Takahashi, Masahiko. 2025. Subjects with accusative Case in Japanese: Phasal transfer and anti-locality. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 10(1). pp. 1–41. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.17820

Open Library of Humanities

Subjects with accusative Case in Japanese: Phasal transfer and anti-locality

Masahiko Takahashi, Yamagata University, mstakahashi@human.kj.yamagata-u.ac.jp

This paper presents a new argument for phasal transfer and anti-locality based on an analysis of subjects with accusative Case in Japanese. I first show that the distribution of subjects with accusative Case closely interacts with the types of CPs: while both accusative subjects and those with the object marker *no koto* (henceforth accusative *no koto* subjects) are allowed with CPs headed by the Report head *to* (ReportP), only accusative *no koto* subjects are allowed with CPs headed by the Force head *ka* (ForceP). I then argue that the distribution of accusative and accusative *no koto* subjects results from phasal transfer and anti-locality: while phasal transfer allows accusative subjects to move out of ReportP into matrix VPs, the interaction of phasal transfer and anti-locality prevents accusative subjects from moving out of ForceP into matrix VPs. Accusative *no koto* subjects, which are base-generated within matrix VPs, are allowed with both ReportP and ForceP because their derivation does not involve movement that violates these constraints. I also suggest that when an accusative subject is licensed across a complex CP involving both the Report head *to* and Force head *ka*, *to* is externally pair-merged with *ka*, rendering the latter "invisible." Implications for improper movement are also discussed.

1 Introduction

While subjects with accusative Case in languages such as English are restricted to contexts where embedded subjects originate in defective or infinitival clauses (TPs), abundant cross-linguistic evidence shows that subjects can indeed receive accusative Case across a CP boundary (Kuno 1972; 1976; Şener 2008; Fong 2019; Wurmbrand 2019). The primary goal of this paper is to examine the restrictions on subjects with accusative Case through an in-depth study of Japanese and explore their theoretical implications.

Japanese has several types of CP complements, including those headed by *to* for reports (ReportP) (1a) and those headed by *ka* for questions (ForceP) (1b) (Saito 2010; 2012; Hiraiwa 2010a; Yoshida 2019; Tomioka 2020; Nasu et al. 2024):[1]

(1) a. **ReportP Complement**

Mary-ga	**[**$_{\text{ReportP}}$ Hanako-ga	kasiko-i	**to**]	omot-ta.
Mary-NOM	Hanako-NOM	smart-PRS	**Report**	think-PST

‘Mary believed that Hanako was smart.’

b. **ForceP Complement**

Mary-ga	**[**$_{\text{ForceP}}$ Hanako-ga	kasiko-i	**ka**]-o	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM	Hanako-NOM	smart-PRS	**Force**-ACC	ask-PST

‘Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.’

While the complement clause in (1a) is headed by the Report head *to*, the one in (1b) is headed by the Force head *ka*, which receives accusative Case.[2] The subject *Hanako* in (1a) and (1b)

---

[1] A reviewer pointed out that *tazune* ‘ask’ requires a dative argument for him/her:

(i)

Mary-ga	John-ni	**[**$_{\text{ForceP}}$ Hanako-ga	kasiko-i	**ka**]-o	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM	John-DAT	Hanako-NOM	smart-PRS	**Force**-ACC	ask-PST

‘Mary asked John whether Hanako was smart.’

The dative argument *John* in (i) seems optional as both (1b) and (i) sound acceptable without any preceding context. However, the following example, which includes only the dative argument, sounds unnatural without any preceding context:

(ii)

#Mary-ga	John-ni	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM	John-DAT	ask-PST

‘Lit. Mary asked John.’

Based on the contrast between (1b) and (i) on the one hand and (ii) on the other hand, in this paper, I assume that the dative argument in (i) is optional, leaving this intra-speaker variation for future research. The arguments presented in the text are unaffected by the presence or absence of the dative argument. See, however, footnote 21 for some remarks concerning dative arguments.

[2] In this paper, I focus on cases where ForcePs are selected by *tazune* ‘ask’ (for a comprehensive discussion of ForcePs, see Saito 2010; 2012; Hiraiwa 2010a; Yoshida 2019; Nasu et al. 2024). Note that ForcePs can appear without accusative Case marking. I first discuss cases where ForcePs morphologically realize Case (Sections 2 and 3) and return to cases where ForcePs do not realize accusative Case morphology (Sections 4 and 5).

receives nominative Case. Interestingly, subjects that receive accusative Case do not behave uniformly with the clausal complements introduced above; while both accusative subjects and those with the object marker *no koto* (henceforth accusative *no koto* subjects) are allowed with ReportPs, only accusative *no koto* subjects are allowed with ForcePs.

I argue that the asymmetry in the distribution of subjects with accusative Case arises from an interaction between phasal transfer (Bošković 2016a; Saito 2017a; b; 2020; 2024a; Takahashi 2023) and anti-locality (Bošković 1994; 2005; 2015; 2016a; b; Ishii 1999; Saito & Murasugi 1999; Abels 2003; Grohmann 2003; Takahashi 2023). Accusative subjects cannot be selected by either *omow-* 'think' or *tazune* 'ask', indicating that they must originate within complement CPs. They can move out of ReportP into matrix VPs because this movement does not violate the ban on improper movement owing to phasal transfer. However, the subjects cannot move out of ForceP because moving out of ForceP places them "too close" to the matrix VP, resulting in an anti-locality violation. By contrast, accusative *no koto* subjects can be selected by both *omow-* 'think' and *tazune* 'ask', showing that they can be base-generated within matrix VPs. They can appear with both ReportP and ForceP because their derivation does not violate any constraint on movement. I also suggest that when an accusative subject is licensed across a "complex" CP involving both the Report head *to* and the Force head *ka*, *to* is externally pair-merged with *ka*, rendering the latter "invisible" (for external pair-merge of heads, see Epstein et al. 2016; Saito 2020).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I present core observations concerning the distribution of accusative (*no koto*) subjects. In Section 3, I present an analysis of the observations based on phasal transfer and anti-locality. In Section 4, I discuss cases where ForcePs apparently lack Case and show that such ForcePs pattern with Case-marked ForcePs, providing further support for the proposed analysis. In Section 5, I examine cases where a ForceP accompanied by the Report head *to* allows accusative subjects and argue that the Report head *to* in such cases is externally pair-merged with the Force head *ka*. Section 6 presents the conclusion.

2 On the distribution of accusative (*no koto*) subjects with ReportP and ForceP

This section focuses on the distribution of accusative (*no koto*) subjects with ReportP and ForceP. I show that while both accusative subjects and those with the object marker *no koto* (accusative *no koto* subjects) are allowed with ReportP, only accusative *no koto* subjects are allowed with ForceP. I also argue that the ban on accusative subjects with ForceP cannot be fully captured by the well-known constraints on multiple accusatives.

Before discussing accusative (*no koto*) subjects, some remarks on *no koto* phrases are in order. *No koto* '-GEN fact' appears with objects and is classified into optional and obligatory types

(Sasaguri 1999; Takubo 2007; Kishimoto 2018; 2021). First, when an object is selected by verbs such as *nagur-* 'hit', the presence of *no koto* on the object is optional:

(2) Mary-ga Hanako(-no koto)-o nagut-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC hit-PST
'Mary hit Hanako.'

Example (2) is acceptable regardless of the presence or absence of *no koto*. Second, when an object is selected by verbs such as *hanas* 'talk', the presence of *no koto* on the object is obligatory:

(3) Mary-ga Hanako*(-no koto)-o hanasi-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC talk-PST
'Mary talked about Hanako.'

Importantly, *no koto* cannot appear with subjects:

(4) Mary(*-no koto)-ga Hanako-o nagut-ta/hanasi-ta.
Mary-GEN fact-NOM Hanako-ACC hit-PST/talk-PST
'Mary hit/talked about Hanako.'

The unacceptability of (4), where the subject *Mary* is accompanied by *no koto*, clearly shows that *no koto* appears with objects but not with subjects.

We now proceed to the discussion on accusative (*no koto*) subjects (Kuno 1972; 1976; 2007; Takemura 1975 – 1976; Saito 1983a; Kitagawa 1985; Kaneko 1988; Oka 1988; Ueda 1988; Hoji 1991; 2005; Sakai 1998; Hiraiwa 2001; 2005; Kobayashi & Maki 2002; Tanaka 2002; Takano 2003; Takeuchi 2010; Takahashi 2016; 2021a; b; Kishimoto 2018; 2021). As is well known, ReportP allows both accusative subjects and accusative *no koto* subjects (for accusative *no koto* subjects, see Saito 1983a; Kitagawa 1985; Kishimoto 2018; 2021; Takahashi 2021b).

(5) **ReportP Complement**
Mary-ga [Hanako(-no koto)-o kasiko-i **to**] omot-ta.
Mary-NOM [Hanako-GEN fact-ACC smart-PRS **Report** think-PST
'Mary believed that Hanako was smart.'

Hanako in (5) receives accusative Case and can be accompanied by *no koto*. Interestingly, ForceP prohibits accusative subjects (Kitagawa 1985; Hiraiwa 2010a; Takeuchi 2010; Takahashi 2016) but (marginally) allows accusative *no koto* subjects:

(6) **ForceP Complement**
a. *Mary-ga [Hanako-o kasiko-i **ka]-o** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC smart-PRS **Force-ACC** ask-PST

b. ??Mary-ga [Hanako-no koto-o kasiko-i **ka]-o** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC smart-PRS **Force-ACC** ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.'

Example (6a), which involves the accusative subject *Hanako*, is unacceptable. Example (6b), which involves the accusative *no koto* subject, is slightly degraded. Significantly, although the judgment can be delicate, (6b) is more acceptable than (6a). Importantly, both (6a) and (6b) contain two accusative phrases. The relative unacceptability of (6a) and (6b) thus seems to relate to the two well-known double-*o* constraints (henceforth D*o*Cs), which prohibit multiple accusatives in different ways. Following Poser (2002), I call them the *surface* Double-*o* Constraint (henceforth the surface D*o*C) and the *deep* Double-*o* Constraint (henceforth the deep D*o*C). The surface D*o*C refers to cases where multiple accusative phrases yield relatively mild degradation (Harada 1973; 1975; Kuroda 1988; Poser 2002; Hiraiwa 2010b; Saito 2016; 2017b).

(7) ??Mary-ga Hanako(-no koto)-o atama-o but-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC head-ACC hit-PST
'Mary hit Hanako on the head.'

Both *Hanako* and *atama* 'head' receive accusative Case in (7), and the presence or absence of *no koto* on the first accusative phrase *Hanako* does not affect the acceptability of this example. Importantly, the violation of the surface D*o*C can be circumvented by various strategies, including clefting (Harada 1973; 1975; Kuroda 1988; Hiraiwa 2010b; Saito 2016; 2017b):

(8) a. Mary-ga t_i atama-o but-ta no-wa Hanako_i(-no koto)-o da.
Mary-NOM head-ACC hit-PST COMP-TOP Hanako-GEN fact-ACC COP
'It was Hanako that Mary hit on the head.'

b. Mary-ga Hanako(-no koto)-o t_i but-ta no-wa atama-o da.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC hit-PST COMP-TOP head-ACC COP
'It was on the head that Mary hit Hanako.'

Hanako(-*no koto*) in (8a) and *atama* 'head' in (8b) are in the focus position of cleft construction. Examples (8a) and (8b) are more acceptable than (7). Notably, (8a) and (8b) are acceptable regardless of whether *Hanako* involves *no koto*.[3] The deep D*o*C refers to cases where multiple accusative phrases lead to complete unacceptability (Kuroda 1965; 1978; Harada 1973; 1975; Williams 1981; Saito 1982; 2020; Poser 2002; Takano 2004; Ochi 2009; Miyagawa 2017). When the causative predicate -(*s*)*ase* 'cause' selects an intransitive verb such as *hasir*- 'run', the causee

[3] Some speakers do not accept the accusative Case marker placed before the copula (Hiraiwa & Ishihara 2012). The discussion here is based on the judgment of the speakers (including the author) who accept the accusative Case marker before the copula. I thank a reviewer for directing me to this point.

can receive either dative Case or accusative Case. The accusative causee can be accompanied by *no koto*.

(9)

Hanako-ga	hasit-ta.
Hanako-NOM	run-PST

'Hanako ran.'

(10)

Mary-ga	Hanako-ni/Hanako(-no	koto)-o	hasir-ase-ta.
Mary-NOM	Hanako-DAT/Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	run-cause-PST

'Mary let/make Hanako run.'

When the causative predicate -(*s*)*ase* 'cause' selects a transitive verb such as *yom-* 'read', the causee cannot receive accusative Case, which the deep D*o*C captures (for a discussion on examples other than causatives, see Miyagawa 2017):

(11)

Hanako-ga	sono	hon-o	yon-da.
Hanako-NOM	the	book-ACC	read-PST

'Hanako read the book.'

(12)

Mary-ga	Hanako-ni/*Hanako(-no	koto)-o	sono	hon-o	yom-ase-ta.
Mary-NOM	Hanako-DAT Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	the	book-ACC	read-cause-PST

'Mary let/made Hanako read the book.'

The causee *Hanako*(*-no koto*) in (12) cannot receive accusative Case. Notably, (12) is unacceptable with or without *no koto* on the accusative causee. Importantly, violations of the deep D*o*C cannot be circumvented by clefting (Harada 1975):

(13) a.

*Mary-ga	t_i	sono	hon-o	yom-ase-ta-no-wa	Hanako$_i$(-no	koto)-o
Mary-NOM		the	book-ACC	read-cause-PST-COMP-TOP	Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC
da.						
COP						

'It is Hanako that Mary let/made read the book.'

b.

*Mary-ga	Hanako$_i$(-no	koto)-o	t_i	yom-ase-ta-no-wa	sono	hon-o
Mary-NOM	Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC		read-cause-PST-COMP-TOP	the	book-ACC
da.						
COP						

'It is the book that Mary let/made Hanako read.'

Hanako(*-no koto*) in (13a) and *sono hon* 'the book' in (13b) are in the focus position of cleft construction. Contrary to (8a) and (8b), (13a) and (13b) are still unacceptable.[4]

[4] A reviewer noted that (13a) with *Hanako-no koto-o* is more acceptable than (13a) with *Hanako-o*. I presented this example to three native speakers of Japanese, all of whom are linguists, and they all reported that they did not find any contrast between the two versions. I leave the issue of speaker variation for future research.

We now consider the distribution of accusative (*no koto*) subjects with ForceP. I show that while the surface D*o*C alone is responsible for the case of the accusative *no koto* subject (6b), the deep D*o*C cannot be responsible for either (6a) or (6b). Interestingly, while (6a) does not improve with clefting, (6b) becomes more acceptable with clefting:

(14) a. *Mary-ga [t_i kasiko-i **ka]**-o tazune-ta no-wa Hanako$_i$-o da.

*Mary-ga	[	t_i	kasiko-i	**ka]**-o	tazune-ta	no-wa	Hanako$_i$-o	da.
Mary-NOM			smart-PRS	**Force-**ACC	ask-PST	COMP-TOP	Hanako-ACC	COP

b.

Mary-ga	[	t_i	kasiko-i	**ka]**-o	tazune-ta	no-wa	Hanako$_i$-no
Mary-NOM			smart-PRS	**Force-**ACC	ask-PST	COMP-TOP	Hanako-GEN
koto-o	da.						
fact-ACC	COP						

'Lit. It is Hanako$_i$ whether Mary asked t_i was interesting.'

The accusative subject in (14a) and the accusative *no koto* subject in (14b) are both clefted. Example (14b) is considerably more acceptable than (14a). The unacceptability of (14a) suggests that the surface D*o*C is at least insufficient to exclude (6a) (i.e., it is not clear if the surface D*o*C is operative here (cf. Hiraiwa 2010b)). Furthermore, the acceptability of (14b) indicates that only the surface D*o*C is operative in (6b). Importantly, (14b) demonstrates that two accusative phrases are, in principle, permitted in this construction. The difference between (6a)/(14a) and (6b)/(14b) is further motivated by cases of other strategies to avoid violations of the surface D*o*C. These violations can be avoided when the two occurrences of accusative Case markers in a certain domain are separated by strategies such as (i) dislocation of one of the two accusative phrases via scrambling (Hale & Kitagawa 1976 – 1977; Hiraiwa 2010b) or (ii) replacement of one of the accusative Case markers with particles (Shibatani 1978; Hiraiwa 2010b). The following examples illustrate the scrambling strategy:

(15) a.

??Mary-ga	omoikkiri	Hanako(-no	koto)-o	atama-o	but-ta.
Mary-NOM	hard	Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	head-ACC	hit-PST

b.

Hanako$_i$(-no	koto)-o	Mary-ga	omoikkiri	t_i	atama-o	but-ta.
Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	Mary-NOM	hard		head-ACC	hit-PST

'Mary hit Hanako hard on the head.' (based on Hiraiwa (2010b: 735))

Example (15a) is a case of surface D*o*C violation caused by the presence of the two accusative phrases *Hanako-no koto* and *atama* 'head'. In (15b), *Hanako-no koto* is scrambled to the sentence-initial position. Example (15b) is more acceptable than (15a). The presence or absence of *no koto* on *Hanako* does not affect the acceptability of these examples. Returning to the case of the accusative (*no koto*) subject with ForceP, the scrambling strategy works only with the accusative *no koto* subject:

(16) a.

*Mary-ga	oogoede	Hanako-o	kasiko-i	**ka-o**	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM	loudly	Hanako-ACC	smart-PRS	**Force-ACC**	ask-PST

b. *Hanako$_i$-o Mary-ga oogoede t_i kasiko-i **ka-o** tazune-ta.
Hanako-ACC Mary-NOM loudly smart-PRS **Force-ACC** ask-PST
'Mary asked in a loud voice whether Hanako was smart.'

(17) a. ??Mary-ga oogoede Hanako-no koto-o kasiko-i **ka-o** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM loudly Hanako-GEN fact-ACC smart-PRS **Force-ACC** ask-PST

b. Hanako$_i$-no koto-o Mary-ga oogoede t_i kasiko-i **ka-o** tazune-ta.
Hanako-GEN fact-ACC Mary-NOM loudly smart-PRS **Force-ACC** ask-PST
'Mary asked in a loud voice whether Hanako was smart.'

The accusative subject *Hanako* in (16a) and the accusative *no koto* subject *Hanako-no koto* in (16b) are placed after the adverb *oogoede* 'loudly'. Significantly, while scrambling of *Hanako* to the sentence-initial position does not result in the acceptability of (16b), scrambling of *Hanako-no koto* in (17b) does, which corroborates the distinction under consideration. The replacement strategy is illustrated below:

(18) a. ??Mary-ga Hanako(-no koto)-o atama-o but-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC head-ACC hit-PST
'Mary hit Hanako on the head.' (= (7))

b Mary-ga Hanako(-no koto)-o atama-mo but-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC head-also hit-PST
'Mary also hit Hanako on the head.'

Atama 'head' in (18b) is accompanied by the focus particle *-mo* 'also', which suppresses the accusative Case maker *-o*. Example (18a) is more acceptable than (18b). The presence or absence of *no koto* on *Hanako* does not affect the acceptability of these examples. Returning to the case of the accusative subject with ForceP, the replacement strategy works only when the accusative subject is accompanied by *no koto*:

(19) a. *Mary-ga Hanako-o kasiko-i-**ka-**o tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC smart-PRS-**Force**-ACC ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.' (= (6a))

b. *Mary-ga Hanako-o kasiko-i-**ka-**mo tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC smart-PRS-**Force**-also ask-PST
'Mary also asked whether Hanako was smart.'

(20) a. ??Mary-ga Hanako-no koto-o kasiko-i-**ka-**o tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC smart-PRS-**Force**-ACC ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.' (= (6b))

b. Mary-ga Hanako-no koto-o kasiko-i-**ka-**mo tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC smart-PRS-**Force**-also ask-PST
'Mary also asked whether Hanako was smart.'

The ForceP complement in (19b) and (20b) is followed by the focus particle *-mo* 'also', which suppresses the accusative Case maker *-o*. While (19a) involving *Hanako* is unacceptable, (19b) involving *Hanako-no koto* is acceptable, which corroborates the distinction under consideration.

The unacceptability of (6a)/(14a) suggests that (6a)/(14a) violates the deep D*o*C, which means that (14a) could be treated on par with (12)/(13). However, if the deep D*o*C were responsible for (6a)/(14a), it should incorrectly rule out (6b)/(14b) as well. Recall that the causative construction with two accusative phrases is completely unacceptable regardless of the presence of *no koto* on the causee argument (12)/(13). Thus, if an account based on the deep D*o*C were to exclude (6a)/(14a), it should similarly exclude (6b)/(14b). If the deep D*o*C is formulated to prohibit more than one (accusative) "objects" (cf. Harada 1975; Williams 1981; Poser 2002; Takano 2004), the contrast between (6a)/(14a) and (6b)/(14b) is mysterious. In particular, the (relative) acceptability of (6b)/(14b) does not seem to receive a principled account because the first accusative phrase in (6b)/(14b) is accompanied by *no koto*, which marks transitive objects (2)/(3). If the deep D*o*C is formulated to prohibit multiple accusative Case assignment (Saito 1982; 2020), the relative acceptability of (6b)/(14b) remains mysterious as (6b)/(14b) contains two accusative phrases. Therefore, I conclude that the deep D*o*C is not responsible for the ban on accusative subjects with ForceP.

Note that the ban on the accusative subject in (6a)/(14a) cannot be attributed to the lexical property of *tazune* 'ask'; one cannot simply say that *tazune* 'ask' disallows accusative subjects. Not all verbs allow accusative subjects (Kuno 1972; 1976; cf. Kobayashi & Maki 2002):[5]

(21) Mary-ga [Hanako-ga/*o kasiko-i **to**] donat-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM/ACC smart-PRS **Report** scream-PST
'Mary screamed that Hanako is smart.'

The matrix verb in (21) is *donat-* 'scream'. The embedded subject *Hanako* can receive nominative Case, but not accusative Case. Thus, it is conceivable that *tazune* 'ask' simply forbids accusative subjects, which would exclude (6a)/(14a). However, this is not the case; *tazune* 'ask' allows accusative subjects when the Force head *ka* is followed by the Report head *to* (Kuno 1972; 1976; Kobayashi & Maki 2002; Takeuchi 2010):[6]

(22) Mary-ga [Hanako-o kasiko-i **ka** **to]** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC smart-PRS **Force** **Report** ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.'

Example (22) involves both *tazune* 'ask' and the embedded ForceP. Interestingly, contrary to (6a)/(14a), (22) is acceptable. We therefore cannot account for the ban on accusative subjects

[5] Example (21) with the accusative subject is based on an example provided by a reviewer.
[6] I thank a reviewer for highlighting the importance of this example in the current context.

with ForceP based on the lexical property of *tazune* 'ask' (see Section 5 for analysis of (22)). The main observations in this section are summarized below:

(23)

	Accusative subjects	Accusative *no koto* subjects
ReportP	✓ (5)	✓ (5)
ForceP	* (6a)/(14a)	??/✓ (6b)/(14b)

3 Analysis: Phasal transfer, anti-locality, and the KP hypothesis

After discussing phasal transfer, anti-locality, and the KP hypothesis, in this section, I demonstrate how their interactions elucidate the observations summarized above.

3.1 Theoretical assumptions

3.1.1 Phases and transfer

Regarding phases and transfer, I make the following assumptions:

(24) a. CPs, *v*Ps, and KPs (Case Phrases) are phases (Chomsky 2000; 2013; 2015; Takahashi 2011; Arano & Oda 2019).
b. A phase is transferred upon the completion of the next phase up (Saito 2017a: 64).

First, (24a) concerns what constitutes phases. I assume that in addition to CPs and *v*Ps, which are usually assumed to be phases (Chomsky 2000; 2013; 2015), KPs (Case Phrases) are also phases (Takahashi 2011; Arano & Oda 2019). Next, (24b) concerns units and the timing of transfer. Expanding on the phasal transfer hypothesis (Chomsky 2000; Bošković 2016a), Saito (2017a; 2020; 2024a) proposes (24b). Saito (2017a; 2020; 2024a) further suggests that in languages with phi-feature agreement, such as English, the phasehood of C and *v* is inherited along with phi-feature inheritance to T and V, respectively (for feature inheritance, see Chomsky 2013; 2015). This means that TP and VP in English are transferred upon the completion of CP and *v*P, respectively (Chomsky 2013; 2015). In languages such as Japanese, which lack phi-feature agreement, neither are phi-features nor is phasehood inherited from C/v to T/V. Hence, what is transferred upon the completion of CP is *v*P, not TP:

(25) a. Constructing the *v*P phase:
$[_{vP}$ SUBJ $[_{VP} \ldots]$ $v]$
b. Movement of the embedded subject to Spec, TP:
$[_{TP}$ SUBJ$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t_i $[_{VP} \ldots]$ $v]$ T$]$
c. Constructing the CP phase:
$[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ SUBJ$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t_i $[_{VP} \ldots]$ $v]$ T$]$ COMP$]$
d. Transfer of <u>the *v*P phase, not the TP complement</u>:
$[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ SUBJ$_i$ $[_{vP}$ t_i $[_{VP} \ldots]$ $v]$ T$]$ COMP$]$

In (25a), the *v*P phase is constructed. In (25b), the nominative subject moves to Spec, TP. In (25c), the CP phase is constructed. In (25d), the *v*P phase, not the TP complement, is transferred in accordance with (24). Saito (2017a; 2020; 2024a) argues that these proposals explain the differences between English and Japanese regarding the locality of reflexive binding (Yang 1983).

3.1.2 Anti-locality and labeling

Anti-locality dictates that movement cannot be too short (Bošković 1994; 2005; 2015; 2016a; 2016b; Ishii 1999; Saito & Murasugi 1999; Abels 2003; Grohmann 2003; Takahashi 2023). In this paper, I adopt a particular definition of anti-locality proposed in the labeling framework (Bošković 2015; 2016b). Chomsky (2013; 2015) proposes that when a syntactic object consists of a head and a phrase, the head serves as the label of the syntactic object:

(26) Head–Phrase Merger
$[_{\boxed{XP}}\ \boxed{X}\quad YP]$

Minimal search identifies the head X in (26) as the label of the resulting syntactic object. The syntactic object is thus XP. However, when a phrase (XP) and another phrase (YP) are merged, minimal search cannot find a unique label/head. Thus, Chomsky (2013; 2015) proposes that either feature-sharing or movement is necessary for the labeling of the resulting syntactic object:

(27) Phrase–Phrase Merger
a. Feature-Sharing
$[_{??}\ [_{XP}\ {}_{[A]}X \ldots]\ [_{YP}\ {}_{[A]}Y\ldots]] \rightarrow [_{<A, A>}\ [_{XP}\ {}_{[A]}X \ldots]\ [_{YP}\ {}_{[A]}Y\ldots]]$
b. Movement
$[_{??}\ [_{XP}\ X \ldots]\ [_{YP}\ Y\ldots]] \rightarrow [\ [_{XP}\ X \ldots]_i\ [_{\boxed{YP}}\ t_i\ [_{\boxed{YP}}\ \boxed{Y}\ldots]]]$

In (27a), [??] is labeled as via feature-sharing: XP and YP share [A], which makes it possible to label [??] as <A, A> via feature-sharing. In (27b), [??] is labeled via movement of a phrase. The movement of XP renders the lower copy/trace of XP invisible for labeling, as [??] does not properly contain XP. The label of the syntactic object is then determined by (the head of) the phrase that does not move (YP). I assume that labeling takes place as soon as possible (Bošković 2015; cf. Bošković 2016b; Saito 2016).

Having addressed how labeling takes place, we now turn to anti-locality. I assume the following definition of anti-locality:

(28) Movement of A targeting B must cross a projection distinct from B (where unlabeled projections are not distinct from labeled projections) (Bošković 2016b: 20).

According to (28), an anti-locality violation occurs when a phrase only moves across an unlabeled syntactic object; this is shown in (29).

(29) $[_{ZP}\quad Z \quad [_{??}\quad XP \quad YP]]$
$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad *$

The constituent resulting from the merger of XP and YP in (29) does not have a label ([??]). The movement of XP to ZP does not cross a projection distinct from ZP (i.e., the movement in question only crosses [??], which does not have a label). Thus, the movement of XP (29) is ruled out by anti-locality.

3.1.3 The KP hypothesis

Regarding Japanese nominals, I make the following assumptions:

(30) a. Japanese nominals are KaseP (Case Phrase) (Travis & Lamontagne 1992; Fukuda 1993; Takahashi 2011; Saito 2018; Arano & Oda 2019), where K (Case) selects NP.
$[_{KP}\ [_{NP}\ N]\ K]$
b. KPs are phases (Takahashi 2011; Arano & Oda 2019) (= (24a)).
c. K head has an anti-labeling property (Saito 2018).

Here, (30a) and (30b) concern the structure and phasal status of Japanese nominals. According to (30a), Case particles in Japanese are assumed to be heads that select NPs as their complements. Meanwhile, (30b) dictates that KPs are phases. Given (24b), this means that once a KP is completed, a phase below the KP gets transferred. Further, (30c) concerns how KPs are integrated within clausal spines. Saito (2016; 2017b; 2018) argues that Case markers in Japanese have an "anti-labeling" property, which explains the availability of scrambling and multiple nominative/accusative sentences. Slightly departing from Saito (2018), I propose the following anti-labeling nature of Japanese Case particles:

(31) Search {α, β} for a label. If search into α yields a K head, then search on the α side is suspended and it continues only on the β side (modified from Saito 2018: 387).

Essentially, (31) states that when KP and XP are merged, the resulting object is labeled as XP:

(32) Phrase–Phrase (KP–XP) Merger
$[_{??}\ [_{KP} \ldots K]\ [_{XP} \ldots X]] \quad \rightarrow \quad [_{\boxed{XP}}\ [_{KP} \ldots K]\ [_{XP} \ldots \boxed{X}]]$

In (32), KP and XP are merged. As the search on the KP side is suspended, minimal search finds X. The resulting syntactic object is thus labeled as XP. This analysis explains why Japanese has scrambling. In (33), the accusative KP is scrambled to the TP domain:

(33) a. Constructing *v*P:
$[_{\boxed{vP}}\ [_{KP}\ldots K]\ \ [_{vP}\ [_{VP}\ [_{KP}\ldots K_{ACC}]\ \ V]\boxed{\boldsymbol{v}}]]$
b. Introducing Tense:
$[_{\boxed{\mathbf{TP3}}}\ [_{vP}\ [_{KP}\ldots K]\ \ [_{vP}\ [_{VP}\ [_{KP}\ldots K_{ACC}]\ \ V]v]]\boxed{\mathbf{T}}]$

c. Subject movement and nominative Case assignment:

$[_{CP} \quad [\boxed{\text{TP2}}\ [_{KP}\ldots K_{NOM}]_k\ [_{TP3}\ [_{vP}\ t_k\ \ [_{vP}\ [_{VP}\ [_{KP}\ldots K_{ACC}]\ \ V]v]]\ \boxed{\text{T}}]]\ \ C]$

d. Scrambling:

$[_{CP}\ \ [\boxed{\text{TP1}}\ [_{KP}\ldots K_{ACC}]_i\ [_{TP2}\ \ [_{KP}\ldots K_{NOM}]_k\ [_{TP3}\ \ [_{vP}\ \ t_k\ \ [_{vP}\ [_{VP}\ \ t_i\ \ V]v]]\ \boxed{\text{T}}]]]\ C]$

In (33a), the KP subject and *v*P are merged, resulting in *v*P (32). In (33b), the merger of Tense (head) and *v*P results in TP (TP3) (26). In (33c), the merger of TP3 and the nominative subject results in TP (TP2): minimal search into the KP subject yields the K head. Thus, minimal search shifts to the lower TP (TP3) and yields T (the lower copy/trace of the moved KP subject (t_k) is ignored). C is introduced, and the subject KP receives nominative Case. In (33d), the result of scrambling of the accusative KP also results in TP (TP1): minimal search into {KP_{ACC}, TP2} yields the K head, and search shifts to the middle TP (TP2). Search into {KP_{NOM}, TP3} yields the K head again, and minimal search shifts to the lowest TP (TP3), yielding T. Importantly, when a KP merges with another KP, the resulting syntactic object does not seem to be labeled:

(34) Phrase–Phrase (KP–KP) Merger

$[_{??}\ \ [_{KP1} \ldots K_1]\ \ [_{KP2} \ldots K_2]\ \ ] \quad \rightarrow \quad [\ [_{KP1} \ldots K_1]_i\ \ \ [_{KP2}\ \ t_i\ \ [_{KP2} \ldots K_2]]\ \ ]$

Given (31), minimal search cannot be continued because there is no phrase it can look into; minimal search must shift to KP2 by locating K1 but also shift to KP1 by locating K2. Thus, one of the KPs in (34) must move to avoid the <KP, KP> configuration, so that [??] does not properly contain one of the two KPs. As the only visible head in [??] in (34) is the K head of KP2, the syntactic object is labeled as KP_2.[7]

3.2 Analysis

I now present an analysis of the observations presented in Section 2. The main observations that need to be accounted for in (23) are repeated below:

---

[7] Saito (2018) proposes that Case markers are weak heads (cf. Chomsky 2015). Saito (2018) defines weak heads as follows:

(i) Search {α, β} for a label. If <u>α is a weak head</u> or search into α yields a K head, then search on the α side is suspended and it continues only on the β side (Saito 2018: 287; emphasis by the author).

According to Saito (2018), the underlined portion becomes relevant when a K head and a DP are merged:

(ii) $\{_{DP}\ \{_{DP}\ \text{NP, D}\}\ \text{K}\}$

When minimal search identifies K in (ii), which is a weak head, it shifts to the (lower) DP and finds D. The entire syntactic object in (ii) is consequently labeled as DP. Contrary to Saito (2018), I assume that K projects KP when merged with an NP (30a). Therefore, I revise Saito's (2018) proposal, as shown in (31), to ensure that the shift of minimal search triggered by a K head operates only when minimal search looks into constituents that properly contain a KP and another phrase.

(35)

	Accusative subjects	Accusative *no koto* subjects
ReportP	✓ (5)	✓ (5)
ForceP	* (6a)/(14a)	??/✓ (6b)/(14b)

Note that the Report head *to* resists accusative Case, whereas the Force head *ka* (optionally) bears accusative Case (Harada 1976; Hiraiwa 2010a; Saito 2010; 2012):[8]

(36) a. **ReportP Complement**

*Mary-ga [$_{\text{ReportP}}$ Hanako-ga kasiko-i **to**]-o omot-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM smart-PRS **Report**-ACC think-PST
'Mary believed that Hanako was smart.'

b. **ForceP Complement**

Mary-ga [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ Hanako-ga kasiko-i **ka**]-(o) tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM smart-PRS **Force**-ACC ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.'

Based on the above contrast, I propose the following distinction regarding the presence or absence of K:

(37) **Case and Complementizers**

a. The Report head *to* is not selected by K.
b. The Force head *ka* is selected by K.[9]

Let us first consider the examples of accusative (*no koto*) subjects with ReportP. Notice that accusative (*no koto*) subjects can precede a matrix adverb.

(38) **ReportP Complement**

Mary-ga Hanako(-no koto)-o tuyoku kasiko-i **to** omot-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC strongly smart-PRS **Report** think-PST
'Mary strongly believed that Hanako was smart.'

The accusative (*no koto*) subject *Hanako* (*-no koto*) in (38) precedes the matrix adverb *tuyoku* 'strongly'. The acceptability of (38) indicates that both *Hanako* and *Hanako-no koto* can be in the matrix VP. An important point to be noted here is that while the accusative phrase cannot be selected by *omow-* 'think', the accusative *no koto* phrase can (Kishimoto 2018):

(39) Mary-ga {?*Hanako-o / Hanako-no koto-o} omot-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC Hanako-GEN fact-ACC think-PST
'Mary thought about Hanako.'

---

[8] See Sections 4 and 5 for cases in which the Force head *ka* does not realize accusative Case morphology.

[9] Specifically, (37b) is intended to cover cases in which *ka* does not co-occur with *to*. Nasu et al. (2024) claim that the ForceP under consideration is selected by *n*. The analysis presented below can be reconciled with this claim if *n*P projects a phase.

When *omow-* ‘think’ takes the sole nominal object as in (39), the latter must be accompanied by *no koto*. *No koto* in (39) thus corresponds to the obligatory instance of *no koto* in (3). The unavailability of *Hanako* in (39) shows that the accusative subject *Hanako* in (38) cannot be the direct object of the matrix verb, which means that the accusative subject in question must originate within the ReportP complement. Therefore, I assume that while the accusative subject moves from the ReportP complement into the matrix VP either optionally (Hiraiwa 2001; 2005; Takeuchi 2010; Kishimoto 2018; 2021) or obligatorily (Kuno 1972; 1973; 1976; 2007; Sakai 1998; Tanaka 2002),[10] the accusative *no koto* subject can be selected by the matrix verb, which means that the accusative *no koto* subject can be base-generated in the matrix VP (Saito 1983a; Kitagawa 1985; Kishimoto 2018; 2021; Takahashi 2021b).[11] I first provide an analysis of the accusative subject with the ReportP complement (38).

(40) a. Constructing the embedded AP:

$$[_{AP}\ \mathrm{KP}\ \mathrm{A}]$$

b. Constructing the embedded TP:

$$[_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ \mathrm{KP}\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]$$

c. Subject movement:

$$[_{TP}\ \mathrm{KP}_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]]$$

d. Constructing the ReportP complement:

$$[_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ \mathrm{KP}_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]]\ \mathrm{C}_{Report}]$$

e. Constructing the matrix VP:

$$[_{VP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ \mathrm{KP}_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]]\ \mathrm{C}_{Report}]\mathrm{V}]$$

f. Movement of the subject:

$$[_{VP}\ \mathrm{KP}_i\ [_{VP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]]\ \mathrm{C}_{Report}]\mathrm{V}]]$$

g. Accusative Case assignment:

$$[_{\nu P}\ [_{VP}\ \mathrm{KP}_{iACC}\ [_{VP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]]\ \mathrm{C}_{Report}]\mathrm{V}]]\nu]$$

h. Transfer of the ReportP complement:

$$[_{\nu P}\ [_{VP}\ \mathrm{KP}_{iACC}\ [_{VP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\mathrm{T}]]\ \mathrm{C}_{Report}]\mathrm{V}]]\nu]$$

In (40a), the embedded subject and the adjective are merged, and the resulting object is labeled as AP (head–phrase merger in (26)). In (40b), the embedded T and the embedded AP are merged, resulting in the TP projection (26). In (40c), the embedded KP and TP are merged. The merger/movement does not violate anti-locality because it crosses the embedded AP. The resulting syntactic object is labeled as TP (KP–XP merger in (32)). In (40d), the Report head *to* is introduced, forming the ReportP complement (26). In (40e), the matrix V and the ReportP complement are merged. The resulting object is labeled as VP (26). In (40f), the embedded KP

[10] Whether the movement is obligatory or optional is orthogonal to the discussion in the text; see footnote 12.

[11] What is important here is that *no koto* subjects *can* be base-generated in matrix VPs. See Takahashi (2021b) for arguments that accusative *no koto* subjects can also originate from complement clauses.

subject moves into the matrix VP, and the resulting syntactic object is labeled as VP (KP–XP merger in (32)). This movement does not violate anti-locality because it crosses the embedded TP and ReportP. In (40g), accusative Case is assigned to the moved KP by the matrix *v*/V. In (40h), the ReportP complement is transferred in accordance with the phasal transfer hypothesis in (24).

Returning to the case of the accusative *no koto* subject, I assume the following structure, where the accusative *no koto* subject is base-generated in the matrix VP (Saito 1983a; Kitagawa 1985; Kishimoto 2018; 2021; Takahashi 2021b):

(41) $[_{vP}\ [_{\boxed{\text{VP1}}}\ [_{\text{KP}}\ [\textbf{NP}_{\text{i}}\textbf{-}\textbf{\textit{no koto}}]\ \textbf{K}_{\text{ACC}}]\quad [_{\boxed{\text{VP2}}}\ [_{\text{CP}} \ldots \textbf{\textit{pro}} \ldots \text{C}_{\text{Report}}]\ \ \text{V}]]v]$

The accusative *no koto* KP functions as an object of the matrix verb *omow*- 'think' and binds *pro* in the ReportP complement. The syntactic object formed by merging the ReportP complement and the matrix V *omow*- 'think' is labeled as VP (i.e., VP2 in (41)) due to (26). The syntactic object formed by merging the accusative *no koto* KP and VP2 is also labeled as VP (i.e., VP1 in (41)) due to (32): minimal search into {KP, VP2} in (41) yields the K head, and search shifts to VP2. Search into {ReportP, V} yields V.

Note that the phrasal transfer hypothesis explains why A-movement out of CP, which is often excluded as an instance of "improper" movement, is possible in (40). It is often claimed that A-movement out of CP is prohibited by the ban on improper movement (i.e., A-A′-A movement), according to which movement from an A′-position to an A-position is prohibited (Chomsky 1973; May 1979; Fukui 1993; Obata & Epstein 2011; Fong 2019; Wurmbrand 2019).

(42) *Ricardo$_{\text{i}}$ seems (that) t_i left. (based on Fong 2019: 1)

Here, (42) is analyzed as a case of improper movement.

(43) * $[_{\text{CP}}\ t_i$ (that) $[_{\text{TP}}\ t_i\ [_{vP}\ t_i$ left]]].

(A) (A') (A)

The subject first moves from the embedded Spec, TP (A-position) to the embedded Spec, CP (A′-position). As its subsequent movement targets the matrix A-position, the movement results in a violation of the ban on improper movement. I assume that Spec, CP is uniformly an A′-position. The phasal transfer hypothesis adopted here correctly rules out cases of improper movement in English. According to Saito (2017a; 2020; 2024a), in languages with phi-features (e.g., English), the phasehood of CP is inherited by TP when phi-features on C are inherited by T (cf. Chomsky 2013; 2015). This means that the embedded TP is transferred when the CP complement is completed in English. The embedded subject must therefore move to the embedded Spec, CP in (43). A-movement after this step thus results in improper movement.

Returning to the movement of accusative subjects, the embedded TP in (40) is not transferred upon completion of the ReportP complement; it is transferred with the ReportP complement only when the matrix *v*P is completed. The accusative subject thus does not have to move to Spec, ReportP (= CP), which is an A′-position, before moving into the matrix VP (Takahashi 2011). This means that the movement of the accusative subject can take place from the embedded TP (an A-position) to the matrix VP (an A-position). Therefore, the movement of the accusative subject does not violate the ban on improper movement.[12]

I now return to an analysis of the accusative (*no koto*) subject with ForceP. The relevant examples in (6) are repeated below:

(44) **ForceP Complement**

a.	*Mary-ga	[Hanako-o	kasiko-i	**ka]-o**	tazune-ta.	
	Mary-NOM	Hanako-ACC	smart-PRS	**Force-ACC**	ask-PST	
b.	??Mary-ga	[Hanako-no	koto-o	kasiko-i	**ka]-o**	tazune-ta.
	Mary-NOM	Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	smart-PRS	**Force-ACC**	ask-PST

‘Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.’ (= (6))

While (44a) is unacceptable, (44b) is relatively more acceptable. I concluded in Section 2 that (44b) is grammatical but only violates the surface DoC. On par with the analysis of the accusative (*no koto*) subject with ReportP (38), I argue that while the accusative subject in (44a) must originate from the ForceP complement, the accusative *no koto* subject in (44b) is base-generated as a matrix object in the matrix VP. As in (39), when *tazune* ‘ask’ takes only a nominal object such as *Hanako*, *no koto* is obligatory.

(45)

Mary-ga	{?*Hanako-o	/ Hanako-no	koto-o}	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM	Hanako-ACC	Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	ask-PST

‘Mary asked about Hanako.’

Here, (45) is unacceptable without *no koto* as part of the nominal object. The unavailability of the accusative NP in (45) shows that the accusative subject in (44a) cannot be selected by *tazune* ‘ask’, which means that the accusative subject must originate from the ForceP complement.

[12] I do not intend to argue that the embedded KP subject always undergoes movement into the matrix clause (Kuno 1972; 1976; 2007; Sakai 1998; Tanaka 2002; cf. Takahashi 2021a). I remain agnostic as to whether the movement in question is obligatory. What is important here is that when the accusative KP subject moves into the matrix VP, as in (40), this movement does not violate the ban on improper movement. The assumptions adopted in this paper do not necessarily exclude the possibility that the accusative subject can remain within the ReportP complement (Kaneko 1988; Hiraiwa 2001; 2005; Takeuchi 2010; Kishimoto 2018; 2021). When the KP subject and the embedded TP are merged in (40e), the resulting syntactic object is labeled as TP due to the anti-labeling property of the K head (32). The KP subject may thus stay within the ReportP complement. As the ReportP complement is not transferred until the matrix *v*P is completed, the KP subject remaining within the ReportP complement can receive accusative Case from the matrix *v*/V.

Recall that (22) shows that *tazune* 'ask' allows accusative subjects in other contexts, which makes the unacceptability of (44a) a puzzle. The availability of the accusative *no koto* phrase in (45) shows that the accusative *no koto* subject can be directly selected by *tazune* 'ask', which in turn means that the accusative *no koto* phrase in (44b) is base-generated in the matrix clause.

I now present an analysis of the accusative subject with ForceP (44a). I show that the accusative subject cannot move into the matrix VP because of an interaction between phasal transfer and anti-locality:

(46) a. Subject movement (= (40c)):

$[_{TP}\ KP_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ A]\ T]]$

b. Constructing the ForceP complement and transfer:

$[_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ KP_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ A]\ T]]\ C_{Force}]$

c. Constructing the clausal KP complement:

$[_{KP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ KP_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ A]\ T]]\ C_{Force}]\ K]$

d. Movement and transfer:

$[_{??}\ KP_i\ [_{KP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ A]T]]\ C_{Force}]\ K]]$

e. Constructing the matrix VP:

$[_{VP}\ [_{??}\ KP_i\ [_{KP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ A]T]]\ C_{Force}]\ K]]V]$

f. Movement of the subject:

$[_{VP}\ [_{??}\ KP_i\ [_{KP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ A]T]]\ C_{Force}]\ K]]V]$

*anti-locality

In (46a) (=(40c)), the embedded KP subject and TP are merged. The merger/movement in question does not violate anti-locality because it crosses the embedded AP. The resulting syntactic object is labeled as TP (32). In (46b), the Force head *ka* is introduced, resulting in the ForceP complement (26). In (46c), the K head is introduced, resulting in the clausal KP complement (26). In (46d), the embedded KP subject and clausal KP complement are merged. The resulting syntactic object is unlabeled (i.e., <KP, KP> configuration (34)). As the clausal KP complement (KP) and embedded ForceP (CP) are phases (24a)/(30b), the latter is transferred in accordance with (24b). In (46e), the matrix V is merged, resulting in the matrix VP (26). Importantly, the embedded KP subject has to move out to avoid the <KP, KP> configuration (46f). However, movement of the embedded KP subject violates anti-locality because it does not cross any labeled projections (28).

An analysis of the accusative *no koto* subject with ForceP (44b) is presented below. The *no koto* accusative phrase is base-generated in the matrix VP:

(47) $[_{vP}\ [_{\boxed{\text{VP1}}}\ [_{KP}\ [\mathbf{NP}_i\textbf{-}\boldsymbol{no\ koto}]K_{ACC}]\ [_{\boxed{\text{VP2}}}[_{KP}\ [_{CP}\ \ldots\ \boldsymbol{pro}\ \ldots\ C_{Force}]\ K_{ACC}]\ V]]\ v]$

The accusative *no koto* KP and clausal KP complement are both base-generated as objects of the matrix verb *tazune* 'ask' in the matrix VP. The accusative *no koto* KP binds *pro* in the clausal KP complement. As both the accusative *no koto* KP and clausal KP complement receive accusative Case, (44b)/(47) violates the surface DoC. The syntactic object resulting from the merger of the clausal KP complement and matrix V *tazune* 'ask' is labeled as VP (VP2 in (47)) due to (26) (and (31)). The syntactic object resulting from the merger of the accusative *no koto* KP and VP2 is also labeled as VP (VP1 in (47)) due to (31): minimal search into {KP, VP2} yields the K head, and search shifts to the VP2. Minimal search into {KP, V} yields V.

As a reviewer pointed out, the ban on the accusative subject in (44a) seems to be explained by appealing to the ban on improper movement (43) (cf. Takeuchi 2010); if Spec, KP is a uniform A′-position, the movement in (46f) (i.e., movement from the edge of the clausal KP complement (an A′-position) to the matrix VP (an A-position)) should be ruled out as improper movement. If this analysis were to be maintained, the explanation employed in (46) would lose its motivation. However, there is evidence that A-movement out of clausal KP complements is possible, which in turn suggests that Spec, KP can be an A-position. This suggests that (44a) cannot be excluded based on the ban on improper movement. Assuming that Spec, KP can be an A-position, the analysis proposed in (46) predicts that the embedded KP subject can undergo further A-movement, taking the embedded KP subject "far enough" from the clausal KP complement. Interestingly, long-distance passive out of ForceP is allowed (for long-distance passives, see Kuno 1972; 1976; Nagai 1991; Ura 1994; Sakai 1998; Ishii 2012; Kishimoto 2018; 2021):[13]

(48) **Long-distance passive out of ForceP**

Sono	riron$_i$-ga	Mary-ni yotte	**[**$_{\mathbf{ForceP}}$ t_i	omosiro-i	**ka**]-ga	tazune-rare-ta.
the	theory-NOM	Mary-by		interesting-PRS	**Force**-NOM	ask-PASS-PST

'Lit. The theory was asked by Mary whether it was interesting.'

Both the nominative subject *sono rion* 'the theory' and the ForceP complement in (48) receive nominative Case. Contrary to (44a), (48) is acceptable. The involvement of movement in (48) is supported by the following example concerning the movement of the ForceP complement. The nominative ForceP complement cannot be followed by the matrix subject:

(49)

* **[**$_{\mathbf{ForceP}}$ t_i	omosiro-i	**ka**]$_j$-ga	sono	riron$_i$-ga	Mary-ni yotte	t_j	tazune-rare-ta.
	interesting-PRS	**Force**-NOM	the	theory-NOM	Mary-by		ask-PASS-PST

'Lit. The theory was asked by Mary whether it was interesting.'

The ForceP complement in (49) is fronted to the sentence-initial position. If the subject *sono riron* 'the theory' moves from the ForceP complement into the matrix clause, the moved ForceP

[13] I employ an inanimate nominative subject here to guarantee that it cannot be seen as promoted from the matrix dative argument.

contains an unbound trace (cf. Kuno 1972; 1976), violating the Proper Binding Condition (PBC), which requires traces to be bound (Fiengo 1977; Saito 1989). Example (48) is analyzed as follows:

(50) a. Constructing the matrix VP (= (46e)):

$[_{VP}$ $[_{??}$ KP$_{i}$
$[_{KP}$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ t_{i} $[_{TP}$ $[_{AP}$ t_{i} A]T]]C$_{Force}$] K]] V]

b. Merger of v and v_{pass}:

v-v_{pass}

c. Constructing the matrix v_{pass}P:

$[_{vpassP}$ by-phrase $[_{VP}$ $[_{??}$ KP$_{i}$
$[_{KP}$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ t_{i} $[_{TP}$ $[_{AP}$ t_{i} A]T]]C$_{Force}$] K]] V] v-v_{pass}]

d. Subject movement and labeling:

$[_{vpassP}$ KP$_{i}$ $[_{vpassP}$ by-phrase $[_{VP}$ $[_{KP}$ t_{i}
$[_{KP}$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ t_{i} $[_{TP}$ $[_{AP}$ t_{i} A]T]]C$_{Force}$] K]] V] v-v_{pass}]]

e. Transfer of the clausal KP complement:

$[_{vpassP}$ KP$_{i}$ $[_{vpassP}$ by-phrase $[_{VP}$ $[_{KP}$ t_{i}
$[_{KP}$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ t_{i} $[_{TP}$ $[_{AP}$ t_{i} A]T]]C$_{Force}$] K]] V] v-v_{pass}]]

f. Introducing the matrix Tense and subject movement:

$[_{TP}$ KP$_{i}$ $[_{TP}$ $[_{vpassP}$ t_{i} $[_{vpassP}$ by-phrase $[_{VP}$ $[_{KP}$ t_{i}
$[_{KP}$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ t_{i} $[_{TP}$ $[_{AP}$ t_{i} A]T]]C$_{Force}$] K]] V] v-v_{pass}]]T]]

g. Introducing the matrix C and nominative Case assignment:

$[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ KP$_{i\ NOM}$ $[_{TP}$ $[_{vpassP}$ t_{i} $[_{vpassP}$ by-phrase $[_{VP}$ $[_{KP}$ t_{i}
$[_{KP}$ $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ t_{i} $[_{TP}$ $[_{AP}$ t_{i} A]T]]C$_{Force}$] K]]$_{NOM}$ V] v-v_{pass}]]T]]C]

In (50a) (= (46e)), the clausal KP complement is merged with the matrix V, forming the matrix VP (26)/(31). In (50b), the passive morpheme *-rare* (v_{pass}) is externally pair-merged with the transitive v (i.e., adjunction of the latter to the former; cf. Goro 2006) (for external pair-merge of heads, see Epstein et al. 2016; Saito 2020). I assume v and *-rare* (v_{pass}) are both phase heads (Legate 2003; Saito 2017a; b; 2020; 2024a). The phasehood of the transitive v is “canceled” due to the external pair-merge (Epstein et al. 2016; Saito 2020; see Section 5 for further remarks). In (50c), this amalgam and the matrix VP are merged, resulting in v_{pass}P (26). The *by*-phrase *Mary-ni yotte* is introduced as an adjunct to the v_{pass}P. As the phasehood of the transitive v is “canceled” due to external pair-merge, the matrix verbal domain consists of a single phase. In (50d), the embedded KP subject and matrix v_{pass}P are merged, and the resulting syntactic object is labeled as v_{pass}P (32). As the movement crosses the matrix VP, it does not violate anti-locality. The [??] is labeled as KP by the clausal KP complement because the lower copy/trace of the moved KP is invisible for labeling (27b). In (50e), the entire clausal KP complement is transferred upon the completion of the matrix v_{pass}P (24). In (50f), the matrix Tense is introduced, resulting in TP (26), and the embedded KP subject and matrix TP are merged, resulting in TP (31). In (50g), the moved KP subject and clausal KP complement receive nominative Case from Tense after the introduction of the matrix C.[14] Importantly, as the movement of the embedded KP subject crosses the labeled constituents (i.e., the embedded KP subject moves across the matrix VP in (50d) and the matrix v_{pass}P and TP in (50f)), there is no anti-locality violation.[15]

The acceptability of (48) provides further support for the analysis in (46). The analysis in (50) shows that the embedded KP subject can move from the edge of the clausal KP complement into the matrix TP, which is an A-position. Given the ban on improper movement (43), I conclude

---

[14] Note that although elements inside the clausal KP complement become inaccessible, the clausal KP complement itself remains accessible (Bošković 2016a).

[15] Note in passing that the clausal KP/ForceP complement can receive accusative Case in the following "long-distance" passive construction:

(i) Sono hon$_i$-ga Mary-ni yotte [$_{ForceP}$ *ec*$_i$ zyuuyoo dearu **ka]** -o handans-are-ta.
the book-NOM Mary-by important-PRS COP **Force**-ACC assess-PASS-PST
'Lit. The book was assessed by Mary whether it was important.'

In (i), the matrix subject *sono hon* 'the book' and the ForceP complement receive nominative Case and accusative Case, respectively. *Sono hon* 'the book' is interpreted as the subject of *zyuuyoo dearu* 'be important', and it does not seem to be the object of the matrix verb *handans* 'assess'.

(ii)?*Mary-ga sono hon-o handansi-ta.
Mary-NOM the book-ACC assess-PST
'Mary assessed the book.'

Handnas 'assess' in (ii) cannot take *sono hon* 'the book' as its object. Note here that Japanese allows so-called possessor passives, where a nominative subject is understood as a "possessor" of an accusative object: (Kubo 1992; Fukuda 2006; Goro 2006):

(iii) Sono hon-ga (Mary-ni yotte) zyuuyoosee-o handans-are-ta.
the book-NOM Mary-by importance-ACC assess-PASS-PST
'The importance of the book was assessed.'

In (iii), *sono hon* 'the book' and *zyuuyoosee* 'importance' receive nominative Case and accusative Case, respectively. *Sono hon* 'the book' is interpreted as the "possessor" of *zyuuyoosee* 'importance'. Thus, the following example, where *sono hon* 'the book' is a genitive argument of *zyuuyoosee* 'importance', is also acceptable.

(iv) [Sono hon-no zyuuyoosee]-ga (Mary-ni yotte) handans-are-ta.
the book-GEN importance-NOM Mary-by assess-PASS-PST
'The importance of the book was assessed.'

Based on the similarity between (i) and (iii), I suggest that (i) is an instance of the possessor passive construction, leaving its exact nature open.

that the edge of the clausal KP complement can be an A-position. This, in turn, shows that the movement of the embedded KP subject in (50d) does not violate the ban on improper movement. The ban on the accusative subject with ForceP (44a) therefore cannot be explained by the ban on improper movement.

To summarize, the observations made in the previous section receive a principled explanation in terms of phasal transfer and anti-locality. I have shown that the phasal transfer hypothesis allows accusative subjects to move from ReportP into matrix VPs without passing through the edge of ReportP, which circumvents the violation of the ban on improper movement. I have also demonstrated that accusative subjects cannot move from ForceP into matrix VPs because of the interaction between phasal transfer and anti-locality. Moreover, I have contended that the edge of KP can be an A-position, which is essential for elucidating the difference between the accusative subject with ForceP and long-distance passive out of ForceP.

4 Apparent Case-less ForceP: Inaudible KP

This section discusses cases where the accusative subject is blocked in the (apparent) absence of accusative Case marking on ForcePs. I argue that in such cases, ForcePs do bear (inaudible) Case, projecting a KP. I also show that the apparently Case-less ForcePs behave differently from ReportPs, which genuinely do not bear Case.

Note that accusative Case marking on the ForceP complement is optional (Fukui 1986; Hiraiwa 2010a; Saito 2010; 2012; Yoshida 2019; Tomioka 2020; Nasu et al. 2024):[16]

(51)	Mary-ga	**[**$_{\textbf{ForceP}}$	Hanako-ga	kasiko-i	**ka**]-(o)	tazune-ta.
	Mary-NOM		Hanako-NOM	interesting-PRS	**Force**-ACC	ask-PST
	‘Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.’ (= (36b))					

Interestingly, the contrast between the accusative subject and accusative *no koto* remains even if the Force head *ka* does not morphologically realize accusative Case:

(52)	Mary-ga	[Hanako*(-no	koto)-o	kasiko-i	**ka]**	tazune-ta.
	Mary-NOM	Hanako-GEN	fact-ACC	smart-PRS	**Force**	ask-PST
	‘Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.’					

While the ForceP with the accusative *no koto* subject is acceptable, the ForceP with the accusative subject is not. The acceptability of (52) with the accusative *no koto* subject is not surprising. As I have claimed above, the distribution of the accusative *no koto* subject is constrained by the surface DoC (47). As two accusative Case markers are not present, the surface DoC is not violated in (52). Example (52) with the accusative *no koto* subject is thus expected to be acceptable. Further, (52) with the accusative subject is interesting. I have argued above that the ban on the accusative

[16] The optionality here is distinct from the Case marker drop allowed in the colloquial style (Saito 1983b; Fukuda 1993). Accusative Case marking of the ForceP complement can be dropped even in the non-colloquial style.

subject with the (overtly) Case-marked ForceP arises from an interaction between phasal transfer and anti-locality, which crucially relies on the presence of the KP projection dominating the ForceP complement (46). Given that (52) with the accusative subject is unacceptable, similar to (44a), I claim (i) that the ForceP in (52) is dominated by a KP and (ii) that the K head does not have to be phonetically realized when it is accusative.

The claim that ForcePs occurring as a complement of *tazune* 'ask' always bear accusative Case is supported by some observations concerning the distribution of ForcePs in the causative construction. As we saw in (12), when the causative predicate -(*s*)*ase* 'cause' selects a transitive verb, the embedded object cannot receive accusative Case in the presence of the accusative causee, which is attributed to the deep D*o*C (Kuroda 1965; 1978; Harada 1973; 1975; Williams 1982; Saito 1982; 2020; Poser 2002; Takano 2004; Ochi 2009; Miyagawa 2017):

(53) Mary-ga Hanako-ni/*Hanako(-no koto)-o sono hon-o yom-ase-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-DAT Hanako-GEN fact-ACC the book-ACC read-cause-PST
'Mary let/made Hanako read the book.' (= (12))

Although a principled explanation of the deep D*o*C is beyond the scope of this paper, I adopt this constraint to assess whether an element bears accusative Case. Note that if the embedded object receives dative Case, it can occur with the accusative causee:

(54) Hanako-ga Taroo-ni/*o at-ta.
Hanako-NOM Taro-DAT/ACC meet-PST
'Hanako met Taro.'

(55) a. ??Mary-ga Hanako-ni Taroo-ni aw-ase-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-DAT Taro-DAT meet-cause-PST
b. Mary-ga Hanako-o Taroo-ni aw-ase-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC Taro-DAT meet-cause-PST
'Mary let/made Hanako meet Taro.'

Example (54) shows that *aw*- 'meet' must take a dative object. While the presence of the embedded dative object and the dative causee results in slight awkwardness (55a) (cf. Ochi 2009), the embedded dative object can co-occur with the accusative causee without severe degradation (55b).

Returning to the clausal complements under consideration, note first that ForcePs that morphologically realize accusative Case cannot appear with the accusative causee:

(56) Kyoo-no nyuusu-ga Hanako-ni/*o **[**$_{\textbf{ForceP}}$ Tookyoo-ga hontooni atu-i
today-GEN news-NOM Hanako-DAT/ACC Tokyo-NOM really hot-PRS
ka]-o tazune-sase-ta.
Force-ACC ask-cause-PST
'Today's news made Hanako ask whether Tokyo was really hot.'

The embedded ForceP in (56) can appear with the dative causee but not with the accusative causee. Importantly, the contrast in (56) persists even if the accusative Case marker is dropped from the ForceP:

(57) Kyoo-no nyuusu-ga Hanako-ni/*o **[**$_{\textbf{ForceP}}$ Tookyoo-ga hontooni atu-i **ka]**
today-GEN news-NOM Hanako-DAT/ACC Tokyo-NOM really hot-PRS **Force**
tazune-sase-ta.
ask-cause-PST

The unacceptability of (57) with the accusative causee supports the claim that apparently Case-less ForcePs indeed bear accusative Case, projecting a KP. By contrast, ReportPs, which cannot bear Case, can appear with either the dative or accusative causee (Poser 2002):

(58) Kyoo-no nyuusu-ga Hanako-ni/o **[**$_{\textbf{ReportP}}$ Tookyoo-ga hontooni atu-i
today-GEN news-NOM Hanako-DAT/ACC Tokyo-NOM really hot-PRS
to] omow-ase-ta.
Report think-cause-PST
'Today's news made Hanako think that Tokyo was really hot.'

The acceptability of (58) with the accusative causee aligns with the assumption that ReportPs do not bear Case. Given that multiple accusatives are prohibited in the causative construction, we predict that while (58) with the dative causee allows an accusative subject, (58) with the accusative causee does not. This prediction is borne out (Poser 2002):

(59) Kyoo-no nyuusu-ga Hanako-ni/*o **[**$_{\textbf{ReportP}}$ Tookyoo-o hontooni atu-i **to]**
today-GEN news-NOM Hanako-DAT/ACC Tokyo-ACC really hot-PRS **Report**
omow-ase-ta.
think-cause-PST

To summarize, I have shown that the apparently Case-less ForcePs do, in fact, bear Case, which is supported by the distribution of ForcePs and ReportPs in the causative construction.[17]

5 Genuinely Case-less ForcePs: External pair-merge of complementizers

In this section, I discuss cases where the Force head *ka* does not bear Case when it co-occurs with the Report head *to*. I argue that such cases allow accusative subjects when they involve external pair-merge of the complementizers.

[17] As a reviewer pointed out, a question remains as to how children acquire the inaudible accusative K head that appears with ForceP complements, as there seems to be no decisive input regarding the inaudible K. I leave this important question open for future research.

The Force head *ka* and Report head *to* can co-occur within a single clause (Saito 2010; 2012):

(60)

Mary-ga	$[_{CP}$	Hanako-ga	kasiko-i	**ka**	**to]**	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM		Hanako-NOM	smart-PRS	**Force**	**Report**	ask-PST

‘Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.’

Interestingly, as we have seen in (22), the “complex” ReportP/ForceP allows accusative subjects (Kuno 1972; 1976; Kobayashi & Maki 2002; Takeuchi 2010):

(61)

Mary-ga	Hanako-o	suguni	kasiko-i	**ka**	**to**	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM	Hanako-ACC	immediately	smart-PRS	**Force**	**Report**	ask-PST

‘Mary immediately asked whether Hanako was smart.’

The accusative subject *Hanako* in (61) precedes the matrix adverb *suguni* ‘immediately’, which indicates that *Hanako* is in the matrix VP. As *tazune* ‘ask’ cannot select *Hanako* as the object (45), the accusative subject must originate from the ReportP/ForceP complement. Note that the Force head *ka* and Report head *to* in (60)/(61) do not bear Case, which suggests that the clausal complement in question does not project a KP:

(62)

Mary-ga	$[_{CP}$	Hanako-ga	kasiko-i	**ka**(-o*)	**to**(-o*)]	tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM		Hanako-NOM	smart-PRS	**Force-**ACC	**Report-**ACC	ask-PST

‘Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.’

However, recall that the phasal transfer hypothesis (24b) dictates that “a phase is transferred upon the completion of the next phase up” (Saito 2017a: 64). Given that CPs are phases (Chomsky 2000; 2013; 2015), we predict that the ForceP is transferred when the ReportP is completed. This means that the embedded subject cannot stay within the complement clause, otherwise the embedded subject in (61) would be transferred together with the ForceP before the former receives accusative Case from the matrix *v*/V:

(63) **Movement of the embedded subject out of ReportP/ForceP**

$$[\ \mathrm{KP}_i\ [_{VP}\ [_{??}\ t_i\ [_{CP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ t_i\ \mathrm{A}]\ \mathrm{T}]]\ \mathrm{C}_{Force}]\ \mathrm{C}_{Report}]]\ \mathrm{V}]]$$

The embedded subject KP is first merged with the ReportP complement before the ForceP is transferred. Here, I assume the following: given that ReportP can undergo scrambling just like KP arguments, the Report head *to* also has an anti-labeling property. Consequently, as both the embedded KP and ReportP complement have an anti-labeling property, the merger of the embedded KP subject and the ReportP complement yields an unlabeled syntactic object [??] (cf. (34)). This unlabeled status thus forces the KP subject to move further. However, the movement from [??] into the matrix VP should be ruled out by anti-locality (i.e., the movement does not cross a labeled projection distinct from the matrix VP) and the ban on improper movement in (43) (i.e., the movement from an A′ position (Spec, CP) to an A-position (Spec, VP) is impossible).

However, the problems are resolved once we assume that the complex ReportP/ForceP forms a single phase, which makes it possible to analyze (61) on par with (40). It has been proposed that when a head is externally pair-merged with a phase head, the latter becomes syntactically "invisible" (Epstein et al. 2016; Saito 2020). Takahashi (2023) argues that in the potential construction in Japanese, where an object can receive either accusative or nominative Case, two phase heads can be externally pair-merged (cf. Bošković 2015), showing that the Case alternation of the object reflects the optionality of the pair-merge operation (Morikate 2022). As is well known, a transitive object can receive nominative Case when a verb is accompanied by a potential suffix, which is a stative predicate (Kuno 1973; Saito 1982; Takezawa 1987):

(64) Kodomo-tati-ga kanzirensyuu-o/ga tuzuke-rare-ru.
child-PL-NOM kanji.practice-ACC/NOM continue-can-PRS
'Children can continue kanji practice.' (Takahashi 2021c: 154)

Tuzuke 'continue' in (64) is accompanied by the potential suffix *-rare* 'can', and the object can receive either accusative or nominative Case. Following insights from past literature (Takezawa 1988; Ura 1999; Takahashi 2011; Moritake 2022), Takahashi (2023) assumes that the Case alternation in (64) reflects the optionality of external pair-merge of two phase heads: the potential suffix (v_{can}) and the embedded *v*:

(65) a. The accusative object construction:
$[_{TP}$ SUBJ$_{iNOM}$ $[_{vcanP}$ t_i $[_{vP}$ PRO $[_{VP}$ OBJ$_{ACC}$ V$]$ $v]$ $v_{can}]$ T$]$

b. The nominative object construction:
$[_{TP}$ SUBJ$_{iNOM}$ OBJ$_{jNOM}$ $[_{vcanP}$ t_i $[_{VP}$ t_j V$]$ v-$v_{can}]$ T$]$

In (65a), which corresponds to (64) with the accusative object, the embedded *v* assigns accusative Case and projects the *v*P phase. The potential suffix (v_{can}) selects the *v*P complement. Assuming the phasal transfer hypothesis (24), the *v*P phase is transferred upon the completion of the v_{can}P phase. In (65b), which corresponds to (64) with the nominative object, the potential suffix (v_{can}) is pair-merged with the embedded *v* (i.e., the *v* head is adjoined to the potential suffix (v_{can})); consequently, the embedded *v* ceases to be a phase head that can assign accusative Case. As there is only one "visible" phase head (i.e., v-v_{can}), there is no transfer upon the completion of the v_{can}P phase. Thus, the object can receive nominative Case from Tense and move into the TP domain (Koizumi 1998; Nomura 2005; Takahashi 2023).

Against this backdrop, I argue that when the movement of the embedded subject takes place out of the complex ReportP/ForceP, the two phase heads (i.e., complementizers) are externally pair-merged. In particular, I propose that the Report head *to* is externally pair-merged with the Force head *ka* (i.e., the Force head *ka* is adjoined to the Report head *to*). This cancels the phasehood of the ForceP complement, and the movement of the embedded subject takes place, as shown in (40).

(66) **Movement of the Embedded Subject out of ReportP/ForceP**

$[_{vP}\ [_{VP}\ \ KP_{iACC}\ [_{VP}\ [_{CP}\ [_{TP}\ t_i\ \ [_{TP}\ [_{AP}\ \ t_i\ \ A]\ \ T]]\ \ C_{Force}\text{-}C_{Report}]\ \ V]]v]$

The ReportP/ForceP in (66) is not transferred until the completion of the matrix *v*P. The accusative subject thus moves directly from the embedded Spec, TP into the matrix VP, crossing the embedded TP and CP. The problems concerning improper movement and anti-locality that were pointed out above therefore do not arise.

The analysis is supported by certain observations regarding the distribution of wh-phrases. Note that when a head X is externally pair-merged with another head Y (i.e., Y is adjoined to X), Y becomes syntactically "invisible." For instance, when a head X is externally pair-merged with a transitive *v*, the latter ceases to be a phase head that licenses its dependents (i.e., phrases that require Case) (Epstein et al. 2016; Saito 2020; Moritake 2022; Takahashi 2023). I suggest extending this idea to complementizers. Given that the Force head *ka* licenses wh-phrases, we expect that the Force head *ka* cannot license wh-phrases when it becomes "invisible" via external pair-merge.[18] Specifically, when the embedded subject moves out of the complex ReportP/ForceP

[18] It is important to address the concept of "invisibility" at this point (I thank a reviewer for raising this issue). I posit that the "invisibility" of a phase head refers to (i) the cancellation of its phasal status and (ii) its inability to value the unvalued features of its dependents (Epstein et al. 2016; Saito 2020; Takahashi 2023). I thus assume that "invisible" heads are visible for selection. In particular, I assume that "invisible" heads can select arguments and be selected by their hosts. First, as suggested by Epstein et al. (2016) and Saito (2020), heads that become "invisible" through external pair-merge can still select arguments. Epstein et al. (2016) suggest that, in bridge verb constructions such as *John thinks that he will win*, the matrix verb is externally pair-merged with the matrix *v*, which makes the matrix *v* "invisible":

(i) John [thinks-*v** [$_{CP}$ that he will win]]

The matrix *v* here loses its (i) phasal status and (ii) ability to license Case (hence "invisible"). However, the matrix *v* can still select the matrix subject *John*. Second, heads that become "invisible" must be visible for selection by their hosts. Consider the following example, where the subject can be interpreted either as an agent or an experiencer (see Inoue 1974; Oehrle & Nishio 1981; Asami 2024):

(ii) Hanako-ga boosi-o tob-asi-ta.
Hanako-NOM cap-ACC be.flown-caus-PST
Agentive reading: 'Hanako flew a cap.'
Experiential reading: 'Hanako$_i$'s cap got blown off on her$_i$.' (based on Asami 2024: 2)

On the agentive reading, *Hanako* caused a cap to fly. On the experiential reading, *Hanako* did not cause the event, but simply experienced the event. The agentive reading can be forced by adding an adverb *wazato* 'intentionally'. Furthermore, the experiential reading can be forced by an adjunct that represents a causer:

complement as in (66), which entails that the Report head *to* is externally pair-merged with the Force head *ka,* wh-phrases fail to be licensed by the Force head *ka*. This prediction is borne out (Takemura 1975–1976; Ueda 1988):

(67) a. Mary-ga **[**$_{\text{ReportP}}$ **[**$_{\text{ForceP}}$ dare-ga gengogaku-ni kuwasi-i **ka**] **to**]
Mary-NOM who-NOM linguistics-DAT familiar-PRS **Force Report**
tazune-ta.
ask-PST

b. *Mary-ga dare-o gengogaku-ni kuwasi-i **ka-to** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM who-ACC linguistics-DAT familiar-PRS **Force-Report** ask-PST
'Mary asked who was familiar with linguistics.'

(iii) Hanako-ga {wazato / kyoohuu-de} boosi-o tob-asi-ta.
Hanako-NOM intentionally blast-due.to cap-ACC be.flown-caus-PST
Agentive reading: 'Hanako intentionally flew a cap.'
Experiential reading: 'Hanako$_i$'s cap got blown off on her$_i$ due to the blast.'
((iii) with the experiential reading is drawn from Asami 2024)

Essentially following Aasami (2024), I assume that the two kinds of subjects are introduced by distinct verbal functional heads. Importantly, when (ii) appears with the potential suffix (v_{can}), we only obtain the agentive interpretation regardless of the Case of the object.

(iv) Hanako-ga boosi-o/ga tob-as-e-ta.
Hanako-NOM cap-ACC/NOM be.flown-caus-can-PST
Agentive reading: 'Hanako could fly a cap.'

The unambiguity of (iv) with the accusative object indicates that the potential suffix v_{can} must select agentive *v*. Recall that when the object receives nominative Case, the potential suffix v_{can} is pair-merged with the embedded *v* (65b). The unambiguity of (iv) with the nominative object thus indicates that the selectional relation between the potential suffix v_{can} and embedded *v* is still preserved when the two are pair-merged. Returning to the case of complex CPs, I propose that even when the Report head *to* is pair-merged with the Force head *ka*, the Force head *ka* selects its complement (cf. (i)) and is selected by the Report head *to* (cf. (iv)):

(v) Mary-ga **[**Hanako-ga/o kasiko-i *(**ka)** **to]** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM/ACC smart-PRS **Force Report** ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.'

Example (v) is unacceptable without *ka* regardless of the case of *Hanako*. I follow Saito (2012; 2024b) in assuming (A) that when *to* and *ka* co-occur as in (v), *tazune* 'ask' only selects the Report head *to*; and (B) that the report head *to* selects the Force head *ka*. The ban on the absence of *ka* in (v) is then captured by the restriction imposed by *tazune* on the kinds of sentences that *to* can embed*:* the complement of *to* must indicate the content of the question asked by the subject. As (v) without *ka* is unacceptable regardless of the case of *Hanako*, *ka* in both versions of (v) selects the clausal complement and is selected by *to*. *Ka* must be visible for selection regardless of whether *to* is pair-merged with *ka*.

In (67a), the embedded nominative subject *dare* 'who' is associated with the Force head *ka*. In (67b), the embedded accusative subject *dare* 'who' fails to be associated with the Force head *ka*.[19]

Note that, as a reviewer pointed out, the contrast between (67a) and (67b) may simply show that the accusative subject is outside the scope (i.e., the c-command domain) of the Force head *ka*, rather than reflecting the invisibility of the Force head *ka*: (67b) may be unacceptable because the accusative subject is positioned above the Force head *ka.* Importantly, the contrast in question is not limited to the accusative wh-subject. This suggests that the Force head *ka* indeed becomes invisible with the accusative subject. Embedded non-accusative wh-phrases also fail to be licensed when an accusative subject is present (Ueda 1988):

(68) a. Mary-ga [$_{\text{ReportP}}$ [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ Hanako-ga nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka**] **to**]
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force** **Report**
tazune-ta.
ask-PST

b. ??Mary-ga Hanako-o nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka-to** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force-Report** ask-PST
'Mary asked what Hanako was familiar with.'

---

[19] Note that (67b) is still unacceptable without the Report head *to* (I thank a reviewer for this point; Kitagawa (1985))

(i) *Mary-ga dare-o gengogaku-ni kuwasi-i **ka** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM who-ACC linguistics-DAT familiar-PRS **Force** ask-PST
'Mary asked who was familiar with linguistics.'

This seems to suggest the unacceptability of (67b) is not due to external pair-merge of the complementizers; whatever excludes (i) also excludes (67b). I suggest that (67b) and (i) must be analyzed differently. I argued in Section 4 that the ForceP complement without an accusative Case marker is indeed the clausal KP complement. Example (i) thus receives an account in terms of phasal transfer and anti-locality on par with (44a) and (52) without *no koto* in the text. Note that (i) is unacceptable even if the accusative subject is not a wh-phrase:

(ii) *Mary-ga kare-o gengogaku-ni kuwasi-i **ka-Ø** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM him-ACC linguistics-DAT familiar-PRS **Force-K** ask-PST
'Mary asked if he was familiar with linguistics.'

The unacceptability of (i) thus has nothing to do with wh-licensing. By contrast, (67b) becomes acceptable when the accusative subject is not a wh-phrase:

(iii) Mary-ga kare-o gengogaku-ni kuwasi-i **ka-to** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM him-ACC linguistics-DAT familiar-PRS **Force-Report** ask-PST
'Mary asked if he was familiar with linguistics.'

The acceptability of (iii) indicates that the unacceptability of (67b) has to do with wh-licensing. Therefore, the similarity of (67b) and (i) is only apparent, and they should be treated differently.

In (68a), the embedded dative argument *nani* 'what' is associated with the Force head *ka*, whereas in (68b), the embedded dative argument *nani* 'what' fails to be associated with the Force head *ka*.[20]

Interestingly, the embedded wh-phrases can be licensed by a matrix complementizer regardless of the Case of the embedded subject:

(69) a. Mary-ga $[_{\text{ReportP}}[_{\text{ForceP}}$ Hanako-ga nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka]** **to]**
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force** **Report**
tazune-ta-**no**?
ask-PST-**COMP**$_{Q}$
'Did Mary ask what Hanako was familiar with?'
'What is a thing such that Mary asked whether Hanako was familiar with it?'

b. Mary-ga Hanako-o nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka-to** tazune-ta-**no**?
Mary-NOM Hanako-ACC what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force-Report** ask-PST-**COMP**$_{Q}$
??'Did Mary ask what Hanako was familiar with?'
'What is a thing such that Mary asked whether Hanako was familiar with it?'

Example (69a) involves the embedded nominative subject. The embedded dative object *nani* 'what' in (69a) takes either the embedded or matrix scope (Yoshida 2019). Example (69b) involves the embedded accusative subject. *Nani* 'what' in (69b) only takes the matrix scope. Example (69b) is unambiguous because the embedded Force head *ka*, with which the Report head *to* is pair-merged, cannot be associated with the embedded wh-phrase *nani* 'what'. I suggest that (69a) is structurally ambiguous because pair-merge of complementizers is optional in this case. Note that as the embedded subject in (69a) receives nominative Case, the Report head *to* does not have to be pair-merged with the Force head *ka*, though nothing blocks the pair-merge operation in question. When the pair-merge operation occurs, the Force head *ka* fails to license the embedded wh-phrase. Therefore, the only complementizer that can be associated with the embedded wh-phrase is the matrix complementizer *no*, which results in the matrix scope

[20] A reviewer pointed out that (68b) is still more acceptable than (67b) (cf. Ueda 1988). I suggest that the different status of the two examples arises from the limited availability of the base-generation of the accusative subject. If the accusative subject in (68b), which is not a wh-phrase, is base-generated as a matrix object of *tazune* 'ask', there is no need for the external pair-merge of complementizers. The embedded wh-phrase can then be licensed by the embedded Force head *ka*, but the example is still degraded on par with (45) with the accusative object (i.e., *tazune* 'ask' cannot select an object without *no koto*). Meanwhile, (67b) does not have such a (marginal) option: if the accusative subject, which is a wh-phrase, is base-generated as a matrix object of *tazune* 'ask', it cannot be licensed by the embedded Force head *ka*.

interpretation. When the pair-merge operation does not occur, the closest complementizer *ka* licenses the embedded wh-phrase, resulting in the embedded scope interpretation.[21,22]

Recall that the accusative *no koto* KP is base-generated in the matrix VP (41). The former can also appear with the complex ForceP/ReportP:

(70) Mary-ga Hanako$_i$-no koto-o [*pro*$_i$ kasiko-i **ka** **to]** tazune-ta.
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC smart-PRS **Force** **Report** ask-PST
'Mary asked whether Hanako was smart.'

---

[21] A reviewer pointed out that possible scope interpretations of the embedded wh-phrase are affected by the presence or absence of the matrix dative argument placed before the matrix verb. According to the reviewer, the following example, where the dative argument *John* is placed before *tazune* 'ask', only allows the embedded scope of *nani* 'what':

(i) Mary-ga [$_{ReportP}$[$_{ForceP}$ Hanako-ga nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka]** **to]** John-ni tazune-ta-no?
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force** **Report** John-DAT ask-PST-COMP$_Q$

I suggest that this observation is related to the prosody of the example (Deguchi & Kitagawa 2002; Kitagawa 2005). Deguchi & Kitagawa (2002) and Kitagawa (2005) have pointed out that the scope of wh-phrases correlates with *emphatic prosody,* which involves the pitch prominence of wh-phrases (indicated below with BOLD CAPITAL LETTERS) and pitch compression of elements following the wh-phrases (post-focal reduction) (indicated by shading). The emphatic prosody is accompanied by interrogative rise (indicated below with ↑) (these notational conventions are adopted from Deguchi & Kitagawa 2002 and Kitagawa 2005). The addition of the dative argument seems to facilitate the termination of the post-focal reduction at the complement clause, which is indicated by the lexical accent of the dative phrase indicated by the $\boxed{\text{s}}$quare.

(ii) Mary-ga [$_{ReportP}$[$_{ForceP}$ Hanako-ga **NA**ni-ni kuwasi-i ka] to] $\boxed{\text{J}}$ohn-ni tazune-ta-no↑
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM what-DAT familiar-PRS Force Report John-DAT ask-PST-COMP$_Q$
'Did Mary ask John what Hanako was familiar with?'
*'What is a thing such that Mary asked John whether Hanako was familiar with it.'

If we carefully control the prosody of the relevant example, ensuring that the post-focal reduction continues beyond the complement clause, the matrix scope of the embedded phrase becomes easier to obtain:

(iii) Mary-ga [$_{ReportP}$[$_{ForceP}$ Hanako-ga **NA**ni-ni kuwasi-i ka] to] John-ni tazune-ta-no↑
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM what-DAT familiar-PRS Force Report John-DAT ask-PST-COMP$_Q$
*'Did Mary ask John what Hanako is familiar with?'
'What is a thing such that Mary asked John whether Hanako is familiar with it?'

[22] Note the Kase head cannot be pair-merged with the Force head *ka*; if this option were to be allowed, the Force head *ka* would cease to license wh-phrases without the Report head *to.* However, this is not the case:

(i) Mary-ga [$_{ForceP}$ Hanako-ga nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka]** (-o) tazune-ta-no?
Mary-NOM Hanako-NOM what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force**-ACC ask-PST-COMP$_Q$
'Did Mary ask what Hanako was familiar with?'
?*'What is a thing such that Mary asked whether Hanako was familiar with it?'

The complement clause in (i) involves the Force head *ka* and the Kase head, but not the Report head *to*. The embedded wh-phrase in (i) must take the embedded scope (Nishigauchi 1990; Watanabe 1992). This indicates that the Kase head cannot be pair-merged with the Force head *ka*, rendering the latter invisible for wh-licensing. Here, I simply stipulate that the K head cannot be pair-merged with complementizers, leaving the precise nature of the constraint on external pair-merge of phase heads open for future research.

Note that (70) does not involve the accusative subject, which is associated with the external pair-merge of the two complementizers. In other words, the presence of the accusative *no koto* KP in (70) indicates that in contrast to (66), external pair-merge of the Report head *to* and Force head *ka* is not required here. Thus, in cases such as (70), embedded wh-phrases can take either the embedded or matrix scope. This prediction is borne out:

(71) Mary-ga Hanako$_i$-no koto-o **[**$_{\mathbf{ReportP}}$**[**$_{\mathbf{ForceP}}$ *pro*$_i$ nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka]**
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force**
to] tazune-ta-no?
Report ask-PST-COMP$_Q$
'Did Mary ask what Hanako was familiar with?'
'What is a thing such that Mary asked whether Hanako was familiar with it?'

The embedded wh-phrase *nani* 'what' in (71) can take either the matrix or embedded scope, which results from the optionality of the pair-merge of complementizers. We also predict that when the complement CP contains only the Force head *ka*, the embedded wh-phrase must take the embedded scope even in the presence of the matrix accusative *no koto* KP. This prediction is borne out (I assume that the K head cannot be pair-merged with the Force head *ka* (see footnote 22)):

(72) Mary-ga Hanako$_i$-no koto-o **[**$_{\mathbf{ForceP}}$ *pro*$_i$ nani-ni kuwasi-i **ka**]-(??o)
Mary-NOM Hanako-GEN fact-ACC what-DAT familiar-PRS **Force**-ACC
tazune-ta-no?
ask-PST-COMP$_Q$
'Did Mary ask what Hanako was familiar with?'
?*'What is a thing such that Mary asked whether Hanako was familiar with it?'

The embedded wh-phrase *nani* 'what' in (72) can only take embedded scope because there is no Report head *to*, which can be pair-merged with the force head *ka*. As the Force head *ka* is closer to the matrix complementizer *no* in (72), the former must license the embedded wh-phrase (Nishigauchi 1990; Watanabe 1992).

To summarize, I have argued that when accusative subjects are allowed with the complex ReportP/ForceP, the Report head *to* is pair-merged with the Force head *ka*. This claim is supported by the distribution of wh-phrases.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that the distribution of accusative (*no koto*) subjects with ReportP and ForceP can be explained through the interaction of phasal transfer and anti-locality. Accusative subjects, which must originate in complement CPs, can move out of ReportP without violating the ban on improper movement. However, they cannot move out of ForceP due to the interaction of phasal transfer and anti-locality. Accusative *no koto* subjects, which are base-generated within matrix VPs, are allowed with both ReportP and ForceP because their derivation does not violate constraints on movement. I have also demonstrated that some seemingly Case-less ForcePs that disallow accusative subjects are selected by the K head. Finally, I have suggested that instances where accusative subjects are permitted with the complex ReportP/ForceP, which truly lacks Case, involve external pair-merge of the two complementizers. This analysis is corroborated by observations regarding the distribution of wh-phrases.

Abbreviations

ACC = accusative, COMP = complementizer, COP = copula, DAT = dative, GEN = genitive, NOM = nominative, PASS = passive, PL = plural, PRS = present, PST = past, TOP = topic

Funding information

This work was partially supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI Grant Number JP23K00473.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Shin Fukuda and three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and helpful suggestions on earlier versions of this paper. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at Tohoku University and the 7th Meeting of Fukuoka Theoretical Linguistics held at Kyushu University. I thank the audiences at those meetings, especially Hiroko Kimura, Masako Maeda, Nozomi Moritake, Nobuaki Nishioka, Yuta Sakamoto, Daiko Takahashi, Hisako Takahashi, and Kensuke Takita, for helpful comments and/or discussions. Any remaining shortcomings are, of course, my own.

Competing interests

The author has no competing interests to declare.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2003. *Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut dissertation.

Arano, Akihiko & Oda, Hiromune. 2019. The A-/A′-distinction in scrambling revisited. In Stockwell, Richard & O'Leary, Maura & Xu, Zhongshi & Zhou, Z. L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 48–54. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Asami, Daiki. 2024. Deriving and processing experiencer subject causatives. *Glossa* 9(1). 1–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.16435

Bošković, Željko. 1994. D-structure, theta-criterion, and movement into theta-positions. *Linguistic Analysis* 24(3–4). 247–286.

Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59(1). 1–45. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.2005.00118.x

Bošković, Željko. 2015. From the Complex NP Constraint to everything: On deep extractions across categories. *The Linguistic Review* 32(4). 603–669. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2015-0006

Bošković, Željko. 2016a. What is sent to spell-out is phases, not phasal complements. *Linguistica* 56(1). 25–66. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4312/linguistica.56.1.25-66

Bošković, Željko. 2016b. On the timing of labeling: Deducing comp-trace effects, the subject condition, the adjunct condition, and tucking in from labeling. *The Linguistic Review* 33(1). 17–66. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2015-0013

Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In Anderson, Stephen & Kiparsky, Paul (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 232–286. New York: Academic Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Martin, Roger & Michaels, David & Uriagereka, Juan (eds.), *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130. 33–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.12.003

Chomsky, Noam. 2015. Problems of projection: Extensions. In Di Domenico, Elisa & Hamann, Cornelia & Matteini, Simona (eds.), *Structures, strategies and beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, 3–16. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/la.223.01cho

Deguchi, Masanori & Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 2002. Prosody and Wh-questions. In Hirotani, Masako (ed.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 32,* 73–92. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.

Epstein, Samuel D. & Kitahara, Hisatsugu & Seely, Daniel. 2016. Phase cancellation by external pair-merge of heads. *The Linguistic Review* 33(1). 87–102. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2015-0015

Fiengo, Robert. 1977. On trace theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1). 35–62. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177972

Fong, Suzana. 2019. Proper movement through Spec-CP: An argument from hyperraising in Mongolian. *Glossa* 4(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.667

Fukuda, Minoru. 1993. Head government and Case marker drop in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(1). 168–172. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4178806

Fukuda, Shin. 2006. Japanese passives, external arguments, and structural case. *UCSD Linguistics Papers* 2. 86–133.

Fukui, Naoki. 1986. *A theory of category projection and its applications.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Fukui, Naoki. 1993. A note on improper movement. *The Linguistic Review* 10(2). 111–126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.1993.10.2.111

Goro, Takuya. 2006. A minimalist analysis of Japanese passives. In Boeckx, Cedric (ed.), *Minimalist Essays*, 232–48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/la.91.16gor

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. *Prolific domains: On the anti-locality of movement dependencies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/la.66

Hale, Ken & Kitagawa, Chisato. 1976–1977. A counter to counter equi. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 5. 41–61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-1976-1-204

Harada, Shin-Ichi. 1973. Counter equi NP deletion. In *Annual Bulletin vol. 8*, 113–147. Tokyo: Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics, University of Tokyo.

Harada, Shin-Ichi. 1975. The functional uniqueness principle. In *Attempts in Linguistics and Literature vol. 2*, 17–24. Tokyo: International Christian University.

Harada, Shin-Ichi. 1976. Arguments that Japanese to-complements are noun phrase complements. In *Attempts in Linguistics and Literature vol. 3,* 33–37. Tokyo: International Christian University.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. Multiple Agree and the defective intervention constraint in Japanese. In Lance, Nathan & Costa, Albert & Martin-Gonzalez, Javier & Matushansky, Ora & Szczegielniak, Adam (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st HUMIT Student Conference in Language Research (HUMIT 2000)*, 67–80. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2005. *Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: Agreement and clausal architecture*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2010a. Complement types and the CP/DP parallelism: A Case of Japanese. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36(2). 189–198. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.2010.013

Hiraiwa, Ken. 2010b. Spelling out the double-o constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28. 723–770. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-010-9098-9

Hiraiwa, Ken & Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2012. Syntactic metamorphosis: Clefts, sluicing, and in-situ focus in Japanese. *Syntax* 15(2). 142–180. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2011.00164.x

Hoji, Hajime. 1991. Raising-to-Object, ECM, and the major object in Japanese. Paper presented at the *Japanese Syntax Workshop at University of Rochester*.

Hoji, Hajime. 2005. A major object analysis of the so-called raising-to-object construction in Japanese (and Korean). Paper presented at the *Korean and Japanese Syntax and Semantics Workshop at Kyoto University*.

Inoue, Kazuko. 1974. Experiencer. *Descriptive and applied linguistics: Bulletin of the ICU Summer Institute in Linguistics* 7. 139–162.

Ishii, Toru. 1999. Cyclic spell-out and the that-t effects. In Bird, Sonya & Carnie, Andrew & Haugen, Jason D. & Norquest, Peter (eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 220–231. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Ishii, Toru. 2012. Long-distance passives in Japanese. In Park, Bun-Sik (ed.), *Proceedings of the 14th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar: Three Factors and Syntactic Theory*, 129–149. Seoul: Hankuk Publishing.

Kaneko, Yoshiaki. 1988. On exceptional case-marking in Japanese. *English Linguistics* 5. 271–289. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj1984.5.271

Kishimoto, Hideki. 2018. On exceptional case marking phenomena in Japanese. *Kobe Papers in Linguistics* 11. 31–49.

Kishimoto, Hideki. 2021. ECM subjects in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 30(3). 231–276. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-021-09226-y

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 1985. Barriers to government. In McDonough, Joyce & Berman, Stephen & Choe, Jae-Woong (eds.), *Proceedings of North East Linguistics Society 16*, 249–273. Amherst, MA: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.

Kitagawa, Yoshihisa. 2005. Prosody, syntax and pragmatics of wh-questions in Japanese. *English Linguistics* 22(2). 302–346. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj1984.22.302

Kobayashi, Keiichiro & Maki, Hideki. 2002. A non-exceptional approach to exceptional case-marking in Japanese. *English Linguistics* 19(2). 211–238. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj1984.19.211

Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1998. Remarks on nominative objects. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 16(1). 39–66. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-1998-0104

Kubo, Miori. 1992. Japanese passives. *Working Papers of the Department of Language and Cultures* 23. 231–301. Hokkaido: Hokkaido University.

Kuno, Susumu. 1972. Evidence for subject raising in Japanese. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 1. 24–51. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-1972-0105

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject raising. In Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), *Syntax and semantics 5: Japanese generative grammar*, 17–49. New York: Academic Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368835_003

Kuno, Susumu. 2007. Revisiting subject raising in Japanese. In Frellesvig, Bjarke & Masayoshi, Shibatani & Smith, John Charles (eds.), *Current issues in the history and structure of Japanese*, 83–105. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1965. *Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1978. Case marking, canonical sentence patterns, and counter Equi in Japanese. In Hinds, John & Howard, Irwin (eds.), *Problems in Japanese syntax and semantics*, 30–51. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki. 1988. Whether we agree or not: A comparative syntax of English and Japanese. *Lingvisticae Investigationes* 12(1). 1–47. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/li.12.1.02kur

Legate, Julie Anne. 2003. Some interface properties of the phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(3). 506–516. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2003.34.3.506

May, Robert. 1979. Must COMP-to-COMP movement be stipulated? *Linguistic Inquiry* 10(4). 719–725. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178141

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2017. *Agreement beyond phi.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10958.001.0001

Moritake, Nozomi. 2022. A focus-based analysis of nominative objects in Japanese. *Lingua* 278. 1–31. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2022.103404

Nagai, Noriko. 1991. Complex passives and major subjects in Japanese. *Linguistics* 29(6). 1053–1092. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1991.29.6.1053

Nasu, Norio & Akimoto, Takayuki & Shimamura, Koji & Yoda, Yusuke. 2024. Clausal nominalization and embedded questions in Japanese. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 9(1). 1–38. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.10051

Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-1972-3

Nomura, Masashi. 2005. *Nominative Case and AGREE(ment)*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticutdissertation.

Obata, Miki & Epstein, Samuel David & David, Samuel. 2011. Feature-splitting internal merge: Improper movement, intervention, and the A/A' distinction. *Syntax* 14(2). 122–147. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2010.00149.x

Ochi, Masao. 2009. Overt object shift in Japanese. *Syntax* 12(4). 324–362. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9612.2009.00130.x

Oehrle, Richard & Nishio, Hiroko. 1981. Adversity. In Farmer, Ann K. & Kitagawa, Chisato (eds.), *Coyote Papers, Proceedings of the Arizona Conference on Japanese Linguistics vol. 2*, 163–187. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona Linguistics Circle.

Oka, Toshifusa. 1988. Abstract Case and empty pronouns. In Oka, Toshifusa (ed.), *Tsukuba English Studies vol. 7*, 187–227. University of Tsukuba.

Poser, William J. 2002. *The double-O constraints in Japanese.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.

Saito, Mamoru. 1982. *Case marking in Japanese: A preliminary study*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Saito, Mamoru. 1983a. Comments on the papers on generative syntax. In Otsu, Yukio & van Riemsdijk, Hans & Inoue, Kazuko & Kamio, Akio & Kawasaki, Noriko (eds.), *Studies in generative grammar and language acquisition: A report on recent trends in linguistics*, 79–89. Tokyo: International Christian University.

Saito, Mamoru. 1983b. Case and government in Japanese. In Barlow, Michael & Flickinger, Daniel P. & Wescoat, Michael T. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, 247 – 259*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Linguistics Association, Department of Linguistics, Stanford University.

Saito, Mamoru. 1989. Scrambling as semantically vacuous A-movement. In Baltin, Mark R. & Kroch, Anthony S. (eds.), *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*, 189–200. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Saito, Mamoru. 2010. On the nature of the complementizer to. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 26(1). 85–100. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-2010-0107

Saito, Mamoru. 2012. Sentence types and the Japanese right periphery. In Grewendorf, Günther & Zimmermann, Thomas Ede (eds.), *Discourse and grammar*, 147–175. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511601

Saito, Mamoru. 2016. (A) Case for labeling: labeling in languages without ϕ-feature agreement. *The Linguistic Review* 33. 129 – 175. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2015-0017

Saito, Mamoru. 2017a. A note on transfer domains. *Nanzan Linguistics* 12. 61–69.

Saito, Mamoru. 2017b. Notes on the locality of anaphor binding and A-movement. *English Linguistics* 34(1). 1–33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj.34.1_1

Saito, Mamoru. 2018. Kase as a weak head. In Kalin, Laura & Paul, Ileana & Vander Klok, Jozina (eds.), *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics 25 (1)*: *Heading in the right direction: Linguistic treats for Lisa Travis*, 382–190. McGill Working Papers in Linguistics.

Saito, Mamoru. 2020. On the causative paradoxes: Derivations and transfer domains. *Nanzan Linguistics* 15. 25–44.

Saito, Mamoru. 2024a. On Minimal Yield and Form Copy: Evidence from East Asian languages. *The Linguistic Review* 41(1). 59–84. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2024-2003

Saito, Mamoru. 2024b. Wh-phrases as genuine focus operators. In Bocci, Giuliano & Botteri, Daniele & Manetti, Claudia & Moscati, Vincenzo (eds.), *Rich descriptions and simple explanations in morphosyntax and language acquisition*, 173–199. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198889472.003.0009

Saito, Mamoru & Murasugi, Keiko. 1999. Subject predication within IP and DP. In Johnson, Kyle & Roberts, Ian (eds.), *Beyond principles and parameters: Essays in memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli*, 159–182. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4822-1_7

Sakai, Hiromu. 1998. Raising asymmetry and improper movement. In Akatsuka, Noriko & Hoji, Hajime & Iwasaki, Shoichi & Sohn, Sung-Ock & Strauss, Susan (eds.), *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 7*, 481–497. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Sasaguri, Junko. 1999. Meishiku-no modariti-tosite no koto [*Koto* as a modal element of noun phrases]. In Sasaki, Yukiko Alam (ed.), *Gengogaku-to nihongokyooiku* [Linguistics and Japanese language education], 161–176. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Şener, Serkan. 2008. *Non-canonical case licensing is canonical: Accusative subjects of CPs in Turkish.* Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1978. *Nihongo no bunseki* [An analysis of Japanese]. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Takahashi, Masahiko. 2011. *Some theoretical consequences of Case-marking in Japanese*. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut dissertation.

Takahashi, Masahiko. 2016. A note on improper movement and locality of AGREE in Japanese. In Sugawara, Ayaka & Hayashi, Shintaro & Ito, Satoshi (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics 8 (FAJL 8)*, 153–164. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Takahashi, Masahiko. 2021a. Reconsidering the optionality of raising in Japanese exceptional Case-marking constructions. *Syntax* 24(2). 224–262. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12206

Takahashi, Masahiko. 2021b. Accusative subjects in Japanese ECM constructions. *Nanzan Linguistics* 16. 133–148.

Takahashi, Masahiko. 2021c. Some notes on the scope properties of nominative objects in Japanese. In Laszakovits, Sabine & Shen, Zheng (eds.), *The size of things I: Structure building,* 153–171. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://zenodo.org/records/5524288

Takahashi, Masahiko. 2023. Phasal transfer and anti-locality: Movement of objects in Japanese. *Glossa* 8(1). 1–39. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.8850

Takano, Yuji. 2003. Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: A prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21(4). 779–834. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025545313178

Takano, Yuji. 2004. On the syntactic structure of Japanese accusative causatives. *Tsukuba English Studies* 22. 295–310.

Takemura, Ken-Ichi. 1975 – 1976. Subject raising and meaning in Japanese. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 4. 181–189. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-1975-1-210

Takeuchi, Hajime. 2010. Exceptional case marking in Japanese and optional feature transmission. *Nanzan Linguistics* 6. 101–128.

Takezawa, Koichi. 1987. *A configurational approach to Case-marking in Japanese.* Seattle, WA: University of Washington dissertation.

Takubo, Yukinori. 2007. An overt marker of individual sublimation in Japanese. In Smith, John Charles & Frellesvig, Byarke, & Shibatani, Masayoshi (eds.), *Current issues in the history and structure of Japanese*, 135–151. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2002. Raising to object out of CP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(4). 637–652. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/002438902762731790

Tomioka, Satoshi. 2020. Japanese embedded questions are nominal: Evidence from quantificational variability effect. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 36(1). 121–156. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/jjl-2019-2020

Travis, Lisa & Lamontagne, Greg. 1992. The Case filter and licensing of empty K. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 37(2). 157–174. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008413100021939

Ueda, Masanobu. 1988. Exceptional case-marking in Japanese. *Sophia Linguistica* 23. 39–46.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 1994. Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 1999. Checking theory and dative subject constructions in Japanese and Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8(3). 223–254. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008383332362

Watanabe, Akira. 1992. Subjacency and S-structure movement of wh-in-situ. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1(3). 255–291. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00130554

Williams, Edwin. 1981. Argument structure and morphology. *The Linguistic Review* 1(1). 81–114. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.1981.1.1.81

Wurmbrand, Susi. 2019. Cross-clausal A-dependencies. In Ronai, Eszter & Stigliano, Laura & Sun, Yenan (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 585 – 604. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Yang, Dong-Whee. 1983. The extended binding theory of anaphors. *Language Research* 19(2). 169–192.

Yoshida, Tomoyuki. 2019. Complement selection and wh-scope in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 28(1). 1 – 27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10831-018-9188-y