

Japanese Relativization and Its Puzzling Hybrid Nature

Koji Hoshi

要旨

本論文の主たる目的は、日本語の主部後置型関係節が、表面上、同時に「移動性と非移動性」を示すという不可解な二面性を有する事実を指摘することであり、その証拠を、複合名詞句制約効果、再構成効果、イディオム読みの欠如、作用域再構成効果の欠如等の観点から詳しく論じる（更に詳しい議論としてはHoshi to appear 及びHoshi in preparation を参照されたい）。

1. Introduction

Reviving Vergnaud's (1974) head-promotion analysis, which is in turn based on Kuroda (1968), Kayne (1994) proposed to analyze relatives as deriving from the underlying D-CP configuration universally within the theory of antisymmetric syntax (cf. also Bianchi 1999, 2000a,b). Consider the following N-initial *that*-relative in English:⁽¹⁾

- (1) John ate [_{DP} the bread_i that Mary baked t_i]

Under this analysis, the N-initial *that*-relative in (1) indicated by brackets involves the derivation as in (2) below:

- (2) $[_{DP} D [_{CP} NP_i [_{CP} C [_{IP} \dots \cancel{NP}_i \dots]]]]$ (N-initial relative)

In (2), the relative NP moves to [Spec, CP] leaving behind its copy NP within the IP and in the phonological component the lower NP copy c-commanded by the upper NP copy is deleted.

One of the consequences of such a line of analysis is that N-final relatives are to be derived via leftward movement of the relative head to [Spec, CP] followed by leftward movement of the remnant IP from a postnominal position under the D-CP complementation structure, as schematically represented in (3) below:⁽²⁾

- (3) a. $[_{DP} [_{IP} \dots \cancel{NP}_i \dots]_j [_{DP} D [_{CP} NP_i [_{CP} C \cancel{[_{IP} \dots \cancel{NP}_i \dots]_j}]]]]]$ (N-final relative)
- b. $[_{DP} [_{IP} \dots NP_i \dots]_j [_{DP} D [_{CP} \cancel{NP}_i [_{CP} C \cancel{[_{IP} \dots \cancel{NP}_i \dots]_j}]]]]]$ (N-final relative)

In the case of N-final relatives as in Japanese, there are two possible derivations. In both (3a) and (3b), after movement of IP to [Spec, DP], its left behind lower copy of IP is deleted in the phonological component in accordance with c-command relation. However, in the former, the NP copy in the

(1) Although I will not discuss N-initial relativization in English in this paper, I will follow Carlson (1977), Aoun and Li (2003), and Sauerland (2003) in assuming that relativization in English requires both raising and matching analyses (under the Kaynean D-CP structure), contra Kayne (1994) and Bianchi (1999, 2000a,b) (cf. also Heim 1987 and Grosu and Landman 1998 *inter alia* for a similar idea).

(2) In the ensuing discussion, I will follow Kayne (1994) rather than Bianchi (1999, 2000a,b) in assuming that what is raised to [Spec,CP] is not a DP but an NP (or QP) uniformly.

raised IP is deleted, while in the latter, the NP copy at [Spec, CP] is deleted. (3a) and (3b) correspond to the head-external relative and the head-internal relative in Japanese, respectively.⁽³⁾ Kayne (1994) guarantees these two options of NP deletion in N-final relatives by proposing the condition on PF deletion in (4) and his definition of c-command in (5):

(4) Condition on PF Deletion:

A given chain link c_k can license PF deletion of another link c_l of the same chain only if c_l does not c-command c_k .

(cf. Kayne 1994: 96)

(5) X c-commands Y iff X and Y are categories and X excludes Y and every category that dominates X dominates Y.

(cf. Kayne 1994: 16)

In this paper, I will be mainly concerned with the structures of the following three-types of N-final relatives in Japanese:⁽⁴⁾

<N-final Relatives in Japanese>

- (6) John-wa [[Mary-ga e_i yaitekureta] [pan]_i]-o tabeta. (= restrictive)
 John-Top Mary-Nom baked bread ate

(3) Honda et al. (1996) and Honda (2002) provide arguments in support of Kayne's (1994) analysis of N-final relatives in Japanese (cf. also Aldridge 2003 for a Kaynean analysis of N-final relatives in Tagalog). In contrast, Murasugi (2000a,b) and Fukui and Takano (2000) put forth different views on N-final relatives in Japanese from Kayne (1994).

(4) See Harada (1974) for a unified analysis of head-external and head-internal relatives in the context of UG. Also, see Kuroda (1998, 1999a,b) and references therein for various analyses of the head-internal relative construction in Japanese.

'John ate the bread that Mary baked.'

- (7) John-wa [[Mary-ga e_i yaitekureta] [sono pan]_i]-o tabeta. (= non-restrictive)

John-Top Mary-Nom baked that bread ate

'John ate that bread, which Mary baked.'

- (8) John-wa [[Mary-ga pan-o yaitekureta] no]-o tabeta. (= head-internal)

John-Top Mary-Nom bread-Acc baked NM-Acc ate

'Mary baked a loaf of bread and John ate it.'

With respect to the N-final relatives in Japanese in (6)–(8), a puzzling hybrid nature of movement and non-movement properties will be pointed out in this paper, which goes against the standard assumption that Japanese relativization is not subject to movement which has been prevalent since Kuno (1973) in the literature.

The present paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I will provide a puzzling set of data concerning N-final relatives in Japanese illustrating a hybrid nature of movement and non-movement properties. More specifically, in section 2.1, a cluster of movement properties are provided: presence of CNPC effects and connectivity/reconstruction effects in head-external and head-internal relatives in Japanese. Then, in section 2.2, a battery of non-movement properties are observed: lack of idiom chunk interpretations, lack of scope reconstruction effects, and lack of Q-scope interaction in the relevant relatives in Japanese. Finally, section 3 concludes this paper.

2. The Puzzle: Apparently Hybrid Nature of N-Final Relativization in Japanese

2.1. Movement Properties

2.1.1. Complex NP Constraint Effects in Head-External Relatives

Since Kuno's (1973) well-known observation, it has been standardly assumed that Japanese relativization does not involve movement due to its apparent lack of island effects, as illustrated in (9) below:

- (9) $[_{DP} [_{DP} [e_i e_j \text{ kiteiru}] \text{ [yoohuku}_j\text{]}]\text{-ga } \text{yogoreteiru}] \text{ [sinsi}_i\text{]}$
 wearing-is suit-Nom dirty-is gentleman
 'the gentleman who [the suit that he is wearing] is dirty.'

In (9), relativization out of a relative clause has occurred in violation of the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC). Acceptability in (9) has been standardly taken to indicate that Japanese relatives need not be derived by movement of the relative head (cf. also Perlmutter 1972). Murasugi (2000a, b) considers this fact as a clear piece of evidence against the relative head-raising analysis for N-final relatives by Kayne (1994).

However, there is another possible derivation in which the relative head can be taken to have been moved without inducing violation of the CNPC. Kuroda (1986a, b; 1992) explores a possibility of movement analysis of topicalization in Japanese, incorporating the notion of the so-called "major subject" in Japanese. Sakai (1994) applies Kuroda's major subject analysis to the empirical domain of relativization in Japanese, arguing that relativization in Japanese can involve movement of a null operator (Op) from the major subject position into [Spec, CP].⁽⁵⁾ Consider (10) and (11) below:

- (10) [(**sono**) **sinsii-ga** [[pro_i e_j kiteiru] [yoohuku_j]]-ga yogoreteiru]
 that gentleman-Nom wearing-is suit-Nom dirty-is
 ‘(that) gentleman is such that the suit that he is wearing is dirty.’
- (11) [Op_i [t_i [[pro_i e_j kiteiru] [yoohuku_j]]-ga yogoreteiru] [sinsii]]
 wearing-is suit-Nom dirty-is gentleman
 ‘the gentleman who [the suit that he is wearing] is dirty.’

Note that (11) involves movement of a null operator (Op) from the major subject position corresponding to the position of the bold-faced (**sono**) **sinsi** ‘(that) gentleman’ in (10), crossing no complex NP (cf. Sakai 1994 and Hoshi 1995 for some discussion of relativization from the major subject position).⁽⁶⁾ By the same token, it is equally plausible to assume a derivation in which the relative head [*sinsi*] ‘gentleman’ rather than a null operator (Op) has been directly moved from the major subject position to [Spec, CP] under the Kaynean D-CP complementation structure, as illustrated in (12) below:

- (12) [_{DP} [_{IP} t_i kiteiru yoohuku-ga yogoreteiru]_j] [_{DP} D [_{CP} sinsi_i [_{CP} C t_j]]]]
 wearing-is suit-Nom dirty-is gentleman
 ‘the gentleman that the suit that he is wearing is dirty’

Thus, apparent lack of island effects does not necessarily indicate lack of movement in Japanese relativization.⁽⁷⁾

(5) See Kuno (1973) *inter alia* for discussion on the correlation between the availability of topicalization and that of relativization in Japanese.

(6) In this paper, I will abstract away from the possibility of the process of subjectivization in Japanese, which has been claimed to be responsible for generating a subset of multiple nominative constructions in Japanese.

If the major subject analysis of the relative head movement is correct, it makes a specific prediction that island effects should emerge where the relative head movement from the major subject position is somehow not available. Indeed, this prediction seems to be borne out, as illustrated in (13) below:

- (13) a. sono $sinsi_i$ -ga kinoo [[pro_i itinen-mae-ni t_j okusan-ni okutta] yubiwa $_j$]-ga
 that gentleman-Nom yesterday a year ago wife-Dat gave ring-Nom
 nusumareta.
 was-stolen
 ‘That gentleman is such that yesterday the ring which he gave his wife a year ago was stolen.’
- b. *[sono $sinsi_i$ -ga kinoo [[pro_i itinen-mae-ni t_j t_k okutta] yubiwa $_j$]-ga
 that gentleman-Nom yesterday a year ago gave ring-Nom
 nusumareta] okusan]
 was-stolen wife
 ‘The wife that that gentleman is such that yesterday the ring which he gave her a year ago was stolen.’

(13b) has been derived from (13a) by relativizing the dative Case-marked nominal *okusan* ‘wife’ out of the relative clause (= a complex NP), resulting in unacceptability. Note that, as the following paradigm in (14) shows, in a

(7) In section 2.1.2, I will show that the head-raising operation should be favored over the null operator movement in light of the presence of connectivity/reconstruction effects in Japanese relativization. If Aoun and Li (2003) is on the right track in claiming that null operator movement does not exhibit connectivity/reconstruction effects in general, this conclusion will be forced.

simplex sentence involving no complex NP, a dative Case-marked nominal can be relativized:

- (14) a .sono *sinsi-ga* *okusan-ni yubiwa-o okutta*.
 that gentleman-Nom wife-Dat ring-Acc gave
 ‘That gentleman gave a ring to his wife.’
 b.[sono *sinsi-ga* *t_i yubiwa-o okutta*] *okusan_i*]
 that gentleman-Nom ring-Acc gave wife
 ‘the wife to whom that gentleman gave a ring’

Thus, the status of the dative Case-marked nominal *per se* does not block its relativization.

One might suspect that (13b) has been derived from the following sentence in (15):

- (15) *sono sinsi-ga okusan_k-ga kinoo* [[*pro_i itinen-mae-ni t_j pro_k okutta*]
 that gentleman-Nom wife-Nom yesterday a year ago gave
 yubiwa_j]-ga nusumareta.
 ring-Nom was-stolen
 ‘That gentleman is such that yesterday his wife had the ring which he
 gave her a year ago stolen.’

In fact, for some unknown reason, the inner nominative subject cannot be relativized in the following multiple nominative construction in (16):

- (16) a. *sono sinsi-ga* *okusan-ga yubiwa-ga nusumareta*.
 that gentleman-Nom wife-Nom ring-Nom was-stolen
 ‘That gentleman is such that his wife had a ring stolen.’
 b. *[*sono sinsi-ga t_i yubiwa-ga nusumareta*] *okusan_i*]

that gentleman-Nom ring-Mom was-stolen wife

'Lit. the wife who that gentleman is such that she had a ring stolen.'

First of all, whatever the exact reason may be, relativization of the inner nominative Case-marked nominal is disallowed in (16). Thus, it is impossible to derive (13b) from (15) by any means. Given this, the unacceptability of (13b) might be expected on a par with (16) under the intended interpretation. But, notice that the relevant intended interpretation in (13a) is different from the one in (15). Therefore, it is impossible to account for the unacceptability of (13b) by appealing to the same reason as in (16b). Based on these considerations, it seems to be legitimate to conclude that in (13b) the relativized head *okusan* 'wife' has been moved out of the complex NP, running afoul of the CNPC (see Hoshi to appear for more discussion concerning availability of movement in Japanese relativization).

2.1.2. Connectivity/Reconstruction Effects in Head-External Relatives

It is well-known that the connectivity/reconstruction effects can emerge with A-bar movement, but it is not the case with a base-generated DP-pronoun relation, as illustrated in (17)–(18) (see Jackendoff (1972), Barss (1986) *inter alia* for discussion on the connectivity/reconstruction effects in English):

(17) [That picture of himself_i]_j, John_i liked t_j. (= topicalization)

(18) *[That picture of himself_i]_j, John liked it_j. (= left dislocation)

As the following example in (19) shows, the restrictive relative in English patterns with (17):

- (19) [[the picture of himself]_i] [that John_i likes t_j best]] (= restrictive relative)

Murasugi (2000a,b) appeals to Hoji's (1985) strong claim for lack of movement in Japanese relativization, which is based on the putative apparent absence of the connectivity/reconstruction effects regarding anaphor binding. Hoji (1985) reports that the Japanese analogue with an anaphoric expression *zibun* 'self' is unacceptable, as displayed in (20):

- (20) *[[John_i-ga e_j taipusita] [zibun_i-no ronbun]_j]
 John-Nom typed self-Gen paper
 'Lit. self's paper that John typed'

First of all, pace Hoji (ibid.), I judge (20) to be quite acceptable, and for that matter, even if the non-local subject oriented-anaphor *zibun* is replaced with the local subject-oriented anaphor *zibun-zisin*, the expression is still fully acceptable, as illustrated below:⁽⁸⁾

- (21) [[John_i-ga e_j taipusita] [zibun-zisin_i-no ronbun]_j]
 John-Nom typed self-Gen paper
 'Lit. self's paper that John typed'

Hoji (2003: 440), however, claims that *zibun* 'self' and *zibun-zisin* 'self' are not anaphors in Japanese. Thus, it may well be fair to use different items other than the two expressions at hand to check reconstruction effects in

(8) Gunji (2002: 212 – 217) also judges that relativization in Japanese exhibits reconstruction effects with respect to the 'anaphor' *zibun*, as illustrated in (i):

relativization.

Ishii (1991: 29) demonstrates that Japanese relatives show connectivity/reconstruction effects with reflexive anaphors such as *kare-zisin* 'himself' and *kanozyo-zisin* 'herself', as illustrated below:

- (22) [[[Johni-ga e_j taipusita] [kare-zisin-no ronbun]_j]
 John-Nom typed himself-Gen paper
 'the paper of himself that John typed'

In this vein, observe the following example:

- (23) Mary-wa [[[Johni-ga e_j taipusita] [kare-zisin-no ronbun]_j]-o mottekita.
 Mary-Top John-Nom typed himself-Gen paper-Acc brought
 'Mary brought the paper of himself that John typed.'

Note that although in (23) the relative clause is embedded within a matrix sentence, it is still possible to interpret the relative subject *John* as coreferential with *kare-zisin* 'himself'. This clearly shows a reconstruction effect with respect to anaphor binding in Japanese.

Ishii (1991: 30) further observes that what he calls long-distance relativization is unacceptable regarding reconstruction effects on anaphor binding, as illustrated below (the judgment ?* is his):

- (24) ?*[[Mary-ga [[[John_i-ga e_k e_j miseta] koto-ga aru] hito_k]-o sitteiru]

(i) [Ken_i-ga e_j kaita] zibun_i-no denki_j-ga besutoseraa-ni natta.
 Ken-Nom wrote self-Gen biography-Nom bestseller-Dat became
 'The biography of himself that Ken wrote became a bestseller.'

Mary-Nom John-Nom showed fact-Nom exist person-Acc know
 [kare-zisin_i-no syasin]_j]
 himself-Gen picture
 ‘Lit. the picture of himself which Mary knows the person to whom
 John has once showed.’

In (24), the external head [*kare-zisin-no syasin*] ‘picture of himself’ is related to a position inside a complex NP. Recall from section 2.1.1 that I claimed that this kind of relativization in Japanese involves the major subject construction underlyingly. As expected, the corresponding major subject construction is also unacceptable, as illustrated in (25) below:

- (25) * [kare-zisin_i-no syasin]_j-ga [Mary-ga [[[John_i-ga e_k e_j miseta]
 himself-Gen picture-Nom Mary-Nom John-Nom showed
 koto-ga aru] hito_k]-o sitteiru]
 fact-Nom exist person-Acc know
 ‘Lit. the picture of himself is such that Mary knows the person to
 which John showed it.’

In (25), the anaphor *kare-zisin* ‘himself’ is contained in the major subject position and thus is not c-commanded by its antecedent *John* at the subject position in the most deeply embedded clause in violation of Condition A of the Binding Theory under reconstruction. Thus, under the major subject analysis, the unacceptability of (24) can be accounted for as a result of connectivity/reconstruction to the underlying structure in (25).

Furthermore, Aoun and Li (2003: 197) touch on connectivity/reconstruction effects of Japanese relatives with respect to bound pronouns, comparing the cases of scrambling and clefting, as illustrated in (26) – (28)

below:

(26) Relativization:

[[Toyota.sae]-ga_i e_j uttaeta] [so-ko-o_i uragitta kaisya]_j-ga tubureta
 Toyota-even-Nom sued that-place-Acc betrayed company-Nom bank-
 rupt
 ‘[(The company/ies that had betrayed it_i that [even Toyota]_j sued]
 went bankrupt.’

(27) Scrambling:

[so-ko-o_i uragitta kaisya-o]_j Toyota-sae-ga_i e_j uttaeta (koto)
 that-place-Acc betrayed company-Acc Toyota-even-Nom sued (fact)
 ‘(the) company/nies that had betrayed it_i, [even Toyota]_j sued.’

(28) Clefting:

[Toyota-sae-ga_i uttaeta] no-wa [so-ko-o_i uragitta kaisya-o] da
 Toyota-even-Nom sued – Top that-place-Acc betrayed company-
 Acc be
 ‘It is [(the) company/nies that had betrayed it_i] that [even Toyota]_j
 sued.’

Aoun and Li (2003: 197) claim, citing Hajime Hoji’s (p.c.) judgements, that (26) does not allow the reconstructed bound pronoun interpretation in contradistinction to its scrambling and clefting counterparts in (27) and (28), respectively. But, I disagree with his acceptability judgements. To the extent that (27) and (28) permit the reconstructed bound pronoun interpretation, it seems that (26) can equally allow for such an interpretation as well.

Finally, Bianchi (1999: 111) shows that the non-restrictive relatives in English and Italian do not exhibit connectivity/reconstruction effects of the

relative head with respect to Condition C as follows (I will use Condition C effects, since Condition A effects are more complicated to obtain in a clear manner (cf. Bianchi 1999: 115–122 on this issue):⁽⁹⁾

- (29) Gianni_i's book, which he_i surely dedicated to his children, is about children psychology.

Interestingly, however, the non-restrictive relatives in Japanese exhibit connectivity/reconstruction effects regarding Condition C, as illustrated below:

- (30) a. *[[kare_i-ga tasikani t_i zibun-no kodomo-ni sasageta] Gianni_i-no he-Nom surely self-Gen children-Dat dedicated Gianni-Gen hon]_j-wa zidoo sinrigaku-ni kansuru mono da.
book-Top children psychology about thing is
'Gianni_i's book, which he_i surely dedicated to his children, is about children psychology.'
- b. *[[pro_i tasikani t_i zibun-no kodomo-ni sasageta] Gianni_i-no hon]_j-wa he-Nom surely self-Gen children-Dat dedicated Gianni-Gen book-Top
zidoo sinrigaku-ni kansuru mono da.
children psychology about thing is
'Gianni_i's book, which he_i surely dedicated to his children, is about children psychology.'

(9) Here, I will assume that non-restrictive relatives in English and Italian are derived without directly raising the relative head from within the IP in the Kaynean D-CP structure.

This seems to indicate that even the relative head in the non-restrictive relative will be reconstructed to its original position within the embedded clause, unlike the case in English. This clearly shows that the non-restrictive relative in Japanese is also derived via the relative head-raising on a par with its restrictive counterpart.⁽¹⁰⁾

2.1.3. Complex NP Constraint Effects in Head-Internal Relatives

The assumption that there is an overt relative head movement to [Spec, CP] is involved in the derivation of the head-internal relative in Japanese is empirically supported by the fact that the construction at hand exhibits the Complex NP Constraint (CNPC) effects as in (31) below, as originally observed by Watanabe (1992a,b) (cf. also Hoshi (1995) and Kuroda (1998, 1999a,b) among others for further discussion on such an A-over-A effect):

(10) Note, however, that Ishii (1991: 49) observes that the non-restrictive relatives in Japanese do not show connectivity/reconstruction effects with respect to Condition A, as illustrated below:

- (i) ?*Mary-wa [[John-ga taipusita] [ano kare-zisin-no ronbun]]-o
 -Top -Nom typed that himself-Gen paper -Acc
 sutete-simatatta
 threw away
 'Mary threw away that paper of himself, which John typed.'

Although I admit that the matrix subject *Mary* tends to blur connectivity/reconstruction effects, I find (i) quite acceptable under the relevant interpretation if the intonation is properly controlled. I have no idea as to where this difference of judgment comes from at this moment.

- (31) a. ?*[[John-ga [[Mary-ga **subarasii ronbun-o** kaita toyuu]
 John-Nom Mary-Nom excellent paper-Acc wrote Comp
 uwasa]-o kiita] no]-ga syuppansareta.
 rumor-Acc heard -Nom was-publish
 (Intended) ‘An excellent paper which John heard a rumor that
 Mary had written was published.’
- b. *[[John-ga [[**subarasii ronbun-o** kaita] hito]-o
 John-Nom excellent paper-Acc wrote person-Acc
 hometeita] no]-ga syuppansareta.
 praised had -Nom was-published
 (Intended) ‘An excellent paper which John had praised the person who
 wrote (it) was published.’

The readings forced in (31a) and (31b) are the ones in which the complex NPs *[[Mary-ga subarasii ronbun-o kaita toyuu] uwasa]* ‘a rumor that Mary had written an excellent paper’ and *[[subarasii ronbun-o kaita] hito]* ‘the person who wrote an excellent paper’ are construed as the internal semantic heads of the head-internal relatives instead of the bold-faced nominals, respectively, which results in semantic anomaly.

By the same token, as Watanabe (2002: 4) observes, in the Japanese-type head-internal relative, stacking of head-internal relatives is prohibited, as illustrated in (32) below:

- (32) *[[John-ga [MIT-no gakusei-ga **subarasii ronbun-o** kaita no]-o
 John-Nom MIT-Gen student-Nom excellent paper-Acc wrote -Acc
 posuto-doku-tosite saiyousite-ita no]-no syuppan-ga okureta.
 Post-doc-as adopted-had -Gen publication-Nom was-delayed
 ‘Publication of an excellent paper which John had hired as a post-

doc an MIT student who wrote (it) was delayed.'

This follows as a result of violation of the CNPC under the assumption that movement of the internal relative head to [Spec,CP] is involved in the derivation.

2.2. Non-Movement Properties

In this section, I will be concerned with a couple of phenomena which display apparent non-movement properties of N-final relatives in Japanese.

2.2.1. Lack of Idiom Chunk Interpretations in Head-External Relatives

One of the motivations for the head raising analysis stems from the fact that an idiom chunk can occur as the head of a relative clause, as illustrated by English examples in (33)(cf. Brame (1968) and Schachter (1973) *inter alia* for idiom chunk arguments in favor of the relative head raising analysis):

- (33) The headway that we made on that problem (cf. make headway = progress)

In contrast, apparently, the Japanese head-external relatives do not allow for an idiom chunk to appear as their head, as illustrated in (34) below:

- (34) *[[kare-ga hutatabi onazi ayamati-o sumai-to katameteita] hozo]
 he-Nom again the same mistake-Acc never-make-to strengthen
 navel
 'Lit. the navel that he has strengthened never to make the same

mistake.'

(cf. *hozo-o katameru* = make up one's mind)

(34) has only a non-idiomatic literal interpretation. One might take this fact to conclude that Japanese relativization does not involve movement of the relative head to [Spec,CP].⁽¹¹⁾

2.2.2. Lack of Scope Reconstruction Effects in Head-External Relatives

Based on Bianchi's (1999: 45–46, 122–123) Italian examples, Aoun and Li (2003: 98, 102–103) discuss the following paradigm in (35), which illustrates an effect of the relative head-raising in English *that*-relatives:

- (35) a. Every doctor will examine two patients.
 b. Every doctor will examine the two patients.

(11) Note that non-restrictive relativization in English does not permit an idiom chunk being the external head, either, as illustrated in (i):

- (i) ***the headway**, which we made on that problem

This is due to the referentiality of the bold-faced external relative head of the non-restrictive relative in English.

Bernstein (2001: 561, n.16) alludes to Mark Baltin's (p.c.) example like (ii) (due to McCawley 1981) and his remark that it would compromise Kayne's (1994) promotion approach to idiom chunks:

- (ii) John made the headway that got us out of here.

This is so, because *headway* would have to be raised from within the relative clause. However, under the framework of the Minimalist Program (cf. Chomsky 1995), idiom chunks are not necessarily subject to the restriction that they must constitute a

- c. I phoned the two patients [that every doctor will examine tomorrow]

In (35a), the object QP *two patients* allows for a narrow scope interpretation,

unit at D-structure due to lack of such a level of representation. Thus, it could be reasonable to assume that in the course of the core computation by Merge they must form a relevant unit to be idiomatically interpreted. The fact that a such-and-such expression is an idiom may well be stored in long-term memory related to the lexicon and checked against it when interpreted at LF/semantic component (cf. Jackendoff 1997 for a different view in the “post-minimalist” framework). In (ii), after raising of the NP *headway* to [Spec, CP] of the D-CP structure, the verbal part *make* of the idiom will be merged to it to make up a relativized idiom *make the headway that got us out of here*. This line of analysis holds the view that idioms are also built out of smaller parts via Merge rather than being inserted as a ‘frozen’ lexical unit. If this line of analysis is on the right track, it seems that for the purpose of idiom interpretation the external D *the* in (ii) is invisible, or can be ignored (cf. **make the headway*).

Ruichi Washio (p.c.) points out that the following examples of idiom chunks in Japanese relatives seem to sound OK:

- (iii) a. *Kare-ga tuini dasita sippo-wa tukamiyasukatta.*
 He-Nom at last showed tail-Top was-easy-to-grab
 ‘Lit. the tail that he showed at last was easy to grab’
- b. *Kare-ga tuini dasita sippo-wa timeiteki data.*
 He-Nom at last showed tail-Top fatal was
 ‘Lit. the tail that he showed at last was fatal’

Note that (iiia) involves two idioms *sippo-o dasu* ‘show one’s true self/true colors’ and *sippo-o tukamu* ‘have something on someone’. I am not sure about the status of (iiib), though. It sounds rather non-idiomatic to me at least. On a par with (ii) in English, for the purpose of idiom interpretation, the specific/referential reading of the raised relative DP at [Spec, CP] in Japanese relatives might be invisible, or can be ignored as well. I will leave a full investigation on this matter to future research.

whereas the one in (35b) containing a definite determiner has only a wide scope interpretation. Interestingly, in (35c), the relativized QP *two patients* preceded by a definite determiner allows for a narrow scope interpretation on a par with (35a), showing scope reconstruction effects due to the relative head-raising to [Spec, CP].

In contrast, the following paradigm in Japanese corresponding to (35) indicates that there is no such scope reconstruction effects in Japanese relatives:

- (36) a. *Dono isya-mo hutari-no kanzya-o sindansuru koto-ni natteiru.*
 every doctor-also two-Gen patient-Acc examine will
 'Every doctor will examine two patients.'
- b. *Dono isya-mo sono hutari-no kanzya-o sindansuru koto-ni natteiru.*
 every doctor-also those two-Gen patient-Acc examine will
 'Every doctor will examine those two patients.'
- c. *Watasi-wa [[dono isya-mo asita t sindansuru koto-ni natteiru]
 I-Top every doctor-also tomorrow examine will
 hutari-no kanzya]-ni denwa-o kaketa.
 two-Gen patient-Dat phone (call) -Acc make
 'I phoned the two patients that every doctor will examine tomorrow.'*

Unlike (35c), the relativized QP *hutari-no kanzya* 'two patients' in (36c) has only a wide scope reading, displaying no scope reconstruction effects. This apparently points to lack of the relative head-raising to [Spec, CP] in Japanese relatives.⁽¹²⁾

(12) Note that the non-restrictive relative counterpart in (i) below does not show any

2.2.3. Q-Scope Facts concerning Head-Internal Relatives

Next, let us turn to Q-scope facts with respect to head-internal relatives in Japanese discussed by Shimoyama (1999) (cf. also Hoshi 1995), which apparently suggest lack of the relative head movement to [Spec, CP] in the relevant construction at hand. First, consider the following paradigm:

- (37) a. Hotondo-no gakuei-ga [[Taro-ga e sikenmae-ni
 most-Gen student-Nom Taro-Nom before exam-at
 dasita] dono syukudai-mo] teisyutusita.
 assigned every homework turned in
 ‘Most students turned in every homework that Taro assigned
 before the exam.’
 (i) Most > \forall (ii) * \forall > Most
- b. [[Taro-ga e sikenmae-ni dasita] dono syukudai-mo]_i
 Taro-Nom before exam-at assigned every homework
 Hotondo-no gakusei-ga t_i teisyutusita.
 Most-Gen student-Nom turned in
 Lit.’ Every homework that Taro assigned before the exam, most stu-
 dents turned in.’
 (i) *Most > \forall (ii) \forall > Most

(37a) involves two quantified nominal expressions *hotondo-no gakusei*

scope reconstruction effects, either:

- (i) Watasi-wa [[dono isya-mo asita t sindansuru koto-ni natteiru]
 I-Top every doctor-also tomorrow examine will
 sono hutari-no kanzya]-ni denwa-o kaketa.
 those two-Gen patient-Dat phone (call) -Acc make
 ‘I phoned those two patients that every doctor will examine tomorrow.’

‘most students’ and *dono syukudai-mo* ‘every homework’ as the matrix subject and the external relative head at the matrix object position, respectively. As far as the relative scope of the two nominal expressions is concerned, only $\text{Most} > \forall$ relation obtains. Interestingly, if the surface order of the two quantified nominal expressions is reversed by scrambling, the relative scope relation is also reversed, as indicated in (37b).

With this fact in mind, observe the following paradigm with regard to head-internal relatives in Japanese:

- (38) a. *Hotondo-no gakusei-ga* [[*Taro-ga dono syukudai-mo*
 most-Gen student-Nom Taro-Nom every homework
sikenmae-ni dasita] *no*]-*o teisyutusita.*
 before exam-at assigned NM-Acc turned in
 ‘Taro assigned every homework before the exam and most
 students turned them in.’
 (i) $\text{Most} > \forall$ (ii) $*\forall > \text{Most}$
- b. [[*Taro-ga dono syukudai-mo sikenmae-ni*
 Taro-Nom every homework before exam-at
dasita] *no*]-*o hotondo-no gakusei-ga* *t_i teisyutusita.*
 assigned NM-Acc most-Gen student-Nom turned in
 ‘Taro assigned every homework before the exam and most
 students turned them in.’
 (i) $\text{Most} > \forall$ (ii) $*\forall > \text{Most}$

As illustrated in (38a,b), regardless of the surface order between the matrix subject and the matrix object involving a head-internal relative, the relevant relative scope relation remains the same, viz., $\text{Most} > \forall$.

If the internal relative head also raises to [Spec, CP] out of the embed-

ded IP on a par with its head-external relative counterpart, then it would be expected that scrambling should change the relative scope relation just as in (37) above. Therefore, the Q-scope facts in (38) apparently point to the absence of the relative head-raising to [Spec, CP] in the head-internal relative in Japanese.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, I have pointed out the fact that the N-final relativization in Japanese exhibits an apparent hybrid nature of movement and non-movement properties, which is contrary to the 'standard' view that Japanese relativization totally lacks movement and only involves 'base-generation' (cf. Kuno 1973 *inter alia.*). Thus, if my observation and consideration in this paper is on the right track, it will certainly pose a mystery to be solved in some principled way. Due to space limitation, I have to relegate an in-depth investigation into this matter to other occasions (cf. Hoshi to appear and Hoshi in preparation).

Acknowledgments

The material in this paper is part of the presentation that I made at the Zisedai no *Gengokenkyu IV* [Linguistic Research in the Next Generation IV] held at the University of Tsukuba on December 25–26, 2003. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Ruichi Washio and Toshiaki Oya for giving me a precious opportunity to make a presentation on that occasion. I would also like to thank the audience there for asking questions and making comments/suggestions, especially, Ruichi Washio, Toshiaki Oya, Masaharu Shimada, and Sadayoshi Ogawa. Needless to say, the usual caveats will apply.

References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2003. 'Remnant Movement in Tagalog Relative Clause Formation.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 631–640.
- Aoun, Joseph and Yen-hui Audrey Li. 2003. *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar: The Diversity of Wh-Constructions*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Bars, Andy. 1986. Chains and Anaphoric Dependence: On Reconstruction and Its Implications. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.
- Bernstein, Judy B. 2001. 'The DP Hypothesis: Identifying Clausal Properties in the Nominal Domain.' In Mark Baltin and Chris Collins (eds.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, 536–561. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 1999. *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Mouton de Gruyter, New York.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2000a. 'The Raising Analysis of Relative Clauses: A Reply to Borsley.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, 123–140.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2000b. 'Some Issues in the Syntax of Relative Determiners.' In Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger, and Chris Wilder (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, 53–82. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Brame, Michael K. 1968. 'A New Analysis of the Relative Clause: Evidence for an Interpretive Theory.' Ms., MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Carlson, Greg N. 1977. 'Amount Relatives.' *Language* 53, 520–542.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Fukui, Naoki and Yuji Takano. 1998. 'Symmetry in Syntax: Merge and Demerge.' *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7, 27–86.
- Grosu, Alexander and Fred Landman. 1998. 'Strange Relatives of the Third

- Kind.' *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 125–170.
- Gunji, Takao. 2002. *Tango to Bun no Koozoo* [Structures of Words and Sentences]. Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo.
- Harada, S. I. (1974) 'Remarks on Relativization.' *Annual Bulletin, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 8, 133–143. University of Tokyo.
- Heim, Irene. 1987. 'Where Does the Definiteness Restriction Apply? Evidence from the Definiteness of Variables.' In Eric J. Reuland and Alice G. B. ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 21–42. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hoji, Hajime. 1985. Logical Form Constraints and Configurational Structures in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation. University of Washington, Seattle.
- Hoji, Hajime. 2003. 'Falsifiability and Repeatability in Generative Grammar: A Case Study of Anaphora and Scope Dependency in Japanese.' *Lingua* 113, 377–446.
- Honda, Kensuke, Kazuhiro Ichikawa, Tomoko Inoue, Kazuhiko Yurugi, and Satoshi Sunami. 1996. 'The Structure of Japanese Relative Clauses.' Ms. Dokkyo University, Saitama.
- Honda, Kensuke. 2002. 'Hantaisyousei Kasetu kara Mita Nihongo Toogoron (An Antisymmetric Approach to Japanese Syntax).' In Tsukuba Daigaku Gendai Gengogaku Kenkyukai (Tsukuba University Association for Modern Linguistic Research) (ed.), *Zisedai no Gengo Kenkyuu I (Linguistic Research in the Next Generation I)*, 175–224. University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba.
- Hoshi, Koji. 1995. Structural and Interpretive Aspects of Head-Internal and Head-External Relative Clauses. Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester.
- Hoshi, Koji. To appear. 'Remarks on N-Final Relativization in Japanese.'

- English Studies* 44. Keio University, Yokohama.
- Hoshi, Koji. In Preparation. 'Parametrization of the External D-System in Relativization.' Ms., Keio University, Yokohama.
- Ishii, Yasuo. 1991. Operators and Empty Categories in Japanese. Doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1997. *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1968. 'English Relativization and Certain Related Problems.' *Language* 44, 244–266.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1986a. 'Movement of Noun Phrases in Japanese.' In Takashi Imai and Mamoru Saito (eds.), *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*. Foris, Dordrecht, 229–271 (Reprinted in Kuroda 1992, 253–292).
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1986b. 'What Happened after the Movement of NPs in La Jolla?' In S.-Y. Kuroda (ed.), *Working Papers from the First SDF Workshop in Japanese Syntax*. UCSD. (Reprinted in Kuroda 1992, 293–314).
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992. *Japanese Syntax and Semantics: Collected Papers*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1998. 'Shubu-Naizai-Kankeisetsu.' In Hideyuki Hirano and Masaru Nakamura (eds.), *Gengo no Naizai to Gaizai*, 1–80. The Faculty of Arts and Letters, Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1999a. 'Notes on So-Called Head-Internal Relative Clauses in

- Japanese.’ In Masatake Muraki and Enoch Iwamoto (eds.), *Linguistics: In Search of the Human Mind* (A Festschrift for Kazuko Inoue), 414–429.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1999b. ‘Shubu-Naizai-Kankeisetsu.’ In S.-Y. Kuroda and Masaru Nakamura (eds.), *Kotoba no Kaku to Shuen — Nihongo to Eigo no Aida*, 27–103. Kurosio Publishers, Tokyo.
- McCawley, James D. 1981. ‘The Syntax and Semantics of English English Relative Clauses.’ *Lingua* 53, 99–149.
- Murasugi, Keiko. 2000a. ‘An Antisymmetry Analysis of Japanese Relative Clauses.’ In Artemis Alexiadou, Paul Law, Andre Meinunger, and Chris Wilder (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, 231–263. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Murasugi, Keiko. 2000b. ‘Japanese Complex Noun Phrases and the Antisymmetry Theory.’ In Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, eds., *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, 211–234. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Perlmutter, David. 1972. ‘Evidence for Shadow Pronouns in French Relativization.’ In J. Jaeger et al. (eds.), *The Chicago Which Hunt*, 73–105. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Sakai, Hiromu. 1994. ‘Complex NP Constraint and Case-Conversions in Japanese.’ In Masaru Nakamura (ed.), *Current Topics in English and Japanese*, 179–203. Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2003. ‘Unpronounced Heads in Relative Clauses.’ In Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The Interfaces: Deriving and Interpreting Omitted Structures*, 205–226. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Schachter, Paul. ‘Focus and Relativization.’ *Language* 49, 19–46.
- Shimoyama, Junko. 1999. ‘Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Japanese and E-Type Anaphora.’ *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 8, 147–182.

- Vergnaud, Jean-Roger. 1974. French Relative Clauses. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1992a. 'Wh-in-Situ, Subjacency, and Chain Formation.' *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics* #2.
- Watanabe, Akira. 1992b. 'Subjacency and S-structure Movement of Wh-in-Situ.' *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 1, 255–291.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2002. 'Parametrization of Quantificational Determiners and Head-Internal Relatives.' Ms., University of Tokyo, Tokyo.