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1 Introduction

► Japanese has the exceptional Case-marking (ECM) construction, where an embedded subject receives accusative Case from a matrix predicate (cf. Kuno 1976):

(1) a. Mary-ga \[ReportP \text{Hanako-ga} \text{kasiko-i to]} \text{omottei-ru.}\]
   Mary-NOM \[ReportP \text{Hanako-NOM} \text{smart-PRS Report]} \text{think-PRS}\n
b. Mary-ga \[\text{Hanako-o} \text{kasiko-i to]} \text{omottei-ru.}\]
   Mary-NOM \[\text{Hanako-ACC} \text{smart-PRS Report]} \text{think-PRS}\n
‘Mary thinks that Hanako is smart.’

The accusative subject can raise into the matrix vP/VP (but see Hoji 1991, 2005 and Takano 2003 for an alternative analysis):

(2) Mary-ga \[vP \text{Hanako-o tuyoku} \text{Report} t_i \text{kasiko-i to]} \text{omottei-ru.}]\]
   Mary-NOM \[vP \text{Hanako-ACC strongly} \text{Report smart-PRS Report]} \text{think-PRS}\n
‘Mary strongly believes that Hanako is smart.’

► It has been debated whether the raising of the accusative subject is obligatory.

\[vP \text{Hanako} [ReportP t_i] [Report] v]\n
obligatory


(4) Optional Raising Analysis (Hiraiwa 2001, 2005)
\[vP \text{Hanako}_{[ip]} [CASE] [Report] V_{[up]} v]\n
optional Agree

The accusative subject \textit{Hanako} in (4) can stay within the ReportP complement (and receive Case via long-distance Agree). Raising of the accusative subject is optional (cf. Lasnik 1999).
I examine two arguments for the optionality of raising (cf. (4)) and show that they can be analyzed under (a particular version of) the obligatory raising analysis (cf. (3)).

(5) **Argument for Optional Raising 1: Indeterminate Accusative Subject**

Mary-ga [Report dare-o kasiko-i to]-мо omottei-na-i.

‘Mary thinks that no one is smart.’

- The accusative subject *dare* ‘who’ in (5) is an indeterminate pronoun (Sakai 1998), which is supposed to work as an NPI (i.e. *no one*) when c-commanded by the particle –мо. (see Hiraiwa 2005). Negation is in the matrix clause.
- Given that –мо in (5) is attached to the Report head to, (5) shows that the indeterminate accusative subject must be in the ReportP complement.

(6) **Argument for Optional Raising 2: Embedded Adjunct**

Mary-NOM [Report [class-representative as] Hanako-ACC earnest COP Report] think-PRS

‘Mary thinks that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’

(based on Kobayashi and Maki 2002: 218)

- The accusative subject *Hanako* in (6) is preceded by an embedded adjunct *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’. If the embedded adjunct must be in the ReportP complement, the accusative subject *Hanako* in (6) must also be in the ReportP complement.
- If the accusative subjects in (5) and (6) stay within the ReportP complement, (5) and (6) provide evidence for the optionality of raising in the Japanese ECM construction.

(7) **Claims of This Presentation**

a. (5) and (6) can be accounted for under the obligatory raising analysis.

b. (5) is analyzed in terms of a condition on indeterminate pronouns defined on Transfer domains (Section 2) and (6) is analyzed in terms of a “free ride” effect in A-movement (Section 3).
2 Indeterminate Pronoun Licensing and Transfer Domains

2.1 Indeterminate Pronouns and the Japanese ECM Construction

- Indeterminate pronouns such as *dare* ‘who’ or *nani* ‘what’ behave as NPIs when they are accompanied by the particle –*mo* (Kuroda 1965; McGloin 1976; Nishigauchi 1990; Kishimoto 2001; D. Takahashi 2002; Hiraiwa 2005, among others):

\[(8)\]

(a) Hanako-ga **dare-mo** home-**nakat**-ta.
Hanako-NOM who-MO praise-NEG-PST
‘Hanako praised no one.’

(b) **Dare-mo** Hanako-o home-**nakat**-ta.
who-MO Hanako-ACC praise-NEG-PST
‘No one praised Hanako.’

- (8a): the object indeterminate pronoun *dare* ‘who’ accompanied by -*mo* behaves as an NPI. (8b): the subject indeterminate pronoun *dare* ‘who’ accompanied by –*mo* behaves as an NPI.

- The particle –*mo* can be displaced from indeterminate pronouns (Kuroda 1965). However, the displacement is not free and obeys a syntactic condition (Kishimoto 2001, Hiraiwa 2005). We thus observe the following subject/object asymmetry:

\[(9)\]

(a) Hanako-ga **dare**-**o** home-**mo**-si-**nakat**-ta.
Hanako-NOM who-ACC praise-MO-do-NEG-PST
‘Hanako praised no one.’

(b) * **Dare-ga** Hanako-o home-**mo**-si-**nakat**-ta.
who-NOM Hanako-ACC praise-MO-do-NEG-PST
‘No one praised Hanako.’

- –*Mo* in (9) is attached to the verb *home* ‘praise’ and followed by the dummy verb -*si* ‘do’, which is inserted to morphologically support negation and Tense. The object *dare* ‘who’ in (9a) behaves as an NPI while the subject *dare* ‘who’ in (9b) fails to behave as an NPI.

- Hiraiwa (2005) proposes the following condition on the licensing of indeterminate pronouns:

\[(10)\]

The head of the chain of the indeterminate must be in the c-command domain of –*mo* at Transfer (based on Hiraiwa 2005: 164).
The subject/object asymmetry in (9):

\[(11) \quad \begin{align*}
& (a) \quad [\text{TP} \text{ Hanako}-\text{NOM} \quad [\text{VP} \quad t_i \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{who}-\text{ACC} \quad V] \quad v-\text{mo}] \quad \text{Neg} \quad T] \quad (= (9a)) \\
& (b) \quad \ast \quad [\text{TP} \quad \text{who}-\text{NOM} \quad [\text{VP} \quad t_i \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{Hanako-ACC} \quad V] \quad v-\text{mo}] \quad \text{Neg} \quad T] \quad (= (9b))
\end{align*}\]

Hiraiwa (2005) assumes \(-mo\) is adjoined to \(v\) (cf. Kishimoto 2001).\(^{(11)a}/(9a):\) the indeterminate pronoun, which is the accusative object, is c-commanded by \(-mo\).\(^{(11)b}/(9b):\) the indeterminate pronoun, which is the nominative subject, fails to be c-commanded by \(-mo\).

The licensing condition in (10) has an important implication for the analysis of the Japanese ECM construction:\(^1\)

**Argument for Optional Raising 1: Indeterminate Accusative Subject**

\[(12) \quad \begin{align*}
& \text{Mary-ga} \quad [\text{Report} \quad \text{dare}-o \quad \text{kasiko-i} \quad \text{to}]-\text{mo} \quad \text{omottei-na-i}. \\
& \text{Mary-NOM} \quad [\text{Report} \quad \text{who}-\text{ACC} \quad \text{smart-PRS} \quad \text{Report}]-\text{MO} \quad \text{think-NEG-PRS} \\
\text{‘Mary thinks that no one is smart.’} \quad (= (5))
\end{align*}\]

The indeterminate accusative subject \(\text{dare} ‘\text{who}’\) in (12) is associated with \(-mo\) attached to the Report head \(\text{to}\) (Sakai 1998). As indeterminate pronouns must be c-commanded by \(-mo\), the acceptability of (12) shows that the accusative subject can stay within the ReportP complement.

When the indeterminate accusative subject is located above \(-mo\), the former fails to be licensed:

\[(13) \quad \begin{align*}
& \text{Movement of the Accusative Subject across the Matrix Subject} \\
& (a) \quad \text{Mary-ga} \quad [\text{ReportP} \quad \text{dare}-o \quad \text{kasiko-i} \quad \text{to}]-\text{mo} \quad \text{omottei-na-i}. \\
& \text{Mary-NOM} \quad [\text{ReportP} \quad \text{who}-\text{ACC} \quad \text{smart-PRS} \quad \text{Report}]-\text{MO} \quad \text{think-NEG-PRS} \\
& (b) \quad \ast \quad \text{Dare}-o \quad \text{Mary-ga} \quad [\text{ReportP} \quad t_i \quad \text{kasiko-i} \quad \text{to}]-\text{mo} \quad \text{omottei-na-i}. \\
& \text{who}-\text{ACC} \quad \text{Mary-NOM} \quad [\text{ReportP} \quad \text{smart-PRS} \quad \text{Report}]-\text{MO} \quad \text{think-NEG-PRS} \\
& \text{‘Mary thinks that no one is smart.’} \quad ((13a) = (12))
\end{align*}\]

When the indeterminate accusative subject moves to the sentence-initial position (cf. (13b)), the former fails to be c-commanded by \(-mo\). (13b) is thus unacceptable.

---

While Hiraiwa’s (2005) analysis is quite insightful, there are reasons to reconsider his analysis. Indeterminate pronouns can be licensed without satisfying the c-command condition (see Takano 2003 and Takahashi 2018).

(14) **Dative Argument above ReportP**

| Mary-ga | VP | Taro-ni | [ReportP Hanako-ga kasiko-i to] |
| Mary-NOM | VP | Taro-DAT | [ReportP Hanako-NOM smart-PRS Report] |

say]-PST

‘Mary told Taro that Hanako was smart.’

- The matrix verb *iwa- ‘say’* in (14) takes the dative argument as well as the ReportP complement.

- When the dative argument is an indeterminate pronoun, the former can be associated with *-mo* attached to the Report head *to* (see Takano 2003 and Takahashi 2018).

(15) **Indeterminate Matrix Dative Argument**

a. ？Mary-ga | VP | dare-ni | [ReportP Hanako-ga kasiko-i to]-mo |
| Mary-NOM | VP | who-DAT | [ReportP Hanako-NOM smart-PRS Report]-MO |
iwa]-anakat-ta. |
say]-NEG-PST

‘Mary told no one that Hanako was smart.’

(15a): the indeterminate dative argument *dare* ‘who’ is associated with *-mo* attached to the Report head *to*. (15b): *dare* ‘who’ in the sentence-initial position fails to be associated with *-mo*.

- The contrast in (15) regarding the indeterminate dative argument seems to be analyzed on a par with the contrast in (13) regarding the indeterminate accusative subject.

- The acceptability of (15a) casts doubts on the c-command condition (cf. (10)):

(16) **Indeterminate Dative Argument (cf. (15a))**

[VP [VP [NP who] [ReportP Report]-mo V]v]
As the dative argument fail to be c-commanded by –mo, the c-command condition predicts (16)/(15a) to be unacceptable, contrary to fact.

(17) Summary of the Observations
a. Indeterminate accusative subjects can be associated with –mo attached to the Report head to (cf. (12)).

b. Matrix indeterminate dative arguments can also be associated with –mo attached to the Report head to (cf. (15)).

2.2 A New Analysis
• The c-command condition on indeterminate pronouns face some empirical problems (cf. (17b)). However, it is true that there is some kind of locality imposed on indeterminate pronouns. Otherwise, we would not expect the subject/object asymmetry in (9):

   Hanako-NOM who-ACC praise-MO-do-NEG-PST
   ‘Hanako praised no one.’

b. * [Dare-ga Hanako-o home-mo-si-nakat-ta.
   who-NOM Hanako-ACC praise-MO-do-NEG-PST
   ‘No one praised Hanako.’

• The object dare ‘who’ in (18a) behaves as an NPI while the subject dare ‘who’ in (18b) fails to behave as an NPI.

(19) Proposal:
The head of the chain of the indeterminate and –mo must be in the same Transfer domain.

• The subject/object asymmetry in (9)/(18) revisited:


• I assume that –mo in (20a) and (20b) is adjoined to V and V does not overtly move to v. (20a): the object indeterminate pronoun dare ‘who’ and –mo are in the same Transfer domain (i.e. VP).

• (20b): the subject indeterminate pronoun dare ‘who’ and -mo are not in the same Transfer domain: –mo is transferred within VP, while dare ‘who’ is not transferred until the higher phase (i.e. CP) is completed.
The matrix dative argument revisited:

(21) **Matrix Dative Argument**

? Mary-ga [VP dare-ni [ReportP Hanako-ga kasiko-i to]-mo
iw]-anakat-ta.

say]-NEG-PST

‘Mary told no one that Hanako is smart.’ (= (15))

The indeterminate dative argument in (21) is located above –mo attached to the Report head to. (21) is hard to accommodate if the indeterminate pronouns must be c-commanded by –mo (cf. (10)).

(22) **Matrix Dative Argument (cf. (21))**

a. Step 1: Construction of the ReportP phase:

    [ReportP [ ] Report]-mo

b. Step 2: Merger of the matrix V and the dative argument/

    [VP who [ReportP [ ] Report]-mo V]

c. Step 3: Merger of the matrix v and the matrix subject:

    [vP Subject [VP who [ReportP [ ] Report]-mo V]v]

d. Step 4: Transfer of VP:

    [vP Subject [VP who [ReportP [ ] Report]-mo V]v]

(22a): the Report head to is a phase head (cf. Takeuchi 2010), which means that when the ReportP complement is constructed, only the complement of the Report head to undergoes Transfer: to and –mo escape Transfer (cf. Chomsky 2000).

(22b): the matrix V and the indeterminate dative argument are introduced into the derivation.

(22c): the matrix v and the matrix subject are introduced into the derivation.

(22d): the matrix VP is transferred.

The dative argument and –mo are in the same Transfer domain. The proposed condition (19) is met here.

The analysis correctly predicts that when the indeterminate dative argument is moved above the subject, the former fails to be licensed:
Movement of the Dative Argument / VP-Adjunct across the Matrix Subject

\[\text{Dare]-ni Mary-ga [VP } t_i [\text{ReportP Hanako-ga kasiko-i to]-[mo}\]
\[\text{who-DAT Mary-NOM [VP [ReportP Hanako-NOM smart-PRS Report]-[MO}\]
\[iw]-anakat-ta.\]
say]-NEG-PST

‘Mary told no one that Hanako is smart.’

\(=(15b)\)

(24) Indeterminate Dative Argument (irrelevant parts are omitted)

a. Step 3: Merger of the matrix \(v\) and the matrix subject (\(= (22c)\)):
\[\text{[vP Subject [VP who [ReportP [ Report]-[mo V]v]}\]
b. Step 4: Movement of the dative argument/: \(\text{[vP who [VP t}_i [\text{ReportP [ ] Report]-[mo V]v]}\]
c. Step 5: Transfer of VP:
\[\ast \text{[vP who [VP t}_i [\text{ReportP [ ] Report]-[mo V]v}\]

- (24a): the matrix \(v\) and the matrix subject are introduced into the derivation.
- (24b): the dative argument moves to the \(vP\) edge.
- (24c): -mo is transferred within the matrix VP while the dative argument escapes Transfer. The proposed condition (19) is not met here.

2.3 Back to the ECM Construction

The proposed analysis has an implication for the analysis of the ECM construction:

(25) Indeterminate Accusative Subject

a. Mary-ga [ \(\text{dare-o kasiko-i to]-[mo}\) omottei]-na-i.
Mary-NOM [ who-ACC smart-PRS Report]-MO think-NEG-PRS
b. \(\ast\) \(\text{Dare-o Mary-ga [ReportP t}_i [\text{kasiko-i to]-[mo}\) omottei]-na-i.
who-ACC Mary-NOM [ReportP smart-PRS Report]-MO think-NEG-PRS

‘Mary thinks that no one is smart.’

\(=(13)\)

- (25a): the indeterminate accusative subject dare ‘who’ is associated with –mo attached to the Report head to. (25b): dare ‘who’ in the sentence-initial position fails to be associated with –mo.

- On the proposed analysis of indeterminate pronouns, the above contrast is accounted for even if the accusative subject obligatorily moves into the matrix VP.
Movement of the Indeterminate Accusative Subject into the Matrix VP (cf. (25a))

a. Step 1: Movement to the ReportP edge and Transfer:

\[
[\text{ReportP} \quad \text{who}_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo}
\]

b. Step 2: Merger of the matrix V and movement into the matrix VP:

\[
[\text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}
\]

c. Step 3: Merger of the matrix \(v\) and the matrix subject:

\[
[\text{VP} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}_{[\varphi]}
\]

d. Step 4: Accusative Case assignment:

\[
[\text{VP} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} - \text{ACC} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}_{[\varphi]} \quad \text{V}
\]

e. Step 5: Transfer of the matrix VP:

\[
[\text{VP} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} - \text{ACC} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}_{[\varphi]} \quad \text{V}
\]

- (26a): the embedded subject moves to the edge of the ReportP phase. The complement of the Report head \(to\) undergoes Transfer: \(to\) and \(-mo\) escape Transfer.
- (26b): the matrix \(V\) is introduced and the embedded subject moves into the matrix VP (cf. Chomsky 2015, to appear).
- (26c): the matrix \(v\) and the matrix subject are introduced.
- (26d): the embedded subject receives accusative Case from the matrix \(v/V\)
- (26e): the accusative subject and \(-mo\) are transferred together. The proposed condition (19) is met.

The analysis correctly predicts that when the indeterminate accusative subject precedes the matrix subject, the former fails to be associated with \(-mo\) attached to the Report head \(to\) (cf. (25b)).

Movement of the Indeterminate Accusative Subject into the Matrix \(vP\) (cf. (25b))

a. Step 4: Accusative Case assignment (= (26d)):

\[
[\text{VP} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} - \text{ACC} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}_{[\varphi]} \quad \text{V}
\]

b. Step 5: Movement into the matrix \(vP\):

\[
[\text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} - \text{ACC} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{VP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}_{[\varphi]} \quad \text{V}
\]

c. Step 6: Transfer of the matrix VP:

\[
* \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{who}_{i} - \text{ACC} \quad \text{Subject} \quad \text{VP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{ReportP} \quad t_{i} \quad \text{Report}] - \text{mo} \quad \text{V}_{[\varphi]} \quad \text{V}
\]

- (27a): the embedded subject receives accusative Case.
- (27b): the embedded subject moves to the matrix \(vP\) edge.
- (27c): the matrix VP is transferred. While \(-mo\) is transferred here, the accusative subject escapes Transfer. The proposed condition (19) is not met here.
Summary

a. The availability of indeterminate accusative subjects can be made consistent with a particular version of the obligatory raising analysis.

b. Indeterminate pronouns are subject to the condition defined on Transfer domains.

3 Embedded Adjuncts: ‘Free Ride’ Effect in A-movement

3.1 Embedded Adjuncts and the Japanese ECM Construction

- Another set of facts that motivated the optional raising analysis of the Japanese ECM construction concerns the distribution of embedded adjuncts (Hiraiwa 2001, Kobayashi and Maki 2002):

(29) **Argument for Optional Raising 2: Embedded Adjunct**


think-PRS

‘Mary thinks that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’

The adjunct *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’ in (29) precedes the accusative subject. The accusative subject is claimed to stay within the ReportP complement.

- This analysis (tacitly) assumes that the embedded adjunct cannot be in the matrix clause, the assumption that I examine below.

- The embedded adjunct *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’ and the accusative subject can follow a matrix VP adverb:


COP Report think]-PRS

‘Mary strongly believes that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’
The embedded adjunct *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’ can precede the matrix VP adverb *tuyoku* ‘strongly’ only when the accusative subject *Hanako* also precedes *tuyoku* ‘strongly’.

(31)  
**Embedded Adjunct and Accusative Subject across the Matrix VP Adverb**

a. * Mary-ga  
   [VP *gakkyuu-iin kurai*]  
   [VP *class-representative as*]  
   *tuyoku*  
   Hanako-o  
   mazime  
   COP  
   Report  
   think]-PRS

Mary-NOM  
   [VP *class-representative as*]  
   *strongly*  
   Hanako-ACC  
   earnest  
   da  
   to  
   omottei]-ru.

b. (?)Mary-ga  
   [VP *gakkyuu-iin kurai*]  
   Hanako-o  
   *tuyoku*  
   mazime  
   COP  
   Report  
   think]-PRS

Mary-NOM  
   [VP *class-representative as*]  
   Hanako-ACC  
   *strongly*  
   earnest  
   da  
   to  
   omottei]-ru.

‘Mary strongly believes that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’

(31a): *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’ alone precedes *tuyoku* ‘strongly’. (31b): both *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’ and the accusative subject *Hanako* precedes *tuyoku* ‘strongly’.

(32)  
**Summary of the Observations**

a. Embedded adjuncts can precede accusative subjects (cf. (29)).

b. Embedded adjuncts can precede matrix adverbs when accompanied by accusative subjects (cf. (31)).

3.2 A New Analysis


(33)  
**Proposal:** A-movement also allows a free ride of adjuncts.

(34)  
**Movement of the Adjunct across the Matrix VP Adverb**

* Mary-ga  
   [VP *gakkyuu-iin kurai*]  
   [VP *class-representative as*]  
   *tuyoku*  
   Hanako-o  
   mazime  
   COP  
   Report  
   think]-PRS

Mary-NOM  
   [VP *class-representative as*]  
   *strongly*  
   Hanako-ACC  
   earnest  
   da  
   to  
   omottei]-ru.

‘Mary strongly believes that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’ (= (31a))
a. Step 1: Constructing the embedded TP:

\[ \text{[TP } \text{NP}_{\text{Hanako}} \text{ Adjunct } ] \]

b. Step 2: Movement of the subject and the adjunct to the edge of the ReportP phase:

\[ \text{[ReportP } \text{NP}_{\text{Hanako}} \text{ Adjunct}_{j} \text{ [TP } t_{i} \text{ } t_{j} ]] \]

c. Step 3: Merger of the matrix V and Movement of the accusative subject:

\[ \text{[VP } \text{NP}_{\text{Hanako}} \text{ [ReportP } t_{i} \text{ Adjunct}_{j} \text{ [TP } t_{i} \text{ } t_{j} ]] V] \]

d. Step 4: Merger of the matrix VP adverb:

\[ \text{[VP } \text{Adverb } \text{NP}_{\text{Hanako}} \text{ [ReportP } t_{i} \text{ Adjunct}_{j} \text{ [TP } t_{i} \text{ } t_{j} ]] V] \]

e. Step 5: Movement of the embedded adjunct into the matrix VP:

\[ \text{* [VP Adjunct}_{j} \text{ Adverb } \text{NP}_{\text{Hanako}} \text{ [ReportP } t_{i} \text{ } t_{j} \text{ [TP } t_{i} \text{ } t_{j} ]] V] \]

- (35a): the adjunct and the embedded subject are introduced into the derivation.
- (35b): they both move to the edge of the ReportP phase.
- (35c): the matrix V is introduced and the embedded subject moves into the matrix VP.
- (35d): the matrix VP adverb 'tuyoku' 'strongly' is introduced.
- (35e): the embedded adjunct moves across the matrix VP adverb 'tuyoku' 'strongly'.

The embedded adjunct and the embedded subject move into the matrix clause independently. I assume that the unacceptability of (34)/(31a) is subsumed under the ban on long-distance movement of adjuncts (cf. Saito 1985, Bošković and Takahashi 1998).
Movement of the Adjunct and the Accusative Subject across the Matrix VP Adverb

(36) Mary-ga [VP [gakkyuu-iin kurai] Hanako-o tuyoku mazime
Mary-NOM [VP [class-representative as] Hanako-ACC strongly earnest
da to omotte]-ru.
COP Report think]-PRS
‘Mary strongly believes that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’ (= (31b))

(37) a. Step 1: Constructing the embedded TP:
[TP [NP Hanako Adjunct]]

b. Step 2: Merger of the adjunct and the embedded subject (i.e. free ride):
[TP [NP Adjunct [NP Hanako]] t_i ]

c. Step 3: Movement of the embedded subject to the edge of the ReportP phase
[ReportP [NP Adjunct [NP Hanako]] [TP t_j t_i ]]

d. Step 4: Merger of the matrix V and the matrix VP adverb:
[VP [Adverb [ReportP [NP Adjunct [NP Hanako]] [TP t_j t_i ]]] V]

e. Step 5: Movement of the embedded subject into the matrix VP:
[VP [NP Adjunct [NP Hanako]] [Adverb [ReportP t_j [TP t_j t_i ]]] V]

- (37a): the embedded adjunct and the embedded subject are introduced into the derivation.
- (37b): the adjunct is merged with the subject (i.e. free ride. cf. Sohn 1994, Takano 2002, 2017). I assume that the resulting syntactic object is an NP (i.e. the adjunct is invisible).
- (37c): the embedded subject with the adjunct moves to the edge of the ReportP phase.
- (37d): the matrix V and the matrix VP adverb tuyoku ‘strongly’ are introduced.
- (37e): the embedded subject with the adjunct moves across the matrix VP adverb tuyoku ‘strongly’.

The embedded adjunct can move into the matrix VP without long-distance movement of adjuncts.

► The above analysis therefore shows that the embedded adjunct can move into the matrix VP, contrary to the (tacit) assumption adopted in the optional raising analysis.
3.3 Back to the Argument for the Optional Raising Analysis

The above analysis leads us to reconsider the example that motivated the optional raising analysis:

(38) **Argument for Optional Raising 2: Embedded Adjunct**
think-PRS
‘Mary thinks that Hanako is as earnest as a class representative.’ (= (29))

- If the adjunct *gakkyuu-iin kurai* ‘as a class representative’ must be within the ReportP complement, the accusative subject must also be within the ReportP complement.
- **The adjunct and the accusative subject are adjacent.** (38) can be analyzed under the obligatory raising analysis once we assume that A-movement allows a free ride of adjuncts:

(39) **Reanalyzing (38) under the Obligatory Raising Analysis**

a. Step 1: Constructing the embedded TP:

\[
\text{[TP } \text{NP}_{\text{Hanako}} \text{ Adjunct }] 
\]

b. Step 2: **Merger of the adjunct and the embedded subject (i.e. “free ride”):**

\[
\text{[TP } \text{NP}_{\text{adjunct}} \text{ NP}_{\text{Hanako}} t_i ] 
\]

c. Step 3: Movement of the embedded subject to the edge of the ReportP phase:

\[
\text{[ReportP } \text{NP}_{\text{adjunct}} \text{ NP}_{\text{Hanako}} ] \text{ [TP } t_j t_i ] 
\]

d. Step 4: Merger of the matrix V:

\[
\text{[VP } \text{ReportP } \text{NP}_{\text{adjunct}} \text{ NP}_{\text{Hanako}} ] \text{ [TP } t_j t_i ] \text{ ]V] 
\]

e. Step 5: Movement of the embedded subject into the matrix VP:

\[
\text{[VP } \text{NP}_{\text{adjunct}} \text{ NP}_{\text{Hanako}} ] \text{ [ReportP } t_j ] \text{ [TP } t_j t_i ] \text{ ]V] 
\]

- (39a): the embedded adjunct and the embedded subject are introduced into the derivation.
- (39b): the embedded adjunct is merged with the embedded subject (i.e. free ride).
- (39c): the embedded subject with the adjunct moves to the edge of the ReportP phase.
- (39d)/(39e): the matrix V is introduced and the embedded subject with the adjunct moves into the matrix VP.

The distribution of embedded adjuncts is consistent with the obligatory raising analysis.
4 Conclusion and Remaining Issues

(40) Summary
   
   a. The two observations that are claimed to support the optionality of raising in the Japanese ECM construction can be accounted for under the obligatory raising analysis.
   
   b. The distribution of indeterminate pronouns is analyzed in terms of a condition defined on Transfer domains and the distribution of embedded adjuncts is analyzed in terms of a free ride effect in A-movement.

► One remaining question concerns the status of Agree in Japanese. The optional raising analysis crucially relies on long-distance Agree for Case-licensing of the accusative subjects.

(41) Case-licensing via Agree

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Alice} \quad \text{who} \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{ReportP} \\
\text{Hanako}[\text{ACC}] \\
\text{V}_\phi \text{v}
\end{array}
\]

Agree

- When the accusative subject stays within the ReportP complement, the former must receive accusative Case via long-distance Agree (but see Taguchi 2015 and Abe 2016a).

► Another question concerns the distribution of embedded indeterminate pronouns. The proposed analysis of indeterminate pronouns based on transfer domains requires –mo and indeterminate pronouns to be ‘close enough’:

(42) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{*who} \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{who} \\
\text{ReportP} \\
\text{who} \\
\text{TP} \quad \text{*who} \\
\text{Report} \quad \text{mo} \\
\text{V}_\phi \text{v}
\end{array}
\]

-Mo in (42) is attached to the Report head to. The indeterminate pronoun must be either in the matrix VP or on the edge of the ReportP complement so that –mo and the indeterminate are transferred together. Indeterminate pronouns within the embedded TP cannot be associated with –mo here. However, this prediction does not seem to be borne out.
Embedded Indeterminate Nominative Subject (cf. Kishimoto 2001)

Mary-ga [Report [TP dare-ga sigoto-o yame-ru] to]-mo omettei-na-i.

‘Mary thinks that no one will quit the job.’

The indeterminate pronoun in (43) is the embedded nominative subject, which is often assumed to be in TP Spec. I tentatively suggest that the embedded subject in (43) moves to the edge of the ReportP complement (cf. Saito 2011, Kato 2016):

Embedded Indeterminate Nominative Subject (cf. Kishimoto 2001)

Mary-ga [Report dare-ga [TP t_i sigoto-o yame-ru] to]-mo

omettei-na-i.
think-NEG-PRS

‘Mary thinks that no one will quit the job.’

It remains to be seen if this string-vacuous movement is justified on independent grounds.

Yet another question concerns the status of “free ride” (see also Takano 2017). Details of ‘free ride’ (how clausal adjuncts merged with NPs become ‘invisible’ etc.) need to be worked out out.
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