

- Choi, J. 2007. *Free Choice and Negative Polarity: A Compositional Analysis of Korean Polarity sensitive Items*. Ph.D dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- Dretske, Fred I. 1972. Contrastive statement. *Philosophical Review*, 411-437.
- Giannakidou, A., 2007. The landscape of EVEN. *Natural Language Linguist Theory* 25, 39-81.
- Gill, K.-H., Tsoulas, G., 2006. Features, concord, quantification: Licensing of conjunctive quantifiers and its implications. Ms. University of Sheffield and University of York.
- Hocksema, J. and F. Zwarts. 1991. Some remarks on focus adverbs. *Semantics* 8, 51-70.
- Hwang, J. 2011. What Intervenes What?: the Flip Side of Intervention Effects. *Language Research* 47, 219-244.
- Kim, K.-S., 1999. A paradox in Korean NPI licensing. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 9, 403-428.
- Kim, Y.-W., 2001. Negative concord and the morpheme *-to* in Korean. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 11, 339-381.
- Lec, C., 1996. Negative polarity items in English and Korean. *Language Sciences* 18, 505-523
- Lee, H., 1996. Two types of polarity sensitive (PS) "any". *Language Research* 32, 237-266.
- Lee, H., 2001. The morphology-based semantics of "any" in English and Korean. *Enehak* 31, 127-158.
- Rooth, M., 1985. *Association with focus*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rullmann, H. 1997. *Even, polarity, and scope*. In M. Gibson, G. Wiebe, & G. Libben (Eds.), *Papers in experimental and theoretical linguistics* vol. 4, Edmonton: University of Alberta, pp. 40-64.
- Sells, P., 2001a. Negative polarity licensing and interpretation. In Kuno, S., et al. (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 9, pp. 3-22.
- Sells, P., 2001b. Three aspects of negation in Korean. *Journal of Linguistic Studies* (Linguistic Society of Cheju) 6, 1-15.
- Sells, P., 2006. Interactions of negative polarity items in Korean. In Kuno, S., et al. (Eds.), *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 11, pp. 724-737.
- Yoshimura, K., 2007. *Focus and polarity in Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago.
- Wilkinson, K., 1996. The scope of *even*. *Natural Language Semantics* 4, 193-215.

Long-Distance Passives in Japanese

Toru Ishii
Meiji University

1. Introduction

There are two types of long-distance passives in Japanese. What I call Type I long-distance passives involves aspectual constructions, where a whole complex predicate is passivized as shown in (1):

- (1) **Sono ronbun-ga** (John-niyotte) **e kaki-oe-rare-ta**
that paper-NOM (John-by) write-finish-PASS(IVE)-PAST
 Lit. 'That paper was finished writing by John.' (Nishigauchi 1993: 85)

In (1), the complex predicate *kaki-oe* 'finish writing', which consists of the main verb *kaki* 'write' and the aspectual morpheme *oe* 'finish', is passivized as a whole. On the assumption that such complex predicate constructions have bi-clausal structures, examples like (1) count as long-distance passives. Type I long-distance passives have been extensively discussed by, among others, Sugioka (1984), Miyagawa (1989), Kageyama (1993), and Nishigauchi (1993). What I call Type II long-distance passives, on the other hand, has not been given so much attention. Type II long-distance passives look as if they involve passivization across a subject and the CP-TP node sequence as shown in (2) and (3):

- (2) [**John-no yoona gankona titioya**]-ga hahayotati-ni
 [**John-GEN like stubborn father**]-NOM mother-by
 [CP [TP **kodomo-ga tomodati-ni e zimansitagaru**] to]
 child-NOM friend-DAT want-to-boast that
 omow-are-teiru yooda yo
 think-PASS-PRES(ENT) seem PART(ICLE)
 Lit. 'Stubborn fathers like John seem to be thought of by mothers that children want to boast to their friends about them.'
- (3) [**John-no yooni mokuhi-o tuzukeru higisya**]-ga
 [**John-GEN like nonconfession-ACC continue suspect**]-NOM

* I am grateful to Hidehito Hoshi, Shigeru Miyagawa, Jairo Nunes, and Norvin Richards for helpful comments and discussions on earlier versions of this paper. Earlier versions were presented at Mini Workshop on Japanese/Korean Syntax at MIT and Minimalist Program: Quo Vadis? at University of Potsdam. I thank those in the audience for comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to Hiroshi Aoyagi, Hajime Ikawa, and Miyoko Yasui for help with the Japanese data. Remaining errors and omissions are, of course, the sole responsibility of the author. This work was supported in part by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science under grant Scientific Research C 22520511.

masukomi-ni [CP [TP kensatukan-ga suguni
mass-media-by prosecutor-NOM immediately
e kisositagaru] to] omow-*are*-teiru mitaida yo
want-to-prosecute that think-PASS-PRES seem PART
Lit. 'Suspects like John who continue to remain silent seem to be
thought of by the mass media that prosecutors want to prosecute them
immediately.'

In (2, 3), there is an object gap in the embedded clause, and the gap is associated with the matrix subject. In (2), for example, the matrix subject *John-no yoono ganko-na titioya* 'stubborn fathers like John' is associated with the object position of the embedded verb *zimansitagaru* 'want-to-boast'. Since this paper only discusses Type II long-distance passives, I refer to Type II long-distance passives simply as long-distance passives in the rest of this paper.

Long-distance passives like (2, 3) have theoretical implications in that the embedded object *prima facie* undergoes "long NP-movement" to the matrix subject position, crossing the embedded subject and the CP-TP node sequence. It has been observed, however, that such "long NP-movement" is not allowed in languages like English as shown in (4):

(4) *John is believed [that Mary likes *t*].

In generative literature, various locality conditions have been proposed to rule out such "long NP-movement," like the Tensed-S Condition, Specified Subject Condition (Chomsky 1973), the Subadjacency Condition (Chomsky 1981), the Empty Category Principle (Lasnik and Saito 1984; Chomsky 1986), and the Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990). In the minimalist program, "long NP-movement" like (4) is excluded by the defective intervention constraint (5) and the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) (see, among others, Chomsky 2000, 2001). This paper adopts Chomsky's (2001) less strict version of the PIC (6):

(5) The Defective Intervention Constraint (adapted from Chomsky 2000)
* $\alpha > \beta > \gamma$, where (i) ' $>$ ' indicates c-command, (ii) β and γ match the probe α , but β is inactive so that the effects of matching are blocked.

(6) The Phase Impenetrability Condition (adapted from Chomsky 2001)
In [ZP Z ... [HP α [H YP]]], where HP is a strong phrase and ZP is the next strong phrase, the domain of H is not accessible to operations at ZP, where the strong phase is CP/v*P.

(4) violates the defective intervention constraint (5), since the matrix T with unvalued ϕ -features, being a probe, cannot match with the embedded object *John* due to the intervening embedded subject *Mary*, whose Case feature is valued and hence inactive. (4) also violates the PIC (6), since the embedded object *John* never appears at the edge of the embedded vP or CP phase, being inaccessible to the matrix T. Given that the defective intervention

constraint and the PIC are 'deep', it has been widely assumed that "long NP-movement" like (4) is prohibited universally. Long-distance passives in Japanese like (2, 3) therefore present a challenge to the universality of these locality conditions.

This paper proposes contra the surface pattern that the matrix subject in (2, 3) originates not in the embedded object position, but in the major subject (MS) position of the embedded clause. It then undergoes NP-movement from the embedded MS position to the matrix Spec of T. I will argue that Japanese long-distance passives do not violate the defective intervention constraint or the PIC, enabling us to maintain the view that these locality conditions hold universally. The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 investigates two previous analyses of long-distance passives, *i.e.* Nagai (1991) and Toyoshima (1996). In section 3, I will point out that there is a hitherto unnoticed restriction on long-distance passives, which cannot be accommodated by Nagai (1991) or Toyoshima (1996). Section 4 proposes that the subject of a long-distance passive originates in the embedded MS position and undergoes NP-movement to the matrix Spec of T. It is shown that the proposed analysis explains the restriction on long-distance passives. I will also present further evidence for our analysis. Section 5 discusses potential objections to our analysis. Section 6 explicates a crosslinguistic perspective of the proposed analysis. Section 7 makes concluding remarks.

2. Previous Analyses

Nagai (1991) claims that the matrix subject of a long-distance passive is base-generated as a "major subject (MS)." The object gap in the complement CP is a small *pro*, as represented in (7):

(7) SUBJ ... [CP ... *pro* ...] V-(*r*)are (V-PASSIVE)

Toyoshima (1996) claims, on the other hand, that the matrix subject is base-generated and selected by the passive morpheme *-(r)are*. An empty operator originates in the position of an object gap within the embedded clause, and then moves to the embedded Spec of C, where it gets identified with the matrix subject through predication, as represented in (8):

(8) SUBJ ... [CP OP [... *t* ... V]] (*r*)are (PASSIVE)

3. A Restriction on Long-distance Passives

There is, however, a hitherto unnoticed restriction on long-distance passives in Japanese. Long-distance passives are not freely allowed, but their distribution is very limited. While examples like (2, 3) are acceptable, those like (9, 10) are deviant. In (9, 10), the matrix subject *John* is associated with the embedded object position:

- (9)?* **John-ga** Bill-ni [CP Mary-ga totuzen *e* nagutta to]
John-NOM Bill-by Mary-NOM suddenly hit that
 omow-*are*-teiru yooda yo
 think-PASS-PRES seem PART
 Lit. 'John seems to be thought of by Bill that Mary suddenly hit him.'
- (10)?* **John-ga** Bill-ni [CP Mary-ga kinoo guuzen *e* atta to]
John-NOM Bill-by Mary-NOM yesterday by accident met that
 omow-*are*-teiru yooda yo
 think-PASS-PRES seem PART
 Lit. 'John seems to be thought of by Bill that Mary happened to meet him yesterday.'

It should be noted that neither Nagai's nor Toyoshima's analysis can explain the contrast between (2, 3) and (9, 10), since they would predict that long-distance passives should be freely available. Before turning to an account of this contrast between (1, 2) and (9, 10), let us explicate the major subject construction (MSC) in Japanese.

3.1. The Major Subject Construction (MSC)

The MSC has been extensively discussed by, among others, Kuno (1973), Saito (1982, 1985), and Ueda (1990). As argued by Saito (1982, 1985), there is a semantic/pragmatic condition on the MSC (11):

- (11) The "Aboutness" Condition on Major Subjects
 A very strict kind of "aboutness relation" is required between a major subject and the sentence following it; the sentence must be a statement of some "important property" of the major subject.
 (adopted from Saito 1985: 264)

Let us look at how the "aboutness" condition (11) works by first looking at what Kuno (1973) calls Subjectivization pattern, where an MS corresponds to the possessor of a subject, as exemplified by (12, 13):

- (12) **John-ga/no** musuko-ga gakusei desu
John-NOM/GEN son-NOM student be
 'John's son is a student.' (Saito 1982: 9)
- (13) **John-?ga/no** musuko-ga odoroiita
John-GEN son-NOM was-surprised
 'John's son was surprised.' (Saito 1982: 9)

In (12), the MS *John-ga* 'John-NOM' corresponds to the possessor of the subject *John-no* 'John-GEN'. The sentence following the MS *John*, i.e. *musuko-ga gakusei desu* 'his son is a student', expresses an "important property" of *John*, thereby satisfying the "aboutness" condition (11). Hence, the MSC in (12) is acceptable. In (13), however, the sentence following the MS *John*, i.e. *musuko-ga odoroiita* 'his son was surprised', cannot be

interpreted as expressing an "important property" of *John*; the MSC in (13) is deviant.

Saito (1982, 1985) claims that the MSC with an object gap is also acceptable (though it sounds a little bit awkward) as far as it satisfies the "aboutness" condition (11), as exemplified by (14a, b) (Saito 1982: 13):

- (14) a. ? **Kono syu-no eiga-ga** kodomo-ga *e* yorokobu
this kind-GEN movie-NOM child-NOM enjoy
 'It is this kind of movie that children enjoy.'
- b. ? **Kono syu-no hon-ga** kodomotati-ga *e* yomitagaru
this kind-GEN book-NOM children-NOM want-to-read
 'It is this kind of book that children want to read.'

In (14), the MSs *kono syu-no eiga* 'this kind of movie' and *kono syu-no hon* 'this kind of book' correspond to the object gaps. (14a) can be interpreted as expressing an "important property" of *kono syu-no eiga* 'this kind of movie' such that children enjoy it. Similarly, (14b) can be interpreted as expressing an "important property" of *kono syu-no hon* 'this kind of book' such that children want to read it. Both (14a) and (14b) satisfy the "aboutness" condition (11). In contrast with (14), (15), where the MS *sono hon* 'that book' corresponds to the object gap, is deviant:

- (15)***Sono hon-ga** John-ga *e* yonda
that book-NOM John-NOM read
 'John read that book.' (Saito 1985: 199)

In (15), the sentence following the MS *sono hon* 'that book' cannot be interpreted as expressing an "important property" of *that book*. This is because its interpretation would be something like "that book has an important property such that John read it," which is anomalous.

3.2. Correlations between Long-distance Passives and the MSCs

Returning to long-distance passives, we have observed that long-distance passives like (2, 3) are acceptable. If we take the embedded clauses from (2, 3), and merge the matrix subjects as their MSs, we get (16, 17), which are the MSCs with object gaps. Taking (2) as an example, if we take the embedded clause 'children want to boast to their friends' from (2), and merge the matrix subject 'stubborn fathers like John' as its MS, we get (16). (16, 17) are acceptable. In other words, the matrix subjects of the well-formed long-distance passives (2, 3) can be licensed as MSs of the embedded clauses:

- (16) [**John-no yoona gankona titioya**]-ga kodomo-ga tomodati-ni *e*
John-GEN like stubborn father-NOM child-NOM friend-DAT
 zimansitagaru yooda yo
 want-to-boast seem PART

Lit. 'It seems that it is stubborn fathers like John that children want to boast to their friends.'

- (17) **John-no yooni mokuhi-o tuzukeru higisya]-ga**
John-GEN like nonconfession-ACC continue suspect-NOM
 kensatukan-ga suguni e kisositagaru mitaida yo
 prosecutor-NOM immediately want-to-prosecute seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is suspects like John who continue to remain silent that prosecutors want to prosecute immediately.'

We have observed, on the other hand, that long-distance passives (9, 10) are deviant. If we take the embedded clauses from (9, 10), and merge the matrix subjects as their MSs, we get (18, 19), which are also deviant. In other words, the matrix subjects of the deviant long-distance passives (9, 10) cannot be licensed as MSs of the embedded clauses:

- (18)***John-ga Mary-ga totuzen e nagutta yooda yo**
John-NOM Mary-NOM suddenly hit seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is John who Mary suddenly hit.'
 (19)***John-ga Mary-ga kinoo guuzen e atta yooda yo**
John-NOM Mary-NOM yesterday by accident met seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems it is John who Mary happened to meet yesterday.'

These facts indicate that there is a correlation between the availability of long-distance passives and that of the MSCs in the embedded clauses. I therefore argue that there is a restriction on long-distance passives (20):

- (20) Restriction on Long-Distance Passives
 Long-distance passives are only allowed when their matrix subject can be licensed as a major subject of the embedded clause.

4. A Proposal

Restriction (20) strongly suggests that the base position of the subject of a long-distance passive is an MS position in the embedded clause. I argue that the subject of a long-distance passive originates in the embedded MS position (not in the apparent gap position), and then undergoes NP-movement from there to the matrix Spec of T. More specifically, I assume with Kuno (1973) and Saito (1982, 1985) that MSs are adjoined to TP, and their associated gap is identified as small *pro*, as represented in (21):

- (21) Structure of the MSC
 [TP **John-ga** [TP [*pro* musuko]-ga gakusei desu]]
John-NOM son-NOM student COPULA
 'John's son is a student.'

I propose that the derivation of Japanese long-distance passives like (2, 3) should proceed as shown in (22):

- (22) a. [TP **NP₁** [TP NP₂ ... [VP *pro* V] T]]
 b. [TP [_{vP} by-NP [CP [TP **NP₁** [TP NP₂... *pro* V T]]] C] V-PASSIVE *v*]
 T
 c. [TP **NP₁** [_{vP} by-NP [CP [TP *t*₁] [TP NP₂... *pro* V T]]] C] V-PASSIVE
v] T]

As shown in (22a), the matrix subject NP₁ originates in the embedded MS position, *i.e.* the TP-adjoined position, where it is associated with *pro* in the object gap position. When we construct (22b), the matrix T can access NP₁ without inducing the defective intervention effect (5), since the embedded subject NP₂ does not intervene between the matrix T and NP₁. (22b) does not violate Chomsky's (2001) less strict version of the PIC (6) either given that the matrix passive *vP* is a weak phase (see, among others, Fujii 2007 and Martins and Nunes 2010). This is because the domain of the embedded C, which is a strong phase head, is only transferred when the next strong phase head, *i.e.* the matrix C, is introduced into the derivation. Hence, NP₁ undergoes NP-movement from the embedded MS position to the matrix subject position without any intermediate step as shown in (22c). The rest of this section presents further evidence for the proposed analysis.

4.1. Locality on NP-movement

First, the proposed analysis claims that the association between the matrix subject and the embedded MS is established by movement. Since this movement is an NP-movement, it should be local in that it cannot cross over a subject or the CP-TP node sequence. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (23).¹

¹ In (23), the matrix subject originates in the MS position of the most deeply embedded clause but not in that of the intermediate clause, since the matrix subject can be licensed as the MS of the most deeply embedded clause as shown in (i), but not as the MS of the intermediate clause as shown in (ii):

- (i) **John-no yooni mokuhi-o tuzukeru higisya]-ga**
John-GEN like nonconfession-ACC continue suspect-NOM
 kensatukan-ga suguni *pro* kisositagaru mitai yo
 prosecutor-NOM immediately want-to-prosecute seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is suspects like John who continue to remain silent that prosecutors want to prosecute immediately.'
 (ii)?***John-no yooni mokuhi-o tuzukeru higisya]-ga**
John-GEN like nonconfession-ACC continue suspect-NOM
 bengosi-ga [kensatukan-ga suguni *pro* kisositagaru to]
 attorney-NOM prosecutor-NOM immediately want-to-prosecute that
 bakurosita mitaida yo
 revealed seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is suspects like John who continue to remain silent'

- (23)?*[John-no yooni mokuhi-o tuzukeru higisya]-ga
John-GEN like nonconfession-ACC continue suspect-NOM

masukomi-ni [CP [TP bengosi-ga [CP [TP *t* [TP kensatukan-ga
mass-media-by attorney-NOM prosecutor-NOM
suguni *pro* kisositagaru to] bakurosita] to]
immediately want-to-prosecute that revealed that
omow-are-teiru mitaida yo
think-PASS-PRES seem PART
Lit. 'Suspects like John who continue to remain silent seem to be
thought of by the mass media that the attorney revealed that
prosecutors want to prosecute **them** immediately.'

In (23), *John-no yooni mokuhi-o tuzukeru higisya* 'suspects like John who continue to remain silent' undergoes NP-movement from the MS position in the most deeply embedded clause to the matrix subject position, crossing the intermediate subject *bengosi* 'attorney' and the CP-TP node sequence. (23) is deviant, as predicted by our analysis.

4.2. No Island Effects

Second, our analysis claims that the association between the embedded MS and its associated gap, which is *pro*, is not formed by movement. We should therefore expect that the MS can be associated with a gap within an island. This prediction is borne out, as shown by the Complex NP case (24) and the Adjunct case (25):

- (24) [Mary-no yooni doowa sakka]-ga syoogakkoo-no
[Mary-GEN like fairy-tale-writer]-NOM elementary school-GEN
sensei-ni [CP [TP *t* [TP tiisai kodomo-ga suguni
teacher-by small child-NOM soon
[Complex NP *pro* kaita sakuhi]-no arasuzi-ga rikaidekiru]]
wrote work-GEN summary-NOM able-to-understand
to] omow-are-teiru yooda yo
that think-PASS-PRES seem PART
Lit. 'Fairy tale writers like Mary seem to be thought of by elementary
school teachers that small children soon understand the summary of
[the book they wrote].'

- (25) John-no yooni yakyuu sensyu-ga hahayotati-ni
John-GEN like baseball player-NOM mothers-by
[CP [TP *t* [TP kodomo-ga [Adjunct mosi *pro* guuzen mikaketara]
child-NOM if happen-to-see
totemo yorokobu daroo]] to] omow-are-teiru yooda yo
very pleased will that think-PASS-PRES seem PART

that the attorney revealed that prosecutors want to prosecute immediately.'

Lit. 'Baseball players like John seem to be thought of by mothers that their child will be very pleased [if she/he happens to see **them**].'

In (24), the MS, *i.e.* the trace left by NP-movement, is associated with *pro* within the relative clause. In (25), the MS is associated with *pro* within the adjunct clause. Both (24) and (25) are acceptable.

4.3. Overt Pronouns

Third, as pointed out by Saito (1985) and Ueda (1990), the MSs marginally allow their associated gaps, *i.e.* *pro*'s, to be spelled out as overt pronouns as shown in (26). In (26), *pro* can be overtly realized as *karera-no* 'they-GEN':

- (26) John-no yooni sakka-ga tiisai kodomo-ga
John-GEN like writer-NOM small child-NOM
[*pro*?karera-no sakuhi]-o yoku rikaidekiru yooda yo
they-GEN work-ACC well able-to-understand seem PART
'It seems that it is fairy tale writers like John whose works small
children understand well.'

Long-distance passives also marginally allow gaps to be replaced by overt pronouns as in (27). In (27), *pro* can be overtly realized as *karera-o* 'they-ACC':

- (27) [John-no yooni gankona titioya]-ga hahayotati-ni
[John-GEN like stubborn father]-NOM mother-by
[CP [TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni *pro*?karera-o zimansitagaru] to]
child-NOM friend-DAT they-ACC want-to-boast that
omow-are-teiru yooda yo
think-PASS-PRES seem PART
Lit. 'Stubborn fathers like John seem to be thought of by mothers that
children want to boast to their friends about them.'

This fact straightforwardly follows from our analysis, where the gaps in long-distance passives are identified as *pro*'s which are associated with the embedded MSs.²

4.4. Further Consequences of the Restriction on Long-Distance Passives

Finally, the restriction on long-distance passives (20) applies not only to those with object gaps like (2, 3) but also to other types of long-distance passives. Let us first consider long-distance passives where the possessor of

2. It should be noted that Toyoshima's (1996) analysis cannot account for the absence of the island effect in (24, 25) or the presence of an overt pronoun in (27). Nagai's (1991) analysis, on the other hand, cannot capture the intervention effect with a subject and the CP-TP node sequence in (23).

a subject is a gap. In (28a), the MS *John* is associated with the possessor of the subject. This satisfies the "aboutness" condition on MSs (11); the result is acceptable. Its corresponding long-distance passive (28b) is also acceptable. In (28b), the matrix subject *John* is associated with the possessor of the embedded subject through the embedded MS position:

- (28) a. [TP **John-ga** [TP [*pro* musuko]-ga gakusei desu]]
 John-NOM son-NOM student be
 'It is John whose son is a student.' (Saito 1982: 9)
- b. **John-ga** Bill-ni [CP [TP *t* [TP [*pro* musuko]-ga gakusei da]] to]
 John-NOM Bill-by son-NOM student be that
 kantigais-are-teiru rasii
 misunderstand-PASS-PRES seem
 Lit. 'John seems to be misunderstood by Bill such that his son is a student.'

The MSC (29a), however, is deviant, since it violates the "aboutness" condition (11). Accordingly, its corresponding long-distance passive (29b) is also deviant:

- (29) a.*[TP **John-ga** [TP [*pro* musuko]-ga odoroitai]]
 John-NOM son-NOM was-surprised
 Lit. 'John is such that his son was surprised.' (Saito 1982: 9)
- b.***John-ga** Bill-ni [CP [TP *t* [TP [*pro* musuko]-ga
 John-NOM Bill-by son-NOM
 odoroitai]] to] kantigais-are-teiru rasii
 was-surprised that misunderstand-PASS-PRES seem
 Lit. 'It seems that John is misunderstood by Bill such that his son was surprised.'

Hence, the restriction on long-distance passives (20) also holds when the possessor of a subject is a gap:

Similarly, restriction (20) holds when an indirect object is a gap as shown by the contrast between (30) and (31) and the possessor of an object is a gap as shown by the contrast between (32) and (33):

- (30) a. ?[TP **John-no yoona sensei-ga** [TP kodomo-ga *pro* nayami-o
 John-GEN like teacher-NOM child-NOM worry-ACC
 teikoonaku utiakeru yooda]] yo
 easily express seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is to teachers like John that children express their worries easily.'
- b. **John-no yoona sensei-ga** hahaoya-tati-ni
 John-GEN like teacher-NOM mother-by
 [CP [TP *t* [TP kodomoga *pro* nayami-o teikoonaku utiakeru]] to]
 child-NOM worry-ACC easily express that
 sinzi-rare-teiru yooda yo
 believe-PASS-PRES seem PART

Lit. 'Teachers like John seem to be believed by mothers that children express their worries to them easily.'

- (31) a. * [TP **Mary-ga** [TP John-ga *pro* sono hon-o watasita yooda]] yo
 Mary-NOM John-NOM that book-ACC gave seem PART
 'It seems that it is to Mary that John gave that book.'
- b. * **Mary-ga** Bill-ni [CP [TP *t* [TP John-ga *pro* sono hon-o
 Mary-NOM Bill-by John-NOM that book-ACC
 watasita]] to] gokais-are-teiru yooda yo
 gave that misunderstand-PASS-PRES seem PART
 Lit. 'Mary seems to be misunderstood by Bill such that John gave that book to her.'
- (32) a. [TP **Mary-no yoona doowa sakka-ga** [TP tiisai kodomo-ga
 Mary-GEN like fairy-tale-writer-NOM small child-NOM
 [*pro* sakuhi]-o yoku rikaidekiru yooda]] yo
 work-ACC well able-to-understand seem PART
 'It seems that it is fairy tale writers like Mary whose works small children understand well.'
- b. **Mary-no yoona doowa sakka-ga** syoogakkoo-no
 Mary-GEN like fairy-tale-writer-NOM elementary school-GEN
 sensei-ni [CP [TP *t* [TP tiisai kodomo-ga [*pro* sakuhi]-o yoku
 teacher-by small child-NOM work-ACC well
 rikaidekiru]] to] sinzir-are-teiru yooda yo
 able-to-understand that believe-PASS-PRES seem PART
 'Fairy tale writers like Mary seem to be believed by elementary school teachers that small children understand their works well.'
- (33) a. * [TP **Mary-ga** [TP Bill-ga [*pro* kodomo]-o totuzen nagutta
 Mary-NOM Bill-NOM child-ACC suddenly hit
 mitaida]] yo
 seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is Mary whose child Bill hit suddenly.'
- b. * **Mary-ga** John-ni [CP [TP *t* [TP Bill-ga [*pro* kodomo]-o
 Mary-NOM John-by Bill-NOM child-ACC
 totuzen nagutta]] to] omow-are-teiru mitaida yo
 suddenly hit that think-PASS-PRES seem PART
 Lit. 'Mary seems to be thought of by John that Bill hit her child suddenly.'

Furthermore, restriction (20) holds with the gapless pattern as shown in (34, 35):

- (34) a. (Sizenkagaku-no naka-de-wa) kotosi-wa [TP **buturi-ga**
 natural science-GEN within-TOP this year-TOP **physics-NOM**
 [TP syuusyoku-ga taihen da]]
 getting-a-job-NOM difficult-be
 '(Among the natural sciences) this year, physics is the area where
 it is difficult to get a job.' (Saito 1982: 14)

- b. Kotosi-wa **buturi-ga** daigakuinsei-ni
 this year-TOP **physics-NOM** graduate-student-by
 [CP [TP *t*_i [TP syuusyoku-ga taihen da]] to]
 getting-a-job-NOM be-difficult that
 gokais-are-teiru rasii
 misunderstand-PASS-PRES seem
 Lit. 'This year, **physics** seems to be *misunderstood* by graduate students such that it is the area where it is most difficult to find a job.'

- (35) a. * [TP **Mary-ga** [TP John-ga Suzy-o korosita yooda]]
Mary-NOM John-NOM Suzy-ACC killed seem
 Lit. 'As for Mary, it seems that John killed Suzy.'
 b. * **Mary-ga** keisatu-ni [CP [TP *t*_i [TP John-ga Suzy-o
Mary-NOM police-by John-NOM Suzy-ACC
 korosita]] to] utagaw-are-teiru yooda
 killed that suspect-PASS-PRES seem
 Lit. 'It is **Mary** who is *suspected* by the police that John killed Suzy.'

These facts present further support for the restriction on long-distance passives (20) and hence for the proposed analysis.³

5. Some Possible Objections

This section investigates three possible objections to our analysis, showing that those objections do not carry much weight.

5.1. The Activity Condition

Since the MS in examples like (16) (repeated here as (36)) is assigned the nominative case marker *-ga*, one might claim that derivation (22) (repeated here as (37)) violates the Activity Condition (38) advocated by Chomsky (2000, 2001), which prevents an element whose Case feature is valued from undergoing further A-movement (NP-movement):

- (36) [TP [**John-no yoona gankona titioya**]-ga [TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni
John-GEN like stubborn father-NOM child-NOM friend-DAT
pro zimansitagaru yooda yo
 want-to-boast seem PART
 Lit. 'It seems that it is stubborn fathers like John that children want to boast to their friends.'

3. Apart from the fact that neither Nagai's (1991) nor Toyoshima's (1996) analysis cannot capture the restriction on long-distance passives (20), the latter would wrongly rule out long-distance passives where the possessor of a nominal is a gap like (28b, 30b) and gapless long-distance passives like (34b).

- (37) [TP NP₁ [_{vP} by-NP [CP [TP *t*_i [TP NP₂... *pro* V T]]] C] V-PASSIVE *v*] T]

- (38) The Activity Condition
 An element is not accessible to A-movement once its Case feature is valued

It should be noted, however, that when the MSC (36) is embedded under verbs like *omou* 'think', the MS exhibits the nominative-accusative case alternation as shown in (39):

- (39) Bill-ga [**John-no yoona gankona titioya**]-ga/o kodomo-ga
 Bill-NOM **John-GEN like stubborn father-NOM/ACC** child-NOM
 tomodati-ni *pro* zimansitagaru to omotteiru rasii
 friend-DAT want-to-boast that think seem
 'It seems that Bill thinks of stubborn fathers like John that children want to boast them to their friend.'

In (39), the embedded MS *John-no yoona gankona titioya* 'stubborn fathers like John' is assigned either the nominative case marker *-ga* or the accusative case marker *-o*. If we assume with, among others, Kuno (1976), Tanaka (1992), and Hiraiwa (2001) that the MS *John-no yoona gankona titioya* 'stubborn fathers like John' in (39) originates within the embedded TP, the Case valuation of the MS by the embedded T should not be mandatory. The Case feature of the MS is valued by either the embedded T or the matrix *v*, leading to the nominative-accusative case alternation. Then, in (37), the embedded T does not have to value the Case feature of the embedded MS, and the matrix *v* does not have the Case valuation property because the matrix verb is passivized. The Case feature of the embedded MS can be left unvalued so that the MS is accessible to A-movement without violating the Activity Condition (38).

5.2. A Prolectic Analysis

One might claim that when the MS is assigned the accusative case marker *-o*, it is base-generated as a matrix element and associated with *pro* in the embedded MS position. Under such a prolectic analysis, when the MS *John-no yoona gankona titioya* 'stubborn fathers like John' in (39) is assigned the accusative case marker *-o*, (39) would be assigned structure (40):

- (40) Bill-ga [**John-no yoona gankona titioya**]-o [CP [TP *pro*
 Bill-NOM **John-GEN like stubborn father-ACC**
 [TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni *pro* zimansitagaru to]]] omotteiru rasii
 child-NOM friend-DAT want-to-boast that think seem
 'It seems that Bill thinks of stubborn fathers like John that children want to boast them to their friend.'

In (40), *John-no yoona gankona titioya* 'stubborn fathers like John' appears as a matrix element, and associated with *pro* in the embedded MS position. If this prolectic analysis were correct, NP movement in long-distance passives like (2, 3) would apply to the matrix element rather than the embedded MS, as represented in (41):

- (41) [John-no yoona gankona titioya]-ga Bill-ni *t* [CP [TP *pro*
John-GEN like stubborn father-NOM Bill-by
[TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni ...
child-NOM friend-DAT

As (42) shows, however, *pro* in the embedded MS position of (41) cannot be realized by an overt pronoun:

- (42)?*Bill-ga [John-no yoona gankona titioya](no-koto)-o
Bill-NOM John-GEN like stubborn father-ACC
[CP [TP *karera-ga* [TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni *pro* zimansitagaru
they-NOM child-NOM friend-DAT want-to-boast
to]]] omotteiru rasii
that think seem
'It seems that Bill thinks of stubborn fathers like John that children
want to boast them to their friend.'

This casts serious doubt on the existence of *pro* in the embedded MS position, indicating that the prolectic analysis (41) is not on the right track.

5.3. A Superraising Analysis

Ura (1994) has presented evidence that many languages differ from languages like English in that they allow "long NP-movement," arguing that "long NP-movement" is subject to a parametric variation. (7, 8) exemplify superraising cases in Moroccan Arabic and Mandarin Chinese:

- (43) Moroccan Arabic (Ura 1994: 10)
Ttshab-et-li mmi [belli šaf-φ-ha muhend *t*
seemed-3SGF-to-1SG mother-1SG COMP saw-3SGM-3SGF Mohand
fsefru]
in-Sefrou
Lit. 'My mother seemed to me that Mohand saw *t* in Sefrou.'
- (44) Mandarin Chinese (Ura 1994: 10)
Tini di-anggap [behwa saja beri-φ surat itu *t*]
Tini PASS-believe COMP I give letter the
Lit. 'Tini is believed that I gave *t* the latter.'

He claims that generalization (45) holds for superraising (Ura 1994: 5):

- (45) If a language allows the so called "Multiple Subject Construction," then

it also allows superraising to take place.

Putting technical details aside, he claims that if we adopt the Minimal Link Condition coupled with the notion of equidistance (see, among others, Chomsky 1995), languages that allow the multiple subject construction, *i.e.* the MSC, may use an outer specifier position of T (AGR in his analysis) as an escape hatch for NP-movement given that the multiple subject construction involves multiple specifiers, as represented in (46):

- (46) Superraising in Languages with the "Multiple Subject Construction"
John seems [that [TP *t'* [TP it is told *t* [that Mary is a genius]]]].

In (46), the two specifiers of T, *i.e.* *t'* and *it*, are equally accessible to the matrix subject position according to the notion of equidistance; superraising is allowed. Since Japanese has the multiple subject (major subject) construction, we should expect that superraising may take place, thereby yielding long-distance passives. Under the superraising analysis, (2) is derived as represented in (47):

- (47) [John-no yoona gankona titioya]-ga hahaoyatati-ni
[John-GEN like stubborn father]-NOM mother-by
[CP [TP *t'* [TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni *t* zimansitagaru] to]
child-NOM friend-DAT want-to-boast that
omow-are-teiru yooda yo
think-PASS-PRES seem PART
Lit. 'Stubborn fathers like John seem to be thought of by mothers that
children want to boast to their friends about them.'

In (47), the matrix subject originates in the embedded object position and then undergoes successive cyclic NP-movement using the embedded outer specifier of T as an escape hatch.

There are, however, at least two points that cast doubt on the validity of the superraising analysis of long-distance passives. First, Zwart (1997) claims that the allegedly "long NP movement" can be explained away as a case of non-raising or topicalization. Second, Dailey-McCartney, Eskenazi, and Huang (2002) claim that Ura's analysis is descriptively inaccurate in that their consultants judge the Moroccan Arabic example (43) and the Mandarin Chinese example (44) as deviant. They also point out that Ura's Indonesian and Persian examples are also deviant for their consultants. They argue that these languages do not allow superraising, contrary to what Ura claims. It is therefore fair to say that further investigation on superraising is needed before we come up with any theoretical conclusions.

Even if Ura's generalization (45) is correct, however, the superraising analysis is too strong as well as too weak to accommodate long-distance passives in Japanese. First, the superraising analysis is too weak to rule out examples like (9, 10), which violate the restriction on long-distance passives (20). The superraising analysis would always allow the matrix subject to originate in the embedded object position and then undergo "long

NP-movement" via the embedded outer Spec of T as an escape hatch; it would wrongly predict that a long-distance passive with an object gap is freely available just like Nagai (1991) and Toyoshima (1996). Furthermore, since the superraising analysis would allow NP-movement to apply in a successive cyclic manner, it cannot capture the intervention effect with a subject and the CP-TP node sequence, which is exemplified by (23). Next, the superraising analysis is too strong in that it would wrongly rule out long-distance passives with a gap within an island like (24, 25), those with a possessor gap within a nominal phrase like (28b, 30b), and those without any gap like (34b).

6. A Crosslinguistic Perspective

This section discusses a crosslinguistic perspective of our proposed analysis. If the proposed analysis is on the right track, Japanese long-distance passives are parallel to what Martins and Nunes (2010) call "apparent hyper-raising" in Brazilian Portuguese like (48):

- (48) *Os meninos parecem que eles viajaram ontem.*
 the boys seem-3PL that they traveled-3PL yesterday
 'The boys seem to have traveled yesterday.'

(Martins and Nunes 2010: 145)

They propose that the derivation of (48) proceeds as schematically represented in (49) with English words:

- (49)a. [_{TopP} **the boys** [_{TP} **they** traveled yesterday]]
 b. [_{TP} T seem [_{CP} that [_{TopP} **the boys** [_{TP} they traveled yesterday]]]]
 c. [_{TP} **The boys** T seem [_{CP} that [_{TopP} *t* [_{TP} they traveled yesterday]]]]

As represented in (49a), the matrix subject *os menios* 'the boys' originates in the embedded topic position, where it is associated with pronoun *eles* 'they' in the embedded Spec of T. When we construct the matrix TP (49b), the matrix T can access *os menios* 'the boys' in the embedded topic position under the less strict version of the PIC (6) given that the matrix raising *vP* is a weak phase. *Os menios* 'the boys' undergoes NP-movement from the embedded topic position to the matrix Spec of T in one swoop as represented in (49c). I argue that Martins and Nunes' analysis of apparent hyper-raising in Brazilian Portuguese counts as further evidence for our analysis of Japanese long-distance passives, since our proposed derivation of Japanese long-distance passives is independently motivated in apparent hyper-raising in Brazilian Portuguese. Specifically, the two analyses share the view that the matrix subject originates in a position between the embedded C and subject, thereby being accessible to the matrix T, and then undergoes NP-movement to the matrix Spec of T without any intermediate step.

There is, however, a difference between Japanese and Brazilian Portuguese. As pointed out by Martins and Nunes (2010: 159), apparent hyper-raising is excluded in passives as shown in (50). In other words, long-distance passives are not allowed in Brazilian Portuguese:

- (50)**Os meninos foram ditos [que eles fizeram a tarefa].*
 the boys were said-MASC-PL that they did the homework
 'It was said that the boys did the homework.'

Nunes (2009) proposes that examples like (50) are excluded by the A-over-A principle. He points out that there is a correlation between apparent hyper-raising and movement of a complement clause. Apparent hyper-raising is only possible if the relevant embedded CP is not movable as shown in (51, 52) (see Nunes 2009):

- (51) a. *Parece [que os meninos fizeram a tarefa]*
 seems that the boys did the homework
 'It seems that the boys did their homework.'
 b.* [*Que os meninos fizeram a tarefa*]_i *parece t_i*
 that the boys did the homework seems
 'It seems that the boys did their homework.'
- (52) a. *Não foi dito [que os meninos fizeram a tarefa]*
 not was said that the boys did the homework
 'It was not said/mentioned that the boys did the homework.'
 b. [*Que os meninos fizeram a tarefa*]_i *não foi dito t_i*
 that the boys did the homework not was said
 'That the boys did their homework was not said/mentioned.'

Raising predicates which license apparent hyper-raising prevent their CP complement from moving into the subject position as shown in (51b). Passive forms that do not license apparent hyper-raising, on the other hand, allow their CP complement to undergo movement to the subject position as shown in (52b). Nunes argues that this correlation can be accounted for if we assume Chomsky's (2008) view that ϕ -features are on C (they are associated with T only by inheritance) coupled with Hornstein's (2009) reinterpretation of Chomsky's (1964) A-over-A condition. Hornstein claims that the A-over-A condition can be subsumed under minimality (= the shortest dependency) if distance is measured by path lengths, *i.e.* the maximal projections intervening between related expressions.

Let us first consider passive forms, taking (50) and (52b) as examples again. When the matrix T probes a target for ϕ -feature agreement, the embedded CP is the closest projection containing ϕ -features, since it defines the shortest path to the matrix T. Crucially, the path from the embedded CP to the matrix T, *i.e.* {VP, *vP*}, is shorter than the one from the embedded topic phrase to the matrix T, *i.e.* {CP, TopP, VP, *vP*}, since the former is a proper subset of the latter. The matrix T undergoes AGREE with the embedded CP but not with the embedded topic phrase. The embedded CP,

but not the embedded topic phrase, undergoes movement to the matrix Spec of T to satisfy the Edge-feature (EF) of T (more precisely, the label of T'), which requires an element to be merged as the sister of T' either by internal or external Merge (see Chomsky 2008). This yields (52b). Hence, we can account for the lack of long-distance passives in Brazilian Portuguese like (50). In the case of raising predicates, Nunes argues that their CP complements are inherently case-marked, being inert for A-movement due to the Activity Condition (38); movement of the embedded CP to the matrix Spec of T is banned as shown in (51b). Since the embedded CP does not induce any intervention effect, the matrix T undergoes AGREE with the embedded topic phrase. The embedded topic phrase may undergo movement to the matrix Spec of T, yielding (48).⁴

I adopt Nunes' insight, claiming that the difference between Japanese and Brazilian Portuguese regarding the presence/absence of long-distance passives can be reduced to the absence/presence of ϕ -feature agreement in the TP-domain in these languages. Since Japanese does not have any overt realizations of ϕ -feature agreement, it is controversial whether Japanese has any ϕ -feature agreement. Fukui (1993) and Saito and Fukui (1998) argue that Japanese does not have any ϕ -feature agreement. Miyagawa (2010), on the other hand, argues that Japanese has ϕ -feature agreement. Miyagawa claims that both agreement-based languages like English and discourse-configurational languages like Japanese have ϕ -features and focus/topic features on C. The difference between these two types of language resides in the fact that ϕ -features are inherited by T in agreement-based languages whereas focus/topic features are inherited by T in discourse-configurational languages. Even under Miyagawa's analysis, therefore, T does not have any ϕ -features in languages like Japanese. Whichever view we adopt, NP-movement in Japanese long-distance passives has nothing to do with ϕ -feature probing of T. I argue that NP-movement is only triggered by the EF of T. Unlike ϕ -features, an EF does not have any valuation, being unable to function as a probe given that only an unvalued feature functions as a probe. An EF is not subject to the Λ -over-A condition, which Nunes (2009) assumes to be a condition on a probe-goal relation. Hence, NP-movement of an embedded MS to the matrix Spec of T is allowed in Japanese long-distance passives, since it vacuously satisfies the A-over-A condition. It should also be noted that as correctly predicted by the proposed analysis, Japanese also allows "long-distance NP-movement" in the raising construction as shown in (53):

- (53) [John-no yoona gankona titioya]-ga hahayotati-ni
 [John-GEN like stubborn father]-NOM mother-by
 [CP t [TP kodomo-ga tomodati-ni e zimansitagaru] yooni] omoeru
 child-NOM friend-DAT want-to-boast that seem

4 Nunes (2009) seems to be assuming that ϕ -features on C remain active for the intervention effect after being inherited by T, though this view is not explicitly mentioned.

Lit. 'Stubborn fathers like John seem to mothers that children want to boast to their friends about them.'

7. Conclusion

This paper has first pointed out that Japanese long-distance passives apparently violate locality conditions on movement. I have argued that contrary to the surface pattern, their matrix subject originates not in the gap position, but in the embedded MS position, and then undergoes NP-movement to the matrix Spec of T in one swoop without inducing the defective intervention effect or violating the PIC. It was shown that this analysis is supported by the restriction on long-distance passives, locality on NP-movement, the appearance of a gap within an island, and the distribution of an overtly realized pronoun. Finally, I have pointed out the similarity between Japanese long-distance passives and apparent hyper-raising in Brazilian Portuguese, which constitutes further support for our analysis.

References:

- Chomsky, Noam. 1964. *Current issues in linguistic theory*. Mouton: The Hague.
 Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, eds., *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, pp. 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
 Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
 Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka eds., *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, pp. 89-155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz ed., *Ken Hale: A life in language*, pp. 1-52. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
 Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Robert Friedin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta eds., *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, pp. 133-166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Dailey-McCartney, Anna, Victor Eskenazi, and Chia-Hui Huang 2002. Response to Ura (1994), Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory. *Working papers of the linguistic circle of the University of Victoria*, pp. 49-54. University of Victoria.
 Fujii, Tomohiro. 2007. Cyclic chain reduction. In Norbert Corver and Jairo Nunes eds., *The copy theory of movement*, pp. 291-326. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
 Fukui, Naoki. 1993. Parameters and optionality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 399-420.
 Hiraiwa, Ken. 2001. Multiple agree and the defective intervention constraint in Japanese. In Ora Matsushansky et al. eds., *MIT working papers in linguistics* 40, pp. 67-80. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

- Hornstein, Novert. 2009. *A theory of syntax: Minimalist operations and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kageyama, Taro. 1993. *Bunpoo to gokeisei* (Grammar and word formation). Tokyo: Hitsuji Shoboo.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject raising. In Masayoshi Shibatani ed., *Syntax and semantics 5: Japanese generative grammar*, pp. 17-49. New York: Academic Press.
- Lasnik, Howard and Mamoru Saito. 1984. On the nature of proper government. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 235-289.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and case marking in Japanese: Syntax and semantics* 22. New York: Academic Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 2010. *Why Agree? Why Move?: Unifying agreement-based and discourse-configurational languages*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Martins, Ana Maria and Jairo Nunes. 2010. Apparent hyper-raising in Brazilian Portuguese: Agreement with topics across a finite CP. In Phoevos Panagiotidis ed. *The complementizer phase: Subjects and operators*, pp. 143-163. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nagai, Noriko. 1991. Complex passives and major subjects in Japanese. *Linguistics* 29: 1053-1092.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1993. Long distance passive. In Nobuko Hasegawa ed. *Japanese syntax in comparative grammar*. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2009. Inherent case as a licensing condition for A-movement: The case of hyper-raising constructions in Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 7: 83-108.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1982. Case marking in Japanese: A preliminary study, ms. MIT.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1985. *Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical consequences*. Doctoral dissertation MIT.
- Saito, Mamoru and Naoki Fukui. 1998. Order in phrase structure and movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 439-474.
- Sugioka, Yoko. 1984. *Interaction of Derivational Morphology and Syntax in English and Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 1992. Raising to object in English, French, and Japanese. *English Linguistics* 9: 39-60.
- Toyoshima, Takashi. 1996. Passive as A'-movement in Japanese and an anatomy of the null operator. Ms., Cornell University.
- Ueda, Masanobu. 1990. *Japanese phrase structure and parameter setting*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1994. Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory. *MIT occasional papers in linguistics* 7, Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 1997. Transitive expletive constructions and the evidence supporting the multiple specifier hypothesis. In Werner Abraham and Elly van Gelderen eds., *German: Syntactic problems - problematic syntax*, pp. 105-134. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

School of Arts and Letters, Meiji University
 1-1 Kangasurugadai, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8301 JAPAN
 tishii@kisc.meiji.ac.jp