

Overview This paper provides new data to tease apart existing analyses of a scope puzzle in Japanese potential construction. An object can get nominative or accusative Case in Japanese potential construction (cf. (1)). Significantly, only the nominative object can take scope over the potential suffix (cf. (2)) (Koizumi 1994, Nomura 2005, Sano 1983, Tada 1992, a.o.). There are at least three possible analyses to capture the wide scope behavior of the nominative object. First, the nominative object is base-generated in a position above the potential suffix (base-generation analysis ((3a): Saito and Hoshi 1998, Takano 2003). Second, the nominative object moves to Spec, TP for Case, in which case the object c-commands the potential suffix (Koizumi 1994, Nomura 2005, a.o. cf. Tada 1992) (Case-movement analysis: (3b)). Third, the focus particle in the nominative object undergoes covert A'-movement (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2007, Takahashi 2010) (covert A'-movement analysis: (3c)). One piece of evidence for the latter two approaches is the fact that even adjuncts show the same scope contrast (Bobaljik and Wurmbrand 2007, Saito and Hoshi 1998, Takahashi 2010). *Dake* 'only' contained in the adjunct can take scope over the potential suffix with the nominative object, which means that Case-movement, which moves only DPs, is not responsible for the scope contrast here. Under the base-generation analysis, the adjunct is base-generated above the potential morpheme and under the covert A'-movement analysis, *dake* 'only' moves to the position above the potential suffix. We provide a new set of data to distinguish the base-generation analysis and the covert A'-movement analysis. We show that the wide scope behavior of the nominative object is subject to *LF intervention effects*, which have been observed for wh-constructions (Hoji 1985), concluding that movement is implicated in the scope puzzle. As the base-generation analysis involves no movement, we are lead to choose the covert A'-movement hypothesis over the base-generation analysis.

Observations Wh-phrases are subject to *LF intervention effects*, which means that they cannot be c-commanded by certain scope bearing elements at S-structure (Hoji 1985). One such item is Negative Polarity Items (NPIs): In (5a), an NPI *daremo* 'anyone' c-commands *nani* 'what', yielding an ungrammatical example. (5b) shows that once the object is moved above the NPI, the sentence improves. A major approach to LF intervention effects is syntactic one (Beck 1996 a.o.), according to which the LF intervention effects occur because quantificational elements like NPIs block LF movement of wh-phrases. Turning back to the scope puzzle under investigation, (6a) shows that the nominative object, when c-commanded by an NPI, cannot take scope over the potential suffix. (6b) shows that just like (5b), once the nominative object is moved above the subject NPI, the wide scope becomes available again, confirming the parallelism between (5a-b) and (6a-b). We thus conclude that the wide scope behavior of the nominative object is subject to the LF intervention effects.

Discussion Given the syntactic account for the LF intervention effects, this fact suggests that (LF) movement is implicated in the wide scope behavior of the nominative object, favoring the movement approaches to the nominative object (Case-movement analysis (3b) and covert A'-movement analysis (3c)) over the base-generation analysis (3a). Under the movement approaches, the nominative object cannot take scope over the potential suffix in (6a) since the NPI blocks LF movement of the nominative object or the focus particle *dake*. On the other hand, under the base-generation analysis, according to which the nominative object can take scope over the potential suffix because the former is base-generated above the latter, this fact remains a mystery. Therefore, the LF intervention effect in (6a) can be taken as evidence for the movement approaches to the nominative object. Given that the Case-movement analysis cannot account for the adjunct data in (4), we can conclude that the covert A'-movement analysis is the empirically most adequate analysis of the wide scope behavior of the nominative object in Japanese.

- (1) Takashi-ga migime-o/ga tumur-e-ru.
Takashi-NOM right.eye-ACC/NOM close-can-PRES
'Takashi can close only his right eye.'
- (2) Takashi-ga migime-dake-o/ga tumur-e-ru.
Takashi-NOM right.eye-only-ACC/NOM close-can-PRES
'Takashi can close only his right eye.' NOM (only > can) ACC (*only > can)
- (3) a. [Obj(only) [_{V/VP} close can]] Base-generation Analysis
b. [TP Subj Obj_i [_{CanP} [_{VP} t_i]]] Case-movement Analysis
c. [TP Subj_i only_i [_{CanP} [_{VP} [Obj t_j]]]] Covert A'-movement Analysis
- (4) Taro-ga sakana-ga kosho-dake-de tabe-rare-ru.
Taro-NOM fish-NOM pepper-only-with eat-can-PRES.
'Taro can eat fish with only pepper.' (only > can) (Takahashi 2010)
- (5) a. ?* Daremo nani-o kaw-ana-katta-no?
anyone what-ACC buy-NEG-PAST-Q
'What didn't anyone buy?'
b. Nani_i-o daremo t_i kaw-ana-katta-no?
what-ACC anyone buy-NEG-PAST-Q
- (6) a. Daremo migime-dake-ga tumur-e-na-i.
anyone right eye-only-NOM close-can-NEG-PRES
'No one can close only his right eye.' (*only > can)
b. Migime-dake_i-ga daremo t_i tumur-e-na-i.
right eye-only-NOM anyone close-can-NEG-PRES
'No one can close only his right eye.' (only > can)

References: Beck, S. 1996. Quantified structures as barriers for LF movement. *Natural Language Semantics* 4, 1-56; Bobaljik J. and S. Wurmbrand 2007. Complex predicates, aspect, and anti-reconstruction. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 16: 27-42; Hoji, H. 1985. *Logical form constraints and configurational structures in Japanese*. PhD diss., University of Washington; Koizumi, M. 1994. Nominative objects: The role of TP in Japanese. In *Formal approaches to Japanese linguistics* 1, eds. M. Koizumi and H. Ura, 211-230. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL; Nomura, M. 2005. *Nominative Case and AGREE(ment)*. PhD diss., University of Connecticut; Saito, M. and H. Hoshi. 1998. Control in complex predicates. In Report of the special research project for the typological investigation of languages and cultures of the east and west, 15-46. University of Tsukuba; Sano, M. 1985. LF movement in Japanese. In *Descriptive and Applied Linguistics* 18: 245-259. Tokyo: International Christian University; Tada, H. 1992. Nominative objects in Japanese. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 14: 91-108; Takahashi, M. 2010. Case, phases, and nominative/accusative conversion in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 19: 319-155; Takano, Y. 2003. Nominative objects in Japanese complex predicate constructions: A prolepsis analysis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 779-834.