A Major Object Analysis of the So-called Raising-to-Object Construction in Japanese

I defend a Major Object analysis of the so-called Raising-to-Object (henceforth simply *RtoO*) Construction in Japanese (e.g., (1)), and maintain that *NP-o* that corresponds to *Mary-o* in (1) (henceforth *Mob*) is 'base-generated' in the matrix clause and is not part of the embedded CP at any stage of derivation and that (1) corresponds more closely to (somewhat unnatural) (2a) than to (more natural) (2b), in terms of the relevant formal properties. The proposal is hinted at in Saito 1983, and explicitly argued for in Hong 1990 and Hoji 1991, and further defended in Takano 2003. I intend to do so by showing (i) that specific negative predictions made by this analysis are confirmed and (ii) that a negative prediction made by a raising analysis re. *Proper Binding Condition* (*PBC*) effects gets disconfirmed.

I adopt (3) and (4), where *Eg** stands for an example that is predicted to be unacceptable (under a specified interpretation) and Eg_1 for an example that forms a minimal pair with an $Eg*_1$. (3) and (4) are formulated in the context of the following format of experiments. Informants are asked to judge a set of examples as GOOD to BAD, by choosing one of the 5 options on the scale of GOOD to BAD. Their marking will then be computed as "+2" for GOOD and "−2" for BAD, and "+1," "0," and "−1" in the middle. While the determination of the exact figures that should count for *falsification* and *corroboration* in the sense introduced above is bound to be somewhat arbitrary, (3) and (4) should serve as an approximate measure for evaluating a hypothesis under discussion.

The first set of experiments has to do with the negation-sensitive elements such as *rokuna-N* and *XP-sika*; see (5). Given (6) and (7), the latter of which is proposed in its essentials in Aoyagi and Ishii 1994, and given the assumptions that downward movement is disallowed and Neg does not raise at LF crossing a clause boundary, we make the predictions as schematized in (8), where α stands for *NP-cm-sika* (with -*cm* representing a case maker other than -*o*). In (8), boxes B and C are for examples that are predicted to be unacceptable while A and D are for those that are not predicted to be unacceptable (but whose acceptability might be affected by various independent factors—including what makes -*o-sika* sequence marginal and -*ga-sika* sequence impossible.) The average scores on four of the 16 examples, corresponding to A, B, C, D are given in (9).

We now make the negative prediction recorded in (10), by combining (7) with the Major Object hypothesis. The examples in (11) and (12) correspond to E and F, respectively, and the average scores of 28 informants are as in (13), where the scores in the parentheses are for the examples with the 'resumptive' *sore-ga*.

As noted, the acceptability of examples like (11) may be affected by various factors and hence we do not predict their acceptability while we do predict the unacceptability of examples like (12). It is, however, noteworthy that 18 of the 28 informants gave +2 or +1 to (11) with *sore-ga*, presumably not being affected much by the non-grammatical factors, and yet their average score on (12) with *sore-ga* remains as low as −1.65, suggesting that what goes wrong with (12) is indeed grammatical in nature, as hypothesized. Similarly, 14 informants gave +2 or +1 to (11) without *sore-ga*, and their average score on (12) without *sore-ga* is −1.85. The results thus confirm the negative prediction under discussion and can be taken as corroborating the Major Object hypothesis. We have obtained similar results in regard to the negative prediction made by combining (6) and the Major Object hypothesis, in an experiment with 8 examples and 35 informants, including a contrast of +1.80 and −1.74 on (14a) and (14b), respectively.

A raising analysis of RtoO in Japanese predicts the examples of the form (15) to be unacceptable due to the PBC, violated by the unbound trace as postulated in the sentence-initial CP in (15). The proponents of a raising analysis of RtoO have in fact maintained that such examples are unacceptable, on a par with those of the form in (16), the typical configuration of 'scrambling' examples that exhibit PBC violation effects. The results of an experiment conducted by Y. Tsuboi (16 examples, 18 informants), however, show that the average score on examples of the form in (15) are far better than those on examples of the form in (16). In a follow-up experiment on PBC effects (20 examples, 27 informants), the PBC violation examples of 'scrambling' got the average score of −1.52 while the alleged PBC violation examples of RtoO (7 in total) got the average scores of +0.81, +0.44, +0.67, +0.89, +0.52, and +0.22, replicating the results of the earlier experiment by Y. Tsuboi. These results thus clearly disconfirm the negative prediction made by the raising analysis, hence falsifies the hypothesis in question, and in turn provide support for the Major Object hypothesis, which does not make such a negative prediction. As we have seen earlier, the negative predictions made under the Major Object analysis, by contrast, have been confirmed, and the hypothesis corroborated (in the sense of (4)).

(1)   John-wa Mary-o   Itariazin da   to   omotteita.
        John-TOP Mary-ACC Italian   be   that thought
(2) a. John believed about Mary that she was Italian.
     b. John believed Mary to be Italian.

(3) *Falsification*
        A hypothesis is *falsified* iff the average score for the example that is predicted to be unacceptable, i.e., the average
        score for $Eg*$, is greater than −1.0.
(4) *Corroboration* (not in the sense of Popper)
        A hypothesis is *corroborated* iff the difference between the average score on $Eg*_n$ and that on Eg_n is greater than 3.

(5) a. Taro-wa   manga-**sika**   yoma-**nai**. / *yomu.
        Taro-TOP   comics-all:but   read-Neg / *read
        'Taro does not read any kind of book but comics.'
     b. Saikin   **rokuna**-sakka-ga syoo-o   {tora-**nai** / *toru}.
        recently good-writer-NOM   award-ACC   get-Neg / *get
        'Recently, no good writers have received an award.'
(6) (Kataoka to appear: (4))
        Rokuna-N must be c-commanded by Neg at LF.
(7) (Kataoka to appear: (23), slightly restated)
        At LF *XP-sika* must be in a mutual c-command relation with a projection of Neg.

(8)   The predictions under (7):

	α in the matrix	α in the embedded
Neg in the matrix	A	C (-2)
Neg in the embedded	B (-2)	D

(9) The average scores by 28 informants on examples corresponding to the four boxes in (8) with *NP-ni-sika* 'NP-DAT-sika':
        A: +1.85, B: −1.63 , C: 1.93 , D: −1.44

(10) The predictions under the Major Object hypothesis, together with (7):

	NP-o-sika as *Mob*
Neg in the matrix	E
Neg in the embedded	F (−2)

(11) John-ga Bush-no   Iraku seisaku-o-sika   (sore-ga) kenkoku-no   seisin-ni
      John-NOM Bush-GEN Iraq policy-ACC -all:but it-NOM national:foundation-GEN spirit-DAT
      hansiteiru to   iwanakatta (koto)
      is:against that say:not:past (fact)
      '(the fact that) John did not say about anything else but Bush's Iraq policy that it is against the spirit of the country's
      founders'
(12) *John-ga Bush-no Iraku seisaku-o-sika (sore-ga) kenkoku-no seisin-ni hansiteinai to   itta (koto)
      (Intended reading) '(the fact that) John said about anything else but Bush's Iraq policy that it is not against the spirit
      of the country's founders'.
(13) a. The average score on (11) (for E): +0.5 (with *sore-ga*), −0.29 (without *soko-ga*)
      b. The average score on (12) (for F): −1.63 (with *sore-ga*), −1.48 (without *sore-ga*)
(14) a. Hanako-wa [*rokuna otoko-ga* kanozyo-no kurasu-ni i*nai* to] omotte ita.
         Hanako-TOP good man-NOM   her-GEN   class-in   be:NEG that thinking was
         '(Roughly)   Hanako had thought that no good man was in her class.'
      b. *Hanako-wa *rokuna otoko-o* kanozyo-no kurasu-ni i*nai*   to omotte ita.
         '(Roughly)   Hanako had thought about no good man that he was in her class.'

(15) [CP ... t_2 ...Verb Infl C]$_1$ ... NP-ACC$_2$ ... NP-TOP/-NOM ... t_1 … Verb
(16) [CP ... NP-NOM ... t_2... Verb Infl C]$_1$ ... NP-DAT$_2$ ... NP-TOP/-NOM ... t_1 … Verb

Hoji, Hajime. (1991). "Raising-to-object, ECM and the major object in Japanese," A talk given at Japanese Syntax Workshop at University of
    Rochester. Hong, Kisun. (1990) "Subject-to-object raising in Korean," in Katarzina Dziwirek, Patrick Farrell, and Elias Mejias-Bikandi
    (eds.), *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*, 215-225, Stanford: CSLI.
Kataoka, Kiyoko. (2004) *Hiteibun-no Koozoo: Kakimaze-bun to Hiteekoohyoogen* (Syntactic Structure of Japanese Negative Sentences:
    Scrambling Construction and Negation-sensitive Elements). Doctoral dissertation. Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan.
Kataoka, Kiyoko. (to appear) "'Neg-sensitive' Elements, Neg-c-command and Scrambling in Japanese," in *JK14*.
Saito, Mamoru. (1983) "Comments on the Papers on Generative Syntax," in Y. Otsu, et al. eds., *Studies in Generative Grammar and Language
    Acquisition,* ICU, Tokyo.
Takano, Yuji. (2003). "Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: a prolepsis analysis," *Natural Language and Linguistic
    Theory* 21, 779-834.