1-1-2007

Restructuring in Japanese revisited: A phrasal movement analysis of purpose expressions

Yukiko Asano

Restructuring in Japanese revisited: A phrasal movement analysis of
purpose expressions

Restructuring in Japanese Revisited: A Phrasal Movement Analysis of Purpose Expressions

Yukiko Asano[*]

1 Introduction

Purpose Expressions (PEs) in Japanese consist of an animate NP, an infinitival phrase (InfP), and a motion verb (MV) such as *iku* 'go' or *kuru* 'come'.

(1) John-ga [$_\text{InfP}$ hon-o   kai-ni] it-ta
     J.-$_\text{NOM}$ book-$_\text{ACC}$ buy-*ni* go-Past
     'John went to buy books.'

PEs in Japanese show restructuring phenomena (Miyagawa 1987, Tsujimura 1993, Wurmbrand 1998, 2001); they show 'mono-clausal' behavior in one context and 'bi-clausal' behavior in others. In this paper, I provide a unified account for both of these types of PEs. Specifically, I propose that i) PE constructions involve a mono-clausal structure, and ii) the so-called bi-clausal behavior of PEs is a consequence of the interaction of two independently motivated syntactic movements, the movement of an element out of the InfP and the movement of the InfP itself.

2 "Mono-clausal" / "Bi-clausal" Alternation of PEs

It has been discussed in the literature that PEs in Japanese pattern with mono-clausal constructions with respect to the distribution of the focus particle *sika* 'only' and the nominative-object in some contexts, while they pattern with bi-clausal constructions in other contexts (Miyagawa 1987, Tsujimura 1993, Wurmbrand 1998, 2001). In this section, we briefly review the licensing conditions for *sika* 'only' and the nominative-object. Then, the mono-/bi-clausal alternation of PEs discussed in Miyagawa (1987) is introduced.

2.1 Clausemate Conditions on *Sika* and Nominative-object Licensing

A focus particle *sika* 'only' is licensed iff the negative element *na(i)* appears within the same clause (cf. Oyakawa 1975, Muraki 1978).

(2)   a. [[[Uma-ga   biiru-o   nomu]-koto]-**sika** omosiroku]-**nai** (koto)
         horse-$_{NOM}$ beer-$_{ACC}$ drink -fact -FOC interesting -NEG fact
         'The only thing interesting is that the horse drinks beer.'
   b. *[[[Uma-ga   biiru-**sika** nomu]-koto]-ga omosiroku-**nai** (koto)
         horse-$_{NOM}$ beer-FOC   drink -fact-$_{NOM}$ interesting-NEG fact
         'Only beer is such that it is interesting that the horse drinks it.'

A sentence is grammatical when both *sika* and *na(i)* appear in the same clause (2a), but it is ungrammatical when *sika* and *na(i)* appear in different clauses (2b).

     Nominative-object licensing appears to be subject to similar conditions; a nominative-case-marked NP must appear as an internal argument of a predicate to which the stativizing morpheme *-(rar)e* 'can' morphologically adjoins (cf. Kuroda 1965, Kuno 1973).

(3)   a. John-wa [$_{CP}$ Tom-ga hon-o/**-ga**   ka-e-ru   to] it-ta
         J.-$_{TOP}$ T.-$_{NOM}$ book-$_{ACC}$/-$_{NOM}$ buy-CAN-PRES C^0 say-PAST
         'John said that Tom can buy books.'
   b. John-wa [$_{CP}$ Tom-ga hon-o/*-**ga** ka-u   to] i-e-ta
         'John could say that Tom buys books.'

2.2 Properties of Purpose Expressions

PEs show mono-clausal behavior with respect to the *sika* phrase/nominative-object licensing in some contexts (cf. Miyagawa 1987).

(4)   a. John-ga ([$_{PP}$ Tokyo e]) hon **sika** kai-ni ik-**anakat**-ta
         J.-$_{NOM}$ Tokyo to   book only buy-*ni* go-NEG-PAST
         'John went to Tokyo to buy books.'
   b. John-ga ([$_{PP}$ Tokyo e]) hon-o/**-ga**   kai-ni ik-e-ru
         J.-$_{NOM}$ Tokyo to   book-$_{ACC}$/-$_{NOM}$ buy-*ni* go-CAN-PRES
         'John can go to Tokyo to buy books.'

As shown in (4a), *sika* can appear on an internal argument of *ka(i)* 'buy' when the negative element *na(i)* appears on the MV.[1] This indicates that the

---

[1] The predicate of the InfP is morphosyntactically realized as *Ren'yoo-kei* (e.g.

InfP is transparent to *sika* licensing, thus it is smaller than a clause. That a nominative-object is licensed in (4b) further supports the view that PEs are associated with a mono-clausal structure in this context.

However, PEs show bi-clausal behavior in other contexts; namely, when an InfP and a MV are not adjacent to each other (cf. Miyagawa 1987).

(5)   a. *John-ga <u>hon **sika**</u> kai-ni [PPTokyo e] <u>ik</u>-ana kat-ta
        b. John-ga <u>hon-o/*-**ga**</u> kai-ni [PPTokyo e] <u>ik</u>-**e**-ru

The examples in (5) differ from (4) minimally in the position of the PP. In (5a), unlike in (4a), *na(i)* fails to license *sika* when the InfP and the MV are linearly separated by a PP. Interestingly, nominative-object licensing shows the same pattern (5b). Given these facts, Miyagawa (1987) proposes that PEs involving the linear sequence *InfP-MV* as in (4) are associated with a mono-clausal structure, but *InfP-XP/X-MV* as in (5) are associated with a bi-clausal structure at some point in the syntactic derivation.

Contrary to previous accounts, I argue that there is only one structure associated with the PE-construction. Specifically, I propose that PEs unitarily involve a mono-clausal structure, and the observed 'bi-clausal' properties are a simple consequence of a syntactic operation dislocating the InfP.[2]

3 The Purpose Expression Construction

In this section, I argue that there is one structure for PEs, regardless of whether they show 'mono-' or 'bi-'clausal behavior. I first discuss another environment in which PEs show a 'mono-'/'bi-'clausal alternation, and argue

---

kai 'buy') rather than a root form (e.g. *kaw-*) in PEs. This indicates that the structure of the InfP may not be as simple as a VP / IP / CP as has been suggested in the literature. *Ren'yoo-kei* Vs show similar distribution patterns with [+N] elements, and fail to host the negative element *na(i)/-(a)zu* in PEs. I will leave this as a future research topic.

      (i)a. *John-ga hon-o   **kai**-nai-ni   it-ta
            J.-NOM   book-ACC buy-NEG-*ni* go-PAST
            (Int.) 'John went not to buy books.'
        b. #John-ga hon-o **kaw**-azu-ni it-ta   (only 'Gerundive' reading)

[2]Following tradition, I will use the notation 'mono-clausal'/'bi-clausal' to indicates whether *sika* / nominative-object licensing is allowed or disallowed in a configuration, respectively. However, they are used just as a conventional description, and there is no implication for the actual structure involved in the construction. In effect, I argue that the 'bi-clausal' behavior of PEs is a consequence of multiple syntactic movements within a mono-clausal structure in section 4.4.

that observed 'bi-clausal' properties of PEs do not necessarily indicate their bi-clausal status. I then discuss an animacy requirement observed in PEs, and show that it is not reducible to the lexical properties of predicates, but that it must come from the argument structure of the MV. These observations support the view that both 'mono-' and 'bi-'clausal PEs stem from the same Merge structure.

3.1 Syntactic Movement and 'Mono-clausal' Behaviors of PEs

As shown in (6) below, syntactic movement of the InfP can trigger a 'mono-' / 'bi-clausal' alternation. This suggests that it is not necessary to postulate a structure for PEs showing 'bi-clausal' behavior distinct from the structure for PEs that show 'mono-clausal' behavior.[3]

(6)   a. John-ga [$_{InfP}$ hon   **sika** kai-ni] ik-**anakat**-ta
           J.-NOM   book only buy-*ni* go-NEG-PAST
           'John went to buy only books'
        b. *[$_{InfP}$ hon **sika**   kai-ni]$_j$ John-ga t_j ik-**anakat**-ta

(6a) and (6b) involve an identical structure except for the position of an InfP; the InfP in (6b) is dislocated from its base-generated position via scrambling. The fact that the presence of *na(i)* on the MV licenses *sika* evidences that (6a) involves a mono-clausal structure. Interestingly, however, licensing of *sika* fails when the InfP is dislocated from its base-generated position (6b). This shows that the licensing of *sika* may fail even when no intervening CP-boundary is present, hence the failure of *sika* licensing does not necessarily show that PEs are associated with a bi-clausal structure. Moreover, the facts seen in (6) indicate that the 'bi-clausal' properties of PEs can be syntactically derived. This suggests that PEs may in fact be associated with a mono-clausal structure, even when they exhibit 'bi-clausal' properties.

3.2 The Animacy Requirement on PE-constructions

While predicates involved in PEs do not require an animate subject independently, inanimate subjects are prohibited in PE-constructions. This suggests that the structural relations holding among NP, MV and InfP are identical in 'mono-clausal' and 'bi-clausal' PEs.

---

[3]Because of space limitations, I will only discuss *sika* licensing for the reminder of the paper. However, the same grammaticality judgements can be assumed to hold for nominative-object licensing, unless otherwise noted.

(7)   a. hokori-ga (koko made) ki-ta
            dust-NOM here up.to come-PAST
            'Dust came over here.'
        b. hokori-ga ma-u
            dust-NOM dance- PRES
            'Dust flies.'

(8)   a. *hokori-ga ([PP koko made]) mai-ni   ki-ta
            dust-NOM   here up.to   dance-*ni* come-PAST
            (Int.) 'Dust came (over here) to fly.'
        b. *hokori-ga mai-ni [PP koko made]ki-ta

(7) shows that neither the MV *kuru* 'come' nor the V *mau* 'dance' prohibits an inanimate subject. Nonetheless, an inanimate subject cannot appear when these predicates are construed as a part of a PE, regardless of whether the PE involves a 'mono-clausal' (8a) or 'bi-clausal' (8b) configuration. Since an inanimate subject is not generally prohibited by an individual predicate, the observed prohibition against an inanimate subject in PEs cannot be attributed solely to the lexical properties of the predicate. Instead, the facts seen in (8) suggest that MVs exhibit the same thematic restrictions in both 'mono-clausal' and 'bi-clausal' PEs, thanks to the presence of the InfP. Since such a thematic restriction is not observed when MVs are construed with an adjunct PP (7a), the observed thematic restriction is most naturally understood as being caused by a structural relation holding between the MV and the InfP. Then, the fact that an inanimate subject is banned in both 'mono-clausal' and 'bi-clausal' PEs indicates that the structural relation holding between the MV and the InfP in both 'mono-clausal' and 'bi-clausal' PEs is identical at least at the point of Merge.

4 Proposal

I propose the following structure for the PE-construction.

(9)   [vP SUBJ [VP (PP$_\theta$)[v′ InfP MV]]]

I argue that PEs exhibit 'mono-clausal' properties due to the fact that they are associated with a mono-clausal structure, and when they exhibit 'bi-clausal' properties, it is a consequence of InfP movement. In order to motivate the structure in (9), I first discuss the thematic properties of MVs in contexts other than PEs. I then show that the animacy requirement in PEs is a subset case of the thematic restrictions of MVs. I also provide further evi-

dence from Tsujimura (1993) to support the claim that InfP is a thematic argument of the MV. The current proposal unifies the two previously discussed environments in which PEs show 'bi-clausal' behavior; these environments are derived as a result of similar derivational procedures, namely, the InfP is dislocated in both contexts. Finally, I argue that the failure of *sika* phrase / nominative-object licensing in 'bi-clausal' PEs is caused by the movement of the InfP, which destroys the context in which such licensing can legitimately take place.

4.1 MVs *iku* 'go' / *kuru* 'come' and the Animacy Requirement in PEs

MVs appearing in restructuring contexts exhibit both lexical and functional properties (Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001, Wurmbrand 2001). In particular, MVs that appear in PEs behave like functional predicates in the sense that they appear in a fixed order with respect to lexical Vs and fail to be modified by an adverb unless the event denoted by the InfP is simultaneously modified. On the other hand, they behave like lexical predicates in the sense that they impose thematic restrictions on their arguments. In this subsection, the lexical properties of MVs in PEs are investigated. To do so, we first examine the thematic properties of MVs *iku* 'go' / *kuru* 'come' in contexts other than PEs. The thematic properties of MVs in contexts other than PEs provide evidence for the InfP being a thematic argument of the MVs.

First, MVs *iku* 'go' / *kuru* 'come' can assign either an Agentive or Theme role to the subject of a sentence.

(10)   a. zoo-ga   wazato   ki-no   sita   e ki-ta
           elephant-NOM purposely tree-GEN under to come-PAST
           'An elephant purposely came under the tree.'
        b. (toppuu ni aorarete,)
           kosi-ni   huusen-o   tuketa   hamusutaa-ga uti-no
           waist-DAT balloon-ACC attached hamster-NOM   home-GEN
           genkan saki   made ki-ta
           porch   in.front.of up.to come-PAST
           '(By being blown by strong wind,) a hamster with a balloon attached to his waist got to the porch of my house.'

The fact that the presence of an intentional adverb *wazato* 'purposely' yields a felicitous sentence in (10a) indicates that the subject is interpreted as an Agent of the event of going. On the other hand, the felicity of (10b) suggests that the subject can also be interpreted as a Theme. On the hypothesis that different θ-roles are mapped to different syntactic positions, the observed

facts suggest that there are two positions in which a subject can Merge in a MV-construction. Below is a schematic picture of the argument structure of MVs hypothesized in terms of their θ-assigning properties.[4]

(11)   [$_{vP}$ Agent [$_{VP}$ Theme MV]]

Although MVs *iku* 'go' / *kuru* 'come' can assign either an Agent or Theme role to their subjects, the subject is interpreted unambiguously as a Theme when it is inanimate. That the inanimate subject cannot be interpreted as Agent is shown by its incompatibility with an intentional adverb *wazato* 'purposely'.

(12)   #hokori-ga wazato   koko made ki-ta
        dust-$_{NOM}$ purposely here up.to come-PAST
        (Int.) 'Dust purposely came over here.'

Based on the view that argument structure and θ-assignment work in tandem, the observation that an inanimate subject cannot be interpreted as an Agent suggests that it can only Merge in an internal argument position.

While the animacy requirement is not a property of MVs *iku* 'go' / *kuru* 'come' in general, MVs appear to require an animate subject when they are construed with a thematic PP.

(13)   a. John-ga (wazato) [$_{PP}$ Tom-no heya e /made] it-ta
          J.-$_{NOM}$ purposely T.-$_{GEN}$ room to up.to go-PAST
          'John (purposely) went to / over to Tom's room.'
        b. hokori-ga [$_{PP}$ Tom-no heya *e /made] it-ta[5]
          dust-$_{NOM}$ T.-$_{GEN}$ room to up.to go-PAST
          'Dust went to / over to Tom's room.'

The MV *iku* 'go', which takes an animate subject, can appear with either an adjunct PP (*made*) or with a thematic Goal PP (*e*), as illustrated in (13a).[6] However, the MV cannot be construed with a Goal PP when an inanimate NP appears as its subject (13b). This observed pattern can be restated in terms of thematic relations, schematically represented in (14).

---

[4] I adopt the general assumption that agentivity is associated with v and other thematic roles are associated with V.

[5] The *e*-PP is acceptable when it is interpreted as a Path, but not as a Goal.

[6] For the general properties of *made* PP vs. *e* PP, see Tsujimura (1994).

(14)   a. [$_{vP}$NP$_{AGENT}$ [$_{VP}$ PP$_{GOAL}$ MV]]
       b. [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ NP$_{THEME}$ MV]]
       c. *[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ NP$_{THEME}$ PP$_{GOAL}$ MV]]

Based on the argument structure of MVs proposed in (11), (14) shows that an NP cannot appear as an internal argument of an MV when the MV takes a thematic PP. Subsequently, the NP must Merge with v whenever the MV is construed with a thematic PP. This explains why the MVs construed with a thematic PP are incompatible with an inanimate subject; the inanimate NP can only Merge in the internal argument position of the MV. However, the presence of a PP blocks NP Merger within the projection of the MV.

The θ-assignment properties of MVs suggest that the InfP is base-generated in an internal θ-position of the MV in the PE-constructions. As discussed in section 3.2, PEs prohibit an inanimate subject throughout, although the predicates involved in the construction do not necessarily do so. The fact that an inanimate subject is prohibited in PEs is naturally accounted for by the thematic restrictions of MVs if we assume that the InfP is base-generated as a thematic argument of the MV. Since the internal θ-position of the MV is occupied by InfP, MVs in the PE-construction are predicted to always require an animate subject, as summarized in (15) (Cf. (14)).

(15)   a. [$_{vP}$ NP$_{AGENT}$ [$_{VP}$ (PP$_{GOAL}$) InfP$_{θ}$ MV]]
       b. *[$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ NP$_{THEME}$ (PP$_{GOAL}$) InfP$_{θ}$ MV]]

Thus, the fact that inanimate subjects are prohibited in PEs is straightforwardly accounted for under the current proposal. Furthermore, the present analysis gives a unified account for the behavior of MVs in MV-constructions and PE-constructions; the observed animacy requirement in PEs is a subset case of the animacy requirement generally observed in MV-constructions.

4.2 Further Evidence for the Argument Status of the InfP

A further piece of evidence for the InfP being an argument of MVs comes from the fact that InfP in PEs cannot be iterative. Tsujimura (1993) demonstrates the argument status of the InfP with the following example (bracketing mine).

(16)   *Taroo-ga Sinzyuku e [$_{InfP}$ hon-o   kai-ni] [$_{InfP}$ susi-o   tabe-ni]
        Taro-$_{NOM}$ Sinzyuku to   book-$_{ACC}$ buy-*ni*   sushi-$_{ACC}$ eat-*ni*
        [$_{InfP}$ eiga-o   mi-ni] it-ta
                movie-$_{ACC}$ see-*ni* go-PAST
        'Taro went to Shinjuku to buy a book, eat sushi, and see a movie.'

Tsujimura (1993) attributes this non-iterativity of InfP to its argument status based on the difference in iterativity between arguments and adjuncts discussed in Larson (1988); adjuncts are iterative both in terms of numbers and types, whereas only a specified number of arguments can appear in a sentence, hence arguments are not iterative. The fact observed in (16) thus provides further support for the InfP as an argument of the MV.

4.3 The Position of InfP and Syntactic Movement

As we have seen above, PEs involving a thematic PP show 'mono-clausal' behavior when the InfP and the MV are contiguous, while they show 'bi-clausal' behavior when the PP linearly intervenes between the InfP and the MV. Under the proposal that the InfP is base-generated as the innermost complement of MVs, the observed 'mono-'/'bi-'clausal alternation can be explained as being triggered by the syntactic movement of the InfP, similar to the scrambling case in (6) discussed in section 3.1.

    Recall that a PE exhibiting 'mono-clausal' properties fails to maintain its 'mono-clausal' properties when the InfP is dislocated. Example (6), which demonstrates this point, is replicated below as (17) with additional bracketing, and summarized in (18).

(17)   a. John-ga [$_{vP}$ [$_{InfP}$ hon   **sika** kai-ni] ik]-**anakat**-ta
           J.-$_{NOM}$ book   only buy-*ni* go-NEG-PAST
           'John went to buy only books'
        b. *[$_{InfP}$ hon **sika** kai-ni]$_j$ John-ga [$_{vP}$ t_j ik]-**anakat**-ta
(18)   a. [$_{vP}$SUBJ [$_{vP}$ InfP MV]] ^{Ok}*sika~nai*
        b. InfP$_j$ [$_{vP}$SUBJ [$_{vP}$ t_j MV]]   **sika~nai*

(18) shows that PEs exhibit 'mono-clausal' properties when the InfP remains *in situ* and 'bi-clausal' properties emerge otherwise.[7] Following the proposal

---

[7]The fact that (17b) is ungrammatical is not simply due to the fact that *sika* is raised out of its base-generated position.

    (i) [$_{SikaP}$ hon   **sika**]$_j$ John-ga[$_{vP}$ [$_{InfP}$ t_j kai-ni] ik]-**anakat**-ta
           book only   J.-$_{NOM}$ buy-*ni* go-NEG-PAST
       'John went to buy only books.'

in (9), the configuration in which *sika* can be licensed in (19) is schematically represented in (20).[8]

(19)   a. John-ga [PP Tokyo e][InfP hon **sika** kai-ni] ik-**anakat**-ta
       J.-NOM   Tokyo to   book only buy-*ni* go-NEG-PAST
       'John went to Tokyo to buy only books.'
       b. *John-ga [InfP hon **sika** kai-ni][PP Tokyo e] ik-**anakat**-ta

(20)   a. ...... [vP SUBJ [VP PP [v' InfP MV]]] ...   OK*sika~nai*
       b. SUBJ ... InfP$_j$ ... [VP PP [v' t_j MV]] ...   **sika~nai*

Analogous to (18), *sika* can be licensed when the InfP remains *in situ* (20a), but fails to be licensed when the InfP is dislocated from its base-generated position (20b). The proposed structure for the PE-construction provides a unified explanation for both environments where *sika* licensing fails, (17) and (19). This in turn suggests that the 'mono-'/'bi-'clausal alternation of PEs is attributed to whether or not the InfP undergoes movement. The current proposal then provides an alternative explanation of the previously observed correlation between restructuring phenomena and the surface linear adjacency between the InfP and the MV. Linearized structures for (20) and (18b) are given in (21).[9]

(21)   a. [SUBJ * PP   * **InfP** * **MV**]   OK*sika~nai* (= (20a))
       b. [SUBJ * **InfP** * PP   * **MV**]   **sika~nai*   (= (20b))
       c. [**InfP** * SUBJ * **MV**]   **sika~nai*   (= (18b))

Since the InfP is construed as the innermost complement of the MV, and *sika* phrase licensing can take place iff the InfP remains *in situ*, the InfP and the MV surface adjacent to each other when *sika* phrase licensing takes place. On the other hand, the InfP does not appear in its base-generated position when *sika* phrase licensing fails, so the InfP is linearized at its landing site,

---

As the grammaticality of (i) indicates, *sika* can be licensed by a negative element *nai* even when it scrambles out from its base-generated position.

[8]One may wonder whether the observed 'mono-clausal'/'bi-clausal' alternations can be accounted for by a string-adjacency requirement (Riemsdijk 1978, 1998), since PEs show 'mono-clausal' behavior only when the InfP and the MV are contiguous. However, although it can capture the empirical facts equally adequately, it cannot avoid theoretical problems such as the 'look-ahead' problem discussed in Wurmbrand and Bobaljik (2005) for Dutch extraposition. In particular, it must entertain the claim that the relationship established in PF determines the well-formedness of a relationship established in the syntax/LF.

[9]Asterisks in the example denote PF precedence and adjacency relations among XPs in (21).

giving rise to a linear structure where the InfP is non-adjacent to the MV, unless it undergoes vacuous movement.

In sum, the current proposal on the structure of PE-constructions allows us to attribute the 'bi-clausal' properties of PEs unitarily to a consequence of the dislocation of the InfP. In the remainder of this section, I show that movement of the InfP results in blocking *sika* / nominative-object licensing processes.

4.4 *Sika* / Nominative-object Licensing Revisited

Tanaka (1997) argues that *sika* phrase licensing involves operator movement; the Op that originates in the Spec-FocP headed by *sika* must raise to spec-NegP in order to establish a Spec-Head relation with Neg^0 in the syntax. Evidence for the operator movement analysis comes from the fact that the distribution of *sika* is constrained by various island conditions, such as the Complex NP Island shown in (22) below.

(22) *Taroo-ga [[LGB-sika katta] hito]-ni   awa-nai(koto)
     T.-$_{NOM}$ LGB-*sika* bought person-$_{DAT}$ meet-NEG
     'Taro met a person who bought only LGB.'

A schematic picture of the licensing configuration is shown below as (23).

(23)...[$_{NegP}$ **Op$_j$** [$_{VP}$ ... [$_{FocP}$ t_j NP-*sika*] ... V] **Neg^0**]

Following Tanaka's (1997) analysis, I argue that *sika* licensing takes place in PE-constructions only when Op can successfully move into Spec-NegP position. (24) illustrates the operator movement for *sika* licensing in PE-constructions (irrelevant details omitted).

(24) a. [$_{NegP}$ **Op$_j$** [$_{VP}$ [$_{InfP}$ [$_{FocP}$ t_j NP-*sika*] V-*ni*] MV] **Neg^0**]
     b. [$_{XP}$ [$_{InfP}$ [$_{FocP}$ t_j NP-*sika*] V-*ni*]$_k$[$_{NegP}$ **Op$_j$** ... [$_{VP}$ t_kMV] **Neg^0**]]

(24a) shows that Op can legitimately move into Spec-NegP when the InfP remains *in situ*. On the other hand, movement of Op results in leaving an unbound trace behind when the InfP is dislocated (24b), violating the Proper Binding Condition (the PBC). Since Op is required to move into Spec-NegP in order to license *sika*, but doing so would result in a violation of the PBC, PEs containing *sika* are predicted to be ungrammatical whenever the InfP is dislocated. Thus the proposed account of 'mono-'/'bi-'clausal PEs correctly rules out empirically unattested patterns such as the ones in (25b,c).

(25) a. John-ga ([_{PP} Tu e]) [_{InfP} hon **sika** kai-ni] ik-**anakat**-ta
      J.-_{NOM}   Tsu to   book only buy-*ni* go-NEG-PAST
      'John went (to Tsu) to buy only books.'
      b. *[_{InfP} hon **sika** kai-ni]_j[_{NegP}...John-ga ([_{PP}Tu e]) t_j ik-**anakat**]-ta
      c. *John-ga [_{InfP} hon **sika** kai-ni]_j[_{NegP}[_{PP}Tu e] t_j ik-**anakat**]-ta

Failure of nominative-object licensing in PEs involving a dislocated InfP can be explained by a similar account. Wurmbrand (1998) argues that a nominative object appears higher than its accusative-object counterpart at LF. This is evidenced by the scope facts with *dake* 'only' appearing with the NP and a stativizing morpheme -(*rar*)*e* 'can'. Example (26) is taken from Tada (1992), cited in Wurmbrand (1998).

(26) a. John-ga migime-dake-o   tumur-e-ru   *can* > *only*
         J.-_{NOM} right.eye-only-_{ACC}close-can-PRES ??*only* > *can*
         'John can close only his right eye.'
      b. John-ga migime-dake-ga   tumur-e-ru   **can* > *only*
         J.-_{NOM} right.eye-only-_{NOM}close-can-PRES *only* > *can*

Although *only* takes scope under *can* when it appears with an accusative object (26a), it must scope over *can* when it appears with a nominative object (26b). Based on Tada's (1992) observation, Wurmbrand (1998) proposes that a nominative object raises to the specifier position of the stativizing morpheme -(*rar*)*e* 'can'. A schematic picture of the proposed nominative-object licensing configuration is shown in (27). (28) is the configuration for nominative-object licensing in PEs involving a dislocated InfP, adopting the mechanism of nominative-object licensing proposed by Wurmbrand (1998). Again, irrelevant details are omitted:

(27) [_{vP} NP_j-*ga* [_{vP} t_{SUBJ} [_{VP} [_{VP} t_j V]-*e*] v]]
(28) a. [_{vP}NP-*ga* [_{vP}[_{VP} [_{VP} [_{InfP} t_j V-*ni*] MV] -*e*]v]]
      b. ... [_{XP} [_{InfP} t_j V-*ni*]_k...[_{vP}NP_j-*ga* [_{vP} t_{SUBJ} [_{VP}[_{VP} t_kMV]-*e*]v]]]

Based on the hypothesis that a nominative object must raise to a vP-adjoined position to be licensed, the trace of a nominative object can be properly bound by its antecedent when the InfP remains *in situ*, while it fails to be bound when the InfP raises above vP, resulting in a violation of the PBC. Consequently, a nominative object can be licensed when the InfP remains *in situ*, but it fails to be licensed when the InfP undergoes movement.

In sum, the analysis of PE-constructions proposed here provides explanations of the distribution of *sika* and nominative objects. Given that the InfP is a non-clausal complement of the MV, *sika* and nominative objects that are

construed as a part of the InfP can be licensed by their respective licenser that appears morphologically adjoined to the MVs. On the other hand, since movement of InfP will target as high as NegP-adjoined positions, *sika* / Nominative-objects construed in the dislocated InfP cannot yield a grammatical sentence because they must simultaneously meet two conflicting conditions; their licensing conditions require them to move out of the InfP, while the PBC requires them to remain within the dislocated InfP. Thus, the analysis proposed here accounts for the failure of *sika* phrase / Nominative-object licensing in PEs involving a dislocated InfP without postulating otherwise unmotivated bi-clausal structure. I will leave aside the question of the exact nature of the InfP movement, such as the exact position it targets and the trigger of the movement, for future research.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, I argued that PEs exhibiting 'mono-clausal' properties and PEs exhbiting 'bi-clausal' properties are in fact derived from the same Merge-structure. I showed that the Purpose Expression Construction involves a mono-clausal structure in which the InfP is construed as an inner-most complement of the MVs, and 'bi-clausal' behavior emerges when the InfP is dislocated. I argued that the animacy requirement observed in PEs comes from the general properties of MVs *iku* 'go' / *kuru* 'come', namely, that they cannot Merge a subject within their own projection when another XP occupies their thematic position. The present analysis provided an alternative explanation for the 'mono-'/'bi-'clausal' alternation of PEs without resorting to actual structural differences; namely, that the so-called 'bi-clausal' behavior of PEs arises as a consequence of violating the Proper Binding Condition.

References

Cardinaletti, Anna, and Giuliana Giusti. 2001. "Semi-lexical" motion verbs in Romance and Germanic. In *Semi-lexical Categories: The Function of Content Words and the Content of Function Words*, ed. N. Corver and H. v. Riemsdijk, 371–414. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kuroda, Shigeyuki. 1965. Generative Grammatical Studies in the Japanese Language. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Larson, Richard. 1988. Implicit arguments in situation semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11:169–201.

Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1987. Restructuring in Japanese. In *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, ed. T. Imai and M. Saito, 273–300. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Muraki, Masatake. 1978. The *sika nai* construction and predicate raising. In *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, ed. G. Bedell et al., 155–177. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Oyakawa, Takatsugu. 1975. On the Japanese *sika nai* construction. *Gengo Kenkyu* 67:1–20.

Riemsdijk, van Henk. 1978. *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Riemsdijk, van Henk. 1998. Head movement and adjacency. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(3):633–678.

Tada, Hiroaki. 1992. Nominative objects in Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 14:91–108.

Tanaka, Hidekazu. 1997. Invisible movement of *sika-nai* and the linear crossing constraint. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6:143–178.

Tsujimura, Natsuko. 1993. Adjunct and event argument in restructuring. In *Japanese / Korean Linguistics* 3, ed. S. Choi, 121–136. Stanford, Ca.: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Tsujimura, Natsuko. 1994. Resultative and motion verbs in Japanese. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 24:429–440.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 1998. *Infinitives*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wurmbrand, Susanne and Jonathan David Bobaljik. 2005. Adjacency, PF, and extraposition. In *Organizing Grammar: Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, ed. H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz, and J. Koster, 679–688. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Department of Linguistics
Stony Brook University
Stony Brook, NY, 11794-4376
yasano@ic.sunysb.edu