**On the Subject Position of Unaccusatives in Japanese: the Kageyama-Kishimoto Puzzle**

<u>Synopsis</u>: Kageyama (1993) and Kishimoto (2009) presented different views on the subject position of unaccusative verbs in Japanese: the former claimed that it should stay within VP/weak *v*P, while the latter held that it should be at Spec-TP. This issue, referred to here as the Kageyama-Kishimoto Puzzle (KKP), remains unsettled still now. The aim of this study is to solve the KKP, demonstrating that the disharmony arises from differences in the clausal structures they used as evidence.

<u>Observations</u>: The most convincing piece of evidence in Kageyama (1993) is arguably the case-dropping phenomenon seen in (1), where Nominative case-marker *-ga* drops.

(1) Kao-ni   gohantsubu (*-ga*)        tsuite-iru-no, sitteru?

    face-on   a grain of rice (-Nom)   stick-BE-Fin, know

    'Do you know that a gain of rice is on your face?'

This case-marker dropping cannot be observed when an unergative verb is used as shown in (2).

(2) Kodomo-tachi $^{?*}$(*-ga*)   sawagu-no,      mita-koto-nai.

    kid-plurals (-Nom)      make-fuss-Fin   see-thing-Neg

    'I have never seen the kids make fuss.'

Kageyama (1993) argued that this is because the subject position in (1), but not in (2), is the same as the object position in transitive clauses, in which the accusative case-marker *-o* may drop. For example, in (3) the DP *that woman* 'ano jyosei' may be case-marked, either Nominative or Accusative.

(3) Ano jyosei-ga/o        sitte-iru-no-wa      dare  desu-ka?

    That woman-Nom/Acc know-BE-Fin-Top who     be-Q

    'Who is the person that woman knows? / Who knows that woman?'

It is, however, impossible to interpret it as the subject when its case-marker drops, as illustrated below.

(4) Ano jyosei   φ       sitte-iru-no-wa      dare  desu-ka?      'Who knows that woman?'

    That woman           know-BE-Fin-Top who    be-Q

This indicates that Nominative cannot drop in (3), and case-marker dropping is possible within VP.

    Contra Kageyama (1993), Kishimoto (2009) claimed that the subject at issue should be at Spec-TP, showing the interpretation of the BAKARI ('only') construction as in (5).

(5) Kodomo-ga   manga-o       yon-de-BAKARI-iru.                [transitive]

    Kid-Nom       cartoon-Acc   read-ONLY-be

    'Our kid is only reading a cartoon. / *Only our kid is reading a cartoon.'

As the translation shows, the scope of BAKARI "only" is limited within VP, excluding Spec-TP. The same is true of both cases of unergatives and unaccusatives, as shown in (6).

(6)  a. John-ga     itsumo   ason-de-BAKARI-iru.                [unergative]

       John-Nom  always    play-ONLY-be 'John is always only playing./*Only John is always playing.'

     b. John-ga      kokode   koron-de-BAKARI-iru.               [unaccusative]

       John-Nom  here       fall-ONLY-be   'John is only falling here./*Only John is falling here.'

Note that the subject in (6b) is also outside the scope of BAKARI. Therefore, Kishimoto (2009) claimed that the subject of unaccusatives is raised to Spec-TP, as are those of transitives and unergatives.

**Analysis**: What cannot be overlooked here is the fact that Kageyama (1993) used prenominal clauses as evidence. It is because a subject without a case-marker can be observed in root clauses even when an unergative verb is used as in (7a).

(7) a.  Taro φ hasit-ta  yo.  (='Taro ran.')      b.  Taro φ koronda yo.  (='Taro stumbled.')
        Taro   run-Past Particle                     Taro   stumeled Particle

This is due to topic -*wa* deletion, and so we cannot distinguish Nominative-case dropping from the topic -*wa* deletion in (7). To avoid this confusion, Kageyama (1993) used prenominal clauses in which topic -*wa* cannot be observed, for it cannot appear in prenominal clauses. This is the very point where Kageyama (1993) and Kishimoto (2009) diverged from each other.

Along with Saito (2011), assuming that the φ-feature agreement does not work in Japanese, and that T is an independent licenser of Nominative case, I propose that only the EPP/edge feature is transmitted from C to T. Thus, CP always exists in root clauses and its C-head transmits the EPP to T, which results in raising a subject DP to Spec-TP. On the other hand, when C does not appear in a certain type of prenominal clauses, T fails to get the EPP and raise a subject DP to Spec-TP. This is the case when we observe the (im-) possibility of Possessor Raising (PR) exemplified below.

(8) a. Taro-no   baiku-ga   kowareta (koto/jiko) ➜ b. Taro-ga   baiku-ga   kowareta (*koto/*jiko)
       Taro-Gen bike-Nom broke     fact/accident    Taro-Nom bike-Nom broke       fact/accident
       '(the fact that/the accident that) Taro's car broke'

(NB: The contrast becomes clearer in 'Hanako-wa *Taro\*-ga/no baiku-ga kowareta koto/jiko*-ni odoroita.')

The genitive DP *Taro-no* in (8a) turns into an independent nominative DP *Taro-ga* only when it is within an independent/root clause, such as '*Taro-ga baiku-ga kowareta*.' PR is analyzed as a sort of focus-induced permutation and the focus feature on C is considered to be involved (cf. Hasegawa (2011)). PR, however, is not allowed when the clause is used as prenominal one. It can be explained straightforwardly if we assume that there is no C within a prenominal clause. That is, the syntactic category of the prenominal clause in question is TP, not CP. Keeping this in mind, let us pay attention to the difference between Kageyama and Kishimoto: the former's analysis was based on the data of prenominal clauses lacking C-head, while the latter's was based on that of main clauses, consisting of full-fledged CPs. This is the cause of the KKP. That is, the (un-)availability of C containing the focus-feature has brought about the different claims on the subject position at issue. It is noteworthy that the scope interpretation is not changed and nominative case-dropping becomes impossible when the BAKARI construction is used as a prenominal clause as illustrated in (9).

(9)  John-ga/*φ   kokode   koron-de-BAKARI-iru   koto
     John-Nom   here     fall-ONLY-be           fact
     'the fact that John is only falling here. / *the fact that only John is falling here.'

It is known that Focus Particles (FPs) like *bakari* "only" must be licensed by the focus-feature on C (cf. Akaso & Haraguchi (2011)), and the prenominal clause must be a CP because of the existence of FP *bakari*. That is why the subject is excluded from the scope and the case marker -*ga* cannot drop.

**Selected References**: [1] Kageyama (1993) *Bumpoo to Gokeisei* (Grammar & Word-formation) [2] Kishimoto (2009) 'Subject Raising in Japanese.' [3] Saito (2011) 'Two Notes on Feature Inheritance.'