Long-Distance Case-Assignment in Japanese and Its Dialectal Variation

Hiroyuki U<small>RA</small>

(Kwansei Gakuin University)

1. Introduction*

"ECM" is the name of the construction in which Case-assignment is executed in an unusual manner. It has commonly been hypothesized that Case-assignment is very local; that is to say, Case usually cannot be assigned to a nominal phrase beyond another nominal phrase or beyond a clause boundary. But an important exception to this hypothesis has been detected in many languages, where a construction can be found in which Case is indeed assigned beyond a clause boundary upon condition that the clause is infinitive or tenseless. "ECM" was coined for this type of exceptional Case-marking, in which Case is extraordinarily assigned beyond an infinitive clause boundary (cf. Chomsky 1981 and Ura 2000c).

On the other hand, owing to the tacit assumption that the other types of long-distance ECM (i.e., Case-assignment beyond a potential Case-assignee and Case-assignment beyond a finite (or tensed) clause boundary) are nonexistent in natural language, researchers have had to invent some syntactic conditions to prohibit them. The Specified Subject Condition and the Tensed S Condition in the pre-Minimalist era played the role of such conditions. Under the current Minimalist framework these conditions can be subsumed under the Defective Intervention Condition (DIC) and under the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), respectively (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004). In the Minimalist literature it is commonly maintained that those two conditions have so much empirically wide coverage as to speculate that their validity holds universally.

Now that it has been established that the DIC and the PIC, being general conditions in UG, are never violable in natural language, it may come as a surprise to find out that it is possible to detect a construction in which Case-assignment is seemingly executed without complying with either of those general conditions in UG: In the literature it has sometimes been pointed out that such an unexpected ECM can be found in several languages in the world. It was Massam (1985) who first discovered in the theoretical context that there are several languages that are likely to allow ECM into a finite clause. Hiraiwa (2005), moreover, has recently studied an extraordinary ECM in which Case is seemingly assigned beyond a structurally intervening DP[1]. Needless to say, these types of "long-distance" ECM, if actually attested in natural language, are of theoretically great importance to the syntactic study on the locality of Case-assignment.

In this paper it will be reported that a still more unusual ECM can be allowed in a dialect of Japanese; more specifically, there is a body of speakers of Kansai Japanese who accept a truly long-distance ECM: It is

---

1) Due to the space limitation we omit citing any data or any discussion from Massam (1985) and Hiraiwa (2005), to which the interested reader is to be referred for details.

truly long-distance in the sense that it looks as if Case-assignment/valuation is executed both beyond a structurally intervening DP and beyond a finite clause boundary. In other words, both the DIC and the PIC are seemingly void in this construction, which is more surprising on theoretical grounds than the aforementioned atypical ECMs that are likely to be exempted either from the DIC or from the PIC. The aim of this paper, thus, is to explicate the following two interwoven questions: (A) why is it that this type of truly long-distance ECM is permissible only in (a certain vernacular of) Kansai Japanese? And (B) how is it that the well-formedness of the truly long-distance ECM in that dialect can be explained with the existing theory of Agree/Phase under the current Minimalist framework?

This paper is organized as in the following fashion: In section 2, we will begin our discussion on long-distance Case-assignment with a closer look at ECM into a finite clause in Japanese. On the basis of the analysis made in section 2, a detailed examination of the syntactic properties of the truly long-distance ECM in Kansai Japanese will be made by comparison with Standard Japanese in section 3, where it will also be pointed out that some technical problems emerge in explaining those properties altogether with the phase-based theory of Agree under the current Minimalist framework. In section 4, we will make a new hypothesis about the range of the DIC, and fully explicate the new hypothesis to draw a coherent solution to the above problems. In section 5, we will scrutinize possible alternatives to our hypothesis and try to dispute them. Concluding remarks will come in section 6.

2. ECM into a Finite Clause in Japanese

In order to set the stage for our technical discussion on the syntax of the long-distance ECM in the relevant dialect of Kansai Japanese, let us begin by considering the 'ordinary' ECM construction in Standard Japanese:

(1)   a. Taro-*wa*   Hanako-*o*   utsukushi-i   to   omot-ta.
        Taro-TOP   Hanako-ACC   beautiful-be   COMP   consider-PAST
        'Taro considered [that Hanako(ACC) was beautiful].'
   b. Daremo-*ga*   kare-*o*   baka-da   to   omot-te
        everyone-NOM   he-ACC   a fool-be   COMP   consider-PROG
        ir-u.
        be-PRES
        'Everyone considers [that he(ACC) is a fool].'

As shown in (1) above, the ordinary ECM in Japanese is an ECM into a finite clause (i.e., ECM beyond the finite clause boundary) (cf. Kaneko 1988 and Mihara and Hiraiwa 2006).

Kuno (1976) proposes to analyze this type of construction as having a structure in which the accusative-marked DP, though originating in the embedded finite clause, is moved out of the clause. This is called the "Raising-to-Object" analysis, the abstract structure of which can be schematized as in (2):

(2)   ..... DP_i [$_{finite clause}$ ..... t_i .....   V .....   ]   .....   V .....

It is interesting to note here that an alternative to this analysis has been proposed in the literature of Japanese syntax: Advocates of this alternative (e.g., Saito 1985, Oka 1988, and Takano 2003) propose to analyze this construction as having a structure in which the accusative-marked DP is base-generated in the matrix clause as an argument of the matrix verb and it binds a null pronominal in the embedded finite clause. The abstract structure in (3) below schematizes this analysis:

(3)   ..... DP_i [$_{finite clause}$ .....   *pro*$_i$ .....   V .....   ]   .....   V .....

This is called the "Prolepsis" analysis because it resembles the proleptic construction found in some languages, which is instantiated by the English example in (4)[2]:

---

  2) See Khalaily (1997) for syntactic details about English prolepses, and see Massam (1985), Ura (1994), and references cited therein for prolepses in other

(4)   John thinks/believes of Mary$_i$ [that she$_{i/*k}$ is intelligent].

(Khalaily 1997: 87)

It is noteworthy that the two analyses are the same in affirming the following proposition: (I) The accusative-marked DP is in the domain of the matrix verb when its Case is assigned/valued. The difference between them comes exclusively from their standpoints concerning the original position of the accusative-marked DP. The former approach advocates the following proposition: (II) The theta-role of the accusative-marked DP is provided within the embedded finite clause. The latter advocates the negation of (II).

The following exemplify two of the representative arguments Kuno (1976) originally provided in favor of the proposition (I):

(5)   **Adverb Placement**

Taro-wa   Hanako-o   ***orokanimo***   kasiko-i   to

Taro-TOP   Hanako-ACC ***stupidly***   clever-be   COMP

omow-u.

consider-PRES

Lit. 'Taro considers Hanako stupidly to be clever.'

(6)   **Quantifier Scope**

a. Dareka-ga   minna-***ga***   baka-da   to   omot-ta.

someone-NOM   everyone-***NOM***   a fool-be   COMP consider-PAST

'Someone considered everyone(NOM) was a fool.'

(some>every; *every>some)

b. Dareka-ga   minna-***o***   baka-da   to   omot-ta.

someone-NOM   everyone-***ACC***   a fool-be   COMP consider-PAST

'Someone considered everyone(ACC) was a fool.'

(some>every; every>some)

In (5), the adverb *orokanimo* 'stupidly' is intended to modify the matrix verb phrase *omow* 'think'. Given the fact, shown in (7) below, that the

languages.

adverb cannot be interjected into the embedded clause, the well-formed-ness of (5) indicates that the accusative-marked DP is located somewhere in the domain of the matrix verb phrase, giving rise to a situation where the adverb on the right-hand side of the accusative DP in (5) is also situated in the domain of the matrix verb phrase.

(7)   *Taro-wa   [Hanako-ga   ***orokanimo***   kashiko-i   to]
       Taro-TOP   Hanako-NOM   ***stupidly***   clever-be   COMP
       omow-u.
       consider-PRES
       Lit. 'Taro considers [that Hanako stupidly is clever].'

In contrast, the nominative-marked DP in (7) is located at the Spec of IP in the embedded finite clause; consequently, the adverb in (7) cannot be situated in the domain of the matrix verb phrase, resulting in its ill-formedness.

Turning our attention to (6), we can get the scopally ambiguous interpretation for (6b), but we can only get the interpretation under which the existential quantifier has a wider scope than the universal quantifier in (6a). Supposing, for the sake of convenience, that a quantifier cannot have its scope over another one unless both quantifiers are in the same clause, we reach the conclusion that the accusative-marked DP in (6b) is situated somewhere in the matrix clause.

To sum up, the facts illustrated in (5) and (6) effectively reveal that the accusative-marked DP in the Japanese construction purporting to be an ECM into a finite clause is situated in the matrix domain at the surface level (see Sakai 1998 and Tanaka 2002 for other arguments in favor of the same point). Note, however, that (5) and (6), though being sufficient to confirm the proposition (I), are insufficient to argue for (II). Thus, the advocates of the "Raising-to-Object" analysis must provide something else for the purpose of affirming the proposition (II). Kuno (1976) actually gives several arguments for (II); furthermore, some convincing arguments in favor of (II) have recently been added independently by Sakai

(1998), Tanaka (2002), and Hiraiwa (2005). It seems safe to presume that they have succeeded in demonstrating that the accusative-marked DP in question originates in the embedded finite clause[3].

Now we conclude that the Japanese construction exemplified in (1) corresponds to a type of ECM into a finite clause; that is, the accusative-marked DP, base-generated within the embedded finite clause, has its Case assigned/valued by the matrix v as a result of its displacement from the embedded clause to some place in the domain of the matrix vP, which is schematized as in (8)[4]:

(8)   ..... DP(ACC)$_i$ [$_{CP}$[$_{TP}$ ..... t$_i$ ..... finite-T] COMP] ..... matrix-V .....

Now that the accusative-marked DP in (1) (=(8)) is in the domain of the matrix vP at the surface level[5], it is very easy to explain how the DP has its uCase valued by the matrix v: Neither the PIC nor the DIC

---

3) Due to the space limitation, we omit citing their arguments here: The reader is referred to each work. As will be clarified in the next section, however, what will be proposed later in this paper with respect to the long-distance ECM in (Kansai) Japanese would never be affected by the issue as to whether the proposition (II) is affirmed or negated.

4) Throughout this paper we employ the term "X is in the domain of Y" to refer to the situation where X can be the target of a probe within the phase of the head of Y. Accordingly, an element at the edge of an embedded clause CP, for example, can be said to be both in the domain of CP and in the domain of the matrix vP. Among the advocates of the "Raising-to-Object" analysis, in passing, there are discrepancies concerning the exact position where the displaced DP in (8) is moved in the domain of the matrix vP: It is possible that it occurs at the edge of the embedded CP, at the Spec of the matrix vP, or somewhere in-between. For the purpose of this paper, however, "somewhere in the domain of the matrix vP" will suffice and clarifying its exact position at the surface level is not requisite at all.

5) For the advocates of the "Raising-to-Object" analysis, it is indispensable to explain why it is that the accusative-marked DP in (8), which could have its uCase valued by the embedded finite T when it was within the embedded clause, is moved to a position in the domain of the matrix vP. Nevertheless, we will not commit ourselves on this issue in this paper because our main concern is to analyze the truly long-distance ECM in Kansai Japanese, which does not involve the accusative-marked subject in the embedded finite clause. The interested reader is referred to Hiraiwa (2005) for extensive discussion on the issue.

prevents the matrix v from agreeing with the DP because the matrix v can properly locate the DP, being situated in the domain of vP, within its phase, and no inactive DP structurally intervenes between them. This results in the successful valuation of the accusative Case on the logical subject of the embedded finite clause, as required.

Keeping in mind the structural analysis of ECM into a finite clause in Japanese sketched here, we will proceed to a close investigation of the long-distance ECM in Kansai Japanese, in which it looks as if accusative Case-assignment/valuation is executed beyond both a structurally intervening DP and a finite clause boundary, giving rise to an unexpected situation where both the DIC and the PIC are seemingly void.

3. Long-distance ECM in Kansai Japanese

Before entering into our discussion of the long-distance ECM (hereafter, LD-ECM) in Kansai Japanese, let us spell out our terminology to avoid any possible confusion. In the preceding section, it has been shown that the Japanese type of ECM into a finite clause is not really long-distance because the Case-assignment/valuation involved in that construction is indeed executed within a very local domain. Thus, we do not refer to it as LD-ECM; on the contrary, a true example of LD-ECM, for the purpose of this paper, should be a construction in which Case-assignment/valuation is executed both beyond a structurally intervening DP and beyond a finite clause boundary.

3.1. Long-distance ECM in Standard Japanese

Now let us consider some Standard Japanese examples in which Case-valuation is seemingly executed both beyond a structurally intervening DP and beyond a finite clause boundary. Relevant data come in (9) below:

(9)　a. *Boku-wa [_{CP} John-ni　　sono koto-**o**　　deki-soo-da
　　　　I-TOP　　　　John-DAT　the　　task-***ACC***　able-likely-be(PRES)
　　　　to]　　omow-u.
　　　　COMP　think-PRES
　　　　'I think [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)].'

　　b. *Gijutsusha-wa [_{CP} sono　kikai-ni　　jidoo　　joohoo
　　　　expert-TOP　　　　the　　machine-DAT automatic　data
　　　　shori-**o**　　　　deki-soo-da　　　　to]　it-te　　i-ta.
　　　　processing-***ACC*** able-likely-be(PRES) COMP　say-PROG　be-PAST
　　　　'Experts have said [that the machine(DAT) is likely to be able to
　　　　process data(ACC) automatically].'

　　c. *Boku-wa [_{CP} John-ni　　piano-de　ano　　kyoku-**o**
　　　　I-TOP　　　　John-DAT　piano-on　that　　tune-***ACC***
　　　　hik-e-ru　　　　to]　　omow-u.
　　　　play-can-PRES　COMP　think-PRES
　　　　'I think [that John(DAT) can play that tune(ACC) on the piano].'

　　d. *Dareka-ga [_{CP} sono　kikai-ni　　hito-**o**　　　koros-e-ru
　　　　someone-NOM　the　　machine-DAT people-***ACC***　kill-can-PRES
　　　　to]　　it-ta.
　　　　COMP　say-PAST
　　　　'Someone said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

It is noteworthy that these examples are noticeably degraded in Standard Japanese (whereas they sound quite acceptable in (a certain vernacular of) Kansai Japanese, as will be argued attentively in the next subsection)[6]. Before exploring where this dialectal difference in the acceptability of this construction comes from, let us consider how to explain its ill-formedness in Standard Japanese under the theory of Phase/Agree, which has been

---

6) Since I began to study this type of construction more than ten years ago, I have found very few speakers of Standard Japanese who judge the type of sentences exemplified in (9) to be perfectly acceptable; thus, it is safe to conclude that LD-ECM sounds totally bad or quite degraded to most of the speakers of Standard Japanese. See the relevant discussion in footnote 11 below.

developed and elaborated in Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2004, in press).

First, it is evident that it is the accusative Case of the logical object in the embedded finite clause that makes LD-ECM ill-formed in Standard Japanese. This is substantiated by the well-formedness of (10) below, whose difference from (9) lies exclusively in the nominative Case on the logical object. Note that the examples in (10), but not the ones in (9), are perfectly acceptable in Standard Japanese:

(10)   a.   Boku-wa [CP John-ni   sono koto-***ga***   deki-soo-da
             I-TOP   John-DAT   the   task-***NOM***   able-likely-be(PRES)
             to]   omow-u.
             COMP   think-PRES
             'I think [that [John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(NOM)]].'

        b.   Gijutsusha-wa [CP sono kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo
             expert-TOP   the   machine-DAT automatic data
             shori-***ga***   deki-soo-da   to]   it-te   i-ta.
             processing-***NOM*** able-likely-be(PRES) COMP say-PROG   be-PAST
             'Experts have said [that the machine(DAT) is likely to be able to process data(NOM) automatically].'

        c.   Boku-wa [CP John-ni   piano-de   ano kyoku-***ga*** hik-e-ru
             I-TOP   John-DAT piano-on   that tune-***NOM*** play-can-PRES
             to]   omow-u.
             COMP   think-PRES
             'I think [that John(DAT) can play that tune(NOM) on the piano].'

        d.   Dareka-ga [CP sono kikai-ni   hito-***ga***   koros-e-ru
             someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT people-***NOM***   kill-can-PRES
             to]   it-ta.
             COMP   say-PAST
             'Someone said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(NOM)].'

Ura (1999, 2000a) proposes to assume (i) that T provides nominative Case to the nominative-object in the dative-subject construction[7)], and

(ii) that the dative-subject moves to the Spec of TP due to the EPP purporting to be effective in Japanese[8]. To put these assumptions under the theory of Multiple Agree (Hiraiwa 2005 and Chomsky in press), T agrees simultaneously with the logical subject and the logical object, resulting in the valuation of Case of the logical subject; whence, the nominative Case appears on the logical object. Although Ura (1999, 2000a) presents ample evidence for the claim that the nominative-object lingers within the projection of the stative predicate in this construction[9], we can assure that T can agree with it, as required, thanks to the syntactically special status of the stative predicates involved in this construction: As suggested in Tada (1992), stative predicates do not possess any ability for accusative, which means, under the theory of Phase/Agree, that they do not have the projection of v, the source of accusative Case; consequently, it does not count as a strong phase. Now that the Case-valuation of the nominative Case of the logical object in (10) is executed by the embedded T, it leads to the prediction that the Case-valuation by T is also successful when the dative-subject construction is not embedded in a clause. This prediction is, of course, borne out:

---

7) See Takezawa (1987) and Ura (1999, 2000a) for the dative-subject construction in Japanese and its relevance to the theory of Case.

8) Many researchers advocate the EPP in Japanese on the basis of their independent studies on varieties of phenomena (e.g., Watanabe 1993, Koizumi 1995, Ura 2000b, Kishimoto 2001, Miyagawa 2001, Kitahara 2002, and Takahashi and Uchibori 2003, to mention only a few). Following them, we assume the existence of EPP in Japanese throughout this paper.

9) Due to the space limitation, we omit going into any detail of Ura (1999, 2000a), whose arguments for the surface position of the nominative-object within VP are founded upon the following facts (some of which have long been recognized in the literature (cf., Shibatani 1977, Kageyama 1978, and Perlmutter 1984)): Its inability to induce subject honorification, its inability to control, its inability to bind a reflexive on the outside of VP, its inability to take scope over an quantified element on the outside of VP (cf. Tada 1992 and Koizumi 1995), and so forth. All of the above can be readily accounted for by positing that the nominative-object stays within the projection of the stative predicate involved. See Ura (1999, 2000a) for detailed discussions.

(11) a. John-ni   sono   koto-**ga**   deki-soo-da.
     John-DAT   the   task-**NOM**   able-likely-be(PRES)
     'John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(NOM).'

   b. Sono kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo shori-**ga**
      the   machine-DAT automatic data   processing-**NOM**
      deki-soo-da.
      able-likely-be(PRES)
      'The machine(DAT) is likely to be able to process data(NOM) au-
      tomatically.'

   c. John-ni   piano-de   ano   kyoku-**ga** hik-e-ru.
      John-DAT piano-on   that   tune-**NOM** play-can-PRES
      'John(DAT) can play that tune(NOM) on the piano.'

   d. Sono kikai-ni   hito-**ga**   koros-e-ru.
      the   machine-DAT   people-**NOM**   kill-can-PRES
      'The machine(DAT) could kill people(NOM).'

Now consider the following examples, where the Case of the logical
objects in (11) are altered from nominative to accusative.

(12) a.*John-ni   sono   koto-**o**   deki-soo-da.
      John-DAT   the   task-**ACC**   able-likely-be(PRES)
      'John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC).'

   b. *Sono kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo shori-**o**
      the   machine-DAT automatic data   processing-**ACC**
      deki-soo-da.
      able-likely-be(PRES)
      'The machine(DAT) is likely to be able to process data(ACC) auto-
      matically.'

   c.*John-ni   piano-de   ano   kyoku-**o**   hik-e-ru.
      John-DAT piano-on   that   tune-**ACC** play-can-PRES
      'John(DAT) can play that tune(ACC) on the piano.'

   d.*Sono kikai-ni   hito-**o**   koros-e-ru.
      the   machine-DAT   people-**ACC**   kill-can-PRES

'The machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC).'

These sentences are totally unacceptable in Standard Japanese[10]. It is evident that the ill-formedness of (12) comes from the fact that there is no element that can value the uCase of the logical object in (12) because the valuation of the accusative Case cannot be accomplished anyhow in (12). This, in turn, points to the fact that the ill-formedness of (9) in Standard Japanese must be explained by positing that something prevents the matrix v from valuing the uCase of the logical object in the embedded finite clause. There are only three possibilities: The barrier due to the PIC induced by the finite clause boundary, the barrier due to the DIC induced by the dative-subject at the Spec of TP, or both of these barriers. After examining the exact structure of the well-formed LD-ECM in (a certain vernacular of) Kansai Japanese in the next subsection, we will return, in section 4, to the issue as to which one of the above three possibilities is the actual cause for the ill-formedness of LD-ECM in Standard Japanese.

3.2. Long-distance ECM in Kansai Japanese

Now let us turn our attention to LD-ECM in Kansai Japanese. The examples in (9) above (as well as their counterparts with the wording and intonation à la the Kansai dialect, which are shown in (13) below) sound fairly acceptable for many speakers of Kansai Japanese:

(13) a. Boku-wa   John-ni   sono koto-***o*** deki-soo-ya
          I-TOP   John-DAT   the   task-***ACC*** able-likely-be(PRES)
          (te)   omow-u.
          COMP   think-PRES
          'I think [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)].'

---

10)   It is noteworthy, here, that the examples in (12) are also totally bad in Kansai Japanese; therefrom, it follows that the perfect acceptability of LD-ECM (exemplified by (9) above) in (a certain vernacular of) Kansai Japanese points to the fact that the accusative Case of the logical objects in the embedded finite clauses in (9) is provided by the matrix verbs, as will be revealed in the next subsection.

b. Gijutsusha-wa sono   kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo
   expert-TOP   the   machine-DAT automatic   data
   shori-***o***   deki-soo-ya   (te)   yuu-te   ta.
   processing-***ACC*** able-likely-be(PRES) COMP say-PROG   PAST
   'Experts have said [that the machine(DAT) is likely to be able to
   process data(ACC) automatically].'

c. Boku-wa   John-ni   piano-de   ano kyoku-***o*** hik-e-ru
   I-TOP   John-DAT   piano-on   that tune-***ACC*** play-can-PRES
   (te)   omow-u.
   COMP   think-PRES
   'I think [that John(DAT) can play that tune(ACC) on the piano].'

d. Dareka-ga   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru
   someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT people-***ACC*** kill-can-PRES
   (te)   yuu-te   ta.
   COMP   say-PROG   PAST
   'Someone has said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

A comment on the acceptability of examples of the kind illustrated in
(13) and its dialectal variation is in order here: In the course of the study
presented in this paper I polled twenty-nine linguistic specialists (includ-
ing eight graduate students of linguistics) and thirty-one junior and
senior undergraduate students for the purpose of certifying that most
of the speakers of the Kansai Japanese accept the LD-ECM of the type
exemplified in (9) and (13). They are all brought up in Osaka, Hyogo,
Kyoto, Wakayama, Nara, Shiga, Fukui, Toyama, Kagawa, Tokushima, or
the Iga district of Mie, all of which can be roughly subsumed, in the light
of accentuation, under one (but yet large) unit of group (cf. McCawley
1968). Despite my expectation, six of the twenty-nine linguists felt that
the examples in (13) are fatally unacceptable, and nine of the rest felt that
some of (13) are rather bad and others are reasonably good, varying in
grammaticality and/or in sentence type. Nonetheless, the other linguistic
specialists (i.e., fourteen out of the twenty-nine) judge the examples in

(13) to be all quite acceptable or perfectly good. Although being less reliable because of their lack of experience in grammatical judgment, twenty-three of the thirty-one undergraduate students felt that the examples in (13) sound almost perfect to them. The conclusion is that there are indeed more than a few speakers of Kansai Japanese (in addition to most of the speakers of Standard Japanese (cf. footnote 6 above)) who disallow LD-ECM in principle, but it is safe to claim that there is a body of quite a few speakers in Kansai Japanese who accept LD-ECM without any problem. It is true that this survey is not sufficient from the statistical viewpoints, but we might just as well make the above claim for the purpose of our syntactic theorizing in this paper. Now we propose to assume that there are two vernaculars in Kansai Japanese; one allows LD-ECM and the other disallows it. In what follows we call the former vernacular "Dialect-A" and the latter "Dialect-B"[11].

Now recall that it was noted in footnote 10 that the examples in (12) above (and their counterparts with the wording and intonation à la the Kansai dialect, which are shown in (14) below) are also totally bad even in Dialect-A, in which the examples in (13) sound perfect.

(14) a. *John-ni   sono koto-*o* deki-soo-ya.
          John-DAT   the   task-*ACC* able-likely-be(PRES)
          'John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC).'

---

11) However, I cannot, at present, detect any geographical clue that distinguishes "Dialect-A" from "Dialect-B". It is interesting, in passing, to note that some of the speakers of Dialect-B (and even some of the speakers of Standard Japanese who judge (9) as totally unacceptable) are apt to accept LD-ECM if an expression with negation and/or strong modality is supplemented (thanks to Taro Kageyama for drawing my attention to this fact). Although this fact is very likely to have some relevance to the phenomenon exemplified in (9) and (13), I ignore it in this paper, tentatively regarding it as being distinct syntactically from LD-ECM, because it seems to me to have much more relevance to what is called "genitive of negation" observed in some Slavic languages, where some type of Case alternation can be induced by adding an expression with negation or some strong modality.

b.*Sono kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo shori-***o***
 the   machine-DAT automatic data   processing-***ACC***
 deki-soo-ya.
 able-likely-be(PRES)
 'The machine(DAT) is likely to be able to process data(ACC) auto-
 matically.'

c.*John-ni   piano-de   ano   kyoku-***o***   hik-e-ru.
 John-DAT piano-on   that   tune-***ACC***   play-can-PRES
 'John(DAT) can play that tune(ACC) on the piano.'

d.*Sono kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru.
 the   machine-DAT people-***ACC***   kill-can-PRES
 'The machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC).'

From the sharp contrast between (13) and (14) in grammaticality in Dia-
lect-A, it is concluded that the perfect acceptability of (13) in this dialect
shows that the accusative Case of the logical objects in the embedded
finite clauses in (13) is provided by the matrix verbs. This is reinforced
by the ill-formedness of (15) below, where the matrix verbs in (13) are
deprived of their ability to value Case by the attachment of the passive
morpheme.

(15) a.*[John-ni   sono koto-***o*** deki-soo-ya   (te)]
   John-DAT the   task-***ACC*** able-likely-be(PRES) COMP
  omow-are-te   ru.
  think-PASS-PROG   PRES
  'It is believed [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the
  task(ACC)].'

b.*[sono kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo shori-***o***
  the   machine-DAT automatic data   processing-***ACC***
 deki-soo-ya   (te)] yuw-are-te   ta.
 able-likely-be(PRES) COMP say-PASS-PROG PAST
 'It has been said [that the machine(DAT) is likely to be able to
 process data(ACC) automatically].'

c. *[John-ni   piano-de   ano   kyoku-***o***   hik-e-ru   (te)]

    John-DAT   piano-on   that   tune-***ACC***   play-can-PRES   COMP

omow-are-te   ru.

think-PASS-PROG   PRES

'It is believed [that John(DAT) can play that tune(ACC) on the piano].'

d. *[Sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru   (te)]

    the   machine-DAT   people-***ACC***   kill-can-PRES   COMP

yuw-are-te   ta.

say-PASS-PROG   PAST

'It was said [that the machine(DAT) can kill people(ACC)].'

The examples in (15) are totally bad in Dialect-A as well as in Standard Japanese and in Dialect-B. In contrast, the well-formedness of (16), where the embedded object are marked as nominative, is never affected by the passivization of the matrix verb, as shown in (17) below:

(16) a. Boku-wa   John-ni   sono koto-***ga***   deki-soo-ya

    I-TOP   John-DAT   the   task-***NOM***   able-likely-be(PRES)

(te)   omow-u.

COMP   think-PRES

'I think [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(NOM)].'

b. Gijutsusha-wa sono kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo

expert-TOP   the   machine-DAT automatic   data

shori-***ga***   deki-soo-ya   (te)   yuu-te ta.

processing-***NOM*** able-likely-be(PRES) COMP   say-PROG past

'Experts have said [that the machine(DAT) is likely to be able to process data(NOM) automatically].'

c. Boku-wa   John-ni   piano-de   ano   kyoku-***ga***

I-TOP   John-DAT   piano-on   that   tune-***NOM***

hik-e-ru   (te)   omow-u.

play-can-PRES   COMP   think-PRES

'I think [that John(DAT) can play that tune(NOM) on the piano].'

    d. Dareka-ga   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***ga***   koros-e-ru

       someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT people-***NOM*** kill-can-PRES

       (te)   yuu-te   ta.

       COMP say-PROG   PAST

       'Someone said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(NOM)].'

(17) a. [John-ni   sono koto-***ga***   deki-soo-ya   (te)]

       John-DAT the   task-***NOM*** able-likely-be(PRES) COMP

       omow-are-te   ru.

       think-PASS-PROG   PRES

       'It is believed [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(NOM)].'

    b. [sono   kikai-ni   jidoo   joohoo shori-***ga***

       the   machine-DAT automatic data   processing-***NOM***

       deki-soo-ya   (te)]   yuw-are-te   ta.

       able-likely-be(PRES) COMP say-PASS-PROG   PAST

       'It has been said [that the machine(DAT) is likely to be able to process data(NOM) automatically].'

    c. [John-ni   piano-de   ano   kyoku-***ga*** hik-e-ru   (te)]

       John-DAT piano-on that   tune-***NOM*** play-can-PRES COMP

       omow-are-te   ru.

       think-PASS-PROG PRES

       'It is believed [that John(DAT) can play that tune(NOM) on the piano].'

    d. [Sono kikai-ni   hito-***ga***   koros-e-ru   (te)]

       the   machine-DAT men-***NOM*** kill-can-PRES COMP

       yuw-are-te   ta.

       say-PASS-PROG PAST

       'It was said [that the machine(DAT) can kill people(NOM)].'

It is important to notice the sharp contrast between (15) and (17) in Dialect-A. From the ill-formedness of (14) and (15) by contrast with the well-formedness of (16) and (17) in Dialect-A, it is concluded that the

well-formedness of (13) in Dialect-A shows that the matrix verb in each example in (13) is the only source of the accusative Case for the logical object in the embedded finite clause in (13).

Now that we have reached the conclusion that the matrix verb in (13) can value uCase of the object in the embedded clause, it must be the case that this valuation of accusative Case is accomplished beyond both the finite clause boundary and the structurally intervening DP that has its Case valued independently. Therefore, the type of ECM exemplified in (13) should be counted as LD-ECM. The next question we have to answer is: How can the matrix *v* agree successfully with the accusative object in the embedded finite clause in Dialect-A, voiding the PIC or the DIC?

3.3. Structure of LD-ECM

In order to answer the above question, we have to clarify the structural position of the accusative-object in addition to that of the dative-subject in (13). First, let us examine where the dative-subject in the acceptable examples of Dialect-A is located. For this purpose, we can utilize the tests which we employed when attesting the structural position of the accusative-marked subject in the Japanese ECM into a finite clause. Consider the facts shown in (18) and (19):

(18) **Adverb Placement**

    a.*Boku-wa   John-ni   ***orokanimo***   sono   koto-*o*

        I-top   John-DAT   ***stupidly***   the   task-*ACC*

        deki-soo-ya   (te)   omo-u.

        able-likely-be(PRES) COMP think-PRES

        Lit. 'I think that John(DAT) is stupidly likely to be able to do the task(ACC).'

    a′. Boku-wa   ***orokanimo***   John-ni   sono koto-*o*

        I-TOP   ***stupidly***   John-DAT   the   task-*ACC*

        deki-soo-ya   (te)   omo-u.

        able-likely-be(PRES) COMP think-PRES

Lit. 'I think stupidly that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC).'

b.*Dareka-ga   sono kikai-ni   ***orokanimo***   hito-***o***

someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT   ***stupidly***   people-***ACC***

koros-e-ru   (te)   yuu-te   ta.

kill-can-PRES COMP   say-PROG   PAST

Lit. 'Someone has said that the machine(DAT) could stupidly kill people(ACC).'

b′. Dareka-ga   ***orokanimo***   sono kikai-ni   hito-***o***

someone-NOM   ***stupidly***   the   machine-DAT people-***ACC***

koros-e-ru   (te)   yuu-te   ta.

kill-can-PRES COMP   say-PROG   PAST

Lit. 'Someone has stupidly said that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC).'

(19) **Quantifier Scope** (some>every; *every>some)

a. Dareka-ga   minna-ni   sono koto-***o***

someone-NOM   everyone-DAT   the   task-***ACC***

deki-soo-ya   (te)   omo-te   ru.

able-likely-be(PRES)   COMP   think-PROG   PRES

Lit. 'Someone thinks that everyone(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC).'

b. Dareka-ga   dono kikai-ni(mo)   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru

someone-NOM   every machine-DAT   people-***ACC*** kill-can-PRES

(te)   yuu-te   ta.

COMP   say-PROG   PAST

Lit. 'Someone said that every machine(DAT) can kill people(ACC).'

Given Kuno's (1976) idea about the placement of the adverb *orokanimo* 'stupidly', which we discussed in section 2, the contrast of acceptability in Dialect-A between (18a) and (18a′) or between (18b) and (18b′) reveals that the dative-subject of the embedded finite clause in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A is not in the domain of the matrix *v*, but it stays

within the embedded finite clause. The same conclusion is drawn from the fact shown in (19): In the examples in (19) we do not get the interpretation under which the universal quantifier takes its scope over the existential quantifier. Thus, we arrive at the conclusion that the universal quantifier (i.e., the dative-subject of the embedded finite clause in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A) is not in the matrix domain.

The ill-formedness of the examples in (20) below affirmatively reinforces our conclusion that neither the dative-subject nor the accusative-object in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A is in the matrix domain.

(20) **Adverb Placement**

    a.*Boku-wa   John-ni   sono koto-***o***   ***orokanimo***

       I-TOP   John-DAT   the   task-*ACC*   ***stupidly***

       deki-soo-ya   (te)   omo-u.

       able-likely-be(PRES) COMP   think-PRES

       Lit. 'I think that John(DAT) is likely to be stupidly able to do the task(ACC).'

    b.*Dareka-ga   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   ***orokanimo***

       someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT people-*ACC*   ***stupidly***

       koros-e-ru   (te)   yuu-te   ta.

       kill-can-PRES COMP say-PROG   PAST

       Lit. 'Someone said that the machine(DAT) could stupidly kill people(ACC).'

Similarly, the same conclusion is drawn from the fact that the universal quantifier cannot take its scope over the existential quantifier in (21) below:

(21) **Quantifier Scope** (some>every; *every>some)

    a. Dareka-ga   John-ni   minna-***o***

       someone-NOM   John-DAT   everyone-*ACC*

       wakari-soo-ya   (te)   omo-te   ru.

       identify-likely-be(PRES) COMP think-PROG   PRES

Lit. 'Someone thinks that John(DAT) is likely to identify everyone(ACC).'

b. Dareka-ga   sono kikai-ni   minna-***o***   koros-e-ru
someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT everyone-***ACC*** kill-can-PRES
(te)   yuu-te   ta.
COMP say-PROG   PAST
Lit. 'Someone said that the machine(DAT) could kill everyone(ACC).'

Here it is important to recall our analysis of the Japanese ECM into a finite clause in section 2, where we argued, following Kuno (1976) and Tanaka (2002), that the adverb placement test and the quantifier scope test tell us whether a given element is in the matrix domain or not, and we also observed that the accusative-marked subject of the embedded finite clause in the Japanese ECM into a finite clause is indeed in the domain of the matrix v. Thus far in this subsection we have observed that neither the dative-subject nor the accusative-object in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A passes the tests. Therefore, we have reached the conclusion that they stay within the embedded finite clause at the surface level and they are not in the domain of the matrix clause.

This conclusion yields a very serious problem to the theory of Phase/Agree. Recall our conclusion in the preceding subsection that the source of the accusative-Case in the LD-ECM construction is the matrix v. This forces us to deduce that the matrix v in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A, which is exemplified in (13), can agree with the logical object of the embedded finite clause despite the fact that the accusative-marked object is deeply embedded within the finite clause with the dative-marked subject intervening structurally between them. In this situation, the existing theory of Phase/Agree, even if reinforced with the theory of Multiple Agree, is no help. We cannot guarantee even that the matrix v in this construction agrees with the intervening dative-subject within the embedded finite clause, because it is not in the domain of the matrix v and the PIC

prevents the probe of the matrix *v* from locating it within its phase. Consequently, Multiple Agree does not work here. How can we explain the empirical fact concerning the well-formed LD-ECM in Dialect-A?

4. Solving the Problems Pertaining to LD-ECM

From the fact that the matrix *v* in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A can agree with the logical object of the embedded finite clause, which is segregated from the matrix *v* both by the finite clause boundary and by the structurally intervening DP, it is evident that both the PIC and the DIC are void in this construction. Thus, we have to devise some mechanism that helps us evade both conditions only in the LD-ECM construction of Dialect-A.

Now we make the following two proposals: (A) The complementizer *to*/*te* 'that' in Dialect-A, if selected by a special kind of verb, assumes the very special property owing to which it does not form a strong phase, and (B) the Defective Intervention Constraint (DIC) should be so modified that its effective range is a little bit diminished. We have some independent supports to these proposals, which will be presented later in this section.

Let us, first, consider the proposal (A). Saito (1983) first observed that the complementizer in Kansai Japanese differs from its counterpart in Standard Japanese in that it can be phonologically deleted, as shown in (22):

(22) a. **Standard Japanese**

        Bill-wa [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ John-ga   ki-ta   ] *(to)]

        Bill-TOP   John-NOM come-PAST   COMP

        it-ta/omot-ta.

        say-PAST/think-PAST

        'Bill said/thought [that [John came]].'

b. **Kansai Japanese**

Bill-wa [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ John-ga   ki-ta   ]   (te/to)]

Bill-TOP   John-NOM come-PAST   COMP

yuu-ta/omo-ta.

say-PAST/think-PAST

'Bill said/thought [(that) [John came]].'

Since this peculiarity of the complementizer in Kansai Japanese are very suggestive of its lack of the property of a strong phase head, we herein propose to hypothesize that the deletability of the complementizer is a necessary condition in order for the complementizer not to create a strong phase[12].

Given that the above hypothesis is reinforced with the provisional speculation that the deletability of the complementizer counts as the sufficient condition in Dialect-A (but not in Dialect-B), the absence of the PIC effect in the LD-ECM in Dialect-A is straightforwardly accounted

---

12) It is worth noting the following point: The deletability of the complementizer is merely a "necessary" condition; thus, the fact is not incompatible with it that Dialect-B, whose complementizer can also be deleted just like in Dialect-A, disallows LD-ECM. That is to say, we are proposing that the complementizer in Dialect-A should have a special property, so that its deletability counts as the sufficient condition in order for the finite clause not to be a strong phase, but the deletability of the complementizer in Dialect-B does not, because the complementizer in Dialect-B lacks that special property; consequently, the finite clause acts as a strong phase in Dialect-B (though I have no gainful idea, at present, about the issue as to what is the special property that distinguishes the complementizer of Dialect-A from that of Dialect-B, the pursuit of which I leave to future research). Therefore, if we run across a language or dialect whose complementizer can be deleted, we cannot expect that the language or the dialect **necessarily** allows LD-ECM for the same reason that Dialect-B does not allow LD-ECM despite the deletability of its complementizer. Accordingly, it is possible to detect a language where LD-ECM is not allowed despite the fact that its complementizer can be deleted in general (such as in the case of English, in which LD-ECM is disallowed despite the fact that the complementizer *that* can be deleted in some contexts). What should be emphasized here is that our hypothesis stipulates that it is always the case that no language allows LD-ECM unless its complementizer is allowed to be deleted, whereas there may be languages that disallow LD-ECM despite the fact that their complementizer is allowed to be deleted.

for. The assumption also enables us to explain why the LD-ECM in Standard Japanese is not acceptable. Reconsider the LD-ECM in Standard Japanese, which is exemplified by (23):

(23) a.*Boku-wa [CP John-ni   sono koto-***o***   deki-soo-da

I-TOP   John-DAT the   task-***ACC***   able-likely-be(PRES)

to]   omow-u.

COMP think-PRES

'I think [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)].'

b.*Dareka-ga [CP sono kikai-ni   hito-***o***

someone-NOM the   machine-DAT people-***ACC***

koros-e-ru   to]   it-ta.

kill-can-PRES COMP say-PAST

'Someone said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

Recall that the complementizer in Standard Japanese cannot be deleted. From our hypothesis, it therefore follows that it unavoidably fails to demolish the formation of a strong phase. Consequently, the CP with it always counts as a barrier for a probe from its outside into its inside (excluding its edge). At the end of the preceding section we concluded that the accusative-object in (23) is not in the domain of the matrix clause (that is, it is not at the edge of the embedded finite CP). Therefore, the matrix *v* cannot agree with the accusative-object in (23) thanks to the PIC, resulting in the ill-formedness of LD-ECM in Standard Japanese, as required.

Furthermore, recall that LD-ECM of the type illustrated in (23) is rather degraded in Dialect-B. The examples in (24), for example, sound pretty awkward to the speakers of Dialect-B:

(24) (OK in Dialect-A and ??? in Dialect-B)

a. Boku-wa John-ni   sono koto-***o***   deki-soo-ya

I-TOP   John-DAT the   task-***ACC***   able-likely-be(PRES)

(te) omow-u.

COMP think-PRES

'I think [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)].'

b. Dareka-ga   sono kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru

    someone-NOM the   machine-DAT   people-***ACC*** kill-can-PRES

    (te)   yuu-te   ta.

    COMP say-PROG   PAST

'Someone has said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

As stipulated in footnote 12 above, there is another condition, yet to be revealed, which disables the complementizer of Dialect-B from having the special property for the ability to demolish the formation of a strong phase. If correct, this proviso can explain the ill-formedness of LD-ECM in Dialect-B in just the same fashion as we have accounted for the ill-formedness of LD-ECM in Standard Japanese: The CP with the defective complementizer, which lacks the ability to avoid creating a strong phase, always counts as a barrier for a probe from its outside into its inside (excluding its edge). Since the accusative-object in (24) is not in the domain of the matrix v, the matrix v cannot agree with the accusative-object thanks to the PIC, resulting in the ill-formedness of LD-ECM of (24) in Dialect-B.

Now, let us return to our proposal (B): The DIC should be so modified that its effective range is a little bit diminished. Before considering how to modulate it, we will comment on a conceptual problem that might possibly emerge from such a modification of a syntactic condition/constraint. The conceptual foundation of the DIC (as well as that of the PIC) lies in its economical nature for the human language computation. When a syntactic operation (i.e., computation) is about to take place, C_{HL} always computes its labor on the economical basis. The PIC is the restriction on the effective domain of a given operation/computation, and the DIC is the restriction on the load of a given operation/computation. As Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001) repeatedly emphasizes, the existence of these conditions in C_{HL} has the virtual conceptual necessity. Notice, however, that the theory-internal formulation of these conditions in a given syntactic theory

depends on the empirical facts concerned. Thus, we will not spoil the conceptual basis of the DIC even if we alter its formulation so as to modulate it according to the empirical facts concerned.

Chomsky (2000: 123) defines the DIC as in the following manner:

(25) ***Chomsky's (2000) definition of the DIC***[13]

In the situation $A>B>C$, where A is a probe and B is a matching goal, A cannot agree with C if B is inactive due to a prior Agree with some other probe.

Now we propose a new definition of the DIC as in the following fashion:

(26) ***New definition of the DIC***

In the situation $A>B>C$, where A is a probe and B is a matching goal, A cannot agree with C if B is inactive due to a prior Agree with some other probe that has no Agree relation with C.

The proviso newly added at the end of the definition works as in the following manner. Consider (27):

(27) ..... *P1* ..... [..... *P2* ..... *Y* ..... [..... *Z* .....

Let *P1* and *P2* be probes in (27) and let there be no strong phase there. Suppose that *Y* has an Agree relation with *P2*. Then, *P1* cannot agree with *Z* under Chomsky's (2000) version of the DIC, regardless of whether *P2* agrees with *Z* or not. Under our new version of the DIC, it depends on whether *Z* has an Agree relation with *P2*. If *P2* agrees with *Z*, then *Y* does not induce a DIC barrier for the Agree between *P1* and *Z* under our new DIC. If *P2* has no Agree relation with *Z*, then *P1* cannot agree with *Z*, just as in the case under Chomsky's DIC[14].

---

13) The sign ">" stands for the asymmetrical c-command relation.

14) One might doubt that a single entity like *Z* in (27) can have multiple Agree relations. We will directly discuss this issue later in this section. It is important to note, here, that the proviso newly added to the original definition of the DIC is, on conceptual grounds, pertinent directly to Collins and Ura's (2001) notion of Accessibility (cf., also, Collins 2002): They propose this notion for the pur-

Now it is time to solve the problems pertaining to the well-formed-ness of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A. First, take a look at representative examples once again:

(28)　(OK in Dialect-A)

　　a. Boku-wa　John-ni　　sono　koto-***o***　　deki-soo-ya

　　　　I-TOP　　　John-DAT　the　　task-*ACC*　　able-likely-be(PRES)

　　　　(te)　　omow-u.

　　　　COMP　think-PRES

　　　　'I think [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)].'

　　b. Dareka-ga　　sono　kikai-ni　　hito-***o***　　　koros-e-ru

　　　　someone-NOM　the　　machine-DAT people-*ACC*　kill-can-PRES

　　　　(te)　　yuu-te　　ta.

　　　　COMP　say-PROG　PAST

　　　　'Someone has said [that the machine(DAT) could kill men(ACC)].'

To recapitulate the arguments so far, we reached the conclusion that the matrix *v* is the only source of the accusative Case of the logical object in this construction, and it was also concluded that the accusative-marked object is not located within the domain of the matrix *v*. Moreover, on the basis of the fact that the logical subject can bind an anaphor within the logical object, but not vice versa, in the Japanese Dative Subject Construc-tion, Ura (1999, 2000a) argues that the logical subject in this construction asymmetrically c-commands the logical object[15]. Supposing that Ura's

─────────

pose of maintaining that each syntactic operation (i.e., syntactic computation), which is usually restricted by the general economy conditions (including the locality conditions such as the PIC and the DIC), may escape those conditions upon condition that the computational burden is not increased by the opera-tion. Under Collins and Ura's (2001) hypothesis, *P2*'s agreement relation with *Z* in (27), for example, renders the computational burden involved in *P1*'s agree-ment with *Z* less economical than the case where *P1*'s agreement with *Z* takes place without *P2*'s agreement relation with *Z*. Thus, it is possible to conjecture, from the viewpoint of economy considerations, that the concept of Accessibility has some resemblance to the concept of Hiraiwa's (2005) idea about Multiple Agree. See Collins and Ura (2001) and Collins (2002) for further discussions.

15)　Due to the space limitation we refer the reader to Ura (1999, 2000a) without

(1999, 2000a) analysis is correct, then we can draw the conclusion that the dative-marked DP asymmetrically c-commands the accusative-marked DP in (28). From all of these three conclusions, it follows that neither the PIC nor the DIC is effective in the well-formed examples of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A. Thus, if we get an explanation of the question as to why they are void in this construction, our problems will be resolved.

Let us return to our proposal (A) above: The complementizer of Dialect-A, unlike its counterpart of Standard Japanese and that of Dialect-B in Kansai Japanese, does not create a strong phase. Given this, we can readily account for the absence of the PIC effect in the LD-ECM in Dialect-A. In (28), for example, the complementizer *te* does not create a strong phase; accordingly, there is no phase boundary between the matrix *v* and the accusative-object in (28). Here it is worth recalling that our proposal (A) states that this special property of the complementizer does not appear even in Dialect-A unless it has the ability to be deleted. As observed in (24) above, the complementizer in Kansai Japanese (including Dialect-A) cannot be deleted unless it is selected by *yuu* or *omow*. This leads to a prediction that LD-ECM is not possible even in Dialect-A when it is embedded by any matrix verb other than *yuu* and *omow*. This prediction is borne out, as the ill-formedness of (29) shows[16]:

(29) a.*Boku-wa   John-ni   sono koto-***o***   deki-soo-ya
        I-TOP   John-DAT   the   task-***ACC*** able-likely-be(PRES)
        te   shinji-te   ru.
        COMP believe-PROG PRES
        'I believe [that John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)].'

_____

citing any data therefrom.

16)   Only three out of the fourteen linguists in Dialect-A that I polled felt that the examples in (29) are not so awkward, but the other eleven felt that they are quite degraded or hopelessly bad.

b. *Dareka-ga   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru
    someone-NOM   the   machine-DAT people-***ACC***   kill-can-PRES
    te   hanasi-te   ta.
    COMP   tell-PROG   PAST
    'Someone has told [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

This fact, therefore, lends strong support to our analysis of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A.

The only remaining question is why the DIC is void in (28). Here we have to stipulate, following Ura's (1999, 2000a) hypothesis about the dative subject construction, that T in the embedded finite clause in (28) agrees both with the dative subject and with the logical object simultaneously. Although Ura (1999, 2000a) provides ample evidence that the dative-subject checks T's EPP, we have no direct evidence that the logical object, if marked as accusative, has an Agree relation with T.

Accepting the above stipulation of Ura (1999, 2000a) for the time being, let us explain why the DIC is exempt in (28). Now the situation involved in (28) resembles the schematic structure in (27) above, repeated here as (30):

(30)   ..... *P1* ..... [..... *P2* ..... *Y* ..... [..... *Z* .....

In (30), *P1* corresponds to the matrix *v* in (28), *P2* to T, *Y* to the dative-subject, and *Z* to the accusative-object. Since our new definition of the DIC allows *P1* to agree with *Z* beyond *Y* if *Z* has an Agree relation with *P2*, with which *Y* also has an Agree relation, the matrix *v* can agree with the accusative-object of the embedded finite clause beyond the dative-subject in (28). This is our answer to the question as to why the DIC is exempt in the well-formed examples of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A. Notice that our new definition of the DIC has no effect on the ill-formedness of the LD-ECM in Standard Japanese and Dialect-B. This is because the ill-formedness is owing exclusively to the PIC, as we argued above, and the DIC is irrelevant to it regardless of whether both the dative-subject

and the accusative-object have an Agree relation with T in the ill-formed examples of the LD-ECM in Standard Japanese and Dialect-B.

    To sum up, we argued that the PIC is exempt in (28) because the complementizer involved therein does not create a strong phase, and that the DIC is also exempt in (28) because our new definition of the DIC allows the matrix v to agree with the object of the embedded finite clause beyond the subject of that clause on condition that T in the embedded finite clause agrees both with the subject and with the object simultaneously. Now that both the PIC and the DIC are exempt in the well-formed examples of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A, the mystery concerning the well-formedness of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A (as well as its ill-formedness in Standard Japanese and Dialect-B) has been resolved, as required[17,18].

---

  17) Although Ura (2006) reports that (some dialect of) Korean also allows the LD-ECM construction of the same sort as the one found in Dialect-A of Kansai Japanese, I leave it to future research to deal with the Korean LD-ECM because it is, at present, empirically unclear to me whether that dialect of Korean allows the complementizer to be deleted or not.

  18) Given Saito's (1983) claim that the complementizer in Kansai Japanese cannot be deleted if the CP with it is transported somewhere by scrambling, one might conjecture that the LD-ECM could be disallowed even in Dialect-A if the embedded clauses in (28) is permuted to the beginning of the sentences. The fact, by contraries, is that the LD-ECM is possible in that context, as shown by the well-formedness of (i):

(i) a. [John-ni   sono koto-**o**   deki-soo-ya   te]$_k$ boku-wa t$_k$
          John-DAT   the   task-**ACC**   able-likely-be(PRES) COMP   I-TOP
          omow-u.
          think-PRES
          Lit. '[That John(DAT) is likely to be able to do the task(ACC)]$_k$ I think t$_k$.'
      b. [Sono kikai-ni   hito-**o**   koros-e-ru   te]   dareka-ga t$_k$
          the   machine-DAT   people-**ACC**   kill-can-PRES COMP   someone-NOM
          yuu-te   ta.
          say-PROG   PAST

      Lit. '[That the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)]$_k$ someone has said t$_k$.'
    This is not so surprising, however, because the scrambling involved in (i) is an operation at the matrix domain: To put it differently, it should be natural, under the theory of Multiple Agree (Hiraiwa 2005 and Chomsky in press), that the Case-valuation by the matrix v and the scrambling operation, both being applicable within the same phase (i.e., the matrix CP), take place simultaneously, whence the matrix v's successful Case-valuation of the object within the scram-

5. Possible Alternatives and Their Refutation

In this section we will scrutinize some possible alternatives to our new definition of the DIC. Let us reconsider the well-formed LD-ECM in Dialect-A, which is exemplified by (31) with the wording and intonation à la the Kansai dialect:

(31)   a. Boku-wa   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru
          I-TOP   the   machine-DAT people-***ACC*** kill-can-PRES
          (te)   omo-ta.
          COMP   think-PAST
          'I thought [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

       b. Sono   gakusha-ga   ano   robotto-ni kaiwa-***o***
          the   scholar-NOM that   robot-DAT   conversation-***ACC***
          deki-soo-ya   (te)   yuu-te   ta.
          able-likely-be(PRES) COMP   say-PROG   PAST
          'The scholar has said [that that robot(DAT) would be able to do conversation(ACC)].'

The issue pertaining to this construction was that the effects of the PIC and the DIC are apparently canceled despite the fact that the construction has the syntactic structure to which both conditions should be applicable.

In order to cancel the PIC effect in this construction one might be tempted to conjecture that the PIC does not exist in the theory of grammar (cf. Stjepanovič and Takahashi 2001). It should be noted, however, that any theory has to admit our assumption about the special property of the complementizer in Dialect-A, which is indispensable to explain the dialectal difference in acceptability of this construction between Dialect-A and Standard Japanese, on the one hand, and the lexical difference,

---

bled clause at the beginning of the sentence in (i). Recall that our proposal (B) states that the complementizer assumes the special property if it is selected only by *yuu* 'say' or *omow* 'think', but it does not state that it assumes that property if it is deleted in actuality. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for pointing out this issue to me.

which is illustrated by the contrast between (32a) and (32b), on the other:

(32)   a. Boku-wa   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru
           I-TOP   the   machine-DAT people-***ACC***   kill-can-PRES
           (te)   omo-ta/yuu-ta.
           COMP   think-PAST/say-PAST
           'I thought/said [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

       b. *Boku-wa   sono   kikai-ni   hito-***o***   koros-e-ru
           I-TOP   the   machine-DAT   people-***ACC***   kill-can-PRES
           te   shinji-ta/hanashi-ta.
           COMP   believe-PAST/tell-PAST
           'I believed/told [that the machine(DAT) could kill people(ACC)].'

Thanks to our assumption, we can correctly explain the existence/absence of the PIC effect in a given example, as we argued in the preceding section. To say that the PIC does not exist in the theory of grammar is to abandon a coherent explanation of those dialectal/lexical differences involved in this construction.

In addition, a straightforward way to explain the absence of the DIC in (31) is to attribute it to the dative-marking on the logical subject in the embedded clause. At the descriptive level, the theory employing this idea predicts that a dative-subject is transparent to the Agree relations beyond it, putting aside its implementation under the theory of Agree/Phase[19]. A piece of empirical evidence against this approach comes from the well-formedness of (33) below:

(33)   (OK in Dialect-A)
       a. Boku-wa [CP John-**ga**   eigo-***o***   deki-soo-ya
           I-TOP   John-**NOM**   English-***ACC***   able-likely-be(PRES)
           (te)] omow-u.
           COMP   think-PRES

---

19) Technically, it might be possible to implement this idea somehow by resorting to McGinnis' (1998) theory of inert Case.

'I think [that John(NOM) is likely to be capable of English(ACC)].'

b. Sono gakusha-ga [_CP ano   robotto-**ga**   kaiwa-*o*

the   scholar-NOM   that   robot-**NOM**   conversation-*ACC*

deki-soo-ya   (te)] yuu-te   ta.

able-likely-be(PRES) COMP say-PROG   past

'The scholar has said [that that robot(NOM) would be able to do

conversation(ACC)].'

Notice that these examples, just like those in (31) above, are acceptable in Dialect-A despite the fact that the logical subject in the embedded finite clause is marked as nominative[20]. This fact, therefore, wipes out any theory employing the idea that a dative-subject is transparent to the Agree relations beyond it.

Here, it is interesting to consider how our theory can explain the well-formedness of (33). Let us observe (34) below:

---

20) It should be noted, here, that the matrix verb in (33) is the only source for the accusative Case of the embedded object, as is evident from the fact that the embedded sentence in (33) becomes unacceptable even in Dialect-A if used as the main clause, as shown in (i):

(i) a. *John-**ga**   eigo-*o*   deki-soo-ya.
        John-**NOM** English-*ACC* able-likely-be(PRES)
        'John(NOM) is likely to be capable of English(ACC).'
     b. *Ano robotto-**ga**   kaiwa-*o*   deki-soo-ya.
        that robot-**NOM**   conversation-*ACC* able-likely-be(PRES)
        'That robot(NOM) would be able to do conversation(ACC).'

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the sentences in (i) become acceptable if the accusative Case is altered to the nominative Case, as expected:

(ii) a. John-**ga**   eigo-***ga***   deki-soo-ya.
        John-**NOM** English-*NOM* able-likely-be(PRES)
        'John(NOM) is likely to be capable of English(NOM).'
     b. Ano robotto-**ga**   kaiwa-***ga***   deki-soo-ya.
        that robot-**NOM**   conversation-*NOM* able-likely-be(PRES)
        'That robot(NOM) would be able to do conversation(NOM).'

See Takezawa (1987), Tada (1992), Koizumi (1995), Ura (1999, 2000a), and Hiraiwa (2005) for further discussion on the nominative-object construction in Japanese. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this point.

(34) (OK in Dialect-A)

    a. Boku-wa [$_{CP}$ John-**ga**   eigo-***ga***   deki-soo-ya

       I-TOP   John-NOM English-*NOM* able-likely-be(PRES)

       (te)]   omow-u.

       COMP   think-PRES

       'I think [that John(NOM) is likely to be capable of English(NOM)].'

    b. Sono gakusha-ga [$_{CP}$ ano   robotto-**ga**   kaiwa-***ga***

       the   scholar-NOM   that   robot-NOM   conversation-*NOM*

       deki-soo-ya   (te)]   yuu-te   ta.

       able-likely-be(PRES) COMP   say-PROG past

       'The scholar has said [that that robot(NOM) would be able to do conversation(NOM)].'

The well-formedness of (34) indicates that, thanks to the theory of Multiple Agree (Hiraiwa 2005 and Chomsky in press), T in the embedded finite clause can agree both with the embedded subject and with the embedded object, if marked as nominative, resulting in the nominative Case on both DPs in (34). Now that we have evidence that the logical object of the embedded finite clause in this construction can have an Agree relation with the embedded finite T, it is natural, under our assumption about multiple Case valuations, to conclude that the accusative-object in (33), too, has an Agree relation with the embedded finite T, which also agrees with the nominative subject. If it is true that this situation emerges in (33), then our new definition of the DIC allows the matrix *v* to agree with the accusative-object beyond the nominative-subject in (33). From the fact that the complementizer in (33) does not create a PIC barrier, it follows that the matrix *v* agrees successfully with the accusative-object within the embedded finite clause beyond the intervening nominative-subject and beyond the finite clause boundary.

    To conclude this section, we examined possible alternatives to our theory of the well-formed LD-ECM construction in Dialect-A, and

argued that our theory has an advantage over any of them on empirical and/or theoretical grounds.

6. Concluding Remarks

In this paper we demonstrated the following: (A) On empirical grounds, we made a careful investigation of the issue as to whether it should be appropriate to regard the alleged examples in a certain vernacular of Kansai Japanese as a true instance of long-distance Case-assignment/ valuation, in which it is expected that neither the PIC effect nor the DIC effect is observable, and we concluded from the result of various types of examination that Dialect-A in Kansai Japanese allows a certain type of LD-ECM. (B) On theoretical grounds, we explicated what causes the LD-ECM construction in Dialect-A immune to the PIC and to the DIC, either of which, if applicable to this construction, would halt it. Through a close scrutiny, we drew the following two conclusions: (I) Due to the special property of the complementizer in Dialect-A, the PIC is voided in the well-formed examples of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A; and (II) The definition of the DIC should be mildly diminished so as to incorporate Collins and Ura's (2001) concept of Accessibility. It was also demonstrated that, with the aforementioned theoretical implementations, the well-formedness of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A and its ill-formedness both in Standard Japanese and in Dialect-B in Kansai Japanese can be accounted for altogether in a coherent fashion under the current theory of Phase/Agree. Finally, we touched on some alternatives to our analysis of the LD-ECM construction and pointed out that ours has some advantage over any of them on empirical and/or theoretical grounds.

In the current theory of Phase/Agree under the minimalist framework, the phenomena involving long-distance Case-assignment/valuation have direct consequences to the phenomena concerning long-distance agreement: In not many but a few languages in the world the morphological agreement is indeed possible between a noun phrase and the head agreeing with it despite the fact that the determinant of the agreement is

deeply embedded in a finite clause subordinate to the clause where the agreeing head appears at the surface level (cf. Ura 1994 and Stjepanovič and Takahashi 2001 for Chukchee and some other Altaic languages; Polinsky and Potsdam 2001 for Tsez (a Daghestanian language); Bruening 2001 and Branigan and MacKenzie 2002 for Algonquian languages (the former works on Passamaquoddy and the latter on Innu-aimûn)). It is noteworthy that long-distance agreement in the aforementioned languages is even possible beyond the noun phrase occupying the subject position in a finite clause. Thus, it is safe to say that it shows the very same type of long-distance dependency that the LD-ECM in Dialect-A of Kansai Japanese shows. Many researchers have begun to work on this type of long-distance agreement under the current theory of Phase/Agree, and varieties of argument for/against the theory-internal formulations of the PIC and the DIC (cf. Bhatt 2003, Bobaljik 2006, Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005, Bošković 2005, Branigan 2005, Di Scuillo and Isac 2003, and Legate 2003, to mention only a few). Empirically and theoretically, it is highly interesting to investigate these long-distance agreement phenomena with our theory of LD-ECM presented in this paper, but we will leave it to future research.

Abbreviations

ACC: accusative COMP: complementizer DAT: dative PROG: progressive INF: infinitive NOM: nominative PASS: passive PAST: past PRES: present TOP: topic

References

Bhatt, Rajesh (2003) Long distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23: 757–807.

Bobaljik, Jonathan (2006) Where's ϕ?: Agreement as a post-syntactic operation. *Leiden Papers in Linguistics* 3 (2): 1–23.

Bobaljik, Jonathan and Susi Wurmbrand (2005) The domain of agreement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23: 809–865.

Bošković, Željko (2005) On the locality of Move and Agree: Eliminating the activation condition, Generalized EPP, inverse Case filter, and phase-impenetrability condition. Ms., University of Connecticut.

Branigan, Phil (2005) Case valuation by phase. Ms., Memorial University of Newfound-land.

Branigan, Phil and Marguerite MacKenzie (2002) Altruism, A-bar movement and object agreement in Innu-aimûn. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 385–407.

Bruening, Benjamin (2001) Syntax at the edge: Cross-clausal phenomena and the syntax of Passamaquoddy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Chomsky, Noam (1981) *Lectures on government and binding.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The minimalist program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (2000) Minimalist inquiries: The interface. In: Roger Martin et al. (eds.) *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (2001) Derivation by phase. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (2004) Beyond explanatory adequacy. In: Adrianna Belletti (ed.) *Structures and beyond*, 104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam (in press) On phases. In: Carlos Otero et al. (eds.) *Foundational issues in linguistic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Collins, Chris (2002) Eliminating labels. In: Samuel Epstein and Daniel Seely (eds.) *Derivation and explanation in the Minimalist Program*, 42–64. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Collins, Chris and Hiroyuki Ura (2001) Eliminating phrase structure. Ms., Cornell University and Kwansei Gakuin University.

Di Scuillo, Anna Maria and D. Isac (2003) Ways of agreeing, phases and interfaces. Ms., University of Quebec at Montreal.

Hiraiwa, Ken (2005) Dimensions of symmetry in syntax: Agreement and clausal architecture. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Kageyama, Taro (1978) On identifying grammatical relations. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 73: 43–61.

Kaneko, Yoshiaki (1988) On exceptional case-marking in Japanese. *English Linguistics* 5, 271–289.

Khalaily, Samir (1997) *One syntax for all categories*. The Hague: Holland Institute of generative Linguistics.

Kishimoto, Hideki (2001) Binding of indeterminate pronouns and clause structure in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 597–634.

Kitahara, Hisatsugu (2002) Scrambling, Case, and interpretability. In: Samuel Epstein and Daniel Seely (eds.), *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*. 167–183. Oxford: Blackwell.

Koizumi, Masatoshi (1995) *Phrase structure in minimalist syntax*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Kuno, Susumu (1976) Subject raising. In: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.) *Syntax and semantics 5: Japanese generative grammar*. 17–49. New York: Academic Press.

Legate. Julie Anne (2003) Phases and cyclic agreement. Ms., Yale University.

McCawley, James (1968) *The phonological component of a grammar of Japanese*. The Hague: Mouton.

McGinnis, Martha (1998) Locality in A-movement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Massam, Diane (1985) *Case theory and the projection principle*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Mihara, Ken-ichi and Ken Hiraiwa (2006) *Shin nihongo-no tougo-kouzou*. Tokyo: Shohakusha.

Miyagawa, Shigeru (2001) EPP, scrambling, and *wh*-in-situ. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*. 293–338. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Oka, Toshifusa (1988) Abstract case and empty pronouns. *Tsukuba English Studies* 7: 187–227.

Perlmutter, David (1984) Working 1s and inversion in Italian, Japanese, and Que-
    chua. In David Perlmutter and Carol Rosen (eds.) *Studies in relational gram-
    mar 2*, 292–330. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam (2001) Long-distance agreement and topic in
    Tsez. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19: 583–646.

Saito, Mamoru (1983) Case and government in Japanese. *Proceedings of WCCFL*
    2: 247–259.

Saito, Mamoru (1985) *Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implica-
    tions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Sakai, Hiromu (1998) Raising asymmetry and improper movement. In: Noriko
    Akatsuka et al. (eds.) *Japanese/Korean* 7, 481–497. Stanford Calif.: CSLI.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (1977) Grammatical relations and surface cases. *Language*
    53: 789–809.

Stjepanovič, Sandra and Shoichi Takahashi (2001) Eliminating the phase impen-
    etrability condition. Ms., Kanda University of International Studies.

Tada, Hiroaki (1992) Nominative objects in Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Linguis-
    tics* 14: 91–108.

Takahashi, Daiko and Asako Uchibori (2003) Pseudoraising. *Gengo Kenkyuu* 123:
    299–329.

Takano, Yuji (2003) Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate construc-
    tions: A prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21: 779–834.

Takezawa, Koichi (1987) A configurational approach to Case-marking in Japanese.
    Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.

Tanaka, Hidekazu (2002) Raising to object out of CP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33,
    637–657.

Ura, Hiroyuki (1994) Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase struc-
    ture theory. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics #7*. Cambridge, MA: Dept.
    of Linguistics & Philosophy, MIT.

Ura, Hiroyuki (1996) Multiple feature checking: A theory of grammatical function
    splitting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Ura, Hiroyuki (1999) Checking theory and dative subject constructions in Japanese
    and Korean. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8, 223–254.

Ura, Hiroyuki (2000a) *Checking theory and grammatical functions in Universal Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ura, Hiroyuki (2000b) Raising in Japanese and its theoretical implications in checking theory. Ms., Osaka University.

Ura, Hiroyuki (2000c) Case. In: Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.) *The handbook of current syntactic theory*, 334–373. London: Blackwell.

Ura, Hiroyuki (2006) Long-distance Case-valuation and its parametric variation in UG. Ms., Kwansei Gakuin University.

Watanabe, Akira (1993) AGR-based Case theory and its interactions with the A-bar system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT

Abstract

In this paper it is demonstrated, through an empirically close scrutiny, that it should be appropriate to recognize that a certain vernacular of Kansai Japanese (what we call Dialect-A) allows a true instance of long-distance ECM (LD-ECM), in which neither the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) effect nor the Defective Intervention Condition (DIC) effect is observable when the matrix verb assigns/values the Case of a DP within the embedded finite clause beyond another structurally intervening DP or beyond the finite clause boundary. Two theoretically significant problems are implicated in this construction: (I) Why is it that LD-ECM is allowed only in Dialect-A, whereas it is not allowed in the other dialects of Kansai Japanese nor in Standard Japanese? And (II) What syntactic mechanism enables the LD-ECM construction in Dialect-A to evade the PIC and the DIC? For the sake of explanation, it is stipulated that there should be two interrelated grounds for the above problems: (A) Due to the special property of the complementizer in Dialect-A, the PIC is voided in the well-formed examples of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A; and (B) The definition of the DIC should be mildly diminished so as to incorporate Collins and Ura's (2001) concept of Accessibility. Then, it is shown, with the aid of these stipulations, that the well-formedness of the LD-ECM in Dialect-A and its ill-formedness in Standard Japanese and in the other dialects of Kansai Japanese can be accounted for altogether in a coherent fashion under the current theory of Phase/Agree. Besides, a brief comment on the recent work concerning the phenomenon involving long-distance agreement is given at the end of the paper.

《要　旨》

日本語の長距離格付与と方言差

浦　　啓之

（関西学院大学）

　「長距離の例外的格付与（LD-ECM）」とは，構造的に介在する名詞句や定形節の境界を通り越して主節動詞が埋め込み文内の名詞句に対して格付与を行っている構文であるが，本論はまず，A 方言と名づけた関西方言のうちのある地方語でこの構文が観察されるということを様々な観察的事実より示した．これを受けて 2 つの問題が浮上する：（I）何故，LD-ECM は A 方言でのみ可能であり，標準日本語や他の関西方言では不可能であるのか？（II）A 方言の LD-ECM 文では，どのようなメカニズムによって Phase Impenetrability Condition（PIC）や Defective Intervention Condition（DIC）が回避され得る状況が起こっているのか？　これらを説明するために次の 2 つの要請がなされた：「A 方言の補文標識の特異性によって，それに導かれた定形節が strong phase にならないこと」・「DIC の定義に Collins and Ura（2001）で提案されている Accessibility の概念を導入すること」，そして，これらの要請に従えば，上記の 2 点の相互に関係した問題点が現行のPhase/Agree- 理論の枠組みで同時に解決可能であることが示された．