**Synopsis.** This paper provides a unified account of the distribution of adverbs in infinitives with -ï¿½ ‘go’ (1), adverbs/adjectives in light verb constructions (2), and QPs/scope in infinitives with wasure ‘forget’ (3). I propose (i) that lexical verbs in certain syntactic contexts are phase heads, phases are thus determined contextually (cf. Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005), and (ii) that adjunction within VP/nP is constrained by Case. 

**Data.** The core data are given in (1)-(3). In (1), the VP complement headed by tabe ‘eat’ is selected by the matrix verb ik ‘go’, which in turn is selected by the potential suffix -(r)are ‘can’. I assume that nominative objects with -(r)are are an indication of ‘restructuring’ (Miyagawa 1987, Nomura 2005 a.o.). (1) shows that while modification of the matrix VP (zidensha-de ‘by bike’) is possible regardless of the case of the embedded object, adverbial modification of the embedded VP (hasti-de ‘with chopsticks’) is possible only with accusative objects (cf. Tsujimura 1993). For (2), I assume with Grimshaw and Mester (1988) that a verbal noun construction is a ‘light verb’ construction if the arguments of the verbal noun (bosshu ‘confiscation’) are not genitive-marked. While adverbial modification (zinsoku-ni ‘quick’) is allowed regardless of the case of the object zaisan ‘property’, adjectival modification (zinsoku-na ‘quick’) is impossible in the light verb construction (Kurogi 2002). Lastly, (3) shows that in an infinitival forget construction, the embedded PP ‘only from Mary’ must scope over the matrix verb wasure ‘forget’ (cf. Koizumi 1995, Saito and Hoshi 1998).

**Analysis.** I propose that (i) lexical verbs (Vs) are phase heads when they combine with VPs/nPs (4) and (ii) adjunction to XP is impossible if VP contains unvalued Case-features (4). (5) schematically represents the derivations of (1)-(3). I assume that ik ‘go’, su ‘do’, wasure ‘forget’ are all lexical Vs (Uchida and Nakayama 1993, Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005, Wurmbrand 2001). Given (4), the complement XP in (5) is a spell-out domain. An argument with a Case-feature thus must move out of XP before XP is transferred to the interfaces. I propose that the object moves to the edge of the matrix VP as in (5) (cf. Bošković 2007). Since XP contains an element with unvalued Case-features, adjunction to this projection is prohibited by (4). After a Case-licensing head such as v is merged (see (5)), the moved object is Case-valued via AGREE. Due to valuation, adjunction to the matrix VP is allowed. On the other hand, no violation of (4) arises if the object is Case-valued within XP as in (5). For (1), the relevant spell-out domain (XP) is vP. Thus, adverbs cannot adjoint to this projection. If the embedded object is marked accusative within the embedded vP, adverb insertion is allowed because the derivation does not violate (4). As for (2), I assume that the complement of su ‘do’ is nP headed by a verbal noun (Kuo 2009 a.o.). As this nP contains an argument with an unvalued Case-feature, adjectival insertion is prohibited. If the argument is Case-licensed within nP, i.e., it appears with genitive, adjectival insertion is again allowed since (4) is met. As for (3), the VP complement of wasure ‘forget’ contains dake ‘only’, which I assume undergoes QR to a projection of type t (Goro 2007; cf. Heim and Kratzer 1998). Dake cannot adjoin to the embedded vP due to (4). Furthermore, dake cannot target the matrix VP because VP is not of type t (6). The only derivation satisfying (4) and the interpretive properties of the QP dake is the one in (6), where the PP moves (via Spec,VP) to the matrix vP, resulting in obligatory wide-scope of dake. The analysis thus derives the anti-reconstruction effect found in restructuring constructions (see Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2005).

**Further Data.** A potential alternative analysis of the modification data is to form a ‘complex head’ by head-movement or direct merger (7), which is pursued for the constructions discussed above (Saito and Hoshi 1998/2000 a.o.). Under this analysis, there is no projection of the embedded verb or noun, thus adjunction is predicted to be impossible (assuming that adjunction must target phrases). There are, however, data that distinguish the two analyses. When the argument of a verbal noun in a light verb construction is CP (8), which does not bear Case, adjectives are again allowed to adjoin to nP. Since the CP argument is not marked genitive, the sentence is a ‘light verb’ construction. The complex head analysis predicts, contrary to fact, no contrast between (2) with an accusative object and (8), since they are both ‘light verb’ constructions, and hence should have the same derivation i.e. complex-head formation. The current proposal, on the other hand, correctly predicts the contrast between (3) and (8), because only (3) violates (4). This contrast shows that adjunction is indeed constrained by Case. I will also suggest a way of deducing the constraint.
(1) Hanako-wa zi-ten-sha-de(NOM/ACC) [robusetta-o/ga hasi-de(NOM/ACC) tabe-ni] ik-er-u. Hanako-Top bike-by lobster-Acc/Nom chopsticks-with eat-Dat go-can-pres ‘Hanako can go eat lobsters with chopsticks by bike.’


(3) Taro-wa [hon-o Mary-dake-kara kari]-wasure-ta. Taro-top book-ACC Mary-only-from borrow-forget-past ‘Taro forgot to borrow books only from Mary (only > forget, *forget < only)’

(4) a. Lexical verbs (Vs) are phase heads when they combine with vPs/nPs.
   b. Adjunction to XP is impossible if XP contains unvalued Case-features.

(5) a. [VP OBJ[CASE] [v V [XP tOBJ[CASE]]]] b. [vP Sub[v CASE] [VP OBJ[CASE] [v V [XP tOBJ[CASE]]]]] MOVE *ADJUNCTION AGREE \ADJUNCTION

   c. [v V [XP X [VP OBJ[CASE]]]] (X = v or n)

(6) a. [VP <e,> OBJ[CASE] [v V [(P tOBJ[CASE] PP (only)]]] (type-mismatch) *(violation of (4))

   b. [VP <e,> Sub[v CASE] [VP OBJ[CASE] PP (only) [v V [VP tOBJ[CASE] tPP]]]]

(7) [VP OBJ [X V]] *ADJUNCTION to X (X = V or N)

   b. John-wa zi-soku-ni, [ookami-ga kuru]-to-no zinsoku-na\ Acc keikoku\o] si-ta.
   John-Top quickly wolf-Nom come-Comp-Gen quick warn-Acc do-past ‘(lit) John made a quick warning that wolves are coming.’