finite T. The question that I must answer is why in Greek a nominative NP cannot appear in the nonfinite clause.

In this appendix, I will discuss the cross-linguistic variation that Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002) illustrate with respect to raising. I claim that nominative Case is licensed by the non-finite T in Greek as well but the NP still undergoes movement into the matrix clause and enters into another AGREE relation with the finite T. Therefore, I propose that the facts in Greek can be accounted for if we assume that Greek shows obligatory EPP and that the impossibility of such movement in Portuguese is due to the lack of EPP.

Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2002) argue that Case is not necessarily linked to agreement, based on Greek raising out of subjunctive clausal complements, where nominative Case is not checked, yet full agreement is present. The examples are given in (198).

(198)	a.		Ta pedhia	arxisan	na	trexoun
			the children.N	started.3PL	SUBJ	run.3PL
	b.	*	Ta pedhia	arxise	na	trexoun
			the children.N	started.3sG	SUBJ	run.3PL
			'The children st	arted to run.'	(Alexi	adou and Anagnostopoulou 2002:20)

Under the multiple Case checking approach, this is no longer an argument against the idea that Case and agreement are the same phenomena, namely they derive from the single operation AGREE. Under the proposed theory, non-finite T values nominative Case to an NP in the non-finite clause and the NP undergoes MOVE by EPP to the higher clause so that it can enter into an AGREE relation with higher functional projection. What is different from Icelandic is that Greek shows agreement in the non-finite clause and has obligatory EPP, while Icelandic shows no agreement in the non-finite clause and has no obligatory EPP (cf. footnote 11). Therefore, the Greek facts simply solidify the proposal that AGREE takes place with non-finite T.

Raposo (1987) shows that Portuguese has inflected infinitives. As shown in (199), raising out of inflected infinitives in impossible.

(199)* As criancas parecem falarem portuguesthe children seem.3PL to.speak.3PL Portuguese'The children seem to speak Portuguese.'

(Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2002:18)

This fact can be easily accounted for under the proposed theory by claiming that Portuguese has agreement in the non-finite clause but bears no EPP.

Let us consider English last. In English, raising takes place out of infinitival clauses (cf. (200a)), while raising is impossible out of finite clauses (cf. (200b)).

(200) a. He seems [t to be happy]

b. * He seems [that t is happy]

As is standardly assumed, I claim that English has obligatory EPP. Under the proposed theory, AGREE takes place with non-finite T in the embedded clause in (200a).⁸⁸ Due to the obligatory EPP, the embedded subject NP has to move out of the embedded clause. An immediate question is why it does not happen in (200b). I argue that *Cyclic Multiple Spell-Out/Transfer* plays some role here.⁸⁹

(201) Cyclic Multiple Spell-Out/Transfer

TRANSFER hands the narrow-syntactic derivation D_{NS} over to PF and to LF phase-by-phase cyclically. (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004)

In (200b), there is CP above finite TP in the embedded clause. Contrary to the subject NP in the non-finite clause in (200a), due to *Cyclic Multiple Spell-Out/Transfer*, the subject NP in the embedded finite clause in (200a) is shipped to the interfaces when the phase CP is complete. Therefore, movement out of the finite clause in (200b) is not possible.

In this appendix, I showed that Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou's (2002) argument against Chomsky's (2000) proposal that structural Case (nominative/accusative) is associated with ϕ -features (Case and agreement are two sides of the same coin) is not a counterargument under the proposed theory of multiple Case

⁸⁸ Susi Wurmbrand (2004 Lecture) points out that English may not have T itself in some non-finite clauses. Whether there is non-finite T in the embedded clause in English is another issue here. I will leave this possibility for future research.

⁸⁹ See chapter 2 for more details.

marking. Instead, their data solidify the proposal that AGREE takes place with non-finite T. Although what I have shown here is not conclusive, I believe that this is the right direction to account for cross-linguistic variation of raising.

Chapter four

4. Nominative Case licensed only by T

In this chapter, I will provide arguments that show nominative Case is licensed only by T and not by some other functional head. In section 4.1, I will provide some new data for the discussion of the scope of nominative objects in Japanese with respect to the scope interactions among the nominative object, potential verb, and negation. The scope facts in Japanese show that a nominative object can be interpreted lower than the potential verb (\neg > can > NOMOBJ) or higher than negation (NOMOBJ > \neg > can), but not between negation and the potential verb ($*\neg$ > NOMOBJ > can). The facts presented here shed light on the approach that the Case of the nominative objects is licensed by T and cast doubt on the approach that nominative is licensed by verbs like the potential verb in Japanese if we assume that NP can move to the Spec of Case-licensing heads and/or the edges of phases. Then I will give an analysis of scope data of nominative objects, adopting Wurmbrand's (2001b) proposal that a sentence with a nominative object involves a restructuring verb which combines with a VP-complement, while one with an accusative object is a non-restructuring verb which combines with a vP-complement. In section 4.2, I establish the syntax of the so-called "V-*te ar*- constructions" in Japanese that are similar to the potential constructions in Japanese and argue that this construction also involves restructuring vs. non-restructuring. Importantly, both potential and V-*te ar*constructions are interesting with respect to the nominative Case licensing to the object of the embedded verbs. I will show that facts in both constructions are succinctly accounted for under the assumption that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T in Japanese as argued in Takezawa (1987), Koizumi (1994, 1995, 1998), and Nomura (2003, Nomura 2004, 2005).

4.1 **Potential constructions in Japanese**

It has been observed in the literature on Japanese that the object can be marked with either ga (nominative Case marker) or wo (accusative Case marker) when a suffix such as the potential suffix *-rare* (with allomorphs *-re*, *-e*) 'can' is attached to the verb as in (202) (see for instance, Kuno 1973). However, the object ordinarily cannot be marked with ga when no such suffix is attached to the verb as in (203).⁹⁰

(202) a. John-wa huransugo-wo hanas-e-ru
John-TOP French-ACC speak-POT-PRES
'John can speak French.'

⁹⁰ In section 4.2.2, I show a piece of evidence that a nominative marked object in the potential construction in Japanese is in fact an object.

b. John-wa huransugo-ga hanas-e-ru
John-TOP French-NOM speak-POT-PRES
'John can speak French.'

(203) a. John-wa huransugo-wo hanas-ruJohn-TOP French-ACC speak-PRES'John speaks French.'

b. * John-wa huransugo-ga hanas-ru
 John-TOP French-NOM speak-PRES
 'John speaks French.'

The purpose of this section is to show how nominative Case of the objects in the potential constructions is licensed. Giving several arguments, I will conclude that the Case of the nominative object is licensed by T in Japanese.

4.1.1 Previous approaches

The syntactic behavior of nominative objects in Japanese has received much attention in the literature (Saito 1982, Takezawa 1987, Dubinsky 1992, Kubo 1992, Tada 1992, 1993, Morikawa 1993, Koizumi 1994, 1995, 1998, Zushi 1995, Ura 1996, 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, Niinuma 1999, Yatsushiro 1999, Wurmbrand 2001b, Nomura 2003, 2004, 2005, Takano 2003).

In this section, I will briefly review previous major approaches to the nominative objects and the accusative objects in potential constructions in Japanese with respect to the Case-licensing. First of all, I discuss Tada (1992), who, to my knowledge, first gives an analysis on the nature of nominative objects under the minimalist approach (though the original observation is in Sano (1985)). Under the Agr-based Case theory (proposed by Chomsky 1993), Tada (1992) claims that under the Spec-Head configuration, the nominative object is Case-licensed by Agro. Second I introduce Koizumi (1994, 1995, 1998) who proposes that the nominative object must enter into a checking relation with T (possibly at LF), pointing out a problem in Tada's analysis. Third I show Ura (1996, 1999, 2000) who proposes that the nominative object enters into a checking relation with T via feature movement at LF under the Agr-less Case theory (proposed by Chomsky 1995). Their arguments are all based on the difference between nominative objects and accusative objects by virtue of the scope interactions between the nominative object and potential verb (and negation). Tada's analysis that intermediate projection between TP and the potential verb licenses the Case of the nominative object becomes important when I discuss Takano's argument that nominative object can be interpreted in the Spec of the potential verb (which I will reject). Koizumi's analysis, on the other hand, is important in a sense that I will argue for some of his observations and I also conclude that nominative object is licensed by T. I will show that Ura's analysis is not correct from empirical grounds but a part of his analysis for the structure of potential constructions in Japanese becomes relevant when I introduce Wurmbrand's (2001b) view of infinitival complements.

Tada (1992) argues that the nominative object can take scope over the potential verb -(rar)e (or, -(r)e), while the accusative object is within the scope of the potential verb:⁹¹

- (204) a. John-ga migime-**dake**-wo tumur-e-ru. John-NOM right eye-**only**-ACC close-POT-PRES
 - b. John-ga migime-dake-ga tumur-e-ru.
 John-NOM right eye-only-NOM close-POT-PRES
 'John can only close his right eye.'

According to Tada (1992), the sentences in (204) have the following interpretations:

(205) a. It is possible for John to close his right eye only, while keeping his left eye open. (interpretation of (204a))

b. It is only his right eye that John can close. $(interpretation of (204b))^{92}$

⁹¹ The original observations of this type of scope interaction were made by Sano (1985).

⁹² Tada (1992), Koizumi (1994) and Ura (1996, 1999, 2000) analyze the sentences in (204) based on Tada's (1992) observation that (204b) only has the interpretation (205b). However, as I have reported in Nomura (2003), my informants show that when the object is marked as nominative, it can take both narrow and wide scopes with respect to the potential verb, while their judgments are consistent with the claim that the accusative object can take only narrow scope with respect to the potential verb. I will come back to this point later.

Assuming that scope relations reflect structural hierarchical relations among scopebearing elements at LF, Tada (1992) argues that the accusative object is within the complement of the potential verb, whereas the nominative object is outside the complement domain at LF. Since the two sentences in (204) are identical except for the Case marking of the object, Tada concludes that the nominative object obligatorily moves into a position higher than the potential verb, the Spec of AgroP:

(206) The structure of (204a) assigned by Tada (1992) (cf. Koizumi 1994:216)



(207) The structure of (204b) assigned by Tada (1992)



In the structure in (206), AgroP is placed in between the lower VP and the potential VP and the amalgamation of V + Agro (established by Head-movement) licenses accusative Case on the NP in the Spec of AgroP so that the object is structurally lower than the potential VP; hence it has narrow scope with respect to the potential verb.⁹³ In the structure in (207), on the other hand, AgroP is assumed to be in a position higher than the potential verb, and the amalgamation of V_{can} + Agro licenses nominative Case on the NP in the Spec of AgroP so that the quantified nominative object is structurally higher than the potential verb; hence it has scope over the potential verb.

In sum, Tada (1992) argues that the accusative object is licensed by a functional head lower than the potential verb while the nominative object is licensed by a functional head higher than the potential verb because no Case licenser lower than the potential verb exists in the nominative object constructions. As I will argue later, his analysis that the embedded predicate lacks Case licenser in the nominative object constructions is essentially correct. Nevertheless, I will reject the proposal that the Case of the nominative object is licensed by Agro. Next, I will discuss Koizumi (1994) who points out a problem of Tada's analysis.

4.1.1.2 Koizumi (1994)

Although it appears promising, Tada's (1992) analysis has a problem. Koizumi (1994) points out some problems of Tada's (1992) analysis and proposes an alternative

⁹³ Tada (1992) does not explicitly discuss how accusative Case is licensed in (204a). I simply follow Koizumi's (1994) interpretation of Tada's paper.
account for the nominative object. Koizumi (1994) argues that Tada's (1992) analysis makes a wrong prediction when we introduce negative counterparts of the sentences in (204). Assuming Chomsky's (1991) configuration, where NegP occurs between TP and AgroP, Tada's (1992) analysis would assign the structures in (208) to the negative counterparts of the sentences in (204).

(208) a. ... $[TP [NegP [AgroP NP_{ACC} [VP t_{DP} V] Agro] V_{can}] Neg] T]$ b. ... $[TP [NegP [AgroP NP_{NOM} [VP [VP t_{DP} V] V_{can}] Agro] Neg] T]$

Under Tada's (1992) analysis, it is predicted that negation always takes wide scope over the object, whether it is a nominative or accusative object. However, this prediction is not borne out, as shown in (209):

(209) a. John-ga migime-dake-wo tumur-e-na-i (koto)
John-NOM right eye-only-ACC close-POT-NEG-PRES (the fact)
'(the fact that) John cannot close only his right eye.'
NEG > can > only (It is not possible for John to close his right eye only.)
b. John-ga migime-dake-ga tumur-e-na-i (koto)⁹⁴
John-NOM right eye-only-NOM close-POT-NEG-PRES (the fact)
only > NEG > can (It is only the right eye that he cannot close.)

⁹⁴ For my informants, a nominative object can take narrow scope with respect to negation (NEG > can > only), in addition to wide scope over negation (only > NEG > can). See footnote 92.

The accusative object in (209a) is in the scope of the negation, as is predicted by Tada's (1992) analysis. Notice however that the nominative object in (209b) can take wide scope over the negation, contrary to the prediction of Tada's analysis. This contrast shows that the nominative object seems to rise to a position above negation, whereas the accusative object remains below negation.⁹⁵

(i) a.
$$\begin{bmatrix} TP & [VP & [AgroP & NP_{ACC} & [NegP & [VP & t_{DP} & V] & Neg] & Agro] & V_{can} \end{bmatrix} T \\ b. & \begin{bmatrix} TP & [AgroP & NP_{NOM} & [NegP & [VP & t_{DP} & V] \end{bmatrix} V_{can} \end{bmatrix} Neg \end{bmatrix} Agro] T \end{bmatrix}$$

If negation appears lower than Agro, then we will wrongly predict that the accusative object can scope over negation, contrary to fact. On the other hand, if we assume that negation appears right above the highest verb phrases, we will have the following structures:

(ii) a. $\begin{bmatrix} TP & [NegP [VP [AgroP NP_{ACC} [VP t_{DP} V] Agro] V_{can}] Neg] & T \end{bmatrix}$ b. $\begin{bmatrix} TP [AgroP NP_{NOM} [NegP [VP & [VP t_{DP} V] & V_{can}] Neg] Agro] & T \end{bmatrix}$

These structures give us correct scope interactions among the nominative/accusative object, potential verb, and negation. Although this derives correct interpretations, if the nominative Case licensing Agro is located in between Neg and T as in (ii), we will have wrong prediction with respect to the predicate fronting. Consider (iii).

(iii) [uisukii-ga nom-e]_i-sae [_{TP} Taro-ga t_i si-nakat-ta] (koto) whiskey-NOM drink-POT-even Taro-NOM do-NEG-PST fact (lit.) 'Even can drink whiskey, Taro did not.'

As one can see, the predicate phrase that has been raised contains the nominative object and the potential verb leaving negation behind. If the nominative object is licensed in the Spec of AgroP as in (iib), sentences like in (iii) should not be possible because even if we assume that covert movement of the nominative object takes place, it will be downward movement which is prohibited under the standard assumption that movement must be upwards (see Lasnik 2002b). Thus I will not consider the structure in (iib) to be correct in Japanese.

165

⁹⁵ Jonathan Bobaljik (p.c.) points out that the syntactic position of negation is often used as a diagnostic for scrambling/Object Shift/movement to the Spec of AgroP in the early minimalist theory. For instance, for Scandinavian languages, it was assumed that Agro is generated structurally higher than negation. First, let us consider the structures that negation is lower than Agro (I ignore the subject NPs in the structures).

Based on the fact that the nominative object has scope over negation, Koizumi (1994) claims that unlike the accusative object, the Case-checking position of the nominative object is higher than negation. Therefore, Koizumi (1994) proposes that the nominative object is in the Spec of Tense, as shown in (210):

- (210) a. $[AgrsP NP_{subj,NOM} [TP NP_{obj,NOM} [NegP [VP [AgroP [VP t_{NPobj} V] Agro] V_{can}] Neg] T] Agrs]$
 - b. [AgrsP NP_{subj.NOM} [TP [NegP [VP [AgroP NP_{obj.ACC}[VP t_{NPobj} V] Agro] V_{can}] Neg] T] Agrs]

This structure solves the problem with Tada's (1992) analysis. Hence, Koizumi concludes that the nominative object in Japanese is Case-licensed in the Spec of Tense.

At this point, Koizumi's (1994) analysis seems to be on the right track. In fact, I will also argue that the Case of the nominative object is licensed by T. In addition to the problem that I will raise in section 4.1.1.4 with respect to LF A-movement, once we consider the data that I have found show that the nominative object can be interpreted in the base-generated position, Spec-Head agreement analysis becomes problematic because NPs are interpreted in the Case-checking position which is corresponding to the position of scope interpretation at LF and the narrow scope of the nominative object is never expected. In the next section, I discuss Ura (1996, 1999, 2000) as one of the feature-movement approaches to nominative objects in Japanese.

4.1.1.3 Ura (1996, 1999, 2000)

Under the Agr-less Case theory (proposed by Chomsky 1995), Ura (1996, 1999, 2000) proposes that the nominative object enters into a checking relation with T at LF. Ura proposes that the potential suffix -(rar)e optionally absorbs the accusative Case-feature of a transitive verb and that T allows multiple feature-checking in Japanese.⁹⁶ He illustrates the following two underlying structures for potential constructions in Japanese:⁹⁷

(211) a. Accusative object construction



⁹⁶ Ura (1996, 1999, 2000) assumes *(rar)e* (or, *-(r)e*) as a potential suffix, but not as a verb. ⁹⁷ sP in (211) stands for the maximal projection of the potential suffix *-(rar)e*.

b. Nominative object construction



As in (211), Ura assumes that the potential suffix takes the two-layered VP-shell for a transitive verb as its complement. In (211a), PRO and DP₂ are assigned Agent by v and Theme by V, respectively. Since v in (211a) retains its accusative Case-feature, DP₂ is required to check it off for convergence. Assuming that the potential suffix has a null Case, and it assigns a θ -role to be discharged to its Spec, Ura argues that PRO is required to check off the null Case of the potential suffix. Thus, DP₁ is marked as nominative by the higher projection T. Therefore, (212) is derived:

(212) [TP John-ga_k [$_{sP}$ PRO_k huransugo-wo hanas-e-ru]].

John-NOM French-ACC speak-POT-PRES 'John can speak French'

In this case, there is no way for the object to be marked as anything other than accusative. (211b), on the other hand, is the situation where the potential suffix absorbs the accusative Case-feature. Since v's accusative Case-feature is absorbed, only T can enter into a Case-checking relation with DP₂ via multiple feature-checking. Hence, (213) is derived:

(213) John-ga huransugo-ga/*-wo hanas-e-ru.

According to Ura (1996, 1999, 2000), PRO does not prohibit the nominative Case-feature of DP_2 from entering into a checking relation with T at LF, despite its intervention between them. Ura argues that this is because PRO is invisible for the LF attraction/checking by T's weak nominative-feature in Japanese since PRO's Case-feature (null Case) does not match with T's Case-feature (nominative).

Now, let us consider Tada's (1992) paradigm under Ura's (1996, 1999, 2000) analysis. Following Hornstein (1995) and Kitahara (1996), Ura assumes that the feature-checking position of NP α counts as α 's LF position relevant to its scopal interpretation.⁹⁸ Then he argues that the data in (204) indicate that the feature-checking position of the nominative object is higher than the potential suffix at LF. According to Ura, the nominative Case-feature of the nominative object moves onto T at LF in order to enter into a checking relation with T; as a result, the nominative Case feature checking position of the nominative object is as high as the position of T at LF. Thus, the scopal domain of the nominative object is the same as the c-command domain of T at LF. Since T c-commands the potential suffix at LF, the nominative object has scope over the potential

⁹⁸ This is problematic under the standard feature-movement approaches. I will point out the problem in the next section.

suffix, as required. On the other hand, the accusative object has its accusative Casefeature checked against v in the structure illustrated in (211a). Thus, according to Ura (1996, 1999, 2000), the accusative object cannot take scope over the potential suffix. This analysis can also correctly capture Koizumi's (1994) examples in (209) (negative counterparts of the sentence in (204)), repeated here as (214):

- (214) a. John-ga migime-dake-wo tumur-e-na-i (koto)
 John-NOM right eye-only-ACC close-POT-NEG-PRES (the fact)
 '(the fact that) John cannot close only his right eye.'
 NEG > can > only (It is not possible for John to close his right eye only.)
 - b. John-ga migime-**dake**-ga tumur-e-na-i (koto) John-NOM right eye-**only**-*NOM* close-**POT-NEG**-PRES (the fact) only > NEG > can (It is only the right eye that he cannot close.)

Under Ura's (1996, 1999, 2000) analysis, this contrast is also accounted for assuming that negation is generated between TP and *s*P. Thus, he concludes that the nominative object has its Case-feature checked against T at LF and as a result, it can take wide scope over negation/potential suffix.

In the next section, I will discuss an apparent problem in the previous analyses.

4.1.1.4 Problem in previous approaches

Chomsky (1986) introduced an instance of covert A-movement: covert movement of the 'associate' to the position occupied in overt syntax by *there*, as in (215).

(215) a. There is a woman here S-structure b. A woman is t here LF

It is often assumed that the agreement facts in *there* construction are captured by movement of some sort. In Chomsky (1986) it was assumed that this expletive replacement operation (covert phrasal movement of the associate) allowed for the agreement with Infl to be appropriately established, while in Chomsky (1995) it was assumed that feature movement of the associate did so.

As pointed out in Chomsky (1991) for scope, and in den Dikken (1995) for binding, covert movement creates neither new scope relations nor new binding relations.⁹⁹ Lasnik (1995b, 1995c) provides an overview of the issue. The following representative examples are taken from Lasnik (1995b, 1999b). Consider (216) and (217).

- (216) a. Many linguistics students <u>aren't</u> here (Lasnik 1995b:19)
 - b. Some linguists seem to <u>each other</u> [t to have been given good job offers] (Lasnik 1995b:21)

⁹⁹ The original observation is attributed to L. Davis.

171

- c. No good linguistic theories seem to any philosophers [t to have been formulated] (Lasnik 1995b:21)
- d. Some defendant_i seems to <u>his_i lawyer</u> [t to have been at the scene]
 (Lasnik 1999b:183)
- (217) a. There <u>aren't</u> many linguistics students here (Lasnik 1995b:19)
 b. * There seem to <u>each other</u> [t to have been some linguists given good job offers] (Lasnik 1995b:21)
 - c. * There seem to <u>any philosophers</u> [t to have been **no good linguistic** theories formulated] (Lasnik 1995b:21)

d. * There seems to <u>his_i lawyer</u> [t to have been **some defendant**_i at the scene] (Lasnik 1999b:183)

The examples in (216) are the pairs involving overt raising to subject position. On the other hand, the examples in (217) are the pairs involving no overt rasing. In all of these cases, the examples in (216) crucially differ from the corresponding examples (217). For example, in (217a), *many linguistics students* does not take scope over negation, while in (216a) it does. As we see in the other examples, when the movement is overt, anaphor binding, negative polarity licensing, and bound pronoun licensing are satisfied. When the movement is covert, however, they fail to provide their higher licensing. Hence, it is concluded that only the formal features of the associate undergo covert movement, leaving everything else behind.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Now, we have a conflict between Tada's (1992) observation and previous approaches to nominative objects in Japanese. As we have shown in section 4.1.1.1, Tada observes that nominative objects can take high scope over potentials. Under the previous approaches, movement for Case checking is LF-movement. If LF-movement (more exactly, LF A-movement) does not affect scope, how can Tada's observation be accounted for by LF-movement?¹⁰⁰ If we argue for Agr-based Case theory, we must say that the nominative object overtly moves to the Spec of the Case-licensing head or different from what we have seen here, there is a covert phrasal A-movement in Japanese that feeds scope. Ura's feature movement analysis apparently conflicts with the observations here and he also has to argue that the movement is not a feature-movement but it is a covert phrasal movement. In the following sections, I will show that the nominative object can be interpreted in the base-generated position contrary to what is claimed in most of the literature cited above. By so doing, I will also show that there is no scope position for the nominative object in between negation and potential verb. Given the assumption that NP can only move to the Spec of Case-licensing head or the edge of the phases, I will conclude that the Case of the nominative object is licensed by T.

 $^{^{100}}$ For discussion of LF A'-movement and its scope effects, see May (1985) and Fox (2000), among many others.

4.1.2 Scope of nominative objects in Japanese

As we have seen in the previous sections, it has been argued that the nominative object obligatorily takes wide scope over the potential verb *-rare* 'can', while the accusative object does not as shown in (218). The interpretation of (218a) is that John can close both eyes but also has the ability to wink with his right eye, that is, to close his right eye alone, while leaving his left eye open. The sentence cannot mean that it is only his right eye that John can close (he cannot close his left eye.).¹⁰¹ On the other hand, it has been argued that this reading is allowed for (218b) and that it is the only reading that the sentence in (218b) has.

(218) a. John-wa migime-dake-wo tumur-e-ru
John-TOP right.eye-only-ACC close-POT-PRES
'John can close only his right eye.' (unless the object is stressed)
(i) can > only (John can wink his right eye.)

(ii) ?* only > can (It is only his right eye that he can close.)

¹⁰¹ As Koizumi (1994) has already pointed out, the object-wide scope reading is possible when the object is stressed or focused, suggesting that it may be induced by focus movement, independent of Case-related movement. The informants that I interviewed did not stress/focalize objects in their judgments. Therefore, I focus on discussing the scope of objects related to A-movement here.

- b. John-wa migime-dake-ga tumur-e-ru
 John-TOP right.eye-only-NOM close-POT-PRES
 (i) (*) can > only¹⁰²
 - (ii) only > can

However, in Nomura (2003), I show that examples such as (219) are judged as noncontradictory, which is only possible if the nominative object is interpreted in the scope of the potential ("can > only").¹⁰³

¹⁰³ The example given in Nomura (2003) was the following:

vodka-dake-ga nom-e-ru vuumei-da-ga, (i) Taro-ga no wa Taro-NOM vodka-only-NOMdrink-POT-PRES NOMINL TOP famous-CPL-but, (kare-ga) gin-dake-ga yoku sir-arete-iru nom-e-ru mo no (he-NOM) gin-only-NOM drink-POT-PRES NOMINL also well know-PASS-PRES 'It is famous that Taro can drink vodka straight (lit. only vodka), but it is also well known that he can drink gin straight.'

Yuji Takano (p.c.), however, points out that the reason why the example in (i) is acceptable is because we may interpret 'vodka-dake-ga' as 'vodka-dake-no-nomimono-ga' (a drink that contains only vodka). If this is the case, then 'only' does not take wide scope over the potential. However, the example in (219), where the nominative object is interpreted in the scope of the potential, shows Takano's objection does not hold given that such a reinterpretation is not available in (219).

 $^{^{102}}$ Here I put * in a parenthesis because I do not consider this interpretation is ungrammatical. Although I also have a strong preference to have the interpretation of (ii) in this sentence, I consider this to be grammatical but just it is hard to get for pragmatic reasons without context. The cases that can have the interpretation of (i) will be given in this section shortly.

(219) Taro-ga koyubi-dake-ga mage-rare-ru no wa Taro-NOM pinkie-only-NOM crook-POT-PRES NOMINL TOP sit-te-ita-ga, (kare-ga) kusuriyubi-dake-mo mage-rare-ru know-being-PAST-but, (he-NOM) ring-finger-only-also crook-POT-PRES no-ni-wa odoro-ita

NOMINL-D-TOP surprise-PAST

'I have known that Taro can crook only his pinkie but I am surprised that he can also crook only his ring finger.'

Considering what I have observed in Nomura (2003), I propose that the reported judgments in the literature represent (apparently strong) preferences but that narrow scope readings ("can > only") are available for nominative objects in the potential construction, contrary to what is claimed in the literature cited above.¹⁰⁴ Thus, I argue that the narrow scope readings emerge given a different set of contexts. In section 4.1.7, I will show another instance of narrow scope readings of nominative objects.

¹⁰⁴ The immediate question why there is a preference must be addressed. Masatoshi Koizumi (p.c.) suggests that this may be due to some pragmatic principle. One instance of such principle is Grice's (1975) maxims. What seems to be relevant here is one of Grice's maxims of manner, namely, "avoid ambiguity". For instance, suppose, as I have observed, that nominative object constructions (218b) have two readings (*can>only*, *only>can*), while there is only one reading (*can>only*) in accusative object constructions (218a). If one likes to utter a sentence whose meaning is *can>only*, then the principle tells him/her to use the expression that does not have ambiguity. Thus, this may be the reason why there is an apparent preference that the sentence in (218b) seems for many speakers not to have *can>only* reading in out-of-the-blue contexts.

4.1.3 Scope of nominative objects with negation

In addition to the scope interaction between nominative objects and potential verbs, Koizumi (1994) introduces negation into the discussion of the potential construction. As we have seen in section 4.1.1.2, he argues that the accusative object in (220a) is in the scope of negation, while the nominative object in (220b) has scope over negation. The examples are repeated here in (220).

(220) a. John-wa migime-dake-wo tumur-e-na-i
John-TOP right.eye-only-ACC close-POT-NEG-PRES
'John cannot close only his right eye.'
¬ > can > only (John cannot wink with his right eye.)
b. John-wa migime-dake-ga tumur-e-na-i
John-TOP right.eye-only-NOM close-POT-NEG-PRES

 $only > \neg > can$ (It is only the right eye that he cannot close.)

Takano (2003), who claims that a nominative object is base-generated in the Spec of a [+stative] verb such as *(rar)e*, argues that narrow scope of the nominative object with respect to negation becomes possible if we replace *dake* with another scope-bearing element such as *subete* 'all/every'. For example, (221) allows for partial negation $(\neg > \forall)$.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ I will call the scope relation " $\forall > \neg$ " total negation and " $\neg > \forall$ " partial negation.

177

(221) John-wa subete-no mondai-ga tok-e-nai.John-TOP all-GEN problem-NOM solve-POT-not'John cannot solve every problem'

It is not the case that, for every problem x, John can solve x. (Takano 2003:817)

Takano claims that the partial negation reading of (221) is " $\neg > \forall > can$ ". However, if this interpretation is correct and it is also true that nominative objects can be interpreted in the scope of the potential as I have reported in Nomura (2003), there should be three LF representations available for the scope of nominative objects as illustrated in (222).¹⁰⁶

(222)	a.	NomObj >		>		can	
	b.			>	NomObj >	can	
	с.		-	>		can	> NomOb.

 106 Actually, there are six logical possibilities with respect to negation, the modal *can*, and the nominative object:

(i)	a.	NomObj	>		>		ca	n	
	b.	NomObj	>	can	>		7		
(ii)	a.			>	NomObj	>	ca	n	
	b.		ca	in >	NomObj	>	~		
(iii)	a.		-	>			an	>	NomObj
	b.		ca	in >	•	•	-	>	NomObj

However, "can > \neg " is not possible in Japanese so that (ia), (iia), and (iiia) are the only possibilities for these scopal elements.

4.1.4 Claim

I claim that nominative objects in Japanese cannot be interpreted as in (222b) contra Takano (2003), while they can be interpreted as in (222a) and (222c); i.e., the sentence in (221) can have interpretation (222c) but not (222b). I argue that a simple account for this fact can be captured by the approaches given in Koizumi (1994) and Nomura (2003), where nominative Case is assigned by T, but not by those in Tada (1992) and Yatsushiro (1999), where nominative Case is assigned by a [+stative] verb, *can*.¹⁰⁷

4.1.5 Truth value judgments

Takano (2003) takes it for granted that the nominative object takes wide scope over the potential verb, based on what is claimed in the literature. Thus, he claims that the partial negation reading of (221) is " $\neg > \forall >$ can". However, if we consider the judgments of (219), then we need to justify whether nominative objects can be interpreted in the three ways as in (222). The Truth Value Judgments Test may show which interpretations nominative objects have. Let us reconsider (221). In order to examine whether (221) has a partial negation reading (i.e., $\neg > \forall$), we need a context that does not describe the LF scope representation in (222a). The relevant context is given in (223).

¹⁰⁷ Takano (2003) does not commit himself on the Case licenser of the nominative object. Whether the Case of the nominative object is licensed by T or by a [+stative] verb is not the main focus of his study.

(223) Context 1: John can solve three questions out of four questions but he cannot solve the fourth.

The potential LF scope representations of (221) in Context 1 are given in (224).

(224) a. F(alse):
$$\forall > \neg > can$$

b. T(rue): $\neg > \forall > can$
c. T(rue): $\neg > can > \forall$

Context 1 does not describe the LF scope representation in (224a) because there are three questions that John can solve. On the other hand, it does describe both (222b) and (222c) and therefore we are not able to tell which LF representation is available for (221) in Context 1. In order to know whether (224b) is available or not, we must use a context which differentiates between (224b) and (224c) (i.e., (224b) is true and (224b) is false). Let us consider the following context.

(225) Context 2: John has a white bookshelf and he wants it to be orange colored. He has two different color paints, red and yellow (Mixing red and yellow will yield orange).

The relevant example is given in (226).¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ I assume that distributive and collective readings of the universal quantifier are scope derived from its syntactic position. Here I take the distributive reading of \forall to be a wide

(226) John-wa subete-no iro-ga tuka-e-nai.John-TOP all-GEN color-NOM use-POT-NEG'John cannot use every color.'

The potential LF scope representations of (226) in Context 2 are given in (227).

(227) a. T:
$$\forall > \neg > can$$

b. T: $\neg > \forall > can$
c. F: $\neg > can > \forall$

Context 2 does not describe (227c). (227c) denies that using all the paints is a way of achieving the desired result: orange. However, given that the mixture of red and yellow is orange, this is a false assertion in Context 2. (227b) denies that any one of the paints would be sufficient to achieve the desired result. This denial is a true statement. In this designated context, (226) can be truthfully uttered. Notice that Context 2 distinguishes (227b) and (227c), but Context 2 also describes (227a), given that (227a) means that none of the paints (on its own) would be sufficient, which is a true statement in Context 2.

scope reading with respect to the modal and negation, while the collective reading is narrow scope with respect to the modal and negation. Note that this is not the only way to approach it (see for instance Landman 1996) and that my conclusion rests on this assumption. If we treat it this way, we can distinguish interpretations of " $\neg > \forall > can$ " and " $\neg > can > \forall$ ".

Thus, although (226) is felicitous in Context 2, we cannot conclude that (227b) is available because the sentence might have the scope relation in (227a). Now consider Context 3.

(228) Context 3: John has a white bookshelf and he wants it to be orange colored. He has three different color paints, red, yellow, and orange.

The potential LF scope representations of (226) in Context 3 are given in (229).

(229)	a.	F:	$\forall >$	7	>		can		
	b.	T:			>	Α >	can		
	c.	F:		-	>		can	>	A

Context 3 does not describe (229a) and (229c) with respect to the sentence in (226). Under the interpretation of (229a) (for every color x, John cannot use x), there has to be no color that John can use. It is true for red and yellow but he can use the orange paint. Hence, this is a false assertion in Context 3. (229c) denies that using all the paints is a way of achieving the desired result: orange. However, given that the mixture of red, yellow, and orange is orange, this is also a false assertion. (229b) denies that any one of the paints would be sufficient to achieve the desired result. Although one of the paints is orange and he can use the orange paint to get the desired result, if he paints the bookshelf with red or yellow, then it will not be orange colored. Hence, this denial is a true statement. In this designated context, (226) cannot be truthfully uttered. The interpretation that can be described in Context 3 is only (229b), but (226) is not felicitous in Context 3. This means that the LF scope representation in (229b) is not available in (226).¹⁰⁹ Therefore, we conclude that although there is a partial negation reading available to the nominative object \forall , it is not " $\neg > \forall > \operatorname{can}$ " but " $\neg > \operatorname{can} > \forall$ " and that the felicitous reading of (226) in Context 2 is due to the availability of the interpretation of (227a).¹¹⁰

The last context that I would like to introduce here shows again that nominative objects can be interpreted in the scope of the potential (" $\neg > can > \forall$ "). Consider Context 4.

(230) Context 4: John has a white bookshelf and he does not want it to be orange colored. He has two different color paints, red and yellow (Mixing red and yellow will yield orange).

Now the relevant example is (231).

¹⁰⁹ Yuji Takano (p.c.) judges (226) to be felicitous under Context 3. However, all of my informants report that (226) is not felicitous at all. Note, however, that one of my informants points out that the intermediate scope seems to become available if we replace the case maker of the nominative object 'ga' with a topic maker 'wa'. I suspect that his judgment of the intermediate scope is focus-related. See also footnote 114.

¹¹⁰ Although I do not have any discussion of accusative objects with respect to all the cases that I have worked out in this sub-section, it is as reported in the previous literature that accusative objects take narrow scope " $\neg > can > \forall$ " but not " $\forall > \neg > can$ " unless the object is stressed. Importantly, the intermediate scope " $\neg > \forall > can$ " is not possible unless we replace the case maker of the accusative object 'wo' with a topic marker 'wa' as I have noted in footnote 109.

(231) John-wa subete-no iro-ga tuka-e-nai.

John-TOP all-GEN color-NOM use-POT-NEG

'John cannot use every color.'

The potential LF scope representations of (231) in the above context are given in (232).

								•
	c.	T:		~ >	can	² >	A	
	b.	F:		-, > V	> can			
(232)	a.	F:	Α >	- >	can			

Context 4 does not describe the LF scope representation in (232a) with respect to the sentence in (231). Under the interpretation of (232a) (For every color x, John cannot use x), there has to be no color that John can use. However, given that he can use a non-orange color, this is a false assertion. (232b) (It is not the case that for every color x, John can use x) denies that John can use any one of the colors. This denial is a false statement because he can use any single color. Context 4 describes (232c). (232c) denies that using all the paints is a way of achieving the undesired result: orange. However, given that mixture of red and yellow is orange, this is a true assertion in Context 4. In this designated context, (231) is felicitous. Thus, the LF scope representation of (231) under Context 4 must be " $\neg >$ can $> \forall$ ", i.e., an interpretation where the nominative object is in

the scope of the potential.¹¹¹ A summary of the (im)possible LF positions of the nominative objects is illustrated in (233).



4.1.6 Implications

There are two competing hypotheses about the source of the Case of the nominative object in the potential constructions: (a) the Case of the nominative object is licensed by the potential verb *-rare* 'can' and (b) it is licensed by T (somehow in tandem with a feature of the verb [+stative]). Assuming that only Case-assigning heads have optional EPP; in other words, NPs can freely/only move to the Spec of their Case-

(i) John-wa oyayubi-dake-ga mage-rare-nai John-TOP thumb-only-NOM crook-POT-NEG 'John cannot crook only his thumb.'

This sentence is not felicitous at all under the contexts where it is possible for John to close only the thumb and only his pinkie. However, if the intermediate scope such as in (iib) exists, (i) should be truthfully uttered given that it is the only possible interpretation in such a context.

(ii) a. * only $> \neg >$ can b. \checkmark $\neg >$ only > can c. * $\neg >$ only > can can > only > 185

¹¹¹ Absence of intermediate scope of a nominative object is also observed when the nominative object is *only*.

assigning head (the head that Agrees with NPs (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004)), I argue that the Case of the nominative object is licensed by T but not by the potential verb.

If the Case of the nominative object comes from *-rare*, then given the above assumptions, the object should be able to move to the Spec of *-rare* on the way to moving above \neg to get the scope "NOM OBJ $> \neg >$ can", and there should be an intermediate trace, hence a priori, intermediate scope should be possible.¹¹² Additional assumptions would be needed to exclude this possibility. However, if the Case of the nominative object comes from T, then there is no reason to posit that the object moves to the Spec of *-rare* rather than moving directly to the Spec of TP. Hence, there is no expectation of intermediate scope and it can be excluded with no additional assumptions.¹¹³ All else being equal, the absence of intermediate scope would thus argue in favor of T rather than *-rare* as the source for the Case of the nominative object.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Thus, there is no reason to assume that movement of the (unfocused/unstressed) nominative object above negation is focus-related.

¹¹⁴ The absence of intermediate scope would also argue against Takano's (2003) approach where the nominative object is base-generated in the Spec of *-rare*. However, as I have noted in footnote 109, Takano can take the intermediate scope. Given the fact that the intermediate scope is possible if ga is replaced with wa, I assume that such a scope becomes available if the nominative object is contrastively focused and thus such an interpretation is not a Case-related movement into the Spec of *-rare*. Since this is obviously related to focus/stress movement, I assume that in such cases, FocP is generated (ex. between Neg and the potential verb). I will not take such movement into consideration in the discussion here.

¹¹² As Howard Lasnik (p.c.) points out, the movement above negation is not possible at all if the movement is only to the Spec of the Case licensing head if -rare is the source of Case. Therefore, we must already make additional assumption that movement of nominative object above negation is focus-related (ex. Spec of FocP located between TP and NegP), even though the object does not need to be focused/stressed to get a scope over negation. Such an assumption is not necessary under the approach that the nominative object is licensed by T, as I will show shortly.

The new data also entails an interesting consequence for phase theory, that is *-rare* is not a phase head. As we have seen in chapter 2, it is argued in Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2004) theory of phases that at least C and transitive v (Case-assigning verbal head) are phase heads, while T and V are not. One part of phase theory requires successive cyclic movement through phase edges (a Spec of each phase head). A standard diagnostic for these positions is reconstruction/intermediate scope. If the potential verb *-rare* is a phase head, then the nominative object should go through the Spec of *-rare*. However, the absence of intermediate scope would suggest that *-rare* is not a phase head.

4.1.7 Scope freezing effect

A focus particle such as *sae* 'even' solidifies the argument that the nominative object cannot be interpreted in the Spec of *-rare* and it does not go through the Spec of *-rare*. As shown in (234), a focus particle *sae* can be attached to a verbal element (as well as to a nominal constituent), but cannot be attached to Neg or T.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ I label the potential verb head F to indicate that it is a functional head rather than a lexical head adopting Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (To appear). They claim that while a lexical verb induces anti-reconstruction effect, a functional verb does not. Since the facts that we have seen obviously show that the nominative object can be interpreted in its base-generated position, I analyze the potential verb as a functional verb.

- (234) a. Taro-wa [vP uisukii-wo nomi]-sae si-ta Taro-TOP whiskey-ACC drink-even do-PST 'Taro even drank whiskey'
 - b. Taro-wa [FP uisukii-wo nom-e]-sae si-ta
 Taro-TOP whiskey-ACC drink-POT-even do-PST
 'Taro could even drink whiskey'
 - c. Taro-wa [FP uisukii-wo nom-e]-sae si-nakat-ta
 Taro-TOP whiskey-ACC drink-POT-even do-NEG-PST
 'Taro could not even drink whiskey'
 - d. * Taro-wa [NegP uisukii-wo nom-e-na(i)]-sae si-ta
 Taro-TOP whiskey-ACC drink-POT-NEG-even do-PST
 'Taro could not even drink whiskey'
 - e. * Hanako-wa [_{CP} [_{TP} Taro-ga uisukii-wo nom-e-ta]-sae to] Hanako-TOP Taro-NOM whiskey-A drink-POT-PST-even C it-ta

say-PST

'Hanako said that Taro could even drink whiskey'

As is observed in (234), *sae* can attach to the potential verb (phrase). Nominative objects can appear with this focus element as shown in (235).

188

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

- (235) a. Taro-wa [FP uisukii-ga nom-e]-sae si-ta Taro-TOP whiskey-NOM drink-POT-even do-PST 'Taro could even drink whiskey'
 - b. Taro-wa [FP uisukii-ga nom-e]-sae si-nakat-ta
 Taro-TOP whiskey-NOM drink-POT-even do-NEG-PST
 'Taro could not even drink whiskey'

Now consider the example in (236).

- (236) John-wa [FP migime-dake-ga tumur-e]-sae si-ta
 John-TOP right.eye-only-NOM close-POT-even do-PST
 'John could even close only right eye.'
 - (i) $\operatorname{can} > \operatorname{only}$
 - (ii) * only > can

Interestingly, the nominative object is interpreted in the scope of the potential verb ("can > only"), while it cannot take wide scope over the potential verb (* "only > can") in (236). Notice that the example in (236) is a minimal pair with (218b), repeated here in (237).

(237) John-wa migime-dake-ga tumur-e-ru

John-TOP right.eye-only-NOM close-POT-PRES

- (i) * can > only
- (ii) only > can

189

Although there is a strong preference that the nominative object tends to take wide scope, I have shown that we can find some cases that show that the nominative object takes narrow scope. The example in (236) is an instance of such a case. The question is why we cannot get wide scope of the nominative object in (236).

The fact presented in (236) can be accounted for if we assume that the focus element *sae* blocks movement of the scope-bearing element (the nominative object) to take wide scope over potential as is illustrated in (238) (where L-R order reflects c-command).

(238) a. [even ... can ... only]
$$\rightarrow$$
 can > only
b. only ... [even ... can ... t] \rightarrow * only > can

Suppose that this is the case. Now there are two possible structures with respect to the landing sites of the nominative object depending on the theory. Since it is obvious that the nominative object can be in the scope of the potential verb, I assume that the nominative object is base-generated lower than the potential verb in both structures (contra Takano 2003, Saito and Hoshi 1998, Hoshi 1999, Saito 2000). The issue here is whether the nominative object can land in the Spec of the potential verb. The structure of (239a) is the structure where the nominative object is licensed by T and can move to the

Spec of TP, while that of (239b) is the structure where the nominative object can move to the Spec of the potential verb *-rare*.¹¹⁶



As in (239a), the nominative object cannot move to the Spec of TP, assuming that *sae* creates some impenetrable domain for movement of the scope-bearing element. If the nominative object moves to the Spec of TP, then it will be outside of the domain and therefore this movement is not allowed. However, if the Spec of *-rare* is available, the movement into the Spec of *-rare* will take place within the domain. Therefore, under the approach that the nominative object can move to the Spec of the potential verb, we

¹¹⁶ Whether the nominative object is licensed by the potential verb is not at issue at this point.

should expect that the nominative object can take wide scope over the potential verb, regardless of the presence of *sae* contrary to fact.

Thus, this suggests that the nominative object does not go through the Spec of *-rare* but rather it stays in its base-generated position when the movement option is not available. If the Case of the nominative object comes from *-rare*, then the object should be able to move to the Spec of *-rare* (even if it cannot move higher), though this is not the case. On the other hand, if the Case of the nominative object comes from T and the Spec of *-rare* is not available, then the possible interpretation is predicted as "can > only" only, given that the movement of the nominative object out of the impenetrable domain into the Spec of TP is not allowed. Hence the latter approach can correctly account for the fact that the interpretation "only > can" is not available in (236). Most importantly, I show that the nominative object can be interpreted in its base-generated position and thus we can get the interpretation "can > only".

4.1.8 Two types of complement clauses in the potential constructions: VP and vP

As we have seen in the previous sections, I have shown that a consistent account can be given assuming that the Case of nominative objects is licensed by T, and not by some other functional head like the potential verb *-rare* 'can' in the potential constructions in Japanese. Hence, I will not adopt Tada's (1992) proposed structures of nominative object constructions and accusative object constructions. On the other hand, Koizumi (1994, 1995, 1998) and Ura (1996, 1999, 2000) both assume that T is the Case

licenser for nominative. However, their proposed structures are virtually identical between nominative object constructions and accusative object constructions with the assumption that the accusative Case-feature of a transitive verb is optionally absorbed in the potential constructions.

In this section, I will argue that the structure of nominative object constructions is different from the one of accusative object constructions and that whether the Case of objects is marked with accusative or nominative resides in which functional heads are selected from the lexicon.¹¹⁷

As I have assumed for some constructions in Icelandic, following Wurmbrand (2001b), I will propose that a sentence with a nominative object involves a restructuring verb which combines with a VP-complement, while one with an accusative object is a non-restructuring verb which combines with a vP-complement in Japanese. On the basis of this and the assumption that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T as argued in Takezawa (1987), Koizumi (1994), and Nomura (2003), the structures of the potential constructions with negation such as (240) are illustrated in (241).

(240) a. John-wa subete-no iro-ga tuka-e-nai.John-TOP all-GEN color-NOM use-POT-NEG'John cannot use every color.'

¹¹⁷ For instance, Lasnik (1999a) discusses that the optionality of raising in ECM constructions in English as the optionality of Agro, having a hint from Chomsky (1995:350-351).

- b. John-wa subete-no iro-wo tuka-e-nai.
 John-TOP all-GEN color-ACC use-POT-NEG
 'John cannot use every color.'
- (241) a. Restructuring Infinitive (NOM: $\mathbf{0} \rightarrow \operatorname{can} > \forall / \mathbf{2} \forall > \neg > \operatorname{can}$)



b. *Non-restructuring infinitive* (ACC: $\neg > can > \forall$)



According to Wurmbrand (2001b), restructuring infinitives (RIs) are reduced structures which lack their own Case-assigning functional projections and that the Case of the object in RIs depends on properties of the selecting matrix predicate. In (241a), since restructuring infinitives do not contain a Case-licensing element, the embedded object has to AGREE with something in the matrix clause. Given that T is the only Case-licensing head in the matrix clause, assuming that the potential verb does not license Case, the object AGREEs with T. Although AGREE is sufficient for licensing, an NP may move to the Spec of its Case-licensing head (AGREE + MOVE). Via Sequential AGREE, T first AGREEs with the subject NP and the NP MOVEs to the Spec of TP. Then T AGREEs with the object NP. Hence, nominative Case is assigned to the object NP. Note that the

movement of a nominative object into the Spec of TP does not take place without movement of the subject. I assume that MOVE can take place either by solely moving the subject NP or by moving the subject NP followed by movement of the nominative object NP in a Tucking-in fashion. This follows from the proposed theory of Sequential AGREEE because the subsequent AGREE takes place only when the primary AGREEd goal is displaced. Thus, the nominative object may be interpreted in the scope of the potential **0** (AGREE) or it may scope over the negation **2** (AGREE + MOVE). In nonrestructuring infinitives such as (241b), on the other hand, the infinitival complement projects its own vP. The closest Case-licensing head for the object is hence the embedded v^* (accusative Case-licenser) rather than the matrix T (nominative Case-licenser). The object AGREEs with v^* , licensing accusative Case, and may move to the Spec of v^*P . Although in principle multiple Case marking is allowed, the object cannot enter into an AGREE relation with T because it is not the primary AGREE. The subsequent AGREE is possible only when the goal has not been valued. Since Case is already assigned to the object NP by v^* and T primary AGREEs with the subject NP, the object NP does not enter into an AGREE relation with T nor does it move into the Spec of TP; i.e., it cannot move above negation for Case reasons.¹¹⁸ Hence, the accusative object does not scope over negation.119

If the reason why the intermediate scope of nominative objects " $\neg > NOMOBJ >$ can" is not possible is because the potential verb is not a Case-licenser (nor a phase), we

¹¹⁸ It is claimed that quantifiers are assigned surface scope and do not undergo Quantifier Raising (QR) in Japanese (see for instance Hoji 1985 among many others).

¹¹⁹ The object-wide scope reading over negation is possible when the object is stressed or focused (see also footnote 101).

predict that such an interpretation exists if a higher predicate contains v^* (a phase). Koizumi (1994) in fact has an observation that shows that our prediction is correct. Consider the following examples.

(242) John-wa migime-dake-wo tumur-e-ru (=(218a))
John-TOP right.eye-only-ACC close-POT-PRES
'John can close only his right eye.' (unless the object is stressed)
(i) can > only (John can wink his right eye.)
(ii) ?* only > can (It is only his right eye that he can close.)

(243) John-ga ringo-dake-wo tabe-hazime-taJohn-NOM apple-only-ACC eat-start-PAST'John started to eat only apples.'

(i) only > start (It is only apples that John started to eat.)

(ii) start > only (It is eat only apples that John started to do.)

(Koizumi 1994:216)

As Koizumi observes, unlike (242), (243) is clearly ambiguous with respect to the scope of the object and the higher verb. The ambiguity of the sentence in (243) is readily accounted for by postulating that verbs like *hazime* are lexical verbs and the higher predicate contains a phase. At issue in such sentences is not movement into the Spec of TP since accusative Case is licensed either by the matrix v or the embedded v (the relevant structures will be given shortly). We thus expect that the object will be in the

197

scope of negation when the sentence is negated because it does not move over the negation. This scope fact has already been reported in Koizumi (1994:222). Koizumi has the example in (244) and reports the scope interpretations as follows:

(244) Niku-dake-wo tabe-tuzuke-na-i koto-ga taisetu-da. meat-only-ACC eat-continue-NEG-PRES that-NOM important-PRES 'It is important that one should not continue to eat only meat.' a. ✓ - > continue > only b. $\sqrt{?}$ \neg > only > continue c. ?* only > \neg > continue

Based on what Koizumi observes and presents, I use the same type of the test as we have had in section 4.1.5 to test the existence of the intermediate scope interpretation as in (244b) even when the nominative object is subete 'all/every'. The result is compatible with what Koizumi reports. Consider a context in (245).

(unless the object is stressed)

(245) John tried to read all the books that he has on his desk in a week. However, since he was very busy this week, he could only read five books and failed to read the rest of the books.

The relevant example is given in (246).

(246) John-wa subete-no hon-wo yomi-sokonawa-nakat-ta.John-TOP all-GEN book-ACC read-fail-NEG-PAST'John did not fail to read all the books.'

The potential LF scope representations of (246) in (245) are given in (247).¹²⁰

(247)	a.	*	A	>	-	>			fail		
	b.	\checkmark				>	A	>	fail		
	c.	*			-	>			fail	>	A

The context in (245) does not describe the LF scope representations in (247a) and (247c) with respect to the sentence in (246). Under the interpretation of (247a), there has to be no book that John fails to read (in other words, John read all the books.). Since there are some books that John could not read, this is a false assertion in (245). (247c) denies that to read all the books is what John fails to do. However, given that it is true that reading all the books is what John fails to do in (245), the denial of this assertion is a false assertion. (247b) denies that for every book, John fails to read it. Given that the assertion that for every book, John fails to read it is false in (245), the denial of this assertion is a true statement. In this designated context, (246) can be truthfully uttered as we expect. The structures of examples such as (246) are illustrated in (248).

 $^{^{120}}$ Note that (247a) and (247c) are logically equivalent. Since what we are looking for here is whether the sentence in (246) has the interpretation of (247b), I ignore this complexity here and simply follow the contrast that Koizumi found in (244) in this type of construction.


b.



In (248a), since restructuring infinitives do not contain a Case-licensing element, the embedded object has to AGREE with the matrix v^* and may move to the Spec of the matrix v^*P .¹²¹ Therefore, the scope of the object is " $\neg > \forall > fail$ " (and " $\neg > fail > \forall$ "). The fact that the object does not scope over the negation follows from Sequential AGREE. T primary AGREEs with the subject NP and hence the subsequent AGREE

¹²¹ I leave open the possibility that the object may stay in the Spec of the embedded vP (AGREE without MOVE) and that the object is in the scope of 'fail' **①** in the structure of (248a). But see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (To appear) who discuss Anti-Reconstruction Effects in lexical restructuring infinitives.

between T and the object that has already been valued will not take place. Therefore, the object NP does not move over the negation for Case reasons.¹²² In non-restructuring infinitives such as (248b), on the other hand, the infinitival complement projects its own vP. The object AGREEs with the embedded v^* and may move to the Spec of the embedded v^*P . Assuming that PRO can get structural Case as we have seen in Icelandic PRO in section 3.3, the matrix v^* may AGREE with PRO but the object NP does not enter into an AGREE relation with the matrix v^* nor does it move into the Spec of v^*P , since Case is already assigned to it by the embedded v^* . Hence the scope of the object is predicted to be " $\neg > fail > \forall$ ".¹²³

4.1.9 Conclusion

The facts that I have shown here indicate not only that nominative objects can take narrow scope in the potential construction (can > NomObj) but also that they cannot take intermediate scope between negation and potential verb -rare 'can' (*not > NomObj) > can), while they can take wide scope over negation (NomObj > not > can). These facts favor an approach where the Case of the nominative object is licensed by T (Koizumi (1994) and Nomura (2003)) over an approach under which verbs like the potential verb

 $^{^{122}}$ Again, we are disregarding the possible interpretation of the object over negation when the object is focalized.

¹²³ Although I do not work out all the possible LF scope representation with contexts for the relevant examples, what is important here is that there is certainly an intermediate scope reading in these examples different from what we have seen in the potential constructions.

license nominative Case (Tada (1992) and Yatsushiro (1999)). Hence, I conclude that only T licenses nominative Case.

4.2 V-te ar- constructions in Japanese

4.2.1 Two types of transitive V-te ar- constructions

In this section, I will establish the syntax of the so-called "V-*te ar*- constructions" in Japanese (Sugioka 1985, Martin 1975, Miyagawa 1989, Hasegawa 1992, Matsumoto 1990), which is exemplified in (249).

(249) Soto-ni kuruma-ga tome-te ar-u outside-LOC car-NOM stop-GER be-PRES

Lit. 'The car is in the state of having been parked outside.'

In this construction, a verb in the active gerundive form (with a suffix *-te*) is followed by a verb *ar-* "be (in the state of ...)". This construction expresses a current state as a result of some previous action of an agent. In (249), for instance, the current state of the car is expressed in terms of the result of someone having parked it outside. What is remarkable in this construction is that the argument of the gerundive verb that is realized as an accusative marked object in an active sentence can be marked nominative. Note that no passive morphology appears on the gerundive verb.

The *-te ar-* sequence also allows the arguments of the gerundive verb to appear with canonical Case marking.

(250) Taro-ga soto-ni kuruma-wo tome-te ar-u

Taro-N outside-LOC car-ACC stop-GER be-PRES

Lit. 'Taro is in the state of having parked the car outside.'

In this pattern, the object of the transitive verb is marked accusative just as it is without *ar*-.

(251) Taro-ga soto-ni kuruma-wo tome-ta Taro-NOM outside-LOC car-ACC stop-PST
'Taro parked the car outside.'

In the pattern like (249), the object of the transitive verb is marked nominative and the subject is suppressed. Hence, the subject cannot appear when the object of the transitive verb is marked nominative, as shown in (252).

(252)* Taro-ga soto-ni kuruma-ga tome-te ar-u Taro-NOM outside-LOC car-NOM stop-GER be-PRES Lit. 'The car is in the state of having been parked outside.'

Let us call the transitive V-*te ar*- pattern in which the object of the verb is marked accusative *Accusative Transitive* te ar- *construction* (henceforth AT *te ar*- construction) and the one in which the object of the verb is marked nominative *Nominative Transitive* te ar- *construction* (NT *te ar*- construction). While the AT *te ar*- construction is typically used to describe the state of the "logical subject" of the gerundive verb (V-*te*), the NT *te ar*- construction is typically used to describe the state of the state of

An intransitive verb can also be used in these constructions as in (253).

(253) Boku-wa kyoo gussuri nemur-te ar-u

I-TOP today soundly sleep-GER be-PRES

Lit.'I am in the state of having slept enough today.'

Since the intransitive V-*te ar*- pattern does not raise relevant syntactic issues here, I will focus on the two transitive V-*te ar*- patterns in these constructions. I will argue that syntactic differences between the two transitive V-*te ar*- patterns can be attributed to whether the complement clause is a restructuring infinitive or a non-restructuring infinitive (Wurmbrand 2001b).

4.2.2 Is a nominative marked argument in Nominative Transitive te arconstruction a subject?

NT te ar- construction is particularly interesting in that the logical object of a gerundive verb is marked nominative. At first glance, this nominative marking in the NT te ar- construction is reminiscent of the nominative marked object of stative predicates. As we have seen in section 4.1, in Japanese the object can be marked with either ga (nominative Case marker) or wo (accusative Case marker) when a suffix such as the potential suffix *-rare* 'can' is attached to the verb as in (254).

(254) John-wa huransugo-wo/ga hanas-e-ru
John-TOP French-ACC/NOM speak-can-PRES
'John can speak French.'

In this sentence, *huransugo* 'French' is apparently the object of the stative predicate *hanas-e-ru*, even when it is marked nominative. A difference between the nominative object in the stative predicate construction such as the potential construction and the nominative marked argument in the NT *te ar*- construction is that while the former functions as an object, the latter behaves as a subject.

That the nominative marked argument in the NT *te ar*- construction is a subject is supported by the subjecthood test constructed by Matsumoto (1990). The grammaticality of (255) indicates that the subject of the passive verb *yom-are* 'be read' in the *zu-ni* clause is controlled by the nominative argument *sono hon* 'that book', while the

ungrammaticality of (256) shows that the same argument that is marked accusative cannot be the controller.

(255) (dare ni mo) yom-are-zu-ni, sono hon-ga hondana-ni simat-te who by too read-PASS-NEG-CONJ that book-NOM bookshelf-LOC keep-GER at-ta (koto)

be-PST fact

'(the fact that) the book was in the state of having been kept on a bookshelf without being read (by anybody).'

(256)* (dare ni mo) yom-are-zu-ni, sono hon-wo hondana-ni simat-te who by too read-PASS-NEG-CONJ that book-ACC bookshelf-LOC keep-GER at-ta (koto)

be-PST fact

'(the fact that) the book was in the state of having been kept on a bookshelf without being read (by anybody).'

The contrast is not particular to the *te ar*- construction and in fact we observe the same contrast without *te ar*- as shown in (257) and (258).

- (257) (dare ni mo) yom-are-zu-ni, sono hon-ga souko-ni
 who by too read-PASS-NEG-CONJ that book-NOM warehouse-LOC
 simaw-are-ta (koto)
 keep-PASS-PST fact
 '(the fact that) the book was put away in the warehouse without being read (by
- (258) *(dare ni mo) yom-are-zu-ni, Taro-ga sono hon-wo souko-ni who by too read-PASS-NEG-CONJ Taro-NOM that book-ACC warehouse-LOC simaw-ta(koto)

keep-PST fact

anybody).'

'(the fact that) Taro put away the book in the warehouse without being read (by anybody).'

This contrast shows that PRO in the Japanese *-zuni* clause cannot be controlled by any non-subject and hence supports that the nominative marked argument in the NT *te ar*-construction is a subject. Moreover, the same subject-hood test that we have conducted with *zu-ni* clause in the *te ar*- construction is applicable in the potential construction. It shows that nominative objects in the potential construction do not control PRO, while nominative arguments in the *te ar*- construction do.

- (259) [PRO_{k/*i} sake-wo noma-zu-ni], John-ga_k Mary-wo_i damasi-ta (koto) sake-ACC drink-NEG-CONJ John-NOM Mary-ACC cheat-PST fact
 '(the fact that) without PRO_{k/*i} drinking sake, John_k cheated Mary_i.'
- (260) [PRO_{k/*i} sake-wo noma-zu-ni], John-ga_k Mary-ga_i damas-e-ru (koto) sake-ACC drink-NEG-CONJ John-NOM Mary-NOM cheat-POT-PRES fact
 '(the fact that) without PRO_{k/*i} drinking sake, John_k can cheat Mary_i.'

It is a well-known fact that the nominative marked object of the stative predicate is in fact an object. As the ill-formedness of (261) shows, PRO in the Japanese *-nagara* construction cannot be controlled by any nonsubject (Perlmutter 1984, Ura 2000).

(261) [PRO_{k/*i} sake-wo nomi-nagara], John-ga_k Mary-wo_i damasi-ta (koto) sake-ACC drink-while John-NOM Mary-ACC cheat-PST fact
'(the fact that) while PRO_{k/*i} drinking sake, John_k cheated Mary_i.'

In the potential construction, we also observe that the nominative object cannot control PRO as shown in (262).

(262) [PRO_{k/*i} sake-wo nomi-nagara], John-ga_k Mary-ga_i damas-e-ru (koto) sake-ACC drink-while John-NOM Mary-NOM cheat-POT-PRES fact '(the fact that) while PRO_{k/*i} drinking sake, John_k can cheat Mary_i.'

209

What the discussion above shows is that the nominative argument in the NT *te ar*construction is a subject, while the nominative marked object in the potential construction is in fact an object. Thus it is interesting to explain how a grammatical function changing in the NT *te ar*- construction is taking place, while no grammatical function changing is taking place in the potential construction. Although we have observed the difference between the potential constructions and the *te ar*- constructions, I argue that they share something in common.

4.2.3 Two types of complement clauses in the V-te ar- constructions: VP and vP

As I have argued in section 4.1.8, following Wurmbrand (2001b), I assume that a sentence with a nominative object involves a restructuring verb which combines with a VP-complement, while one with an accusative object is a non-restructuring verb which combines with a vP-complement.¹²⁴ On the basis of this and the assumption that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T, the structures of the potential construction are illustrated in (263).

¹²⁴ See Wurmbrand (2001b) and Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2004b) for more detailed discussions.



b. Non-restructuring infinitive



Turing now to the structures for the *te ar*- constructions such as (249) and (250), I propose that (249) involves a restructuring verb which combines with a VP-complement. The example in (250), on the other hand, is a non-restructuring verb which combines with a *v*P-complement. What is different from the potential constructions is that the functional verb *ar*- does not take an external argument while the verb *rare* 'can' does.

(264) a. *Restructuring infinitive*



Non-restructuring infinitive

b.



As we have seen in the case of the potential construction, since restructuring infinitives do not contain a structural case position, the embedded object has to AGREE with the matrix functional head to check its Case. Given that T is the only Case-licensing head in the matrix clause, the object AGREEs with T and may move to the Spec of TP.¹²⁵ Remember that under the proposed theory, the primary AGREEd Goal with T functions as a subject of the clause. Since there is no agentive vP in (264a) and hence no agent argument, the logical object of the embedded verb is the only argument that can promote

¹²⁵ Movement into the Spec of FP may take place if FP is a phase and successive cyclic movement through these phase edges (ex. passive/unaccusative vP) is also required. Here I will simply assume that movement occurs directly to the Spec of TP since it is not relevant for the focus of this section. See Legate (2003) for discussion on some properties of phase.

to be the subject of the matrix verb (cf. raising construction) by primary AGREE with T. In non-restructuring infinitives such as (264b), on the other hand, the infinitival complement projects (at least) its own vP and contains the agent NP in the Spec of vP. Therefore this NP enters into AGREE relation with the matrix T and become the subject. In the embedded clause, the embedded object AGREEs with v^* . As I have been arguing, the subsequent AGREE does not take place with the valued Goal(s). Hence, the embedded object cannot AGREE with the matrix T.

Assuming an analysis along these lines, we expect to find differences between the two examples in (264). One piece of evidence comes from the availability of sentential adverbials. Suppose that sentential adverbs like *kinoo* 'yesterday' have to adjoin to vP (or TP), but not VP; matrix vP or TP are possible positions in (264a), while the embedded vP and the matrix vP or TP are possible positions in (264b). Then we predict that such adverbs are not available to modify the embedded event in (264a) but available in (264b). Our prediction is in fact borne out.

(265) watasi-wa kinoo kippu-wo kaw-te at-ta/ar-u
I-TOP yesterday ticket-ACC buy-GER be-PST/be-PRES
PST Lit. 'Yesterday, I was in the state of having bought a ticket.'
PRES Lit. 'I am in the state of having bought a ticket yesterday'

(266) kippu-ga kinoo kaw-te at-ta/*ar-u
ticket-NOM yesterday buy-GER be-PST/be-PRES
PST Lit. 'Yesterday, the ticket was in the state of having been bought.'
PRES Lit. 'The ticket is in the state of having been bought yesterday.'

In the AT *te ar*- construction such as (265), the adverb *kinoo* can be interpreted as a matrix adverb and an embedded adverb. The verb *ar*- corresponds to the tense marker depending on where *kinoo* adjoins. *kinoo* can be either a matrix adverb or an embedded adverb when the matrix tense is past, but it must be an embedded adverb when the matrix tense is present because it cannot be with present tense as shown in (267).

(267) watasi-wa kinoo kippu-wo kaw-ta/*u
I-TOP yesterday ticket-ACC buy-PST/PRES
'I bought a ticket yesterday.'

* 'I buy a ticket yesterday.'

Thus, I conclude that the NT *te ar*- construction involves a restructuring verb and takes restructuring infinitives (a VP-complement), while the AT *te ar*- construction contains a non-restructuring verb which combines with non-restructuring infinitives (a vP or TP-complement). Hence, this Japanese *te ar*- construction is another piece of evidence for

Wurmbrand's (2001b) proposal that infinitival complements fall into different classes: restructuring infinitives and non-restructuring infinitives.¹²⁶

Appendix: VP-complementation v.s. Complex Predicate

Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2004a, 2004b) argue against complex predicate approaches (Saito and Hoshi 1998, Hoshi 1999, Saito 2000), showing that the potential verb *-rare* combines with full-fledged VPs. Two relevant structures: VP-complementation and derived complex predicate (V-V Incorporation) are given below:



VP-complementation



Full-fledged VP (Object originates below *can*)

¹²⁶ Wurmbrand shows that infinitival complements fall into four basic classes: *lexical restructuring infinitives, functional restructuring infinitives, reduced non-restructuring infinitives, and non-restructuring infinitives.* See Wurmbrand (2001b) for the summary of the distribution and properties of these types of infinitival constructions.

Derived complex predicate (V-V Incorporation)



b.

Deficient, non-thematic VP (Object originates above can)

The structure I have assumed is the one in (268a), while the structure in (268b) is the one that is assumed under complex predicate approaches. Saito and Hoshi (1998), Hoshi (1999), and Saito (2000) argue that the high scope of nominative object follows from complex predicate formation. However, the data that I have showed challenge such a view, given that the nominative object can be interpreted below *can*. Namely, it is not possible for the complex predicate approaches to derive the scope of nominative objects below *can* at all.

One piece of evidence against a complex predicate approach that Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2004a, 2004b) show is based on the presence of object (trace) and modifiers in the lower VP, namely, aspectual properties. According to Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2004b), it is expected under the complex predicate approach that there is only one event since the lower VP is non-thematic and theta-roles are assigned compositionally by both verbs. Under the VP-complementation approach, which I have assumed, on the other hand, it is expected that multiple event modifiers of the same type are possible simultaneously since there are two events and no event unification. The following examples support the view of VP-complementation.

- (269) a. Taro-wa terebi-ga iti-nen-kan san-jikan mir-e-ru
 Taro-TOP TV-NOM one-year-for three-hour-for watch-POT-PRES
 'For one year, Taro can watch TV for three hours.'
 - b. Taro-wa hon-ga hutu-ka-kan-no-aida iti-byoo-de yom-e-ru
 Taro-TOPbook-NOM 2-days-period-GEN-during1-second-in read-POT-PRES
 'For two days, Taro can read the book in one second.'

(Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2004b)

The examples in (269) show that multiple event modifiers of the same type are possible. Moreover, as is expected under VP-complementation approach, modifiers (in the unmarked, non-focused use) appear in the order matrix modifier \gg embedded modifier because the examples in (270) where modifiers appear in the order embedded modifier \gg matrix modifier are not acceptable.

- (270) a. (*) Taro-wa terebi-ga san-jikan iti-nen-kan mir-e-ru¹²⁷
 Taro-TOP TV-NOM three-hour-for one-year-for watch-POT-PRES
 'For one year, Taro can watch TV for three hours.'
 - b. ?? Taro-wa hon-ga iti-byoo-de hutu-ka-kan-no-aida yom-e-ru
 Taro-TOPbook-NOM 1-second-in 2-days-period-GEN-duringread-POT-PRES
 'For two days, Taro can read the book in one second.'

(Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2004b)

¹²⁷ The sentence is fine in the marked/focused use.

Thus, Bobaljik and Wurmbrand (2004b) conclude that VP-complementation makes the right predictions regarding the distribution and ordering of modifiers, while under complex predicate approaches, modification is non-compositional and cannot be treated as targeting syntactic structure and ordering restrictions among adverbials are unexpected at all.

Chapter five

5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I will give a summary of the dissertation and discuss some remaining issues.

5.1 Summary

In chapter 1, I started to discuss apparent discrepancies between Case and agreement. Thus I set the following research question in this dissertation:

(271) How is it that nominative case can surface on NPs other than finite subjects?

In addressing this question, I developed in chapter 2 a new theory of Case and agreement based on Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2004) recent proposed theory of long distance

agreement (AGREE) between two linguistics expressions: Probe, which is a functional category that contains uninterpretable ϕ -features and Goal, which is an argument NP that contains interpretable ϕ -features and uninterpretable structural Case feature. I showed that examples like (272) and (273) are derived via multiple application of AGREE by a single head, namely, structural nominative Case features of both a dative/nominative subject and a nominative object are licensed by a single head T.

- (272) a. Jóni líkuðu þessir sokkar
 John.DAT liked.3PL these sock.NOM.PL
 'John liked these socks.' (Jónsson 1996:143)
 - b. Jóni voru gefnir þessir sokkar
 John.DAT were.3PL given these sock.NOM.PL
 'John was given these socks.' (Jónsson 1996:144)
- (273) a. Taro-ni/ga eigo-ga waka-ru (koto) Taro-DAT/NOM English-NOM understand-PRES fact 'Taro understands English.'
 - b. Taro-ni/ga kono hon-ga yom-e-ru (koto)
 Taro-DAT/NOM this book-NOM read-POT-PRES fact
 'Taro can read this book.'

I proposed that AGREE by a single Probe with multiple Goals can take place sequentially (Sequential AGREE) and argued that AGREE never takes place crossing a potential closer Goal to Probe that can enter into AGREE relation as in (274).

 $(274)*P > G_1 > G_2$ $AGREE (P, G_2)$ ('>' is a c-command relation)

I also argued that no simultaneous multiple AGREE operation such as proposed by Hiraiwa's (2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2004) series of work occurs (cf. (275)).

 $(275)* P > G_1 > G_2$ $AGREE (P, G_1, G_2)$ ('>' is a c-command relation)

Following Chomsky (2000), I assumed that the unavailability of such AGREE relations comes from Locality (closest c-command). Locality for AGREE is the following:

(276) Locality for AGREE

 $P \hspace{0.1in} > \hspace{0.1in} G_1 \hspace{0.1in} > \hspace{0.1in} G_2$

P AGREEs with G_2 only if there is no G_1 , G_1 closer to P than G_2 , such that P AGREEs with G_1 .

 G_1 is closer to P than G_2 is and hence G_2 cannot have AGREE relation with P due to the presence of G_1 . I proposed that multiple application of AGREE takes place step-by-step as in (277).

(277) a.

$$P > G_1 > G_2 \quad AGREE(P, G_1)$$
b.

$$G_1 > P > t_{G1} > G_2 \quad MOVE(P, G_1)$$
c.

$$G_1 > P > t_{G1} > G_2 \quad AGREE(P, G_2)$$

First AGREE (P, G_1) takes place. Locality does not allow AGREE (P, G_2). Second, MOVE (P, G_1) takes place. Third, AGREE (P, G_2) takes place. In (277c) as well a phrase with ϕ -features intervenes between matrix T and G_2 , namely, the trace of G_1 . As Chomsky argues, it is only the head of an A-chain but not the trace of the A-chain that blocks AGREE under the locality condition.

The difference between the proposed Sequential AGREE and simultaneous MULTIPLE AGREE was from double object passive expletive constructions as in (278).

(278) a. Það höfðu einhverjum stúdent verið gefnar tölvurnar
EXPL had.3PL some student.DAT been given the.computers.NOM
'Some student had been given the computers.'

223

b. * Það höfðu/hafði verið gefnar einhverjum stúdent tölvurnar
EXPL had.3PL/3SG been given some student.DAT the.computers.NOM
'Some student had been given the computers.'

(Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

This word order fact can be explained if we assume that the higher NP that AGREEs with T must be displaced in order for T to have an AGREE relation with a lower target. Thus, the displacement of the higher NP must be obligatory for the second sequence. If it does not take place, the lower NP does not get a Case. Hence, the derivation does not converge due to the violation of the Case Filter. MULTIPLE AGREE, however, predicts that sentences like (278b) are good unless an additional assumption is made.

Based on this, I proposed that (the primary) AGREE obligatorily takes place with the closest Goal (cf. G_1) if possible. Namely, if there is a Goal, AGREE must take place (to check uninterpretable features of Probe) but if there is no Goal, AGREE will not take place (default agreement). On the other hand, the subsequent AGREE takes place only when it is necessary. Namely if G_2 has not entered into an AGREE relation, the subsequent AGREE must take place (to avoid violating the Case Filter) but if G_2 has already entered into AGREE relation, the subsequent AGREE does not take place (economy principle). Based on these proposals, I reached the conclusion that multiple Case marking is possible if the conditions are met. Namely, the primary AGREE with a valued active Goal is possible, while the subsequent AGREE is not. Since the primary AGREE takes place with an active Goal (by assumption), it does not matter whether the Goal has been valued or not. On the other hand, a valued active Goal is never multiply Case marked via subsequent AGREE since subsequent AGREE is an instance of a last resort operation.

Chapter 3 and 4 presented evidence that supports the idea that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T via AGREE. Chapter 3 presented the argument that not only finite T but also non-finite T licenses nominative Case based on Icelandic data. I presented various phenomena that are related to nominative arguments in non-finite clauses and reached the conclusion that non-finite T licenses nominative Case. The first piece of evidence that supports the idea that AGREE takes place even with non-finite T was from a person restriction in Icelandic. We observed that a nominative argument in the infinitival clause does not show a person restriction if it is not in an agreement relation with a finite predicate. The examples are given in (279).

- (279) a. Henni mundu þá virðast <u>þeir</u> vera hérna.
 her.DAT would.3PL then seem they.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to her that they are here.'
 - b. * Henni mundum þá virðast [<u>við</u> vera hérna].
 her.DAT would.1PL then seem we.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to her that we are here.'
 - c. * Mér munduð þá virðast [<u>þið</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.2PL then seem you.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that you are here.'

- d. Mér mundi þá virðast [<u>við</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.3sG then seem we.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that we/you are here.'
- e. Mér mundi þá virðast [<u>þið</u> vera hérna].
 me.DAT would.3sG then seem you.NOM.PL be here
 'It would then seem to me that we/you are here.'

Strikingly, however, a person restriction was observed even in infinitival clauses if the nominative element is in the object position as shown in (280).

(280) a. *Raising infinitives*

* Jóni virtist [Bjarna hafa líkað ég/við/þið]
 John.DAT seemed Bjarni.DAT have liked I/we/you.NOM.PL
 'It seems to John that Bjarni likes me/us/you' (Boeckx 2003)

b. *Control infinitives*

Viðvonumsttil[aðleiðasthún/*þiðekki]we.NOMhope.PLfor[tobore.INFshe.NOM/you.NOM.PLnot]'We hope not to be bored with her/*you.'(Bobaljik 2004 lecture)

c. *ECM infinitives*

Ég taldi [Jóni líka ***ég/*við/*?þið**] I.NOM believed John.DAT to.like **I.NOM/we.NOM/you.NOM.PL** 'I believed John to like me/us/you.' (Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson p.c.)

Based on these facts, I stated the generalization on person restrictions as follows:

- (281) a. There is a person restriction on embedded nominative subjects that agree with the matrix predicate.
 - b. There is a person restriction on nominative objects (agreeing and non-agreeing).

Thus, the agreement relation with finite predicate was not crucial to the person restrictions. In order to capture the generalization, I proposed that non-finite T licenses nominative Case via AGREE, following Béjar and Rezac (2003) that the second sequence of AGREE does not induce person feature checking.

The second piece of evidence was from PRO in Icelandic. Sigurðsson (1991) has argued that Icelandic PRO is case-marked and that the evidence comes from morphological case chains in infinitives. Icelandic lexical NPs head morphological case chains, involving floating quantifiers, (the secondary predicates and etc.) as shown in (282).

- (282) a. Strákarnir komust allir í skóla the.boys.NOM got all.NOM.PL.M to school
 'The boys all managed to get to school.'
 - b. Strákunum leiddist öllum í skóla
 the.boys.DAT bored all.DAT.PL.M in school
 'The boys were all bored in school'

227

As we see in (282), the quantifier must show up in exactly the same form in the infinitives as in corresponding finite clauses. Thus, Icelandic PRO heads morphological case chains in the same way as lexical subjects do. It seems obvious that it does so by virtue of being case-marked.

(283)	a.	Strákarnir	vonast	til	[að	PRO	komast		allir		skóla]	l
		the.boys.NOM	hope	for	to	NOM	get		all.NOM	to	school	
	b.	Strákarnir	vonast	til	[að	PRO	leiðast	ekki	öllum	í	skóla]	
		the.boys.NOM	hope	for	to	DAT	bore	not	all.DAT	in	school	
								(Sigurðsso	on 19	991:331)	

Thus this fact indicated that Icelandic non-finite T licenses nominative Case.

The last piece of evidence was from a well-known intervention effect in Icelandic; that is, the dative NP is inaccessible for agreement, but nevertheless blocks agreement with the nominative NP when it occurs between the finite verb and the nominative NP in V2 controlled contexts. Thus when there is a dative NP between the finite verb and nominative NP, intervention is observed as in (284a), while it is not when there is no intervening dative NP as in (284b).

- (284) a. Mér hefur/*hafa alltaf virst honum líka bækur
 me.DAT has.3SG/*3PL often seem him.DAT like books.NOM.PL
 'It has often seemed to me that he likes books.' (Schütze 1997:108)
 - b. Mér virðast [hafa verið seldir margir hestar]
 me.DAT seem.3PL [to.have been sold.NOM many horses.NOM.PL]
 'It seems to me that many horses have been sold.' (Jonas 2004 and p.c.)

I showed that even in non-intervention contexts, a nominative NP in the embedded clause does not have to be in an agreement relation with finite verb (default agreement is possible) as in (285).

(285) a. Sitráknum virðist líka þessir bílar the.boy.DAT seem.3SG like these cars.NOM
b. Sitráknum virðast líka þessir bílar the.boy.DAT seem.3PL like these cars.NOM
'The boy seems to like these cars.' (Watanabe 1993:414)

Thus, I argued that these non-agreeing cases are merely instances of non-finite T licensing nominative Case.

In favor of Wurmbrand's view that the sizes of the complement clauses vary, I gave accounts for optional agreement in Icelandic Rasing/ECM constructions. I proposed to extend Wurmbrand's (2001b) selectional differences to account for the Icelandic optional agreement facts. The relevant examples are repeated here as in (286) and (287).

- (286) a. Manninum virðist/virðast t_i [hestarnir vera seinir.] the.man.DAT seem.3sg/3pL [the.horses.NOM be slow 1 'The man finds the horses slow.' (Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003:1000) b. <u>Mér</u>i mundi/mundu þá t_i virðast þeir vera hérna. me.DAT would.3SG/3PL then seem they.NOM.M.PL be here 'It would then seem to me that they are here.'
- (287) a. Það virðist/virðast <u>einhverjum manni</u> hestarnir vera seinir
 EXPL seem.3SG/3PL some man.DAT the.horses.NOM be slow
 'The horses seems to some man to be slow.'
 - b. Það mundi/mundu <u>einhverjum manni</u> virðast hestarnir
 EXPL would.3SG/3PL some man.DAT seem the.horses.NOM vera seinir

be slow

'The horses would seem to some man to be slow.'

I proposed that the optionality comes from whether the infinitival complement contains TP or not. This approach gave a unified account for the distribution of nominative NP in the non-finite clause and its agreement facts in Icelandic. The Icelandic constructions that I investigated with respect to Case and agreement in this chapter are summarized below:

(288)	Seem-	type EC	СM					PL	DFLT	Γ
	a.	DAT	V/Aux	t _{DAT}	[NOM.	PL]	√	\checkmark	(cf.(150))
	b.	DAT	V/Aux	t _{DAT}	[DAT	•••	NOM.PL]	*	\checkmark	(cf.(165))
	c.	DAT	V/Aux	t _{DAT}	[NOM.PL]	\checkmark	\checkmark	(cf.(171))
	Seem-1	type rai	sing							
	d.	DAT	V/Aux		[t _{DAT}		NOM.PL]	\checkmark	\checkmark	(cf.(172))

(289) *Believe*-type ECM

ł	a.	NOM	V/Aux		[ACC	ACC]	(cf.(179a))
1). *	NOM	V/Aux	•••	[NOM	ACC]	(cf. (179b))
(2.	NOM	V/Aux	•••	[DAT	NOM]	(cf.(181))
(ł. (*) NOM	V/Aux	•••	[DAT	ACC]	(cf. (181), fn 82(i))
(.	NOM	V/Aux		L	ACC]	(cf.(184))

Under the proposed theory, we derive the sentences that show finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative argument when the complement clauses contain TP, while the sentences do not show finite verb agreement with the embedded nominative argument when the complement clauses do not contain TP. Moreover, the nominative object in the embedded clause in the *believe*-type ECM is licensed by the embedded non-finite T. Then I concluded that the reason why the embedded subject in the *believe*-type ECM cannot be morphologically realized as nominative is a result of the multiple Case checking.

231

Chapter 4 presented an argument that only T but not some other category between T and the nominative argument licenses nominative Case based on Japanese facts. I provided some new data for the discussion of the scope of nominative objects in Japanese. The key example is given in (290).

(290) John-wa subete-no iro-ga tuka-e-nai.John-TOP all-GEN color-NOM use-POT-NEG'John cannot use every color.'

I claimed that the example in (290) has two interpretations with respect to the scope interactions among the nominative object, potential verb, and negation.

a.	Nom	Obj	>	> ¬ >				can					
<u>.</u>				10848	ersee 22	(antaidhe	8 2 .00	97 Co.2	883 S	27/17/5	agest, Ph	6385-113	1930 P
b.				-	> 1	Nom	1OBJ	1 >	> (xan		99-19 	

I showed that (290) has interpretations (291a) and (291c), but not (291b). Based on this fact, I reached the conclusion that only T but not some other category between T and nominative argument licenses nominative Case, assuming that NPs do not move to the Spec of any non-Case-licensing or non-phase heads.

In favor of Wurmbrand's view, I gave accounts for Case alternations in Japanese stative verb constructions. I argued that Case alternation in potential constructions in Japanese derives from the size of the complement clause of the potential verb.

(292)	a.	Taro-ga	osake-wo	nom-e-ru	(koto)
		Taro-NOM	alcohol-ACC	drink-POT-PRES	fact
	b.	Taro-ga	osake-ga	nom-e-ru	(koto)
		Taro-NOM	alcohol-NOM	drink-pot-pres	fact
		'Taro can d	drink alcohol.	?	

When the complement clause contains v^* , accusative Case is licensed on the object. When the complement clause does not contain v^* , nominative Case is licensed by the matrix T via Sequential AGREE. As another instance of supporting evidence for this view, I established the syntax of the so-called "V-*te ar*- constructions" in Japanese that are similar to the potential constructions in Japanese and argued that this construction also involves restructuring vs. non-restructuring. I focused on the two transitive V-*te ar*patterns in these constructions as in (293) and (294).

(293) Nominative Transitive te ar- construction (NT te ar- construction)

Soto-ni kuruma-ga tome-te ar-u outside-LOC car-NOM stop-GER be-PRES Lit. 'The car is in the state of having been parked outside.'

(294) Accusative Transitive te ar- construction (AT te ar- construction)

Taro-ga soto-nikuruma-wo tome-tear-uTaro-Noutside-LOCcar-ACCstop-GERbe-PRESLit. 'Taro is in the state of having parked the car outside.'

I showed that the nominative argument in NT *te ar*- construction is a subject by conducting the subject-hood test. Then, I argued that syntactic differences between the two transitive V-*te ar*- patterns in this construction can also be attributed to whether the complement clause contains v^*P or not.

Importantly, both potential and V-*te ar*- constructions are related to the nominative Case licensing to the object of the embedded verbs. I showed that facts in both constructions are succinctly accounted for under the assumption that nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T in Japanese.

In sum, I made two significant assumptions: (i) nominative Case is uniformly licensed by T and (ii) sizes of infinitival complement clauses vary. With these assumptions, all the data in Icelandic and Japanese that I presented in this dissertation were succinctly accounted for under the proposed theory of Sequential AGREE.

5.2 Remaining issues

5.2.1 Wh-movement in Icelandic revisited

Although I managed to give an account for wh-movement data in Icelandic in Appendix I in chapter 3, there is a very controversial case of wh-movement. These data are from a letter that Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson wrote to Noam Chomsky, Anders Holmberg, and Christer Platzack in 2001. In (295a), we can observe the person restriction, while there is no restriction when the finite verb does not show agreement with the embedded nominative NP as in (295b).

(295) a. Hverjum myndum bá hafa virst [við vera gáfuð]? whom.DAT would.1PL then have seemed we.NOM be intelligent]? b. Hverjum myndi þá hafa virst [við vera gáfuð whom.DAT would.3sG then have seemed we.NOM be intelligent

These are not surprising given the assumption that the person restriction occurs when the NP that has $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ person-feature enters into subsequent AGREE relation with T. Interestingly, movement of the embedded nominative NP across an experiencer NP is observed only when the experiencer is wh-moved as illustrated in (296).¹²⁸

¹²⁸ Movement across experiencer is generally impossible in Icelandic as shown in (i).
- (296) a. Hverjum myndum við þá hafa virst [vera gáfuð]?
 whom.DAT would.1PL we.NOM then have seemed be intelligent
 b. * Hverjum myndi við þá hafa virst [vera gáfuð]?
 - b. * Hverjum myndi við þá hafa virst [vera gáfuð]? whom.DAT would.3SG we.NOM then have seemed be intelligent

What is most surprising in (296) is that agreement between finite verb and the nominative NP becomes possible and in fact obligatory. This is apparently problematic under the proposed theory. As we have analyzed wh-constructions in Appendix I in chapter 3, the wh-dative NP remains between T and the nominative NP until C merges without undergoing movement to the Spec of TP. If this is the case, the nominative NP has no chance to move to AGREE with T nor MOVE to the Spec of TP.

One very tentative solution that I can offer is hinted at by the agreement facts in (296). Remember that the person restriction occurs only when subsequent AGREE takes place (by assumption). Since there is no person restriction observed in (296a), this suggests that the nominative NP in fact enters into primary AGREE relation with T. How could it happen? Recall that German dative NP never enters into AGREE relation with T because of the lack of structural Case. Suppose that Icelandic dative in this instance behaves like German dative NP. If that is so, T simply ignores wh-dative NP. Therefore,

(i)	a.		Hafði	þeim	virst	[Ólafur	vera	gáfaður]?	
			had	them.DAT	seemed		Olaf.NOM	be	intelliger	it	
			'Did it	seem to the	em that C)la	f was intell	igent.).		
	b.	*	Hafði	Ólafur _i þein	n virst [t _i	Vŧ	era gafaður]	?			
	c.	*	Hafði	Ólafur _i virs	t þeim [t _i	ve	ra gáfaður]	?			
	d.	*	Hafði l	beim Ólafu	r; virst It;	ve	era gafaður]	?	(5	Sigurðsso	m 1

.996)

T finds the lower NP to AGREE with and moves it to the Spec of TP. Here AGREE relation is primary and hence there is no person restriction.

For this account, there are two questions remaining. One is why Icelandic quirky NP behaves like German dative NP only in this example. The second one is why the embedded nominative NP must move to the Spec of TP only when the dative NP behaves like German dative NP, given that Icelandic shows no obligatory EPP.¹²⁹ At this point, I have no good account of these data.

5.2.2 Phrase-structural differences among Icelandic infinitives

Although I was able to collect a certain amount of Icelandic data that could support the proposed theory, I could not conduct the tests to justify the assumption that Icelandic infinitival complements may differ with respect to whether the complement clauses contain TP or not. What we need to show is whether the availability of a TP projection in the embedded clause is in fact correlated with agreement. Since this is a phrase-structural difference, phrase-structural evidence should converge.

Sigurðsson (1989) has already tried to investigate the internal structures of infinitives and has suggested the following analysis with respect to the infinitives.

¹²⁹ And Wurmbrand (2004a) shows that German has no EPP.

(297) Seem-type ECM: either a small clause (with no Infl) or a bare IP (having Infl)
 Seem-type raising: a small clause (with no Infl)
 Believe-type ECM: a small clause (with no Infl)¹³⁰

However, as Sigurðsson himself has mentioned, the data that he presented were difficult to understand. For instance, Sigurðsson shows that sentential adverbs like *sennilega* 'probably' and *varla* 'hardly' are normally infelicitious inside all relevant Icelandic infinitivals.

(298) Seem-type ECM

a.		Mér	hafði	virst [María	lesa		bókina]
		me.DAT	had	seemed	Mary.NOM	read		the.book.	ACC
b.	*	Mér	hafði	virst [María sennilega	lesa		bókina]
c.	*	Mér	hafði	virst [María	lesa	sennilega	bókina]
							(Sigurð	sson 1989	:85)

(299) Seem-type raising

a.		María _i	hafði	virst	[t _i		lesa		bókina]
		Mary.NOM	seemed			read		the.book.ACC		
b.	*	María _i	hafði	virst	[t _i	sennilega	lesa		bókina	
c.	*	María _i	hafði	virst	[t _i		lesa	sennilega	bókina	Ţ
								(Sigurð	sson 1989	:85)

¹³⁰ Sigurðsson (1989) discusses standard complement clauses (cf. (179a)) and does not discuss dative-nominative complement clauses (cf. (181)) in the *believe*-type ECM.

238

(300) Believe-type ECM

a.		Ég	hafði	talið	[Maríu	lesa		bókina	
		I.NOM	had	believed		Mary.ACC	read		the.book.AC	C
b.	*	Ég	hafði	talið	[Maríu sennilega	lesa		bókina]
c.	*	Ég	hafði	talið	[Maríu	lesa	sennilega	bókina]
								(Sigu	rðsson 1989:	85)

However, Sigurðsson (1989:85) also shows that these infinitivals tolerate sentential adverbs marginally if they also contain a modal verb.¹³¹

(301) Seem-type ECM

a.	??	Mér	hafði	virst	[hún	varla	vilja		snerta	matinn]
		me.DAT	had	seemed	she.NOM	hardly	want		touch	the.food	
b.	??	Mér	hafði	virst	[hún		vilja	varla	snerta	matinn]
		me	had	seemed	she		want	hardly	touch	the.food	
								(S	igurðss	on 1989:8	85)

¹³¹ Note that Icelandic modal verbs can appear in infinitivals.

239

(302) Seem-type raising¹³²

a.	??	Hún	hafði	virst	[ekki	vilja		snerta	matinn]
		she.NOM	had	seemed	not	want		touch	the.food
b.	*	Hún	hafði	virst		vilja	ekki	snerta	matinn]
		she.NOM	had	seemed		want	not	touch	the food
									(Sigurðsson 1989:85)

(303) Believe-type ECM

a.	??	Ég	hafði	talið [hana	varla	mundu	lesa	bókina]
		I.NOM	had	believed	her.ACC	hardly	would	read	the.book.AC	С
b.	*	Ég	hafði	talið [hana	mundu	varla	lesa	bókina]
		I.NOM	had	believed	her.ACC	would	hardly	read	the.book.AC	С
cf.		Ég	hafði	talið [hana		varla	lesa	bókina]
		I.NOM	had	believed	her.ACC		hardly	read	the.book.AC	С

(Sigurðsson 1989:85)

Because of these marginal judgments, it is certainly not clear if we can make any conclusion about the structures of these infinitives. However, it may be worth examining whether the relevant data that I discussed in this dissertation show any systematic patterns or not. In addition to what Sigurðsson (1989:85) tested to look into the phrase structures of Icelandic infinitives, there should be more cases that we can examine. For

¹³² Recall that Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson does not take *ekki* in the complement of the *seem*-verb normally.

instance, Wurmbrand (2001b) correlates presence/absence of TP with tense properties (only tenseless infinitives can lack TP) and presents some tests to distinguish whether infinitives contain TP or not. If we could show some systematic difference among these relevant infinitives, the proposal that I made in this dissertation would be more solid and promising.¹³³

As I have mentioned, Sigurðsson (1989:85) has already had a similar insight to what I have argued for. Namely, he tries to find and propose phrase-structural differences among Icelandic infinitives. Sigurðsson's insight that Icelandic infinitives may have different phrase-structures had not received much attention but I believe it is time that we reconsider it. Thus, I would like to conclude my dissertation with a passage from Lasnik (2002a:3): "As has happened not infrequently in recent syntactic research, what's old is new again."

¹³³ See Thráinson (1993) on Icelandic infinitives. See also Bobaljik and Thráinson (1998) who suggested verb raising differences might follow from structural difference à la Wurmbrand (2001b).

Bibliography

- Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Doctroral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 2002. Raising without infinitives and the role of agreement. In *Dimensions of movement: From features to remnants*, eds. Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers and Hans-Martin Gaertner, 17-30. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The syntax of ditransitives: Evidence from clitics*: Studies in generative grammar 54. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1982. The representation of case in Modern Icelandic. In *The mental* representation of grammatical relations, ed. Joan Bresnan, 427-503. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1990a. Case structures and control in Modern Icelandic. In *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, vol. 24, eds. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen, 187-234. Syntax and Semantics 24. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.
- Andrews, Avery D. 1990b. The VP-complement analysis in Modern Icelandic. In Modern Icelandic Syntax, vol. 24, eds. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen, 165-185. Syntax and Semantics 24. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press. [Revision of a paper originally published in NELS 6, 1976, 1-21].

Belletti, Adriana. 1988. The Case of unaccusatives. Linguistic Inquiry 19:1-34.

Bhatt, Rajesh. 2003. Long distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu. Ms.University of Texas at Austin.

242

- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2002. A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and "covert" movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20:197-267.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2003. Floating Quantifiers: Handle with care. In *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book*, eds. Lisa Cheng and Rint Sybesma, 107-148. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. [revision of 1998 Glot article and bibliography].
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 2005. Where's Φ ? Agreement as a postsyntactic operation. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Dianne Elizabeth Jonas. 1993. Specs for subjects: The role of TP in Icelandic. In *Papers on Case and agreement: I*, eds. Jonathan David Bobaljik and Colin Phillips, 59-98. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 18. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Dianne Elizabeth Jonas. 1996. Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27:195-236.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Höskuldur Thráinson. 1998. Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1:37-71.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Susanne Wurmbrand. 2004a. Anti-reconstruction effects are anti-reconstruction effects. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association (CLA)*, eds. Sophie Burelle and Stanca Somesfalean, 13-24. Montréal, Canada: Université du Québec à Montréal, Département de linguistique et de didactique des langues.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Susanne Wurmbrand. 2004b. Complex predicates, aspect, and anti-reconstruction. Paper presented at *Japanese/Korean Linguistics Conference 14*, Tucson, Arizona.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Susanne Wurmbrand. To appear. The domain of agreement. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2000a. Quirky agreement. Studia Linguistica 53:451-480.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2000b. Raising and Experiencers, cross-linguistically. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.

- Boeckx, Cedric. 2003. Intricacies of Icelandic agreement. Ms.University of Maryland/Harvard University as of July 2003.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2004. Long-distance agreement in Hindi: Some theoretical implications. *Studia Linguistica* 58:23-36.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997a. On certain violations of the superiority condition, AgrO, and economy of derivation. *Journal of Linguistics* 33:227-254.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997b. The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2004a. Be careful where you float your quantifers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:681-742.
- Bošković, Željko. 2004b. Case and agreement with genitive of quantification in Russian. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Béjar, Susana. 2003. Phi-syntax: A theory of agreement. Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.
- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2003. Person licensing and the derivation of PCC effects. In Selected papers from LSRL 32. Benjamins.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. Lectures on government and binding. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. Knowledge of language. New York: Praeger.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 417-454. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, eds. Kenneth Hale and Samuel J. Keyser, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. Categories and transformations. In *The minimalist program*, 219-394. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik, eds. Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. [Also available as MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 15. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL].
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1-52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In *Structures and beyond: The cartography of syntactic structures*, ed. Adriana Belletti, 104-131. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Chris, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1996. VP-internal structure and object shift in Icelandic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27:391-444.
- Cowper, Elizabeth A. 1988. What is a subject? Non-nominative subjects in Icelandic. In *NELS 18*, eds. James Blevins and Juli Carter, 94-108. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.

den Dikken, Marcel. 1995. Binding, expletives, and levels. Linguistic Inquiry 26:347-354.

- Diesing, Molly. 1996. Semantic variables and object shift. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax II*, eds. Höskuldur Thráinsson, Samuel David Epstein and Steve Peter, 66-84. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Diesing, Molly. 1997. Yiddish VP order and the typology of object movement in Germanic. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 15:369-427.
- Dubinsky, Stanley. 1992. Case assignment to VP-adjoined positions: nominative objects in Japanese. *Linguistics* 30:873-910.
- Déprez, Viviane. 1989. On the typology of syntactic projections and the nature of chains: Move α to the specifier of functional projections. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Representation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press and MITWPL.

- Frampton, John, and Sam Gutmann. 2000. Agreement is feature sharing. Ms., Northeastern University.
- Freidin, Robert, and Rex A. Sprouse. 1991. Lexical case phenomena. In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 392-416. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- George, Leland M., and Jaklin Kornfilt. 1981. Finiteness and boundedness in Turkish. In *Binding and filtering*, ed. Frank Heny, 105-127. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In *Speech acts*, eds. Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41-58. Syntax and Semantics 3. New York: Academic Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 1995. Abstracting away from abstract case. In Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistics Society Annual Meeting (NELS 25), ed. Jill Beckman, 207-221. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 1992. On the ambiguity between the perfect and the resultative: Evidence from V-te ar- constructions in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 18th* Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 88-99. Berkeley, CA.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001a. Multiple Agree and the defective intervention constraint in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the HUMIT 2000*, 67-80. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 40. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001b. On nominative-genitive conversion. In A Few from Building E39: Papers in Syntax, Semantics and their Interface, eds. Elena Guerzoni and Ora Matushansky, 67-125. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 39. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Hiraiwa, Ken. 2002a. EPP: Object shift and stylistic fronting in Scandinavian. In *The proceedings of the 20th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, eds. Karine Megerdoomian and Leora Anne Bar-el, 290-303. Somerville, Mass: Cascadilla Press.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2002b. Move or Agree? Case and raising in Japanese. Ms., MIT.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2002c. Multiple Agree. Paper presented at *The 25th GLOW Colloquium: Tools in Linguistic Theory (TiLT) 2002*, Utrecht.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2004. Dimensions of agreement. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

- Hoji, Hajime. 1985. Logical form constraints and configurational structures in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2002. Expletives and agreement in Scandinavian passives. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 4:85-128.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Thorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2003. Agreement and movement in Icelandic raising constructions. *Lingua* 113:997-1019.
- Holmberg, Anders, and Christer Platzack. 1995. *The role of Inflection in Scandinavian syntax*: Oxford studies in comparative syntax. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1991. Expletives: a comparative study of English and Icelandic. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 47:1-88.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. Logical form: From GB to minimalism. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Hoshi, Hiroto. 1999. Complex predicate formation in Japanese: A (non-)configurational theory. In SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics, 427-473. London: SOAS.
- Jonas, Dianne Elizabeth. 1996. Clause structure and verb syntax in Scandinavian and English. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jonas, Dianne Elizabeth. 2004. Abstract Case, agreement and positional licensing. Paper presented at *Australian Linguistic Society Annual Conference 2004*, University of Sydney.
- Jónsson, Jóhannes Gísli. 1996. Clausal architecture and Case in Icelandic. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

- Kitahara, Hisatsugu. 1996. Raising quantifiers without quantifier raising. In *Minimal ideas: Syntactic studies in the minimalist framework*, eds. Werner Abraham, Samuel David Epstein, Höskuldur Thráinson and C. Jan-Wouter Zwart, 189-198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1994. Nominative objects: The role of TP in Japanese. In Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics 1, eds. Masatoshi Koizumi and Hiroyuki Ura, 211-230. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 24. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1995. Phrase structure in minimalist syntax. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1998. Remarks on nominative objects. Journal of Japanese Linguistics 16:39-66.
- Kubo, Miori. 1992. Japanese syntactic structures and their constructional meaning. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. The structure of the Japanese language. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject raising. In *Japanese Generative Grammar*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani, 17-49. Syntax and Semantics 5. New York: Academic Press.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. Elements of control: Structure and meaning in infinitival constructions. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landman, Fred. 1996. Plurality. In *The handbook of contemporary semantic theory*, ed. Shalom Lappin, 425-457. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995a. Case and expletives revisited: On Greed and other human failings. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26:615-633.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995b. Last resort. In *Minimalism and linguistic theory*, eds. Shosuke Haraguchi and Michio Funaki, 1-32. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

- Lasnik, Howard. 1995c. Last resort and attract F. Paper presented at *Proceedings of the* Sixth Annual Meeting of the Formal Linguistics Society of Mid-America, Bloomington, In.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999a. Chains of arguments. In *Working minimalism*, eds. Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 189-215. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lasnik, Howard. 1999b. Minimalist analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.

Lasnik, Howard. 2002a. Clause-mate conditions revisited. *Glot International* 6:94-96.

- Lasnik, Howard. 2002b. Feature movement or agreement at a distance? In *Dimensions of movement*, eds. Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers and Hans-Martin Gaertner. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In CLS 27, eds. Lise M. Dobrin, Lynn Nichols and Rosa M. Rodriguez, 324-343. Chicago, Ill: Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago. [Reprinted in Minimalist analysis, Howard Lasnik, 7-24. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999].
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2003. Some interface properties of the phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:506-516.
- Mahajan, Anoop Kumar. 1989. Agreement and agreement phrases. In Functional heads and clause structure, eds. Itziar Laka and Anoop Kumar Mahajan, 217-252. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 10. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Maling, Joan. 1988. Variations on a theme: Existential sentences in Swedish and Icelandic. In *Special Issue on Comparative Germanic Syntax*, eds. Denise Fekete and Zofia Laubitz, 168-191. 1988 McGill Working Papers in Linguistics/Cahiers linguistiques de McGill. Montreal: McGill University, Department of Linguistics.
- Maling, Joan, and Sigríður Sigurjónsdóttir. 2002. The 'new impoersonal' construction in Icelandic. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5:97-142.
- Maling, Joan, and Rex A. Sprouse. 1995. Structural Case, specifier-head relations, and the Case of predicate NPs. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, eds.

Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen and Sten Vikner, 167-186. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (ESCOL '91)*, eds. German Westphal, Benjamin Ao and Hee-Rahk Chae, 234-253. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1975. A reference grammar of Japanese. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1990. On the syntax of Japanese "intransitivizing" -te aru construction: Non-lexical function changing. In *Proceedings of the 26th Regioonal Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 277-291. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- May, Robert. 1985. Logical Form: Its structure and derivation. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

McCloskey, James. 1991. There, it and agreement. Linguistic Inquiry 22:563-567.

- McCloskey, James. 1996. Subjects and subject positions in irish. In *The syntax of the Celtic langauges: A comparative perspective*, eds. Robert Borsley and Ian Roberts, 241-283. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCloskey, James. 2000. Quantifier float and wh-movement in an Irish English. Linguistic Inquiry 31:57-84.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. Numeral quantifiers and thematic relations. In *Structure and Case marking in Japanese*, ed. Shigeru Miyagawa, 19-83. Syntax and Semantics 22. New York: Academic Press.
- Morikawa, Masahiro. 1993. A parametric approach to Case alternation phenomena in Japanese. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Nichols, Lynn. 2001. The syntactic basis of referential hierarchy phenomena: Clues from languages with and without morphological case. *Lingua* 111:515-537.

- Niinuma, Fumikazu. 1999. Nominative objects and overt A-movement in Japanese. Paper presented at *ESCOL*, Storrs.
- Nissenbaum, Jonathan W. 2000. Investigations of covert phrase movement. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Nomura, Masashi. 2003. The true nature of nominative objects in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, eds. Elsi Kaiser and Sudha Arunachalam, 169-183. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 9.1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Penn Linguistics Club.
- Nomura, Masashi. 2004. Partial negation and the scope of nominative objects in Japanese. Ms., Storrs, University of Connecticut.
- Nomura, Masashi. 2005. Remarks on the scope of nominative objects in Japanese. Paper presented at *TCP 2005*, Tokyo.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1984. Working 1s and inversion in Italian, Japanese, and Quechua. In *Studies in relational grammar*, vol. 2, eds. David Perlmutter and Carol G. Rosen, 292-330. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2003. Non-canonical agreement is canonical. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 101:279-312.

Postal, Paul M. 1974. On raising. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case and Infl-to-Comp: the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:85-109.
- Richards, Norvin. 1997. What moves where when in which language? Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1990. On Icelandic word order once more. In *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, eds. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen, 3-40. Syntax and Semantics 24. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.

Saito, Mamoru. 1982. Case-marking in Japanese. Ms., MIT.

- Saito, Mamoru. 2000. Predicate raising and theta relations. Ms.Nanzan University, Nagoya.
- Saito, Mamoru, and Hiroto Hoshi. 1998. Control in complex predicates. Ms.Nanzan University, Nagoya and SOAS, London.
- Sano, Masaki. 1985. LF movement in Japanese. *Descriptive and applied linguistics* 18:245-259.
- Schütze, Carson Theodore Robert. 1997. INFL in child and adult language: agreement, Case and licensing. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Schütze, Carson Theodore Robert. 2003. Syncretism and double agreement with Icelandic nominative objects. In *Grammar in focus: Festschrift for Christer Platzack 18 November 2003*, vol. 2, eds. Lars-Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson and Halldór Ármann Sigurðsson, 295-303. Lund.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1989. Verbal syntax and Case in Icelandic. Doctoral dissertation, University of Lund.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1991. Icelandic case-marked PRO and the licensing of lexical arguments. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:327-363.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1992. The case of Quirky subjects. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 49:1-26.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1993. Agreement as head visible feature government. *Studia Linguistica* 47:32-56.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1996. Icelandic finite verb agreement. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 57:1-46.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2000. The locus of Case and agreement. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 65:65-108.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2002. Agree and agreement: Evidence from Germanic. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 70:101-156.

252

- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 2004. Agree in syntax, agreement in signs. Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax 74:1-42.
- Sugioka, Yoko. 1985. Interaction of derivational morphology and syntax in Japanese and English. New York: Garland.
- Tada, Hiroaki. 1992. Nominative objects in Japanese. Journal of Japanese Linguistics 14:91-108.
- Tada, Hiroaki. 1993. A/A' partition in derivation. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Takano, Yuji. 2003. Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: A prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:779-834.
- Takezawa, Koichi. 1987. A configurational approach to Case-marking in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Tanaka, Hiroyuki. 2000. Cyclic application of Agree and restrictions on Case-assignment in Japanese. Ms., Himeji-Dokkyo University.
- Taraldsen, Knut Tarald. 1995. On agreement and nominative objects in Icelandic. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, eds. Hubert Haider, Susan Olsen and Sten Vikner, 307-327. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Thráinson, Höskuldur. 1993. On the structure of infinitival complements. In *Harvard* working papers in linguistics, vol. 3, 181-213. Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Linguistics, Harvard University.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1979. On complementation in Icelandic. New York: Garland.

- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 2001. Object shift and scrambling. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, eds. Mark R. Baltin and Chris Collins, 148-202. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. Multiple Feature-checking: A theory of grammatical function splitting. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1999. Checking theory and dative subject constructions in Japanese and Korean. Journal of East Asian Linguistics 8:223-254.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 2000. *Checking theory and grammatical functions in Universal Grammar*: Oxford studies in comparative syntax. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 2001a. Case. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, eds. Mark R. Baltin and Chris Collins, 334-373. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 2001b. A theory of grammatical functions in the minimalist program. In *The minimalist parameter*, eds. Galina M. Alexandrova and Olga Arnaudova, 51-64. Current issues in linguistic theory. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1999. Multiple Spell-Out. In *Working minimalism*, eds. Samuel David Epstein and Norbert Hornstein, 251-282. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1991. Another look at Icelandic Case marking and grammatical relations. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9:145-194.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1993. AGR-based CAse theory and its interaction with the A-bar system. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001a. AGREE: The other VP-internal subject hypothesis. In Proceedings of the 20th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 20), eds. Karine Megerdoomian and Leora Anne Bar-el, 635-648. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001b. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2003. A-movement to the point of no return. In Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistics Society Annual Meeting 33 (NELS 33), eds. Makoto Kadowaki and Shigeto Kawahara, 463-474. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2004a. Licensing Case. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.

- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2004b. No TP fronting meets nearly headless Nick. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Yatsushiro, Kazuko. 1999. Case licensing and VP structure. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions: the Icelandic passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3:441-483. [Reprinted in *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, eds. Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen, 95-136. Syntax and Semantics 24. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press (1990)].
- Zushi, Mihoko. 1995. Long distance dependencies. Doctoral dissertation, McGill University,