Non-raising Approach to Japanese Raising-to-Object Constructions Revisited

The present study aims to give additional support for the non-raising analysis of Raising-to-Object (RTO) constructions in Japanese as in (1b).

Kuno 1976 argues that Japanese has an expression in which the subject of an embedded clause such as *Tanaka* in (1) is marked with accusative case as in (1b). Since Kuno 1976, at least three types of analyses of Japanese RTO Constructions like (1b) have been proposed: the obligatory raising analysis (2), the optional raising analysis (3), and the non-raising analysis (4). In this study, I try to give additional support for the non-raising analysis, by providing a new type of data which I name a gapless RTO construction like (5). In (5), both an accusative-marked nominal and a nominative-marked nominal appear in the matrix clause and the embedded clause respectively. Because there is a nominative-marked nominal in the subject position of the embedded clause, and accordingly there is no gap corresponding to the accusative nominal like $[e_i]$ in (1b), the accusative-marked nominal cannot move from the embedded subject position and cannot stay in the embedded subject position. Thus, it is reasonable to think that accusative nominal is base-generated in the matrix clause. I argue that the RTO constructions in Japanese do not involve raising and are licensed by semantic computation, whether they have gaps or not.

As for the examples that have been said to support the raising analysis, I argue that they are not convincing from the viewpoint of examples of gapless RTO constructions. For example, the violation of the Proper Binding Condition (PBC) like (6) is often said to support movement of the accusative nominal. The unacceptability has been attributed to the fact that the trace t_i created by movement of *Tanaka-o* 'Tanaka-Acc' is not properly governed. However, gapless RTO constructions also display the same effect, as shown in (7). This implies that the unacceptability of (6) and (7) is irrelevant to the PBC violation because (7) has no gap that is not properly governed, which further implies that (6) and (7) are irrelevant to movement.

Finally, I show some empirical consequences of non-raising analysis of RTO constructions. For example, Japanese has multiple RTO constructions as in (8)-(9). The two conjoined nominals correspond to two gaps or elements in the embedded clause that do not form a constituent. It is unclear how the raising analysis and the optional raising analysis deal with these examples because the moved conjoined accusative nominals do not form a constituent before movement. On the other hand, the non-raising analysis does not raise an issue because the conjoined accusative nominal is just base-generated in the matrix clause. Thus, the examples like (8)-(9) presents obstacles to the obligatory raising analysis and the optional raising analysis. Through these arguments, I aim to make the non-raising analysis of RTO constructions in Japanese more plausible.

(1) a. Yamada-wa [Tanaka-ga baka-da-to] omottei-ta.
      Y-Top   T-Nom   fool-Cop-that think-Past   'Yamada believes that Tanaka is a fool.'
    b. Yamada-wa Tanaka$_i$-o   [[e_i] baka-da-to]   omotteita.
      Y-Top   T-Acc   fool-Cop-that think-Past 'Yamada believes of Tanaka that he is a fool.'

(2) Obligatory Raising Analysis (Takahashi 2021 a.o.)   (3) Optional Raising Analysis (Hiraiwa 2005)

    [$_{vP}$ NP$_i$ [t_i…]v]   a. [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ [NP …]V]v]
                                         b. [$_{vP}$ NP [$_{VP}$ [t_i…]V]v]

(4) Non-raising (Takano 2003 a.o.)

    [$_{vP}$ NP$_i$ [pro$_i$…]v]

(5) Taro-wa sakana-o [tai-ga   itiban oisii   to] omotte-iru.
    T-Top   fish-Acc red-snapper-Nom best delicious that think-Pres
    'Taro believes of fish that red snappers are most delicious.'

(6) *[[t_i]Baka-da-to]$_j$ Yamada$_i$-ga Tanaka-o [t_j]   omotteita.
         fool-Cop-that Y-Nom   T-Acc   think-Past
    Intended: 'Yamada believes of Tanaka that he is a fool.'

(7) *[Tai-ga   itiban oisii   to]$_j$ Taro-ga sakana-o [t_j]   omotte-iru.
    red-snapper-Nom best delicious that T-Nom fish-Acc   think-Pres
    'Taro believes of fish that red snappers are most delicious.'

(8) Taro-wa kono hon$_i$-to isu$_j$ -o   [Hanako-ga [[e_j] kosikake-nagara][e_i]yonde-ita-to] suisokusi-ta.
    T-Top   this book-and chair -Acc Hanako-Nom   sit-while   read-Past-that infer-Past
    'Taro inferred of this book and chair that Hanako was reading the book while siting on the chair.'

(9) Taro-wa osake$_1$-to   kudamono$_2$-o[uisukii$_1$-ga itigo$_2$-ni   yoku au-to]   omotte-iru.
    T-Top   alcohol-and fruit-Acc   whisky-Nom strawberry-Dat well   go.well.with-that think-Pres
    'Taro believes of fish and fruit that whisky goes well with strawberries.'

Selected References: [1] Kuno, S. 1976. Subject raising. *Syntax and semantics 5*, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 17–49. New York:Academic Press.[2] Takano, Y. 2003.Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21:779–834.