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In *te hosī* constructions, the subject of an embedded proposition may be marked either with dative *-ni* or nominative *-ga*. Shibatani (1978) observes that dative case-marking is semantically constrained, while nominative case-marking may occur freely. Under a close inspection of relevant data, however, it reveals that nominative case-marking also seems to be semantically constrained. Namely, nominative may not be assigned to [+agentive] subjects, but the assignment is made possible once the [+agentive] subject is focalized. This fact about nominative case-marking poses a problem since Case marks the syntactic position that an argument occupies, not the argument’s semantic property such as [agentive] or [focus]. This paper shows that the fact is given a simple syntactic account with a new definition of phase-impenetrability condition (PIC). The suggested analysis also accounts for other phenomena observed in *te hosī* constructions.
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1. Introduction

A propositional phrase can be embedded by *te hosī* ‘wish’, which represents a wish that the matrix subject bears in mind. Consider the following examples:¹

(1) a. [ame-ga hur] u.
[rain-NOM fall] PRES
‘It rains.’

b. (Watasi-wa) [ame-ga hur] te hosī i.
(I-TOP) -NOM wish PRES
‘I wish that it will rain.’

(2) a. [Taro-ga mado-o ake] ru.
[Taro-NOM window-ACC open] PRES
‘Taro opens the window.’

b. (Watasi-wa) [Taro-ni mado-o ake] te hosī i.
(I-TOP) -DAT wish PRES
‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

¹ I would like to thank two anonymous JIL reviewers for critical comments and suggestions. Also I gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with Kunihiro Iwakura, Jun Sasaki, Fuminori Matsubara, and Hiroyuki Nawata on several points in the paper. Thanks are also due to Scott Menking for stylistic help. An earlier version of the suggested analysis was presented at the Hiroshima Linguistics and Culture Circle at Hiroshima University on June 24, 2006. I thank the audience there for helpful comments and suggestions. Needless to say, all remaining inadequacies are my own.

¹ The following are the abbreviations used in this paper: NOM (Nominate), ACC (Accusative), DAT (Dative), GEN (genitive), TOP (Topic), LOC (locative), Q (question), COP (Copula), NEG (Negation), PAST (Past tense), PRES (Present tense), PASS (passive), CAUS (causative), FOC (focus).
Since the subject of *te hosî* is almost always the speaker, it is normally omitted, as shown within parentheses. In (1b), the subject wishes that an ergative event be realized. On the other hand, in (2b), the subject expects another person to behave in accordance with his/her wishes.

This paper aims to identify what case should be assigned to the highest argument in the embedded propositional phrase. The highest argument (i.e. *ame* ‘rain’ in (1a) and *Taroo* in (2a)) is assigned nominative case *-ga* when the proposition constitutes a matrix clause, as shown in (1a) and (1b). When the proposition is selected by *te hosî*, the highest argument in the embedded propositional phrase – henceforth referred to as *Wishee* – is either marked with nominative *-ga* or with dative *-ni*, as shown in (1b) and (2b). At first glance, the difference in case seems to reflect the differences in the semantic category of Wishees (i.e. nonhuman vs. human) or the difference in the semantics/syntax of the embedded proposition (i.e. ergative vs. unergative). However, facts are more complicated, as shown in later sections. Focus interpretation is observed to affect case marking in some cases. This paper will explore how syntax and semantics affect case marking on Wishees.

In the course of discussion, this paper will propose a new definition for locality. In the minimalist program, locality is defined in terms of phase. However, it is not clear when and how a phase constitutes a barrier for operations from outside. The explanation provided by Chomsky himself changes almost every year (see appendix A). This may suggest that there are several possible formulations conforming to the strong minimalist thesis (SMT), and that the one that is actually working in Faculty of Language (FL) should be selected empirically. This paper proposes a new, SMT-compatible locality condition that can explain the relevant data. It is to be determined in future research, on empirical grounds, whether or not this formulation is more adequate than others.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews how previous analyses explain case marking on Wishees in *te hosî* constructions. Section 3 points out empirical problems with the previous analyses and provides more precise descriptive rules of case marking on Wishees. Section 4 introduces a new analysis of *te hosî* constructions, and shows that the suggested analysis provides a straightforward account of the relevant data. Section 5 extends the discussion to other related phenomena. Section 6 concludes the discussion.

2. Previous analyses

Although grammar books on Japanese refer to *te hosî* constructions without fail, they scarcely explain what case should be assigned to what type of Wishee. Some merely provide a sample case frame in which the Wishee is assigned dative *-ni* case (e.g. Saeki 1989:129). Some do not refer to case on Wishees, or even Wishees themselves (e.g. Morita and Matsuki 1989:272, Morita 1989:1032). Some provide two sample case frames, as in (3), without explaining why or how two kinds of case are used.

(3)a. (Watasi-wa) hito-*ni* ... *te hosî* i.
   (I-TOP) person-DAT wish PRES
   ‘I wish that someone will …’

b. (Watasi-wa) zitai-*ga* ... *te hosî* i.
   (I-TOP) situation-NOM wish PRES
   ‘I wish that something will …’

(adapted from Ichikawa 2004)

The above sample case frames may imply that dative *-ni* is assigned to animate Wishees, whereas nominative *-ga* is assigned to inanimate Wishees.

On shifting our attention from grammar books to linguistic research, it is found that there are very few studies on this issue. As far as my literature research is concerned, only Shibatani (1978) presents an
analysis of *te hosi* constructions that accounts for the two cases on Wishees. Although there are a few other studies in generative literature that mention case marking in *te hosi* (e.g. Takezawa 1987, Matsumoto 1996, Takezawa and Whitman 1998), they briefly touch upon *te hosi* in their attempts to provide a uniform account of case-conversion phenomena in Japanese, without referring to how these cases are used or constrained. It would, of course, be preferable to have case-conversion phenomena in *te hosi* constructions incorporated into a general theory of case marking. However, it is important to establish a more precise empirical generalization before attempting to theorize. The remainder of this section will review Shibatani’s observation and analysis. As will be revealed in the next section, the situation is more complicated than those observed in Shibatani and other researchers.

According to Shibatani, Wishees may be assigned either nominative -*ga* or dative -*ni*. He quotes the following passages from a fiction (4a) and an essay (4b):

(4a)  Natue-wa, [nantoka Yooko-*ga* hazukasigar] te hosi katta.  
Natue-TOP [somehow Yooko-NOM feel.ashamed] wish PAST  
‘Natue wished that Yoko felt ashamed in whatever way.’

b.  [Otoosama-*ni* gekisaku, sibaimono-o kak] te hosi katta toiu kimoti-*ga* ari masu ka.  
[father-DAT play, drama-ACC write] wish PAST that feeling-NOM be POLITE Q  
‘Do you think you wished that your father had written a play or a drama?’  
(Shibatani 1978:104, my translation)

In (4a), the experiencer argument of hazukasigar ‘feel ashamed’, Yooko, is assigned nominative -*ga*. On the other hand, in (4b), the agent argument of kak ‘write’, otoosama ‘(your) father’, is assigned dative -*ni*. According to Shibatani, either sentence continues to be acceptable if the Wishee is marked with the other case:

(5a)  Natue-wa, [Yooko-*ni* hazukasigar] te hosi katta.  

b.  [Otoosama-*ga* gekisaku, sibaimono-o kak] te hosi katta toiu kimoti-*ga* ari masu ka.2  
(Ibid. p.116)

As far as the above examples are concerned, it appears that one is free to select either -*ni* or -*ga* for the Wishee.

However, there are cases in which a Wishee is obligatorily assigned nominative -*ga*. Consider the following examples:

(6a)  Boku-wa [ame-{-*ga*/*-ni} hur] te hosi i.  
I-TOP [rain{-NOM/-DAT} fall] wish PRES  
‘I wish that it will rain.’

b.  Boku-wa [kono hon-{-*ga*/*-ni} ure] te hosi i.  
I-TOP [this book{-NOM/-DAT} sell.well] wish PRES  
‘I wish that this book will sell well.’  
(Ibid. p.117)

Ame ‘rain’ in (6a) and kono hon ‘this book’ in (6b) cannot be marked with dative -*ni*. Shibatani assumes that animacy is the relevant factor:

2 All the native Japanese speakers I consulted found example (5b) to be somewhat unnatural, although not totally unacceptable. The awkwardness is explained in the discussion to follow.
[These examples] indicate that -ni cannot occur with inanimate Wishees. This may be because we cannot direct to an inanimate entity such as a wish as “I want it to do this,” or “I want it to become that.” (Ibid. p.117, my translation)

Therefore, in Shibatani’s account, syntax does not constrain case marking on Wishees. Either -ga or -ni can be assigned in syntax. The assignment of -ni case to inanimate Wishees is prohibited on semantic grounds.

Based on the above observation, Shibatani provides an analysis of te hosî constructions.

In each example, te hosî embeds a clause that includes a nominative subject. Further, the predicate may take a dative object that refers to the same entity as the embedded subject, as observed in (7b) and (8b). When a dative Wishee appears in the matrix clause, a nominative Wishee in the embedded clause gets deleted by Equi Deletion. Since the presence of the matrix Wishee is optional, either -ga or -ni Wishee may emerge, as shown in (7a, b). The same explanation holds for (8a, b). Both should be acceptable in syntax, and example (8b) is excluded for semantic reasons. Although both are OK in syntax, example (8b) is excluded for semantic reasons. We usually do not direct our wish to an inanimate entity because it is unable to respond to the wish.

Following Shibatani, therefore, we obtain the following descriptive rules as to possible case on Wishees.

(9)a. [+animate] Wishee → -ni or -ga
b. [–animate] Wishee → -ga

However, a closer inspection of the relevant data reveals that the situation is more complicated. The next section presents problems with the rules in (9).

3. Nominative marking and focus reading
Although Shibatani’s account suggests that animate Wishees may be assigned either -ni or -ga, the latter case marking is prohibited in some cases. Confusingly enough, the prohibited case marking becomes legitimate if the Wishee is interpreted as focus of the sentence. Section 3.1 closely examines the relevant data, and provides more precise descriptive rules of case marking on Wishees. Section 3.2 shows how the observed facts pose a problem for Case theory.

3.1. Nominative-case marking on [+agentive] Wishees
Although the case-marking rules in (9) state that animate Wishees may be assigned either -ni or -ga, it does not always hold. In reality, some animate Wishees greatly prefer -ga, and others are obligatorily assigned -ni. Consider the following examples:

(10)a. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {-ga / ??-ni} yukue humei-ni nar] te hosî i.
     (I-TOP) [Taroo {-NOM/ ??-DAT} missing-DAT become] wish PRES
     ‘I wish that Taro will get lost.’
b. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {\text{-ga} / ??-\text{ni}} keisatu-de zizyoo tyoosyu s-are] te hosii i.
   (I-TOP) [Taroo {-NOM/ ??-DAT} police-LOC interrogation do-PASS] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that Taro will be interrogated by the police.’

As shown in the above examples, \text{ga}-marking is preferred when the Wishee is not a volitional actor in the wished eventuality. If the Wishee is marked with \text{-ni}, the subject expects the Wishee to purposely perform the wished action. Marginal acceptability occurs as a result of the unnaturalness of such expectation: it is unlikely that someone gets lost or interrogated by the police on purpose. These examples suggest that \text{agentivity} rather than animacy is the factor that determines the case to be assigned.

This point is further supported by the following examples, in which the Wishees are obviously agentive:

(11)a. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {*-\text{ga} / -\text{ni}} tosyokan-de hatarak] te hosii i.
   (I-TOP) [Taroo {*-NOM/ -DAT} library-LOC work] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that Taro will work at the library.’
   b. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {*-\text{ga} / -\text{ni}} mado-o ake] te hosii i.
   (I-TOP) [Taroo {*-NOM/ -DAT} window-ACC open] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

When Taro works at the library or opens the window, it can scarcely be assumed that the event is accidental or that Taro does not intend to perform the action. In this sense, \text{Taro} in the above examples must be agentive. As shown in the examples above, agentive Wishees must be marked with dative \text{-ni}.

Given the above observation, the case marking rules (9) must be modified as follows:

(12)a. [+agentive] Wishee $\rightarrow$ -ni
    b. [–agentive] Wishee $\rightarrow$ -ga

The Wishees in (10) are preferably assigned -\text{ga} since it is highly unlikely that they are agentive actors of the wished eventualities. The Wishees in (11) must be assigned -\text{ni} since they must be agentive in order to perform the wished action.

So far, so good. However, (12) is not sufficient for dealing with another type of data: The \text{ga}-marking in (11) becomes legitimate when the Wishee receives focus interpretation. A focalized phrase receives a high pitch, but it is difficult to identify. Hence, in the following I control focus interpretation by context. First, let us consider the following conversation:

(13) A: Gakusei-ga hon-o yom a nak te komari masu ne.
     student-NOM book-ACC read NEG for be troubled POLITE PARTICLE
     ‘Don’t you find it annoying that students do not read books?’
   B: Iya, musiro [kyooin-ga motto hon-o yom] te hosii i desu yo.
     no rather [teacher-NOM more book-ACC read] wish PRES POLITE PARTICLE
     ‘No, I’d rather wish that teachers read books more often.’

In B’s response, the Wishee \text{kyooin} ‘teacher’ is contrastively focalized against \text{gakusei} ‘student’ in A’s utterance. The above example shows that the focalized Wishee is legitimately marked with nominative
This is further supported by the following examples. Suppose that speaker B in (13) continues and utters either (14a) or (14b):

   but [scholarly.book-only teacher-NOM read] wish NEG POLITE
   ‘But I wish that teachers read nothing but scholarly books.’
     but [scholarly.book-only teacher-NOM read] wish PRES POLITE
     ‘But I wish that teachers read nothing but scholarly books.’

(-Sika ‘only’ in (14a) is a negative polarity item, and hence is associated with the negative word (nai) in the matrix clause.) In either example, gakuzyutusyo ‘scholarly book’, emphasized by -sika or -dake ‘only’, stands out as an exhaustive focus. If Rizzi (1997) and Kiss (1998) are right in claiming that a clause cannot contain more than one focus, then the Wishee kyoo-in ‘teacher’ can no longer have focus interpretation. Again, the deviance of (14a, b) indicates that a [+agentive] Wishee cannot receive nominative -ga unless it bears focus interpretation. Compare examples (14a, b) with the following. The ni-marked Wishee can occur with a focus phrase, which indicates that the ni-Wishee does not have to be a focus.

   teacher-DAT

\(^3\) According to an anonymous reviewer, focus interpretation is unnecessary when the te hos-i clause is embedded inside ~to omow te iru ‘think’ or ~to negaw te iru ‘hope’. The following sentences are minimally different from (11a, b) in that the te hos-i clause is embedded:

(iia. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {?-ga/-ni} tosyokan-de hatarak] te hos-i i] to negaw te iru.
   that hope PRES

   (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {?-ga/-ni} mado-o ake] te hos-i i] to omow te iru.
   that think PRES

The ga-marked Wishees without focus interpretation are acceptable. Currently I have no explanation of how embedding affects the possible case frames of te hos-i constructions. I merely point out that this is observed in other constructions as well. Consider the following examples:

(iiia. Aitu {[?-ni/-ga} gaikokugo-ga negate da.
   that.guy{?-D/ -NOM} foreign.language-NOM poor.at be PRES
   ‘That guy is poor at foreign languages.’

   b. Boku-ga kare-no kimoti{?-o/-ga} yoku wakar te iru.
      I-NOM he-GEN feeling{?-ACC/-NOM} well know PRES
      ‘I understand his feelings well.’

(iiiia. [Aitu-[ni gaikokugo-ga negate na] koto-wa dare-demo sir te iru.
   thing-TOP anyone know PRES
   ‘Anyone knows that this guy is poor at foreign languages.’

   b. [Boku-ga kare-no kimoti-o yoku wakar te iru] koto-wa kare-mo sir te iru daroo.
      thing-TOP he-too know PRES should
      ‘He himself should know that I understand his feelings well.’

   (adapted from Mihara 1994:138-9)"

Mihara observes that the ni-ga frame in (iiia) and the ga-o frame in (iiib) are marginal when the stative predicate appears in the matrix clause. In either case, the same frame becomes acceptable when the clause is embedded, as shown in (iiia, b). I leave for future research how embedding affects case conversion. This paper ignores case frames that become acceptable only in embedded configurations.

\(^4\) In each example in (14) and (15), the focalized object has been moved to the left of the subject (Wishee). None of them is legitimate in the unmarked subject-object order, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer. I account for why the reversed order is obligatory in section 5.3. The important concern here, however, is the contrast between (14) and (15). I attribute the deviance of (14) to the occurrence of two focus phrases.
   teacher-DAT

With regard to [–agentive] Wishees, ga-marking has nothing to do with focus interpretation. A [–agentive] Wishee is obligatorily assigned nominative -ga, regardless of whether or not it is a focus. Consider the following examples:

\[(16)\]a. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo-ga titoiya-ni-sika sikar-rare] te hosi ku nai desu.
   (I-TOP) [Taroo-NOM father-by-only scold-PASS] wish NEG POLITE
   ‘I wish that Taro will be scolded by nobody but his father.’

b. (Watasi-wa) [ame-ga Tokyo-de-sika hur] te hosi ku nai desu.
   (I-TOP) [rain-NOM Tokyo-LOC-only fall] wish NEG POLITE
   ‘I wish that it will rain in nowhere but in Tokyo.’

Unlike (14), the nominative Wishees in (16a, b) can occur with a focus sika-phrase, which indicates that the Wishees are assigned nominative irrelevant to focus interpretation. Based on this, the more precise descriptive rules of case marking for Wishees are summarized in (17):

\[(17)\]a. [–agentive] Wishee \(\rightarrow\) -ga
b. [+agentive, –focus] Wishee \(\rightarrow\) -ni
c. [+agentive, +focus] Wishee \(\rightarrow\) -ni or -ga

3.2. New problems to be solved
The descriptive rules of case marking for Wishees as stated in (17) include semantic notions such as [agentive] and [focus]. It poses a problem since case should be a structural marking with regard to the grammatical position that an argument occupies. Put differently, the problem is divided into two distinct but related problems. If we follow Shibatani (1978) and assume that te hosi takes a sentential complement, the Wishee should appear as the subject of the embedded clause:

\[(18)\]a. (Watasi-wa) [TP ame-ga hur] te hosi i.
   (I-TOP) [ rain-NOM fall] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that it will rain.’

b. (Watasi-wa) [TP Taroo-ga keisatu-de zizyootyoosyu s-are] te hosi i.
   (I-TOP) [ Taroo-NOM police-Loc interrogation do-PASS] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that Taro will be interrogated by the police.’

Apparently the embedded T bears a nominative-assigning property and assigns -ga to the subject of the embedded clause. However, this gives rise to the first problem:

\[(19)\] *(Watasi-wa) [TP Taroo-ga mado-o ake] te hosi i.
   (I-TOP) [ Taoo-NOM window-ACC open] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

If the embedded T had a nominative-assigning property, it would be able to assign nominative to Taroo as well, regardless of whether it is agentive or not. Why not?
A second problem concerns the focus interpretation of a nominative Wishee. Sentence (19) becomes acceptable when *Taro* receives focus interpretation (through a pitch accent or/and some appropriate context). It is highly unlikely that T, when assigning nominative to a DP, takes into consideration whether or not the DP is a focus. So, how does focus interpretation affect nominative-case assignment?

The problems continue to exist even when we assume that embedded T does not assign nominative case. If the Wishees in (18a, b) were assigned nominative case by matrix T, then matrix T would be able to assign nominative case to the Wishee in (19) as well, regardless of its agentive status or the presence/absence of focus interpretation.

4. A new analysis
This section proposes a new analysis of *te hosī* constructions and shows how well the suggested analysis accounts for the data observed in the previous sections.

4.1. Selectional properties of *te hosī*
I adopt the following three assumptions with respect to argument selection by *te hosī*.

(20) The argument structure of *te hosī*: ($x$, $y_{[\text{dative}]}$, $z$) or ($x$, $z$)
(21) The semantic constraint on the $y$-argument: The dative argument ($y$) must be the one to whom the external argument ($x$) directs his/her wish and who is expected to realize the wished proposition ($z$). Consequently, the dative argument must be a potential agent who can initiate and control the wished event.
(22) $z$ (proposition) = $vP$ or $v*P$

Assumptions (20) and (21) are virtually the same as those shown in Shibatani (1978). Shibatani maintains that a *ni*-marked Wishee is an optional goal, and that it must be animate since otherwise the subject could not direct his/her wish to it. As discussed in section 3, agentivity rather than animacy is the relevant factor for the selection of a goal argument. Constraint (21), in this respect, is different from Shibatani’s. It should be noted that this semantic constraint is not on *ni*-case marking, but on the selection of a goal argument. Given (21), the deviancy/marginality of *ni*-marking on the Wishees in examples (6) and (10), repeated here as (23) and (24), respectively, is given a semantic account.

(23)a. Boku-wa [ame [-*ga / *-ni] hur] te hosī i.5
     I-TOP [rain[-NOM/ *-DAT] fall] wish PRES
     ‘I wish that it will rain.’

5 More precisely, the *ni*-marked Wishee must appear in the matrix clause and control PRO in the embedded vP. The same analysis holds for the other sentences in this paper.
(i) *Boku-wa ame[-ni] [v PRO1 hur] te hosī i.
   I-TOP rain[-DAT fall] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that it will rain.’
(ii) (Watasi-wa) Taro-o-ni [v*P PRO1 mado-o ake] te hosī i.
     (I-TOP) Taro-DAT [window-ACC open] wish PRES
     ‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

The questions that are posed at this point are: How is the emergence of PRO guaranteed?, or/and How does PRO receive Case? (The same questions arise in Shibatani’s analysis.) At present I have no idea how to answer these questions. I simply assume that when *te hosī* is a three-place predicate, it constructs a control configuration.
   I-TOP [this book {-NOM / *-DAT} sell.well] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that this book will sell well.’

(24)a. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {-ga / ??-ni} yuke ni humei-ni nar] te hosii.
         (I-TOP) [Taroo {-NOM / ??-DAT} missing-DAT become] wish PRES
      ‘I wish that Taro will get lost.’

b. (Watasi-wa) [Taroo {-ga / ??-ni} keisatsu-de zizyoo tyoosyu s-are] te hosii.
         (I-TOP) [Taroo {-NOM / ??-DAT} police-LOC interrogation do-PASS] wish PRES
      ‘I wish that Taro will be interrogated by the police.’

The ni-marked Wishee in each example is a goal argument selected by te hosii, and hence is subject to the semantic constraint in (21). The inanimate Wishees in (23) can never be agentive, rendering the sentences deviant. The animate Wishees in (24) may be OK, but it requires some unnatural situation to conform to (21): Taro should purposefully get lost or be interrogated by the police. The unnaturality degrades the acceptability of the sentences. However, since assumption (21) is a semantic requirement, the oddness of ni-marked Wishees can be alleviated by some appropriate context. The constraint on ni-marking of Wishees is thus obtained, given a slight modification of Shibatani’s observation.

Let us now turn to assumption (22). I assume that te hosii selects a (extended) verbal phrase as its argument. It will be a v*P if the heading verb is agentive, and a vP if it is not. In either case, the verbal phrase does not include any nominative assigner. The Wishee must be assigned nominative case by some assigner in the matrix clause, which I assume is T. The idea of long-distance case assignment is not new. In the EST/GB framework several linguists have proposed that the embedded clause may be reduced optionally; owing to this, an argument in the clause is assigned case by a case-assigner in the higher clause (e.g. Kuroda 1978, Takezawa 1987). My proposal is that the propositional phrase is not clausal in the first place.

One might suspect that the nonfinite complement of te hosii might be a TP rather than a vP/v*P. Even under the TP-embedding assumption, the Wishee will have to be assigned nominative case by matrix T. The discussion below continues to be the same even if we assume TP-embedding. I adopt vP/v*P-embedding merely because there is no apparent Tense head in the wished domain. In either case, the Wishee should be assigned nominative case by matrix T.

---

6 I do not adopt the idea that a stative predicate (hosii in this case) bears a case-assigning property for the reason provided in appendix B.

7 An anonymous reviewer has provided the following sentence as possible evidence for TP-embedding:

(i) **Kinoo** watasi-wa Hanako-ni [asu Tokyo-ni ik] te hosii katta.
   yesterday I-TOP Hanako-DAT [tomorrow Tokyo-DAT go] wish PAST
   ‘Yesterday I wished that Hanako would go to Tokyo tomorrow.’

The embedded and matrix predicates can be modified by different time adverbials. This kind of modification is not allowed in causative sentences:

(ii) **Kinoo** watasi-wa Hanako-ni [asu Tokyo-ni ik] ase ta.
   yesterday I-TOP Hanako-DAT [tomorrow Tokyo-DAT go] CAUS PAST
   ‘(Lit.) Yesterday I made Hanako go to Tokyo tomorrow.’

Does the acceptability of example (i) indicate that te hosii takes a TP-complement with an independent time specification? I do not believe that this may necessarily be the case because the grammaticality of (i) and (ii) can be given a semantic account. Let us first consider the deviance of example (ii). The major premise: The causing event is completed when the caused event takes place. Therefore, the use of past tense in (ii) suggests that the causing and caused events are both completed at the time of utterance. It generates a contradiction since the caused event is supposed to occur tomorrow. The deviance of (ii) thus follows. Let us then consider example (i). The temporal gap does not pose a problem since we normally desire that a wished event occur after we have made such a wish. The embedded proposition can thus include the future-time adverbial.
If the above assumption is adopted, matrix T assigns case to the Wishee across a vP or v*P boundary. According to Chomsky (2001, 2004, 2005, 2006), a v*P constitutes a cycle of computation (phase), but a vP does not. Following this line of argument, the problems raised in section 3.2 are paraphrased in syntactic terms as follows. Examples (18) and (19) are assigned structures as illustrated in (25) and (26), respectively:

(25)a. (Watasi-wa) \[vP\ ame-ga\ hur\] te hosio i.
b. (Watasi-wa) \[vP\ Taroo-ga\ keisatu-de\ zizyootyoosyu\ s-are\] te hosio i.
(26)a. *(Watasi-wa) \[v*P\ Taroo-ga\ mado-o\ ake\] te hosio i. (Taroo ≠ focus)
b. (Watasi-wa) \[v*P\ Taroo-ga\ mado-o\ ake\] te hosio i. (Taroo = focus)

In (25a, b), since the embedded proposition does not constitute a phase, matrix T can legitimately assign nominative case to the Wishee ame ‘rain’. In (26a), on the other hand, since the embedded proposition constitutes a phase, matrix T cannot assign nominative case to the Wishee Taroo. However, when the Wishee bears focus interpretation, it can be assigned nominative case, as shown in (26b).

Given this observation, then, it can be claimed that the acceptability of nominative marking is dependent on the presence/absence of a phase boundary between the probe (T) and the goal (a Wishee). To make this line of argument possible, it will be necessary to newly define a locality condition, i.e. phase-impenetrability condition (PIC). In the following sections, I provide a new PIC definition, and show how it accounts for the relevant data.

4.2. PIC and multiple Agree
As mentioned in section 1, the precise definition of PIC is far from being fixed. The general consensus is that at some point of derivation, Transfer applies to some part of a phase, and sends the part to the CI and SM interfaces. For minimal computation, the transferred unit will be forgotten and will be inaccessible for further computation. At this point, there arise two questions: (i) Which part of the phase is transferred?, (ii) When does Transfer apply? As shown in appendix A, assumptions have changed in the course of inquiry.

Given below is a new, simple definition of PIC. My proposal is to follow what Chomsky assumes in 2001 in a strictly literal sense:

(27) Ph₁ is interpreted/evaluated at Ph₂. (Chomsky 2001:14)

Transfer is an operation that sends some unit to the interfaces in which the unit is interpreted/evaluated. If we literally interpret (27), Transfer applies to the entire phase when the next higher phase is completed. (As a matter of course, the last phase, i.e. matrix CP, is transferred without waiting for the next higher phase to be completed.) Let us consider what locality is like if we adopt this postulate, using the following illustrative configurations:

(28)a. [#1 … Goal … ]
b. [α … (Probe) … [#1 … Goal … ]] (α ≠ phase)
c. [#2 … [#1 … Goal … ]]
d. *[β … Probe … [#2 … [#1 … Goal … ]] (β ≠ phase)

Suppose that when a phase (#1) is completed, a goal remains with its [–Interpretive] feature unvalued, as in (28a). Transfer does not apply at this point. When the next higher phase is under construction, as in (28b), a probe in the higher phase can see into the lower phase and agree with a goal there. When the phase is
completed, Transfer applies to the lower phase, rendering it inaccessible to further syntactic computation. The shade in (28c) indicates that the phase has been transferred and is now invisible. If the third phase being constructed contains a probe, it is unable to agree with the goal in the lowest phase, as in (28d).

Although Chomsky (2005: fn.24) seems to consider the “next higher phase” notion an unnecessary complication to be dispensed with, there is at least one conceptual advantage of maintaining (27): we can dispense with the “complement domain” notion. A phase is, in a literal sense, a cycle of derivation and interpretation.

In addition, I assume, following Chomsky (2005:9), that “the probe agrees with goals in its domain as far as a goal with no unvalued features, which blocks further search (intervention).” Multiple Agree, whatever its definition may be, seems indispensable to the explanation of multiple nominative constructions in Japanese (cf. Kuno 1973, Kuroda 1988, Vermeulen 2005):

(29)a.  \[\text{Zoo}_1\text{-ga} \text{ NP}_1 \text{ hana}\text{-ga} \text{ nagi.} \]
    \[\text{elephant-NOM [ nose]-NOM long PRES} \]
    ‘An elephant’s nose is long.’

b.  Ano mise\text{-ga} hon\text{-ga yoku ure ru.}
    that shop-NOM book-NOM well sell PRES
    ‘Books sell well at that shop.’

Let us proceed with these two assumptions, i.e. a new PIC definition and multiple Agree, and see how well they account for the relevant data.

4.3. The relation between nominative case and focus interpretation

Given the discussion thus far, it is predicted that a successful Agree relation between T and a Wishee should be like the one shown in (30a), but Agree fails in such configuration as demonstrated in (30b).

(30)a.  \([\text{TP} \ T \ ... \ [#2 \ ... \ Wishee \ ... \ [#1 \ ... \ ]] \]

b.  \[*[\text{TP} \ T \ ... \ [#2 \ ... \ [#1 \ ... \ Wishee \ ... \ ]] \]

Either (30a) or (30b) involves two completed phases, #1 and #2. The lower phase #1 has been transferred to the interfaces. The higher phase #2 is yet to be transferred. In (30a), the Wishee in #2 is visible to computation. Hence, T agrees with the Wishee and assigns it nominative case. In (30b), on the other hand, the Wishee in #1 is transferred when #2 is completed and becomes inaccessible from outside #2. Hence, T cannot agree with the Wishee. In this configuration, the Wishee cannot be marked with nominative case.

Bearing this in mind, let us consider cases in which [–focus] Wishees are marked with nominative case. Examples (25a, b) and (26a) are repeated here as (31a-c), with the addition of relevant structural information:

(31)a.  \([\text{TP} \ v^*p \ (watasi-wa) \ v_p \ ame\text{-ga} \ hur] \text{ te hosi } \text{T(i)}. \]
    \[#1 \]

b.  \([\text{TP} \ v^*p \ (watasi-wa) \ v_p \ Taroo\text{-ga} \ keisatu-de \ zizyootyoosyu \ s\text{-are}] \text{ te hosi } \text{T(i)}. \]
    \[#1 \]

c.  \[*[\text{TP} \ v^*p \ (watasi-wa) \ v_p \ Taroo\text{-ga} \ mado\text{-o ake}] \text{ te hosi } \text{T(i)}. \]
    \[#2 \ #1 \]
When the embedded verb is unaccusative (as in (31a)) or passivized (as in (31b)), its extended verbal projection is a vP, which is not a phase. The vP is selected by the matrix predicate *te hosī*, which is associated with v* and constitutes a v*P phase. When the v*P is merged to T, as in (31a, b), nothing has been transferred to the interfaces. Therefore, T can agree with the Wishee in the embedded vP (i.e. *ame ‘rain’ in (31a) and *Taro in (31b)), assigning each of them a nominative value.

On the other hand, when the embedded verb is agentive (as in (31c)), the verb constitutes a v*P phase. The v*P is selected by *te hosī*, which also constitutes another v*P phase. When the higher phase (#2) is completed, the lower phase (#1) has to be transferred to the interfaces. After the Transfer, the matrix v*P is merged to T. Since T cannot see into the embedded v*P phase, Agree (T, Wishee) does not hold, and the Wishee never receives nominative case.

Let us then consider why example (31c) becomes legitimate when the Wishee bears focus interpretation. It is widely observed that a focus phrase undergoes syntactic movement of some kind (e.g. Horvath (1986) and Kiss (1998) for Hungarian; Rizzi (1997) for Italian; Uriagereka (1999) for Basque; Yanagida (1996a, b) and Miyagawa (1997) for Japanese; Bošković (1998) for Serbo-Croatian; Kim 1997 for Korean; Kobayashi (2001) for English).

When focalized, then, *Taro in (31c) should undergo movement to the position in which focus interpretation is assigned. The movement may be overt or

---

8 An anonymous reviewer observes that not all passives can be selected by *te hosī*. The following example is provided by the reviewer:

I wish that a new Tokyo tower will be designed by XXX.

I suspect that the deviance might be semantic. The following example, which is minimally different from example (i) in that it contains another passive verb, is completely acceptable.

I wish that a new Tokyo tower will be designed and made public by XXX.

The contrast in grammaticality might be explained as follows. When the subject wishes something, s/he usually bears an image of the wished eventuality in mind. In other words, s/he is aware of what it will be like when the wished event is realized. Example (i) might be odd since it is difficult to have a clear image of the wish: a situation in which the designing is being done. (Of course, the subject may have an image in which someone is designing a new Tokyo tower, but the wished eventuality should then be expressed in active voice.) Regarding example (ii), the image will be easier to obtain: a situation in which the designing has been done and appeared in newspapers, for example.

9 Here, “focus” does not mean new information. Unlike information focus, syntactic focus asserts that (A) the said sentence is true and (B) the proposition made by replacing the focus with any other (contextually-available) entity is false. I illustrate the difference using the following examples. Suppose that each sentence is given as an answer to the question “Did you watch TV yesterday?”:

(i) *Kinoo-wa nyusu-o mi ta.* (information focus)
Yesterday-I watch news-ACC watch PAST
‘Yesterday I watched a news show.’

(ii) *Kinoo-wa nyusu-sika mi na katta.* (exhaustive focus)
Yesterday-I watch news-only watch NEG PAST
‘Yesterday I watched only a news show.’

(iii) *Kinoo-wa nyusu-wa mi ta.* (contrastive focus)
Yesterday-I watch news-FOC watch PAST
‘Yesterday I watched a NEWS SHOW (but not the other(s)).’

In (i), *nyusu ‘news’ is the focus of the sentence since it is new information. What is new is determined against the context in which the sentence appears. Information focus does not bear logical entailment of the (B)-type; The speaker may have watched some other TV program. In (ii) and (iii), on the other hand, *nyusu*, occurring with a syntactic focus marker, yields an implication of the (B)-type. (ii) entails that the speaker did not watch any other TV programs, and (iii) entails that the speaker did not watch the other programs which s/he was supposed to watch. It is foci of (ii) and (iii) types that undergo syntactic movement. See Kiss (1998) for a more detailed discussion on information and identificational foci.
covert. I leave this open since it has little relevance to the present discussion. I just assume that a focus phrase undergoes movement at some point of derivation. Given this assumption, let us consider how the Wishee (Taroo) receives nominative case when it bears focus interpretation. Suppose that (32a) is constructed at some point of derivation:

(32)a. \[v_P (\text{watasi}) \quad [v_P \text{Taroo mado-o ake}] \text{ te hosi } ]

b. \[v_P (\text{watasi}) \quad \text{Taroo}_1 \quad [v_P t_1 \text{ mado-o ake}] \text{ te hosi } ]

c. \[TP \quad [v_P (\text{watasi}) \quad \text{Taroo}_1 \quad [v_P t_1 \text{ mado-o ake}] \text{ te hosi } ] \text{T(i)}. \]

\text{Taroo, to be interpreted as a focus, must be shifted to the higher phase before the lower v*P phase is transferred to the interfaces. After the movement and Transfer of the lower v*P, (32b) is obtained. The higher v*P is then merged to T, as in (32c), and in this configuration, T legitimately agrees with Taroo, assigning it nominative case. Consequently, the agentive Wishee, which is normally contained in the lower edge position and hence resists nominative-case marking, can be marked with nominative when it bears focus interpretation, i.e. when it moves out of the lower phase.}

A note is in order. One might claim that the suggested analysis would wrongly rule in (31c), if we assume that the Wishee should move to a higher phase, as shown in (32), in order to get its [Case]-feature valued and deleted. It seems unlikely, though. For reasons that are as yet unclear, an unvalued [Case]-feature does not trigger movement to the edge position, deriving an A-A’-A chain (cf. Chomsky’s (1973) “Improper movement”; Rizzi’s (1990) Relativized Minimality; Epstein and Seely’s (2006) ban on successive A-movement). Taroo in (32b, c) is moved to the edge position, but not for Case. The trigger of movement is a [focus]-feature of Taroo, and nominative assignment occurs as a by-product.

To sum up, we can explain why we have such case-marking rules as in (17), repeated here as (33).

(33)a. \([-\text{agentive}] \quad \text{Wishee} \quad \Rightarrow -ga \\

b. \[+\text{agentive}, -\text{focus}] \quad \text{Wishee} \quad \Rightarrow -ni \\

c. \[+\text{agentive}, +\text{focus}] \quad \text{Wishee} \quad \Rightarrow -ni \text{ or } -ga \]

10 In the framework of Chomsky (1995), “covert movement is restricted to feature movement” (p.265). This, however, is denied in Chomsky (2000): “[F]eatures cannot move or be attracted” (p.119). At this point of time, therefore, no covert movement is allowed. Although in Chomsky (2004) it is maintained that features cannot move, covert movement is revived: “[I]nternal Merge can apply either before or after TRANSFER, …  The former case yields overt movement, the latter case covert movement, …” (p.111).

11 The “edge” position may either be outer or inner SPEC of a probe (cf. Chomsky 2004, 2006). I do not decide which. The order between the external argument \text{watasi} ‘I’ and the raised focus phrase Taroo in (32b, c) may be reversed.

12 Several researchers have proposed an analysis in which Case-movement occurs across the phase boundary, and hence via an edge position. Tanaka (2002) and Kiguchi (2006) are examples of such researchers. See Takano (2003) for an argument against long-distance Case-movement.

13 This is reminiscent of the explanation that Chomsky (2005) provides for the contrast in grammaticality between the following examples:

(i) *It was the CAR \[CP \] of which C \[TP \] the driver T \[v_P t \] caused a scandal].

(ii) It is the car \[CP \] of which C \[TP \] the driver T-is likely \[TP t \] to \[v_P t \] cause a scandal]

(adapted from Chomsky 2005:20))

According to Chomsky (2005), the edge-feature on C attracts a wh-phrase in its merged position. C can see \textit{the driver of which} in SPEC-v*, but not \textit{of which}. Hence, the extraction as in (i) does not occur. In (ii), however, the extraction is legitimate. The difference between (i) and (ii) is that in the latter \textit{the driver of which} passes through SPEC of the infinitive TP in the course of A-movement. Chomsky (2005:20) claims that “along the way, the edge-feature of C extracts the PP complement and raises it to SPEC-C, with no deep search required because no phase boundaries are crossed.” To put differently, the extraction of \textit{of which} becomes possible as a by-product of successive A-movement. My proposal is in the opposite direction, but in the same vein: nominative-case assignment becomes possible as a by-product of successive A’-movement.
First, the *ni*-marked Wishee is a goal selected by *te hosî*. The selection of the goal is not constrained in syntax, but in semantics. Since the subject directs his/her wish to the Wishee and expects the Wishee to act as wished, only potentially [+agentive] entities are appropriate. Consequently, [–agentive] Wishees do not appear with *ni*-case. Second, the wished proposition is realized as a vP or a v*P. An unaccusative or passive verb constitutes a vP, whereas an agentive verb constitutes a v*P. Since a vP is not a phase, T can see into the vP and agree with the highest, internal argument in the vP. Hence [–agentive] Wishees can be *ga*-marked. On the other hand, an embedded v*P constitutes a phase and becomes inaccessible from matrix T. Hence T cannot agree with the highest argument in the embedded v*P, i.e. the [+agentive] DP. Consequently, [+agentive] Wishees cannot be *ga*-marked. The situation changes when a [+agentive] Wishee bears focus interpretation. The Wishee undergoes focus movement to the position to which focus interpretation is assigned. Along the way, the Wishee becomes visible from matrix T. Hence, [+agentive, +focus] Wishees can be *ga*-marked.

5. Further consequences
This section considers further empirical evidence for the suggested analysis. First, I observe that a [+agentive, −focus] Wishee can be marked with -*ga* if it undergoes another type of syntactic movement. This fact is predicted in the suggested analysis. Second, I take up o-*ga* conversion in *te hosî* constructions. It is shown that the suggested analysis correctly predicts when o-*ga* conversion is allowed and when such conversion is not allowed. Third, I take up obligatory focus movement in *te hosî* sentences. As was observed in section 3.1, the focus phrase needs to precede the Wishee in some cases, but not in others. The suggested analysis provides a simple account for this fact. Fourth, I discuss focus reading in sentences that include more than one *ga*-phrase. It is well known that the first *ga*-phrase in multiple subject constructions is often understood as focus. The suggested analysis accounts for why this is the case and why this does not hold in some cases.

5.1. When a [+agentive, −focus] Wishee can be marked with nominative
If the discussion thus far is on the right track, we can make the following prediction. Focus movement is only one way to move out of an embedded v*P phase. It is therefore expected that a [+agentive, −focus] Wishee can be assigned nominative case as well if it undergoes another type of movement. Let us consider Quantifier Raising (QR) as an example.

(34)a. *(Watasi-wa) [v*P Taroo-*ga* mado-o ake] te hosî i. (Taroo ≠ focus)
   (I-TOP) [Taroo-NOM window-ACC open] wish PRES
   ‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

b.  (Watasi-wa) [vP dareka-*ga* mado-o ake] te hosî i. (dareka ≠ focus)
   someone-NOM
   ‘I wish that someone will open the window.’

In (34a), the [+agentive] Wishee (*Taroo*) cannot be assigned nominative case since it is in the embedded v*P phase, hence invisible from matrix T. The sentence becomes legitimate if *Taroo* is replaced with *dareka* ‘someone’, as in (34b). The existential quantifier is not a focus when it lacks specific reading. Example (34b) thus indicates that a [+agentive, −focus] Wishee can be assigned nominative.

The assignment of nominative case in (34b) proceeds as follows. *Dareka* undergoes QR at some point of the derivation (overtly or covertly), moving out of the embedded v*P phase. In the final or intermediate landing position, the matrix T agrees with *dareka*, assigning it a nominative value.
5.2. O-ga conversion in te hosi constructions

Te hosi constructions allow another possible case frame. According to Saeki (1989) and Morita (1989), the internal argument of the wished event may be marked with -ga.

(35) (Watasi-wa) kimi-ni [hon{-o/-ga} yom] te hosi i.
(I-TOP) you-DAT [book{-ACC/-NOM} read] wish PRES
‘I wish that you will read a book.’ (Saeki 1989:129)

(36) [Dokosoko-no ozyoosan-ga ki te iru yoona huku-ga kaw] te hosi i.
[such.and.such.a.place-GEN young.lady-NOM wear PRES like dress-NOM buy] wish PRES
‘I wish that (someone) will buy me such a dress as the young lady of such and such a family wears.’
(Jun-Ichiro Tanizaki, Chiisana ookoku [Little kingdom]; cited in Morita 1989:1032)

In (35), the Wishee kimi ‘you’ is marked with -ni. The internal argument of the embedded predicate yom ‘read’ (i.e. hon ‘book’) may be marked with either -o or -ga. In (36), the Wishee is not expressed overtly. In this case, too, the internal argument of kaw ‘buy’ (i.e. dokosoko-no … huku ‘such a dress as the young lady of such and such a family wears’) may be marked with either -o or -ga. Apparently the o-ga conversion poses a problem for the suggested analysis. Since either embedded predicate is agentive and hence constitutes a v*P phase, T cannot agree with and assign nominative case to the internal argument in the lower v*P. It is illustrated schematically in (37).

(37)a. \[TP [v*P (watasi-wa) kimi$_1$-ni [v*P PRO$_1$ [hon-ga yom]] te hosi] T(i)]
     Agree*

     b. \[TP [v*P (pro$_1$) [v*P (pro$_2$) [dokosoko-no … huku-ga kaw]] te hosi] T(i)]
     Agree*

However, a closer look at the data reveals that the case-converted objects bear focus interpretation. This is attested by the fact that the nominative object cannot occur with a focus phrase, as shown in (38).

(38)a. *(Watasi-wa) kimi-ni [nitiyoo-ni-sika hon-ga yom] te hosi ku nai.
     (I-TOP) you-DAT [Sunday-on-only book-NOM read] wish NEG
     ‘I wish that you read books only on Sunday.’

     b. *(Watasi-wa) kimi-ni [nitiyoo-ni-dake hon-ga yom] te hosi i.
     (I-TOP) you-DAT [Sunday-on-only book-NOM read] wish PRES
     ‘I wish that you read books only on Sunday.’

As pointed out in section 3.1, a clause cannot contain more than one focus. Therefore, the contrast in grammaticality between (35) and (38a, b) indicates that the object hon ‘book’ can be assigned nominative case only when it bears focus interpretation.

Given that the case-converted object is a focus, the nominative marking in (35) is given a simple account. Suppose that the derivation has reached the following configuration:

(39) \[v*P (watasi) kimi$_1$-ni [v*P PRO$_1$ hon yom] te hosi]$_{14}$

\[14\] I assume that the accusative-assigning property of the embedded verb is optionally absorbed by te hosi. Optional case-absorption is observed in other constructions as well, where the matrix predicate is [+stative]. Two of them are exemplified below:
When the higher v*P phase is completed, the lower v*P phase is transferred and becomes inaccessible for further computation. If the object hon ‘book’ bears a [focus]-feature, it must move to the higher phase before Transfer takes place. Suppose that the object has been shifted, and T is merged to matrix v*P, forming the following configuration:

(40)  \[ TP \[ v*P \text{(watasi)} \text{kimi}_{1}\text{-ni} \text{hon}_{2} \[ v*P PRO_{1}\text{t}_{2} \text{yom} \text{te hosi}] \text{T(i)} \] \]

T agrees with the shifted object hon, assigning it a nominative value. O-ga conversion of the embedded object is thus allowed as long as it bears focus interpretation.

The suggested analysis correctly predicts that o-ga conversion is impossible when there is a nominative [+agentive] Wishee. The relevant example is given below:

(41)  *(Watasi-wa) Taroo-ga hon-ga yom te hosi i.

(I-TOP) Taroo-NOM book-NOM read wish PRES
‘I wish that Taro will read this book.’

Both Taroo and hon must be foci and move out of the embedded v*P phase since otherwise T cannot agree with them. It is not possible, however, since a clause can contain only one focus. Example (41) is hence correctly excluded by the suggested analysis.

5.3. Obligatory focus movement in te hosi constructions
Recall that in section 3.1 I presented cases in which a focus phrase appears in the embedded v*P/vP. The relevant examples are repeated below:

(42)  *Demo gakuzyutusyo-sika kyooin-ga yom te hosi ku nai desu. (=14a))

but scholarly.book-only teacher-NOM read wish NEG POLITE
‘But I wish that teachers read nothing but scholarly books.’

(43)  Demo gakuzyutusyo-sika kyooin-ni yom te hosi ku nai desu. (=15a))

but scholarly.book-only teacher-DAT read wish NEG POLITE
‘But I wish that teachers read nothing but scholarly books.’

(44)  (Watasi-wa) Taroo-ga titioya-ni-sika sikar-rare te hosi ku nai desu. (=16a))

(I-TOP) Taroo-NOM father-by-only scold-PASS wish NEG POLITE
‘I wish that Taro will be scolded by nobody but his father.’

Notice that the focus objects in (42) and (43) have been shifted to the left of the Wishee. In the unmarked subject-object order, neither sentence would be acceptable:


The deviance of (42) and (45a) is expected since the nominative Wishee, which is a focus, cannot occur with another focus. At this point, it is necessary to find answers to the following two questions: Why is the dative Wishee in (45b), which need not be a focus, unable to occur with a focus? Why is the reversed order as in (43) necessary?

The suggested analysis accounts for the contrast as follows. In (45a) there exist two phase boundaries between the probe and the goal (the focus phrase), as illustrated in (46a). Thus, they cannot enter into an agreement relation. The agreement is possible if the focus phrase is moved out of the lower v*P phase, as in (46b). The obligatory movement of a focus phrase as observed in (43) is thus explained.

\[(46)\]

(a) \*Focus … [vP Subject \[vP Subject Object(focus) V] want]

(b) Focus … [vP Subject Object(focus) [vP Subject t V] want]

Let us now turn to example (44). Since the embedded vP is not a phase, there is only one phase boundary between the probe and the goal, as illustrated in (47). Therefore, the focus phrase can be licensed without movement.

\[(47)\]

\[Focus … [vP Subject \[vP Subject tito-iaka(focus) V] want]\]

To sum, the presence/absence of obligatory focus movement in te hosii constructions is given a straightforward account under the suggested locality constraint.

5.4 Exhaustive focus interpretation in multiple subject constructions

It was shown thus far that the [+agentive] nominative Wishee has to be an exhaustive focus. Example (48) entails that the subject wants Taro, but not anyone else, to open the window.

\[(48)\] (Watasi-wa) [Taroo-ga mado-o ake] te hosii. (Taroo = focus)

(I-TOP) [Taroo-NOM window-ACC open] wish PRES

‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

An anonymous reviewer suggested that this fact might have something to do with the focus interpretation observed in multiple subject constructions. Consider the following examples:

\[(49)\] Zaoo1-ga [e1 hana]-ga naga i. (zoo = focus)

elephant-NOM [nose]-NOM long PRES

‘An elephant’s nose is long.’

According to Kuno (1973), zoo ‘elephant’ is extracted out of the subject. Both DPs are assigned nominative since they are directly dominated by S (or since T agrees with both of them). In this configuration, the first nominative DP (zoo) bears exhaustive focus interpretation. From the observation of (48) and (49), therefore, one might assume that the occurrence of two nominative phrases should somehow be related to focus interpretation.

It should be noted, however, that there are differences between the two types of constructions. First, in (48) it is the second nominative phrase that bears focus reading, while in (49) it is the first nominative
phrase. Second, in (48) the nominative Wishee (Taroo) is understood to be a focus regardless of whether or not the matrix subject (watasi ‘I’) is marked with the topic -wa.\textsuperscript{15} In contrast, if zoo is marked with -wa, sentence (49) need not bear focus interpretation. Third, the multiple occurrence of nominative does not necessarily result in focus reading in \textit{te hosî} constructions. Consider the following example:

(50) (Watasi-wa) [ame-ga hur] te hosî i. (ame ≠ focus)
     (I-TOP) [rain-NOM fall] wish PRES
     ‘I wish that it will rain.’

The nominative Wishee (ame ‘rain’) need not be a focus when the embedded proposition is ergative.

In the suggested analysis, the similarity and the differences between the \textit{te hosî} and multiple subject constructions follow straightforwardly. That is, a DP is understood as a focus when it moves out of a phase. The locality relations between T and the Wishee/raised subject in (48), (49) and (50) are schematically shown in (51a), (51b), and (51c), respectively.

(51)a. T … [vP SUBJ\textsubscript{1} SUBJ\textsubscript{2} [vP t\textsubscript{2} … ] te hosî] # #
    b. T … [vP SUBJ\textsubscript{1} [DP t\textsubscript{1} SUBJ\textsubscript{2} … ] # #
    c. T … [vP SUBJ\textsubscript{1} [vP SUBJ\textsubscript{2} … ] te hosî] #

In (51a), SUBJ\textsubscript{2} (Wishee) undergoes focus movement, as a result of which it becomes visible from T. Without the movement the Wishee would not be marked with nominative case. Hence the Wishee bears focus reading. In (51b), it is SUBJ\textsubscript{1} (raised subject) that undergoes focus movement. Without movement, T cannot see into the subject DP and agree with SUBJ\textsubscript{1}.\textsuperscript{16} In (51c), since the embedded vP is not a phase, T can agree with SUBJ\textsubscript{2} in situ. The nominative Wishee, remaining in situ, need not be a focus.

Under the suggested analysis, nominative assignment in (51a, b) becomes possible as a result of focus movement. It is not nominative marking or nominative position that is responsible for focus interpretation.\textsuperscript{17} We have already observed from the contrast between (48) and (50) that the multiple occurrence of nominative phrases in \textit{te hosî} constructions does not always result in focus reading. The same is true for multiple subject constructions. Consider the following examples:

(52)a. Taroo-ga otoosan-ga daiku da. (Taroo = focus)
     Taroo-NOM father-NOM carpenter COP
     ‘Taro’s father is a carpenter.’

\textsuperscript{15} In stative sentences, the first subject is often marked with -wa. It is assumed that watasi-wa bears nominative Case, but it is not morphologically realized when the topic marker -wa is associated with it.

\textsuperscript{16} Several linguists have claimed that (at least some) DPs constitute a phase. See, for example, McGinnis (2000) and Chomsky (2006).

\textsuperscript{17} This assumption is made by Saito (1982). According to Saito, nominative DPs are base-generated in their surface positions, which are optionally mapped to focus interpretation. Since the mapping is optional, his analysis is unable to predict when, and when not, focus reading will be obligatory.

Saito also deals with nominative objects in potential constructions. I leave it open how the suggested analysis can account for nominative objects, though I briefly touch upon a possible analysis in appendix B.
b. **Dareka-ga** otoosan-ga daiku da.  \[*dareka ≠ focus*

someone-NOM

‘Someone’s father is a carpenter.’

Whereas *Taroo* in (52a) is obligatorily understood to be a focus, *dareka* ‘someone’ in (52b) is not. The suggested analysis explains this contrast as follows. The relevant structure is provided in (51b). Since there are two phase boundaries, T cannot agree with SUBJ₁ in its merged position. However, when SUBJ₁ moves out of the lower phase DP for some reason, the agreement becomes possible. In (52a), the feature that drives *Taroo* out of the subject DP must be a [focus]-feature. Hence, the raised subject *Taroo*-ga must be understood to be a focus. In (52b), on the other hand, *dareka* ‘someone’ undergoes QR out of the subject DP even if it does not bear a [focus]-phrase. Then, T can agree with *dareka*, assigning nominative case to it. Therefore, the raised subject need not be understood to be a focus.

6. Conclusion

In this paper I proposed a new analysis of *te hosí* constructions. *Te hosí* selects a v*P* or a vP. Since the full projection of an agentive verb is a v*P*, which is a phase, the [+agentive] Wishee cannot be assigned nominative case from matrix T. On the other hand, a non-agentive verb does not form a phase. Hence the [−agentive] Wishee can be assigned nominative case from matrix T. We also observed that even a [+agentive] Wishee can be marked with nominative if it bears focus interpretation or if it is another type of quantifier. This fact is accounted for as well in a straightforward way. Such a Wishee undergoes scopal movement out of the embedded v*P* phase. Along the way it becomes visible from matrix T, receiving nominative case from T. Moreover, I showed that the suggested analysis accounts for other properties of *te hosí* constructions as well in a straightforward way.

In the course of discussion, I introduced a new definition for locality. That is, a phase is transferred to the interfaces when the next higher phase is completed. The transferred phase then becomes invisible. The new definition may involve a complex notion “the next higher phase,” but it can instead dispense with another complex notion “the complement domain.” It should be resolved in the course of inquiries which is empirically more adequate.

Appendix A: What becomes invisible? When? How?

This appendix reviews how a locality condition (phase-impenetrability condition, PIC) has been formulated in Chomsky’s recent papers. The citations below reveal that the formulation of PIC has been modified several times in the course of inquiries. When PIC was first mentioned in Chomsky (2000: 108), the complement domain of a phase is not accessible from outside of the phase:

(1)  *Phase-Impenetrability Condition*

In phase \(\alpha\) with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside \(\alpha\), only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

The assumption was referred to in Chomsky (2001: 13) as well:

(2)  YP [the complement of a phase] is spelled out at the level of HP [the phase].

However, Chomsky (2001: 14) suggested another possible derivational flow:

(3)a. Ph₁ is interpreted/evaluated at Ph₂.

b. *PIC*: The domain of H is not accessible to operations at ZP; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations. \([HP, ZP = strong phases]\)
c. The probe $T$ can access an element of the domain $YP$ [complement] of $HP$ [the lower phase].

The complement domain of a phase is inaccessible only from the phase head of the next higher phase. I illustrate the difference between Chomsky (2000) and Chomsky (2001) using the following example:

\[(4) \quad [TP \ldots [v^*P \text{DP-DAT} [v^* [v^*_P V \text{DP-NOM}]]]]\]

In Chomsky (2000), when the $v^*_P$ phase is completed, its complement domain $VP$ is transferred and becomes invisible. Hence $T$ cannot agree with the DP inside the VP and assign nominative to it. It thus predicts that the nominative object is not allowed unless the object moves out of the VP. In Chomsky (2001), on the other hand, the VP is transferred at the next higher phase, i.e. CP. Since $C$ is not merged yet in (4), the VP is still accessible. Hence $T$ can assign nominative to the object DP in situ (if the agreement is not blocked by any intervener).

Chomsky (2004: 18) seems to maintain the idea of Chomsky (2001):

\[(5)\]
\[\begin{align*}
&\text{a. At the phase ZP containing phase HP, … The domain of H is not accessible to operations, but only the edge of HP.} \\
&\text{b. T can access Quirky NOM object within vP, …}
\end{align*}\]

A lower phase is not transferred until the next higher phase is introduced. Hence, $T$ can search for an element in the complement domain of the lower phase.

The “next higher phase” notion, however, is given up in Chomsky (2005) (see section 4.2). According to Chomsky (2005: 9) (and Chomsky (2006) as well), only phase heads can be probes. $T$ can be a probe since it inherits relevant features from $C$.

It is also natural to expect that along with Transfer, all other operations will also apply at the phase level, as determined by the label/probe.

Since the “next higher phase” notion is dispensed with, and Transfer applies at the phase level, Transfer should apply to the complement domain of a phase at the point where the phase is completed. In this sense, the explanation has returned to the original one provided by Chomsky (2000). PIC is formulated in terms of Transfer:

\[(6)\] For minimal computation, as soon as the information is transferred it will be forgotten, not accessed in subsequent stages of derivation … Working that out, we try to formulate a phase-impenetrability condition PIC, … . (p.9)

Oddly enough, though, Chomsky (2005) seemingly assumes that PIC is violable. According to Chomsky (2005), Agree ($T$, DP-NOM) is illegitimate in Icelandic in a configuration like (4), since “probe into an earlier phase will almost always be blocked by intervention effects” (p.9). The agreement violates PIC as well, but the violation does not pose a problem. If the DP-DAT is displaced by A-movement and ceases to be an intervener, the configuration, still in violation of PIC, leads to an acceptable sentence.

It may be, then, that PIC holds only for the mapping to the interface, with the effects for narrow syntax automatic. (p.10)

It is not clear to me how a transferred, “forgotten” unit is still accessible to computation and what PIC (and Transfer) is for if it is ignorable at all.

As shown by the brief review of PIC thus far, the formulation of PIC is far from being fixed, and each modification is not necessarily for descriptive adequacy, or for precision. PIC, like other constraints, may be defined in several different ways in terms of SMT, and the best one should be selected in the course of inquiries.

Before closing this appendix, I illustrate how each PIC predicts as to the grammaticality of the following te hosi sentences.
Constraints on nominative-case marking in *te hosi* constructions

(9a) \[TP[vP (watasi-wa) [vp ame-ga hur] v] te hosi] T (i)\]

(I-TOP) rain-NOM fall wish PRES

‘I wish that it will rain.’

b. \[TP[vP (watasi-wa) [vP Taroo-ga [vp mado-o ake] v*] te hosi] T(i)\]

(I-TOP) Taroo-NOM window-ACC open wish PRES

‘I wish that Taro will open the window.’

(10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9a)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9b)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chomsky (2000) excludes (9a). When the matrix v*P is formed, its complement domain becomes inaccessible from outside. Hence, T cannot assign nominative to *ame* ‘rain’. Chomsky (2001, 2004) wrongly rules in (9b). When the embedded v*P phase is completed, nothing is transferred. Transfer takes place at the level of the next higher phase, i.e. the matrix v*P. At that point, the complement domain of the lower phase, i.e. the embedded VP, is transferred. *Taro* is not transferred since it is outside of the VP. It is therefore predicted that T can agree with *Taro* and assign it a nominative value. In Chomsky (2005), both (9a) and (9b) violate PIC, as in Chomsky (2000). However, the violation of PIC is tolerable. Either sentence should be acceptable unless it violates another condition. The definition of PIC proposed in this paper correctly explains the grammaticality of (9a) and (9b). It does not give the suggested analysis any advantage over the other PIC proposals: it would be a circular account. Again, the best one should be determined empirically in the course of inquiries.

Appendix B: What is responsible for nominative assignment to non-subject arguments?

This article assumed that nominative is assigned exclusively by (finite) T. When a Wishee is marked with nominative case, matrix T should be the case assigner.

However, several researchers have claimed that non-subject arguments are assigned nominative case in a different manner. Roughly, there are three types of claims in previous analyses:

(1a) The T-assignment assumption: T assigns nominative to non-subject argument in some unusual way.
(E.g. Takezawa and Whitman 1998, Ura 2000, Mihara and Hiraiwa 2006)

b. The V-assignment assumption: Stative predicates assign nominative to its complement.

c. The hybrid assumption: T is lowered and attached to a stative verb, where T assigns nominative to the complement of T-V. (E.g. Takezawa 1987)

In the GB framework it has been a standard assumption that Case should be assigned by a Case-assigner under government. However, apparently T does not govern the object argument. To overcome this puzzle, we need to stipulate either a special kind of government for T or another nominative assigner for the object. The above assumptions are the result of such attempts.

The introduction of Agree, however, has driven this puzzle out of existence. Any argument can receive nominative in situ if it is visible from T (cf. Chomsky 2001, 2005; Woolford 2006). Under Agree theory, there is no reason to maintain the V-assignment or the hybrid assumptions any longer. This paper therefore assumes that T is the exclusive nominative assigner.

Recall that Agree is subject to PIC. In some cases, the object is not visible from T in its merged position, but it becomes visible after it undergoes some kind of A’-movement. We have already seen such cases in *te hosi*
constructions and multiple subject constructions. It might be reminiscent of Tada’s (1992) analysis of nominative objects in potential constructions. Tada claims that the nominative object undergoes movement into a higher VP domain, while the accusative object remains in the lower VP domain. Consider the following examples:

(2)a. Zyon-wa migi mimi-dake-o ugokas-e ru. (can > only, ?*only > can)
   Zyon-TOP right ear-only-ACC move-POSS PRES
   ‘John can move his right ear (without moving his left).’

b. Zyon-wa migi mimi-dake-ga ugokas-e ru. (*can > only, only> can)
   right ear-only-NOM
   ‘John can move his right ear (but not his left).’
   (Mihara and Hiraiwa 2006: 184)

In either sentence, the focus phrase (migi mimi-dake ‘only (his) right ear’) appears as object. According to Mihara and Hiraiwa (2006), if it is associated with accusative -o, the potential predicate -(r)e ‘can’ takes scope over the focus phrase, while the scope relation is reversed when the focus phrase is marked with nominative -ga. Tada’s explanation for this fact roughly goes as follows. The object gets its case checked in SPEC of AgrO, to which a case-assigning verb is adjoined. In potential constructions there are two possible Case-assigners for the object: the embedded V or the potential predicate. In the latter case the object moves to SPEC of the higher AgrO.

(3)a. …[AgroP [vP [AgroP OBJ-o … V] POSS] …

b. …[AgroP OBJ-ga [vP [AgroP … V] POSS] …

The scope interpretation is determined by c-command relations. Therefore, in (3a), the potential predicate takes scope over the accusative object, while in (3b) the nominative object takes scope over the potential predicate. The contrast in examples (2a, b) is thus explained in terms of longer-distance movement of the nominative object.

I do not discuss whether the nominative object really undergoes this kind of long-distance movement out of its original v*P in order to receive nominative case. What I want to stress for the suggested analysis is that the contrast in (2a, b) does not necessarily make an argument for the V-assignment assumption (1b). It can be dealt with by the T-assignment assumption as well. Mihara and Hiraiwa, for example, assign the following structure for the two kinds of potential sentences:

(4)a. [TP [vP SUBJ ga [vP PRO1 … OBJ-o V] POSS] T]

b. [TP [vP SUBJ ga OBJ-ga [vP PRO1 … pro2 … V] POSS] T]

The potential argument takes a v(‘*)P as its complement. In (4a) the object is assigned accusative case within the embedded v*P, thereby taking a narrow scope reading. In (4b), on the other hand, the object is base-generated in the higher vP as a proleptic phrase (cf. Takano 2003). The object is assigned nominative case by T, thereby taking a wide scope reading.
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