

Exceptional Q Particle Binding and Frozen Phenomena in Japanese

In this paper, I propose that the Japanese Verbal Noun (VN) is categorially a verb, but is nominalized by a null morpheme ‘Ø’ in (1). In addition, the indirect object PP is theta-marked by a postposition, not a verbal noun, following a suggestion by Baker (1997). Based on this, I propose that the indirect object in nominalization is placed at *v*’ which is a new idea (1b, c). By proposing (1), I am going to account for an exceptional Q binding and the so-called frozen phenomena in Japanese. In Japanese, the Q particle *mo* is attached to a lexical item such as a verb and binds the indeterminate pronoun *dare-ni* ‘to anyone’ in (2). According to Kishimoto (2001), the Q particle binding is accounted for in (3). In (3), *age-mo* adjoins a little *v*. As a result, *age-mo* is located in the head position of *vP*, and *dare-ni* is under *vP*. Under (3), *mo* binds *dare-ni*. On the other hand, once an indeterminate pronoun such as *dare* ‘anyone’ in (4) is outside *vP*, the binding condition does not hold. According to Kishimoto, there is a restriction and an exception of the binding condition on the indeterminate pronoun ((5) is from Kishimoto). The Q particle *mo* is attached to the nouns *hon* ‘book’ in (5a) and *soodan* ‘consultation’ in (5b), and only (5b) is grammatical. Kishimoto explains that the verb *su* adjoins to *v*, and VN *soodan* incorporates into the *su+v* complex at LF as in (5c). This incorporation makes *soodan-mo-su* be located in the head position of *vP*. Under (5c), *mo* binds *dare-ni*. This is called an exceptional Q binding. On the other hand, *hon* as a common noun in (5a) cannot undergo LF-incorporation. Thus, the indirect object *dare-ni* cannot be bound by the Q particle *mo*. Kishimoto further claims that a verbal noun to be incorporated into the verb *su* ‘do’ cannot be phrasal ((6) is from Kishimoto). In (6), the verbal noun *soodan* is modified by the adjective *henna* ‘strange’. Kishimoto explains that a phrasal element does not undergo incorporation since it involves head movement (Baker 1988). Accordingly, the reason why sentence (6) is ungrammatical is that the verbal noun *soodan* is in a phrase [_{NP} [_A *henna*][_N *soodan*]]. At LF, head movement of *soodan* cannot take place, nor does the binding condition of the indeterminate pronoun hold. However, example (7) cannot be explained under Kishimoto’s system. In (7), the verbal noun *bunyo* ‘sharing’ is in a phrase ([_{zaisan-no} *bunyo*]), but the indeterminate pronoun *dare-ni* seems to be bound. However, once nominalization (1b) is adopted, (7) is easily explained ((8) is the relevant reanalysis). In (8), I assume that the Q particle is attached to *v*, and that Japanese does not have overt V to *v* movement in the line of Fukui and Takano (1998). As a result, *dare-ni* is under the scope of *mo*. Under this explanation, *mo* can bind *dare-ni* without resorting to unmotivated LF-incorporation. On the other hand, the ungrammatical example (6) is accounted for by (1a) (the relevant reanalysis is (9)). That is, the verb *soodan* is nominalized and becomes a common noun like *hon* ‘book’ as in (10). Accordingly, the particle *mo* that is attached to a noun cannot extend its domain and as a result, *dare-ni* cannot be bound by *mo*. The current study can also account for why *zaisan-o* can undergo a syntactic process such as scrambling, but *bunyo-o* cannot (the so-called frozen phenomena) in (11b, c) once we adopt nominalization (1c). It is because it is an illegitimate syntactic constituent (12). Thus, unlike Miyamoto (1999) who assumes that *bunyo-o* in (11a) is a predicate noun, the current study is able to account for frozen phenomena without stipulating anything. Furthermore, under (13), the adverb *subayaku* ‘quickly’, not the adjective *subayai* ‘quick’, can modify *bunyo*. Thus, this analysis reveals that adverbs exist inside nominalization in Japanese and support VP-within-Nominalization in the line of Alexiadou (2001), Fu, Roeper, and Borer (2001), and van Hout and Roeper (1998), among others.

- (1) a. [N [v VN][N Ø]]
 b. [vP [v' [PP P][v' [N [VP [NP N][v VN]][N Ø]]v]]]
 c. [N [vP [v' [PP P][v' [VP [NP N][v VN]]v]]] [N Ø]]
- (2) Taroo-wa dare-ni ringo-o age-mo-si-nakat-ta.
 Taroo-Top anyone-to apple-Acc give-Q-do-Neg-Past
 'Taroo did not give anyone an apple.'
- (3) Taroo-wa [vP [PP dare-ni] [v' [VP [NP ringo]-o ti] [v age-mo]_{i-v}]] si-nakat-ta.
 (4) *Dare-ga [vP [PP Hanako-ni] [v' [VP [NP ringo] ti] [v age-mo]_{i-v}]] si-nakat-ta.
 Anyone-Nom Hanako-to apple give-Q do-Neg-Past
 'No one gives Hanako an apple.'
- (5) a. *Taroo-wa dare-ni hon-mo watasa-nakat-ta.
 Taroo-Top anyone-to book-Q hand-Neg-Past
 'Taroo did not hand anyone a book.'
 b. Taroo-wa dare-ni soodan-mo si-nakat-ta.
 Taroo-Top anyone-to consultation-Q do-Neg-Past
 'Taroo did not make a consultation with anyone.'
 c. Taroo-wa [vP [PP dare-ni] [v' [VP t_j ti] [v [NP soodan-mo]_j+ [v sui+v]]]]. (LF representation)
- (6) *Taroo-wa dare-ni [henna soodan]-mo si-nakat-ta.
 Taroo-Top anyone-to strange consultation-Q do-Neg-Past
 'Taroo did not make a strange consultation with anyone.'
- (7) Taroo-wa dare-ni [zaisan-no bunyo]-mo si-nakat-ta.
 Taroo-Top anyone-to fortune-Gen sharing-Q do-Neg-Past
 'Taroo did not share the fortune with anyone.'
- (8) Taroo-wa [vP [v' [dare-ni] [v' [N [VP [NP zaisan]-no [v bunyo]] [N Ø]] v-mo]]] si-nakat-ta
 Taroo-Top anyone-to fortune-Gen sharing -Q do-Neg-past
- (9) *Taroo-wa dare-ni [NP [A henna] [N [v soodan] [N Ø]]]-mo si-naka-ta.
 (10) *Taroo-wa dare-ni [NP hon]-mo watasa-nakat-ta.
 (11) a. Taroo-wa Hanako-ni zaisan-o bunyo-o sita.
 b. Zaisano-oi Taroo-wa Hanako-ni ti bunyo-o sita.
 c. *Bunyo-o_j Taroo-wa zaisan-o t_j sita.
 (12) Taro-ga [N [vP [Hanako-ni] [VP [NP zaisan-o] [v bunyo]] v][N Ø]]-o sita.
 (13) Taro-ga [N [vP [Hanako-ni] [VP [NP zaisan-o] subayaku/*subayai[v bunyo]] v][N Ø]]-o sita.
 quickly/quick

References: Alexiadou, A. 2001. *Functional Structure in Nominals. Nominalization and ergativity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins; Baker, M. 1997. Thematic roles and syntactic structure. In: Haegeman, Liliane (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 73-137. Dordrecht: Kluwer; Fu, J. T. Roeper and H. Borer. 2001. The VP within nominalizations: evidence from adverbs and the VP anaphor *do-so*. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19.3: 549-582; Fukui, N. and Y. Takano. 1998. Symmetry in syntax: merge and demerge. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7: 27-86; Kishimoto, H. 2001. Binding of indeterminate pronouns and clause structure in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 32: 597-633; Miyamoto, T. 1999. *The Light Verb Construction in Japanese: the role of verbal noun*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins; Van Hout, Angelika and Thomas Roeper. 1998. Events and aspectual structure in derivational morphology. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 32: 175-200.