## Hiroyuki Tanaka Kwansei Gakuin University

## A Bottom-Up View of Nominative-Genitive Conversion in Japanese

Overview & Goals: This study proposes that the genitive arguments in nominative-genitive conversion (NGC) in Japanese are contained in a null nominal projection that licenses genitive case and that the head of the projection "absorbs" the Case of the closest c-commanding functional head. The analysis works hand in hand with the assumption that universally c-commands the base position of the external argument (EA), which allows a genitive EA to interact with , leading to an account of transitivity restriction (TR) and the restriction on genitive of dependent tense to unaccusative subjects. The Source of Genitive Case: There have been two approaches regarding the source of the genitive Case on the subjects of prenominal (relative/complement) clauses like in (1): One approach is to assume that the D associated with 'reason' assigns genitive to the subject (e.g. Miyagawa 1993). In (1) this assignment crosses the boundary of an adjunct !, which is a relative clause, and this kind of remote Case relation is usually illicit and should be dispensed with if possible. Another approach is to say that the T (together with C; e.g. Hiraiwa 2000) of ! licenses genitive, the availability of genitive subjects being connected to the adnominal form of the verb. Though the latter approach does not have the locality issue that the former does, it is not very clear why (C-)T assigns genitive, a hallmark of nominal domains. This study pursues a third line which is exempt from the above problems. Any argument DP in Japanese can be in the form of DP<sub>1</sub> in (2), which is headed by semantically and phonologically null nominal head

 $(D_{\text{expl}})$ , and the argument itself, DP<sub>2</sub>, situated inside DP<sub>1</sub>, appears in genitive, by whatever mechanism that

Spec, P, creating multiple Specs, and from there either argument can abosorb T's Case, as no head intervenes between either argument in Spec, P and T. Both arguments can be in genitive because T can assign multiple Cases, and therefore can host multiple Dexpl's. ! What Miyagawa (2012) calls genitive of dependent tense can show up on unaccusative subjects but not on unergative ones (11) ((11) becomes 'laughed' is replaced by some unaccusative verb like acceptable with genitive if This fact can be accounted for with the assumption that the Case of dependent T is obligatory (4c), unlike prenominal T (4b). This makes the derivation along the lines of (7) impossible, since EA has already fulfilled its Case requirement within Pand T's Case will be left unassigned. Extensions: As the name suggests, Dexpl is intended to be analogous to overt expletives in other languages. Abe (2018) treats English as a D head that moves out of the "associate" DP. Our Dexpl is similar to his D but different in that it is a Case absorber, not an "EPP satisfier". However, it is interesting to note that both NGC in Japanese and sentences in English have TR, and a similar treatment of the latter is readily available against the background of (3). < References> J. Abe. 2018. How to probe expletives. 72:76-112. M. Baker, K. Johnson, and I. Roberts. 1989. Passive arguments raised. 20:219–251. N. Chomsky. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In , ed. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. K. Hiraiwa. 2000. Nominative-Genitive Conversion. 39:67-125. S. Miyagawa. 1993. LF Case checking and minimal link condition. 19:213-254. S. Miyagawa. 2012. . New York: Routledge. L. Travis. 1984. , Doctoral Dissertation, MIT. " }: must invoke its operation before does; OBL/OPT: <Examples and structures> (Notations:{ 's operation is obligatory/optional; M/S: can relate to multiple goals/only a single goal) [ $_{DP}$  [ $_{\alpha}$  John-ga/-no kita] riyuu D] (1) J.-nom/-gen came reason 'the reason why John came'