

On the EPP Analysis of A-Scrambling in Japanese

[Issues] One of the core properties of Japanese A-scrambling is that it is *locality-free*. As shown in (1), object can A-scramble over subject allowing anaphor binding. Miyagawa (2001) provides an illuminating account; he argues that overt V-raising to T makes it possible for verb's arguments to be equidistance from T (cf. Chomsky 1993), and hence T's EPP-feature can attract any phrase that Agrees with the verbal complex. This paper demonstrates that Miyagawa's (2001) proposal that A-movement scrambling in Japanese to TP-Spec (i) requires V-raising to T (to overcome an apparently minimality violating nature of A-scrambling; "Equidistance Condition") and (ii) is restricted to only XPs Agreeing with T⁰ (Agree (T, XP); "Agree Condition") are both empirically incorrect. On the contrary, I demonstrate, by critically scrutinizing Miyagawa's (2001) EPP analysis of A-scrambling, that A-movement scrambling in Japanese can occur (i) irrespective of the availability of V-raising to T and (ii) Agree (T, XP), but (iii) it is a movement driven solely by the EPP. Specifically, I argue, extending the Split EPP/Agree Parameter ((A)), that A-scrambling/movement in Japanese is Agree-free EPP-driven movement; absence of minimality violation with A-scrambling follows from the absence of Agree in implementing Move.

(A) The Split EPP/Agree Parameter (Hiraiwa 2002: 293); Satisfaction of EPP on T is (not) contingent on Agree.

[Miyagawa's 2001 analysis] Miyagawa uses scope interaction between a (subject) quantifier and negation to motivate his theory. The crucial minimal pair for his analysis is (2) and (3). In (2) *zen'in* "all" can only be interpreted outside the scope of sentential negation (cf. Kato 1988), but in the scrambled example in (3), it may be interpreted inside the scope of negation. Relevant derivations are depicted in (2)' and (3)'. The particularly interesting fact he observes is that when a focus particle (e.g. *mo* "even") is attached to the verb stem, object scrambling fails to yield the "Neg >> all" reading (4). Miyagawa argues that this is because A-scrambling by the EPP is impossible since V-raising is blocked by the focus particle as can be seen by the *su*-support.

[Against Miyagawa 2001] (i) Against Equidistance Condition. However, there is compelling evidence to doubt Miyagawa's argument. Nemoto (1993) and Uchibori (2001) argue that V-raising is irrelevant for A-scrambling, based on the control construction. As shown in (5), object in the control complement can A-bind the matrix subject when it is scrambled (even if the matrix indirect object intervenes between the matrix predicate and the embedded control complement, which clearly shows that embedded predicate is not overtly raised to the matrix). Note also that even when V-raising is blocked by a focus particle, anaphorbinding is possible (6). Equidistance Condition wrongly predicts it to be ungrammatical. The scope fact (7) also shows the same point; "Neg >> all" reading is possible when object in the control complement scramble above the matrix subject. The remaining data to be accounted for is the absence of "Neg >> all" reading in (4). I argue that what is responsible is not the lack of V-raising, but the presence of a focus particle. Consider first unambiguous (8) (lacking "Neg >> all" reading), which minimally differs from (7) in that it has a focus particle attached to the embedded control complement. Note further the minimal pair (9) and (10). (10) lacks the "Neg >> all" reading despite the fact that V-raising forming *tanoma-nakat-ta* is not blocked and what is scrambled is the internal argument of the matrix verb. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the lack of "Neg > all" reading in (4), (8), and (10) is due to the presence of a focus particle which forces a universal quantifier to take scope over negation, and it does not constitute evidence for the Equidistance Condition. English data (11)-(12) confirms that it is the focus particle that prevents the otherwise possible "Neg > all" reading. (ii) Against Agree Condition. That Agree (T, XP) is irrelevant for A-scrambling can be found in Takano (1998) where it is argued that PP-scrambling can license anaphor binding (13). The scope fact (14) also shows that PP can satisfy the EPP on T.

[On the EPP] Another obvious problem Miyagawa faces is that in order to deal with the absence of "Neg > all" reading in (2), he had to assume that a copy left behind in vP-Spec is not available. However, corresponding English example (9) shows that such a copy is indeed available. The Agree-free nature of A-movement/scrambling in Japanese (vs. Agree-dependent nature of subject-raising in English) paves the way to account for the Japanese/English contrast under Nevins and Anand's (2003) generalization (B); Given that the satisfaction of EPP on T is dissociated from T's Agree, movement of subject in Japanese (but not in English) is driven solely by the EPP, and hence cannot reconstruct to yield the low scope reading of subject ("Neg >> all").

(B) PEPPER (Purely EPP Eliminates Reconstruction; N&A 2003: 102); A-movement only for the EPP does not reconstruct. Note crucially that the locality-free nature of A-scrambling Japanese naturally follows from the (negative setting of) EPP/Agree Split Parameter. Given the reasonable assumption that locality is calculated by Agree, and EPP-driven A-scrambling is a movement that does not require Agree, object/non-subject can A-move over subject without incurring locality violation.

Data

- (1) [John-to Mary]-o_{2/i} [otagai₂-no oya]-ga t_i sikat-ta.
 J-and M-Acc e.o.-Gen parents-Nom scold-Tns
 ‘John and Mary_{2/i}, each other₂’s parents scolded t_i.’
- (2) Zen’in-ga CD-o kawa-nakat-ta. (all >> Neg, *Neg >> all)
 all-Nom CD-Acc buy-Neg-Tns ‘All did not buy CD.’
- (3) CD-o_i zen’in-ga t_i kawa-nakat-ta. (all >> Neg, Neg >> all)
 CD-Acc all-Nom buy-Neg-Tns ‘CD_i, all did not buy t_i.’
- (2)’ [TP SUB(all) [_{vP} t_{SUB(all)} OBJ t_v]-t_{Neg} V-Neg-T] → all >> Neg
 (3)’ [TP OBJ [_{vP} SUB(all) t_{OBJ} t_v]-t_{Neg} V-Neg-T] → Neg >> all
- (4) CD-o_i zen’in-ga t_i kai-mo-si-nakat-ta. (all >> Neg, *Neg >> all)
 CD-Acc all-Nom buy-even-do-Neg-Tns ‘CD_i, all did not even buy t_i.’
- (5) [John-to Mary]-o_{2/i} [otagai₂-no oya]-ga (Tom-ni) [PRO t_i sikaru-yoo-ni]
 J-and M-Acc e.o.-Gen parents-Nom (T-Dat) scold-to
 (Tom-ni) tanoma-nakat-ta.
 (T-Dat) ask-Neg-Tns
 ‘John and Mary_{2/i}, each other₂’s parents did not ask Tom [PRO to scold t_i.]’
- (6) [John-to Mary]-o_{2/i} [otagai₂-no oya]-ga t_i sikari-mo-si-nakat-ta.
 J-and M-Acc e.o.-Gen parents-Nom scold-even-do-Neg-Tns
 ‘John and Mary_{2/i}, each other₂’s parents didn’t even scold t_i.’
- (7) CD-o_i zen’in-ga (Mary-ni) [PRO t_i kau-yoo-ni] (Mary-ni) tanoma-nakat-ta.
 CD-Acc all-Nom (M-Dat) buy-to (M-Dat) ask-Neg-Tns
 ‘CD_i, all did not ask Mary [PRO to buy t_i.]’ (all >> Neg, Neg >> all)
- (8) CD-o_i zen’in-ga Mary-ni [PRO t_i kau-yoo-ni]-mo tanoma-nakat-ta.
 CD-Acc all-Nom M-Dat buy-to-even ask-Neg-Tns
 ‘CD_i, all did not ask Mary [PRO to even buy t_i.]’ (all >> Neg, *Neg >> all)
- (9) Mary-ni_i zen’in-ga t_i [PRO CD-o_i kau-yoo-ni] tanoma-nakat-ta.
 M-Dat all-Nom CD-Acc buy-to ask-Neg-Tns
 ‘Mary_i, all did not ask t_i [PRO to buy CD].’ (all >> Neg, Neg >> all)
- (10) Mary-ni_i zen’in-ga t_i [PRO CD-o_i kau-yoo-ni]-mo tanoma-nakat-ta.
 M-Dat all-Nom CD-Acc buy-to-even ask-Neg-Tns
 ‘Mary_i, all did not ask t_i [PRO to even buy CD].’ (all >> Neg, *Neg >> all)
- (11) Everyone didn’t take the test. (all >> Neg, Neg >> all)
 (12) Everyone didn’t even take the test. (all >> Neg, *Neg >> all)
- (13) [John-to Mary]-kara_{2/i} [otagai₂-no hahaoya]-ga t_i okane-o kari-ta.
 J-and M-from e.o.-Gen mother-Nom money-Acc borrow-Tns
 ‘[from [John and Mary]₂]_i, each other₂’s mothers borrowed money t_i.’ (Takano 1998: (82a))
- (14) John-kara_i zen’in-ga t_i okane-o kari-nakat-ta.
 J-from all-Nom money-Acc borrow-Neg-Tns
 ‘[from [John]]_i, all did not borrow money t_i.’ (all >> Neg, Neg >> all)

References: Miyagawa 2001. The EPP, Scrambling, and *Wh*-in-situ. In Kenstowicz (ed.). MIT Press. Hiraiwa 2001. EPP: Object Shift and Stylistic Fronting in Scandinavian. WCCFL 20. Nemoto, Naoko. 1993. Chains and Case Positions: A Study from Scrambling in Japanese. Ph.D. Diss., UConn. Nevins and Anand 2003. Some AGREEMENT MATTERS. WCCFL 22. Uchibori 2000. The Syntax of Subjunctive Complements. Ph.D. Diss., UConn.