An adjunction is usually classified as an A'-movement. If this analysis is correct, it is expected that Scrambling induces WCO effects. At least apparently this prediction is not borne out, as shown in (155).

(155) a. \[\text{Do-no hon-o i} \] John-wa [\[pp Mary-ga ec yomo maeni\] ti yonda no read COMP 'Which book did John read? [before Mary read ec?]'] (Saito 1985:105 (107))

b. \[\text{Dare-o} \] [\[NP [S ec hitome ec mita] hito,-ga] ti sukininatta no who-ACC COMP COMP COMP 'Who did [the person that took a glance at him] fall in love with ti? ' (Hoji 1985:74 (80))

c. \[\text{Do-no hito-ni-mo i} \] John-ga [\[pp Mary-ga ec atta atode\] ti met after atta (koto) met fact 'Every person, John met ti [after Mary had met him].' (Hoji 1985:75 (82b))

d. \[\text{A-no yubiwa-sae-o} \] John-kara [\[s ec \{azukatta/kariteita\}\] that-GEN ring-even-ACC John-from asked to:keep borrowed gakusei,]-ga ti nakusita (koto) student- NOM lost fact '(Lit.) (the fact that) even that ring, [the student who was asked to keep/borrowed ec] lost ti.' (Hoji 1985:227 (32c))

In Saito & Hoji 1983, Saito 1985 and Hoji 1985, the examples in (155) are analyzed as a parasitic gap construction: that is to say, the configuration in (155) is assimilated to (156):

(156) \[\text{Which article}, \] did you file ti [without reading ec]? Since it is generally assumed that a parasitic gap is licensed only by an overt A'-movement, the observation in (155) is regarded as supporting the claim that Scrambling is an overt A'-movement.

To summarize: Saito 1985 argues (i) that the OS-type construction is derived by the movement of a DL—Scrambling—, and (ii) that Scrambling is an adjunction which is an A'-movement. (i) is supported by the observations of the subjacency effects and ‘proper binding violations’ (section A.4.1). (ii) is motivated by the fact that DLs can be stacked, and defended by claiming that the sentences in (155) are instances of the parasitic gap construction. We will see in section B.1.3 that Yoshimura 1992 argues against (ii), mainly by demonstrating that those in (155) are not instances of the parasitic gap construction.

B.1.2. Scrambling and Anti-scrambling: Kitagawa 1990

Kitagawa 1990 considers (as Saito 1985) that the OS-type construction can be derived by moving a DL—Scrambling—, but he argues that it can also be derived by what he calls Anti-scrambling. Let us see first how the two should be replaced with (i) below, to which an accusative-marker is added to it.

(i) \[\text{A-no yubiwa-sae-o} \] John-kara [\[s ec \{azukatta/kariteita\}\] that-GEN ring-even-ACC John-from asked to:keep borrowed gakusei,]-ga ti nakusita (koto) student-NOM lost fact '(Lit.) (the fact that) even that ring, [the student who was asked to keep/borrowed ec] lost ti.' (Saito 1985:112 (117))

Note that the observational generalization is not affected by this modification. 81

80 Saito 1985 argues that the 'reconstruction effects of Condition C violation' also support the claim that Scrambling is an A'-movement, but as discussed in section A.3.2 above, I consider it inappropriate to regard the observation in question as a basis for constructing a theory of Grammar.

81 More precisely, Kitagawa 1990 uses the terms 'scrambling' and 'anti-scrambling', without capitals. But I represent them with capitals in this thesis in order to indicate that they refer to specific operations.
operations are characterized in Kitagawa 1990.

On the one hand, Scrambling is considered to be an adjunction of a focus operator (Kitagawa 1990:16). The derivation is schematized in (157).

\[(157) \text{Scrambling:} \]
\[\text{a. D-structure:} \quad \text{NP-} \text{NOM \ NP-ACC/DAT \ V} \]
\[\text{b. S-structure/LF:} \quad \text{[NP-ACC/DAT]} \text{ \ NP-} \text{NOM \ ti \ V} \]

He claims that the NP moved by scrambling is necessarily interpreted as a focus, and usually (but not always) phonologically marked by stress.

On the other hand, he proposes that the OS-type construction can be base-generated as in (158a), and then transformed to (158b).

\[(158) \text{Anti-scrambling:} \]
\[\text{a. D-/S-structure:} \quad \text{NP-ACC/DAT \ NP-} \text{NOM \ V} \]
\[\text{b. LF:} \quad \text{NP-} \text{NOM \ NP-ACC/DAT \ V} \]

In (158), the nominative-marked NP is moved by Anti-scrambling without leaving a trace. It is assumed in Kitagawa 1990 that Anti-scrambling does not leave a trace because no principle requires its existence. According to his theory, Anti-scrambling is called for because the structure in (158a) would cause a 'Case conflict' if an abstract accusative Case is to be assigned to a nominative-marked NP. No NP is expected to be interpreted as focus in (158), since Scrambling is not involved in deriving this OS-type construction.

Schematically speaking, the PF and the LF representations resulted from Scrambling and Anti-scrambling coincide with the representations of the Deep and the Surface OS-type, respectively.

\[(159) \text{Scrambling:} \]
\[\text{PF:} \quad \text{NP-ACC/DAT (=DL) ... NP-} \text{NOM \ ... \ V} \]
\[\text{LF:} \quad \text{NP-ACC/DAT (=DL) ... NP-} \text{NOM \ ... \ V} \]

\[(160) \text{Anti-scrambling:} \]
\[\text{PF:} \quad \text{NP-ACC/DAT (=DL) ... NP-} \text{NOM \ ... \ V} \]
\[\text{LF:} \quad \text{NP-} \text{NOM \ NP-ACC/DAT (=DL) \ ... \ V} \]

82 Haig 1976 calls the operation which derives the scrambling construction as *Emphatic Fronting*, which implies that he considers that the marked word order has something to do with 'emphasis'. Saito 1985:section 3.1 also mentions that the scrambling construction is often requires a focus interpretation, especially in the case of the long distance scrambling construction.

83 Thus, Kitagawa 1990 has proposed the abolishment of the Projection Principle as early as 1990, as he explicitly argues in section 5.

84 (i) is an example which is discussed in Kitagawa 1990:section 4.1 regarding the property in (161b).

\[ \text{(i) [ec hahaoya]-o daremo-ga kokoro-kara aisiteiru (koto)} \]  
\[ \text{mother-ACC everyone-NOM heart-from love} \]  
\[ \text{Everyone sincerely loves his/her mother.} \]  
\[ \text{(Kitagawa 1990:31 (47a))} \]

Kitagawa 1990 describes the property of (i) by stating that such sentences "do not exhibit a Weak Crossover violation".
NP.

(164) Property of (160):
The DL cannot contain a name which is coreferential with the subject NP.

And this phenomenon provides empirical support for the claim that the long distance OS-type construction can only be derived in terms of Scrambling. As I have argued in section A.3.2, however, I do not consider that the nature of this phenomenon is understood enough so that an analysis can be constructed on the basis of it.

In contrast, the Deep and the Surface OS-type have the following properties under our analysis.

(58) Properties of the Deep OS-type:
- a. Wide scope reading of DL with respect to the subject
- b. Absence of WCO effects (18)

(59) Properties of the Surface OS-type:
- a. Narrow scope reading of DL with respect to the subject
- b. Reconstruction effects (23)
- c. Absence of Condition C violation (24)
- d. Reconstruction of a wh-phrase (28),(32)

I have demonstrated that there are syntactic environments in which the Deep OS-type is not allowed, including the long distance OS-type construction, and

that the property in (58a) is not observed there. This observation cannot be expressed under the analysis in Kitagawa 1990, because (i) the property (58a) is not ascribed to a particular derivation and (ii) those syntactic environments allow the application of Scrambling whose resulting representation (159) is not different from the Deep OS-type (3).86

Although I thus do not agree with Kitagawa 1990 in the analysis of the OS-type construction, it bears an important consequence regarding the SO-type construction. Since a D-structure such as in (158a) is allowed in his analysis, it is expected that a derivation such as in (165) is also possible, in which an SO-type construction is derived by the interaction of Scrambling and Anti-scrambling.

(165) 'SO-type-looking scrambling construction':
- a. D-structure:
  NP-ACC/DAT NP-NOM V
- b. S-structure (after scrambling NP-NOM):
  [NP-NOM], NP-ACC/DAT t_i V
- c. LF (after anti-scrambling of t_i):
  [NP-NOM], t_i NP-ACC/DAT V

According to Kitagawa 1990, (165) is marked when the nominative-marked NP is not focused/stressed, while it is not marked if the NP is focused/stressed. Kitagawa 1990:28 states as follows: "[m]ore likely than not, when we attempt to detect a higher scope reading of the universal quantifier in [(i)] \[∃-NOM ∀-ACC V\], our mind unconsciously attempts to associate the surface string of this sentence with an LF derivation that permits such an interpretation. While grammar does in fact permit such an LF derivation of [(i)], i.e., that in [(165) with QR taking place between (b) and (c)], this LF derivation must be associated with a PF representation which lacks the phonetic information to support it. Note that the subject NP in the PF representation of [(i)] is not accompanied by any focus intonation, and hence does not indicate that scrambling has actually applied in this sentence. This mismatch between LF and PF, we claim, enhances the markedness of the scope ambiguity in [(i)]." He thus argues that this analysis can account for the otherwise unexplained mysteries, i.e., why some speakers detect the properties of the OS-type construction (161) even in an SO-type construction, weakly without stress/focus

86 It is stated: "[w]hen scrambling is long-distance, this exhausts the possible analysis, and the preposed phrase is necessarily followed by a pause, and is unmistakably interpreted as a focus with at least a mild stress" (Kitagawa 1990:16). Compare (i) and (ii):

(i) Long distance Scrambling:
- a. D-structure:
  NP1-NOM \[NP2-NOM NP3-ACC/DAT V2 COMP\] V1
- b. S-structure/LF:
  [NP3-ACC/DAT], NP1-NOM \[NP2-NOM t_i V2 COMP\] V1

(ii) No long distance Anti-scrambling:
- a. D/S-structure:
  NP3-ACC/DAT NP1-NOM \[NP2-NOM V2 COMP\] V1
- b. unavailable LF for (ii-a):
  NP1-NOM \[NP2-NOM NP3-ACC/DAT V2 COMP\] V1

I interpret the quote above as saying that (ii) is not a possible option because the representation in (ii-b) cannot be derived by moving NP2-NOM in (ii-a). As far as the surface word order is concerned, however, it appears that (ii-b) can be derived by applying Anti-scrambling to both NP1-NOM and NP2-NOM in (ii-a), contrary to what is claimed in Kitagawa 1990. I suppose that he assumes that Anti-scrambling must be as local as A-movement.

87 It is assumed that there is no need for extrinsic ordering of operations at LF (or any other component), and hence, Anti-scrambling may take place after QR, which Kitagawa 1990 assumes to be constrained by the scope interpretation hypothesis proposed in Hoji 1985 (see (51) in section 2.3.2 above).
and clearly with stress/focus.

The following examples are provided in Kitagawa 1990 to support this claim.

(166) Scope ambiguity in the focused/stressed SO-type construction:

DAREKA-GA  daremo-o  aisiteiru
someone-NOM  everyone-ACC  love

'SOMEONE loves everyone.'

∃y[∀x[ x loves y ]]
∀x[∃y[ x loves y ]]
(Kitagawa 1990:9 (13a))

cf. Dareka-ga  daremo-o  NANTO  SIBATTESSIMATTA
someone-NOM  everyone-ACC  surprisingly  roped

'Surprisingly someone ROPED everyone.'

∃y[∀x[ x roped y ]]
*∀x[∃y[ x roped y ]]
(Kitagawa 1990:29 (44b))

(167) BVA in the focused/stressed SO-type construction:

a. [ ec  HAHAOYA]-GA  daremo-o  kokoro-kara  aisiteiru  (koto)
mother-NOM  everyone-ACC  heart-from  love

'(Lit.) HIS/HER MOTHER sincerely loves everyone.'

b. [ ec  ec  AISITEIRU  HITO]-GA  daremo-o  tuneni  kabau
love  person-NOM  everyone-ACC  always  try:to:protect

to-wa  kagiranai.
COMP-TOP  not:necessarily:the:case

'(Lit.) It is not necessarily the case that THE ONE WHO LOVES HIM/HER always tries to protect everyone.'

(Kitagawa 1990:31 (46))

(168) Quantifier floating in the focused/stressed SO-type construction:

a. (Kodomo-zyanakute)  OTONA-GA  biidama-o  huta-ri
child-not  adult-NOM  marble-ACC  2-person

kaimasita yo
bought

'bought PARTICLE

'Not kids, but two adults bought marbles.'

b. (Zyosigakusei-zyanakute)  DANSIGAKUSEI-GA  tyokoreeto-o

Not three female students, but three male students gave me chocolate.'

(Kitagawa 1990:38 (58a,b))

I more or less agree with his judgment that (166) can be ambiguous and that (167) and (168) can be acceptable. But I am not certain if the existence of stress/focus plays a crucial role in obtaining the relevant judgment. Notice that (166) uses daremo 'everyone', and we have seen in section 2.3.1 that the wide scope reading regarding such a QP does not necessarily depend on the structure. Similarly (167) can be an instance of 'quirky binding' to be discussed in Appendix D, and it is demonstrated there that the apparent BVA reading is not constrained by the familiar c-command requirement. (168) might indicate (94)-(95) mentioned above, if we are to assume that a floating quantifier has to be generated in an adjacent/local position of the related NP.

(94) The PF movement crossing the Deep DL is allowed only marginally.

(95) 'SO-type-looking Deep OS-type':

PF: NP- NOMj  NP-ACC (=Deep DL)  ...  tJ  ...  ecJ  ...
LF: NP-ACC (=Deep DL)  OpJ  NP-NOM  ...  tJ  ...

But I do not pursue this possibility in this work, mainly because the relevant empirical facts are not yet very clear to me.


Let us move on to Yoshimura 1992, who argues, contrary to Saito 1985, that Scrambling should be characterized as an A-movement.

Recall that the substantial part of the arguments in Saito 1985 that Scrambling is an A'-movement is (i) that it can be stacked, and (ii) that it licenses the parasitic gap construction.

Regarding (i), Yoshimura 1992 adopts the theory proposed in Kuroda 1988, in which it is assumed that there can be multiple specifier positions in Japanese. Thus, each nominative-marked NP in (169) can be located in the IP-spec position according to this theory.88

(169) Multiple nominative-marked NP construction:

Bunmeikoku-ga  dansei-ga  heikin-zyumyoo-ga  mizikai.
civilized:country-NOM  male-NOM  average-life:span-ACC  short

88 See section B.2.1 for the brief summary of Kuroda's theory.
Since a Deep DL undergoes movement in Saito's analysis, it also suffer from the problem pointed out in section 2.5.2: namely, it has to be stipulated that Scrambling cannot take place in the covert component. This problem is mentioned in Saito 1992:108 himself, but it is presented as a problem for the absence of WCO effects only, and this has led him to assume that the WCO effects should be attributed to an S-structure constraint. However, it should be considered as a problem for any property which is to be connected with the Deep OS-type. For example, Saito 1992 assumes that the Binding Theory applies at LF, and that an "anaphor" otagai 'each other' can be bound by a Deep DL. Although we have argued against the assumption that otagai has the feature [+anaphoric] in section A.3.1 above, let us tentatively suppose so, for the sake of discussion. It is then predicted by his theory that an "anaphor" within the nominative-marked NP could be bound by an accusative-marked NP even in an SO-type sentence as long as Scrambling takes place at LF. However, he claims that an SO-type sentence does not allow such "anaphor"-binding (cf. (13) and (15) of Saito 1992), which explicitly goes against his prediction.

Saito 1992 cannot adopt the assumption that Scrambling is motivated by a strong feature, either. Recall that it is one of the core idea of Saito's analysis that scrambling is not driven by feature-checking, and that this is the reason why scrambling can be 'undone' at LF, unlike wh-movement or raising in English. Therefore, it would cause internal incoherence if such an assumption is added to Saito's analysis.

Thus, although our analysis has many open ends, as pointed out in section 2.5, I have argued that Saito's analysis would face more serious and fundamental problems in order to account for the full range of facts.104

B.2. Other relevant theories
In this last section of chapter 2, we briefly summarize three works: (i) Kuroda 1988, (ii) Webelhuth 1989, and (iii) Mahajan 1990. They are put separately in this section because they are not particularly on the OS-type construction in Japanese. Nevertheless, (i) is crucially referred to by Yoshimura 1992 and Saito 1992 among others, and both (ii) and (iii) provide some theoretical bases for Saito 1992. The following subsections only contain the part of the theories which are relevant to the discussions in the preceding sections.

B.2.1. Kuroda 1988105
Kuroda 1988 considers that the contrasts between (186) and (187) reflect the fundamental difference between English and Japanese.

(186) Generalizations with respect to English:
   a. Move-WH is obligatory in S-structure (Kuroda 1992:325 Corollary E-5-1)
   a'. Only one WH-phrase is preposed in a +WH sentence (Kuroda 1992:332 Proposition E-6)
   b. The Extended Projection Principle holds for English (Kuroda 1992:325 Corollary E-5-4)
   c. A non-theta subject position may not be left vacant in S-Structure (Kuroda 1992:326 Corollary E-5-5)
   d. There is at most one subject in a sentence (Kuroda 1992:332 Proposition E-7)
   e. There is at most one object in a sentence (Kuroda 1992:332 Proposition E-8)

(187) Generalizations with respect to Japanese:
   c. A non-theta subject position (Ext(V)) may be left vacant in SS (Kuroda 1992:330 Corollary J-11-5)106
   d. A Japanese sentence may have multiple subjects (Kuroda 1992:347 Proposition J-16)
   e. There are double object structures in Japanese (Kuroda 1992:343 Proposition J-15)

The observations in (186) and (187) can be generalized in the following schematic forms, roughly speaking, where $\alpha$ ranges over 'preposed WH', 'subject', 'object'.

(188) Generalizations with respect to English:
   a. $\alpha$ must exist

---

104 Saito's analysis may face another problem with respect to the availability of resumption in the Deep OS-type (cf. section A.2), since it is normally considered that an A-chain does not allow resumption. However, this does not make a strong counter argument without a formal theory of resumption in Japanese, which will be pursued in a separate work (Hoji & Ueyama 1998).

105 Kuroda 1988 is reprinted in Kuroda 1992:315-357. I use Kuroda 1992 for page references in the following exposition, since I suppose that this version is easier to obtain for most of us.

106 By 'a non-theta subject position', Kuroda has in mind a subject position of a weather verb. And 'Ext(X)' can be translated as '[Spec,X(P)]' in Chomsky 1995. See Kuroda 1992:354 note 2 for his remark regarding why he avoids using the term 'Specifier' in his paper.
b. There is at most one $\alpha$.

(189) Generalizations with respect to Japanese:

a. $\alpha$ need not exist.

Kuroda 1988 proposes that such a contrast between English and Japanese stems from (190), under the assumption of (191).

(190) a. English is a forced Agreement language  (Kuroda 1992:325 Proposition E-5)

b. Japanese is not a forced Agreement language  (Kuroda 1992:326 Proposition J-11)

(191) a. Languages are parametrized as to whether X-Agreement is forced or not  (Kuroda 1992:323 Assumption U-3)

b. X-Agreement is a feature-sharing (co-specification) between a base category and a Max(X) that it governs  (Kuroda 1992:323 Assumption U-4)\(^{107}\)

c. A base category Agrees with at most one Max(X)  (Kuroda 1992:332 Assumption U-6)

Kuroda's account roughly goes as follows. Suppose that $\alpha$ occurs in a position related to Agreement. Then since English is a forced Agreement language, $\alpha$ must occur ((188a)), and since Agreement relation is restricted to be one-to-one, there can be only one $\alpha$ ((188b)). In contrast, since Japanese is not a forced Agreement language, $\alpha$ need not occur ((189a)), and if it need not be licensed by Agreement, its occurrence is not constrained by (191c) and hence there can be more than one $\alpha$ ((189b)).

He further argues that multiple specifiers are possible as long as (191c) is not violated. Thus, in the structure such as in (192a), "both Max(X) and Max(Y) are interpreted as Ext(I)s": (192a) can be translated as in (192b), if we are to use the more familiar notations.

(192) a. $[[\text{Max}(X), \text{Max}(Y)] [\text{Max}(V), \text{INFL}]]$

(Kuroda 1992:334 (27))

b. $[[\text{XP}, \text{YP}, [\text{VP}, \text{INFL}]]$

where both XP and YP are interpreted as [Spec,INFL].

The basic ideas underlying the notion of 'X-Agreement' given in (191b,c) appear not very different from the theory of agreement proposed in Chomsky 1991 or the checking theory in Chomsky 1995, especially in that the distribution of nominal phrases is aimed to be accounted for in terms of their relations with X’s, and in that the features WH and Case play a central role.\(^{108}\)

However, the contrast between (188a) and (189a) should be derived separately from the one between (188b) and (189b) under Chomsky's theory. On the one hand, the contrast between (188a) and (189a) would be attributed to the existence and the non-existence of a certain feature.\(^{109}\) On the other hand, the contrast between (188b) and (189b) would be attributed to the difference in property of the relevant features: for example, since it is assumed in Chomsky 1995:section 4.5 that an interpretable feature can enter into checking relation more than once, it would follow that (188b) involves an uninterpretable feature while (189b) involves an interpretable one. The crucial difference between Kuroda's theory and Chomsky's theory is that the former does not, but the latter does, assume Last Resort, which is repeated from section 1.3.3.2.

(193) Last Resort (Chomsky 1995:280 (51))

Move F raises F to target K only if F enters into a checking relation with a sublabel of K.

Because of Last Resort, feature checking is necessary in the case of (189b) as well as (188) under Chomsky's theory. In contrast, Kuroda 1988 allows a movement which is not driven by feature checking, and hence he can assume that (189b) does not involve any Agreement.\(^{110}\)

Kuroda 1988 considers that the contrast between English and Japanese given in (194) can also be derived from (190).

(194) a. English does not scramble  (Kuroda 1992:325 Corollary E-5-3)


---

\(^{107}\) 'Max(X)' in Kuroda's theory stands for XP or X$^\text{ext}$ in the familiar notation. Similarly, 'a base category' should be understood as X'.

\(^{108}\) There are several differences between Kuroda's and Chomsky's agreement theories. For one thing, Kuroda allows a lexical category to 'agree' with its complement, while Chomsky does not consider it a configuration in which agreement/checking can take place. For another thing, Kuroda assumes that agreement is an S-structure phenomenon (Kuroda 1992:324). In this respect, Kuroda's agreement theory is more comparable to the theory of strong feature checking in Chomsky 1995. Notice that Chomsky 1995:232 assumes that "feature strength is one element of language variation," thus reminding us of (191a). Although the careful comparison between these two theories would lead us to many interesting profound issues, I refrain from it because it is not the purpose of this work.

\(^{109}\) Considering Kuroda's remark that Agreement is an S-structure phenomenon (Kuroda 1992:324), we should consider that the contrast between (188a) and (189a) should be expressed by the existence and the non-existence of a certain strong feature, as mention in the preceding footnote 108. See Chomsky 1995:232-235, and Chomsky 1995:section 4.5 for the notion 'strong'.

\(^{110}\) This aspect of Kuroda's theory is restated more explicitly in Fukui & Saito 1996 using the terms of Chomsky 1995.
First he characterizes Scrambling as a substitution to an IP-spec position.¹¹¹

(195) The effect of Move-alpha of Max(X) into Ext(I) is scrambling (Kuroda 1992:321 Proposition J-4)¹¹²

It is important under Kuroda's theory to distinguish between the notions 'Agree with/Case-mark' a position' and 'A category or a chain'. For example, both Int(V) (i.e., a complement position within VP) and Ext(I) (i.e., IP-spec) are assumed to be a Case-marked position, but it is another issue whether a category in such a position is actually Case-marked by the head. To be more concrete, there are logically four combinations, as shown in (196), of which (196c) is not a possible combination since it is assumed that an NP can be Case-marked only in a Case-marked position:

(196) a. a Case-marked category in a Case-marked position
b. a non-Case-marked category in a Case-marked position
c. a Case-marked category in a non-Case-marked position
d. a non-Case-marked category in a non-Case-marked position

Now in order to account for the contrast between (194a) and (194b), Kuroda 1988 proposes (197):¹¹³

(197) A Case-marked maximal category may not move into a Case-marked position (Kuroda 1992:325 Assumption U-5)

If the movement from Int(V) to Ext(I) is called scrambling, the chain resulted from scrambling necessarily occupies more than one position by definition. Therefore, such a movement is excluded by (197) once the chain is Case-marked. Thus, (198a,b) are instances of (196a,b), respectively, under Kuroda's theory.

(198) a. a subject of a finite clause in English; an object in English; some non-Scrambled NPs in Japanese ¹¹⁴
b. a Scrambled NP in Japanese; some non-Scrambled NPs in Japanese

It is expected from (197) that a movement from Int(V) to Ext(I) is not allowed in a language which requires Agreement, such as English; in contrast, such a movement is expected to be possible in a language which does not force Agreement, such as Japanese. Kuroda 1988 thus derives the observation in (194) from the assumption in (190). The fact that Japanese allows multiple Scrambling is also expected, since IP-spec can be multiple under Kuroda's theory, as discussed in (192).

B.2.2. Webelhuth 1989

Webelhuth 1989 examines Scrambling in German and proposes a theory which accounts for the ambiguous status of Scrambling. Since his theory is mainly based on the observations of Germanic languages, it sometimes does not carry over to the discussion of Japanese as it is, but I briefly introduce his theory in this subsection, since it is mentioned in Saito 1992, reviewed in section B.1.4.¹¹⁵

Webelhuth 1989 claims that the 'licensing of a parasitic gap' and the 'reconstruction effects of Condition C violation' are the properties of an O(perator)-chain, as opposed to an A(rgument)-chain.¹¹⁶ Therefore, he categorizes Scrambling as a movement which forms an O-chain. In his section 6.4.3, he argues that the NP moved by Scrambling must have a feature [-F(ocus)], and that this feature is interpreted as an operator feature. Thus, Scrambling shares these properties with a wh-movement because both Scrambling and wh-movement carry an operator feature and hence form an O-chain.

Now, 'multiple stacking' is not possible in the case of a wh-movement. Webelhuth 1989 claims that this is because Scrambling is an adjunction while a wh-movement is a substitution to a Spec position.

Finally, the 'absence of the WCO effects' and the 'availability of anaphor-binding' appear to be properties which are often observed with an A-chain, and here the dichotomy of A/O-chain needs to be augmented by some other notions. Calling the relation involved in these phenomena as A-binding and the one

but it is considered in Kuroda 1988 that every NP without a case-marker must be included in (198a).

¹¹¹ Although Kuroda 1988 claims (195), he does not reject the possibility that the scrambling construction is derived by an adjunction to VP: "if an adjunction may also cause word-order change, apparent scrambling could also take place in Max(V). Relevant facts are difficult to determine, and I will leave this problem aside for now." (Kuroda 1992:321)

¹¹² As mentioned above, Max(X) stands for X^ven and Ext(I) for [Spec, I].

¹¹³ Kuroda 1988 revises (197) into (i) in order to account for the case-marker drop phenomena in Japanese, but I do not reproduce the argument here. ¹¹⁴ I do not present Kuroda's analysis of the case-marker drop phenomena in this work, but it is considered in Kuroda 1988 that every NP without a case-marker must be included in (198a).

¹¹⁴ As noted in section A.3.2 above, Webelhuth 1989 reports that the generalization which Lebeaux 1990 puts forth with respect to the reconstruction effects of Condition C violation is confirmed in German. Therefore, we do not have particular reasons to dismiss this observation in this case.