Kobe University Repository : Kernel

PDF issue: 2026-11-21

Structural effects of nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese

岸本，秀樹

(Citation)
Proceedings of the International Argument Alternation Workshop:36-47

(Issue Date)
2026-01-20

(Resource Type)
conference paper

(Version)
Version of Record

(JaLCDOI)
https://doi.org/10.24546/0100499706

(URL)
https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/0100499706

KOBE UNIVERSITY

Structural effects of nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese*

Hideki Kishimoto
Kobe University

1. Introduction

In Japanese, genitive subjects can be derived via so-called "nominative-genitive (*ga-no*) conversion" when finite clauses comprising nominative subjects are embedded under nominals to form complex DPs (i.e. relative clauses and noun-complement clauses) (see Harada 1971, Maki and Uchibori 2008, Ochi 2016, and others).

(1) a. [*gakusei-*{***ga/no***} *yon-da*] *hon*
student-{NOM/GEN} read-PAST book
'the book which the students read' (relative clause)
b. [*gakusei-*{***ga/no***} *ku-ru*] *kanoosei*
student-{NOM/GEN} come-PRES possibility
'the possibility that the students will come' (noun-complement clause)

The genitive case marking is not allowed on the subject in the matrix context. Thus, the subjects in (2) can be marked with nominative case, but not genitive case.

(2) a. *Gakusei-*{***ga/*no***} *hon-o* *yon-da*.
student-{NOM/GEN} book-ACC read-PAST
'The students read the books.'
b. *Gakusei-*{***ga/*no***} *ku-ru*.
student-{NOM/GEN} come-PRES
'The students will come.'

One perennial issue surrounding the nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese is where subjects are located. Three different proposals are available in the literature.

(3) a. [$_{DP}$ **SBJ-GEN** [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ SBJ-NOM [$_{vP}$ V-v] T] C] D]
b. [$_{DP}$ [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ SBJ-NOM [$_{vP}$ **SBJ-GEN** V-v] T] C] D]
c. [$_{DP}$ [$_{CP}$ **SBJ-GEN** [$_{TP}$ SBJ-NOM [$_{vP}$ V-v] T] C] D]

Some researchers (e.g. Bedell (1972), Saito (2004), Sakai (1994)) maintain a classic view, and claim that genitive subjects appear in the nominal domain which is projected above the embedded clause, as in (3a). Watanabe (1996), Hiraiwa (2001, 2005), and Miyagawa (2011, 2013) hold that genitive subjects appear in vP without undergoing A-movement to a higher position, as in (3b), which is currently the most prevent view. Kishimoto

* This paper was presented at *The International Argument Alternation Workshop* held on July 16-17, 2025, hosted by the Graduate School of Humanities, Kobe University. I am thankful to Kazuhiko Fukushima, Saeko Urushibara, and the audience for their comments and suggestions. This work is supported by the JSPS Grant-in-Aids for Scientific Research (C) (Grant no. 24K03840).

(2017a) advances another analysis, and claims that genitive subjects appear in the CP domain, as in (3c).

In this paper, I will argue that the genitive subject is moved to Spec CP, in line with the third analysis, and that genitive subjects are located in Spec-CP in overt syntax by virtue of the EPP feature assigned to C. Crucial empirical data in support of this claim come from the facts of NPI licensing. It is shown that genitive objects derived via nominative-genitive conversion stay in situ in overt syntax, but are raised to CP at LF. On the basis of this fact, I suggest that genitive Case is licensed by D while observing the PIC (Phase Impenetrability Condition).

2. The structural position of genitive subjects

In this section, I will provide several pieces of new data that allow us to state that genitive subjects derived by nominative-genitive conversion are moved to CP.

2.1. Genitive subjects are not in the nominal domain

In this section, I argue that genitive subjects derived from nominative-genitive conversion are *not* located in the nominal domain, i.e. DP or NP (pace the classic analysis (Bedell (1972), Saito (2004), and Sakai (1994)).

The view that genitive subjects appear inside the nominal domain, i.e. the DP/NP, projected above the embedded clause gains empirical support from the facts of adjectival modification (Kishimoto 2017a). First, observe that the adjectival modifier *oisii* 'delicious' cannot follow the subject of the predicate *taberu* 'eat' regardless of its case marking in (4).

(4) [[(***oisii***) *gakusei-*{***ga/no***} (****oisii***) *tabe-ta*] *keeki*]
delicious student-{NOM/GEN} delicious eat-PAST cake
'the (delicious) cake that the student ate'

The same adjectival modifier *oisii* can appear either to the left or the right of a genitive argument located in the nominal domain, as shown in (5).

(5) [(***oisii***) *gakusei-no* (***oisii***) *obentoo*]
delicious student-GEN delicious lunchbox
'the student's (delicious) lunchbox'

In (5), the adjectival modifier can follow the genitive argument since it appears inside the DP/NP. The impossibility of placing the adjectival modifier to the right of the genitive subject in (4) indicates then that it appears not in DP/NP, but the embedded clause.

Additional support for the view that the genitive subject is in the embedded clause may be adduced from the noun-complement construction in (6), where the nominal *isi* 'intention' selects a control complement.

(6) [*Eri-*{*no/*ga*} *kaigai-ni iku*] *isi-wa* *kawara-nakat-ta*.
Eri-{GEN/NOM} overseas-to go-PRES intention-TOP change-NEG-PAST
'Eri's intention that she will go abroad did not change.'

In (6), the genitive argument is interpreted as the subject of the predicate, but cannot be marked with nominative case. This fact illustrates that the genitive argument in (6) is not

derived via nominative-genitive conversion, but is an argument selected by the nominal *isi*. It can be posited then that the complement clause has PRO controlled by the genitive argument located inside the DP in (7).

(7) [$_{DP}$ Eri$_i$-GEN [$_{CP}$ PRO$_i$ …..]]

The genitive argument *Eri* in (6) is interpreted as the subject of the embedded predicate since Eri controls PRO. Notably, it is not possible to embedd an inanimate subject clause under the nominal *isi* 'intention', as (8) illustrates.

(8) *[*Ame-no huru*] *isi-wa* *kawara-nakat-ta*.
rain-GEN fall-PRES intention-TOP change-NEG-PAST
(lit.) 'The rain's intention that it will fall did not change.'

As argued by Kishimoto (2005, 2017b), an animacy requirement is imposed on controlled PRO in Japanese. Then the fact that (8) is excluded as unacceptable suggests that the complement clause in (6) has a control structure.

By contrast, no animacy requirement is imposed on the genitive-subject construction whereby the genitive subject is derived by the nominative-genitive conversion. Thus, (9) is acceptable.

(9) [*Ame-no huru*] *kanoosei-wa* *kawara-nakat-ta*.
rain-GEN fall-PRES possibility-TOP change-NEG-PAST
'The probability that it will rain did not change.'

(9) shows that the complement clause does not have a control structure, which in turn suggests that the genitive subject appears in the noun-complement clause, and thus the adjectival modifier is prevented from occurring to the right of the genitive subject in (4).

Remarkably, the noun-complement construction whose head noun is *isi* allows an adjectival modifier to follow the genitive argument.

(10) [(*katai*) *Eri-no* (*katai*) *kaigai-ni* *iku*] *isi*
firm Eri-GEN firm overseas go-PRES intention
'Eri's (firm) intention to go abroad'

Obviously, the adjectival modifier can be placed to right of the genitive argument, since it appears inside the nominal domain. The data point to the conclusion that genitive subjects derived via nominative-genitive conversion are not located inside DP/NP.

2.2. The position of genitive/nominative subjects in the embedded clause

Some researchers (including Watanabe (1996), Hiraiwa (2001, 2005), and Miyagawa (2011, 2013)) claim that genitive subjects stay in vP, as in (11a).

(11) a. [$_{CP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{vP}$ SUBJ-GEN V-*v*] **T**] C]
b. [$_{CP}$ SUBJ-GEN [$_{TP}$ [$_{vP}$ ~~SUBJ-GEN~~ V-*v*] T] C]

I will provide empirical evidence in support of the view that the genitive subject is located in CP, occupying a higher position than the nominative subject, as (11b) illustrates.

Crucial empirical evidence comes from the interpretation of an NPI *amari ooku-no* 'very many' (Kishimoto 2017b).

As an entry to this discussion, let us mention some notable properties of the NPI *amari ooku-no* 'very many'. First, the NPI is a premodifier to a DP, which allows the host to bear an overt case marking. It can appear in a negative clause, but not an affirmative clause, as shown in (12a) and (12b).

(12) a. [***Amari*** ***ooku-no*** *hito*]-*ga* *hanasa-**nakat**-ta*.
very many-GEN man-NOM talk-NEG-PAST
'Not very many people have talked (=a small number of people talked).'
b. *[***Amari*** ***ooku-no*** *hito*]-*ga* *hanasi-ta*.
very many-GEN man-NOM talk-PAST
(lit.) 'Very many people talked.'

Note that if the NPI is licensed in the negative context, negation necessarily takes scope over *ooku-no* 'many', obataining the "NEG > very many" interpretation, i.e. the combination of "*amari ooku-no* plus NEG" mean "(just) a small number of".[1]

Secondly, no subject-object asymmetry is observed in the licensing of *amari ooku-no* in a simple finite clause owing to the fact that the negator takes scope over TP (Kishimoto 2017b).

(13) a. [***Amari*** ***ooku**-no* *hito*]-***ga*** *sono koto-o* *hanasa-**nakat**-ta.*
very many-GEN man-NOM that matter-ACC talk-NEG-PAST
'A small number of people talked about that matter.'
b. *Ken-wa* [***amari*** ***ooku**-no* *koto*]-***o*** *hanasa-**nakat**-ta*.
Ken-TOP very many-GEN thing-ACC talk-NEG-PAST
'Ken talked about a small number of matters.'

The NPI residing outside the scope of negation is not licensed. This can be confirmed by the bi-clausal construction with *soo-da* 'likely' indicating probability.

(14) a. *[***Amari*** ***ooku**-no* *hito*]-***ga*** *sono koto-o* *hanasa-**nasa**-soo-da*.
very many-GEN man-NOM that matter-ACC talk-NEG-likely-PRES
(lit.) 'Very many people are likely not to talk about that matter.'
b. *Ken-wa* [***amari*** ***ooku**-no* *koto*]-***o*** *hanasa-**nasa**-soo-da*.
Ken-TOP very many-GEN thing-ACC talk-NEG-likely-PRES
'Ken is likely to talk about a small number of matters.'

In both sentences in (14), the negator is followed by *soo da*. In (14a), the NPI in the subject position is not licensed, so that the sentence cannot have the interpretation that a

[1] There are cases where the NPI *amari* is licensed without negation, since the NPI is not a strong type (Sawada, Kishimoto, and Imani 2024). When *amari* is allowed in a non-negative context, it carries the meaning of "too much". Importantly, "neg > many" interpretation is possible only if the NPI is licensed under the scope of negation. Thus, the presence or absence of a "neg > many" interpretation is used as a yardstick to assess whether *amari* falls under the scope of negation.

small number of people talked about that matter. In (14b), where the NPI appears in the object position, the NPI is licensed, so that the sentence can have the interpretation that Ken talked about a small number of matters.

It is also possible to place the negator to the right of *soo da*, in which case the negator appears in the matrix clause. In this case, the matrix subject NPI, as well as the object NPI, is licensed in (15).

(15) a. [***Amari*** ***ooku-no*** *hito*]-*ga* *hanasi-soo-ni-**na**-i.*
very many-GEN man-NOM talk-likely-COP-NEG-PRES
'A small number of people are likely to talk.'
b. *Ken-wa* [***amari*** ***ooku-no*** *koto*]-*o* *hanasi-soo-ni-**na**-i*.
Ken-TOP very many-GEN matter-NOM talk-likely-COP-NEG-PRES
'Ken is not likely to talk about a small number of matters.'

(15a) is legitimate with the interpretation that a small number of people seem to talk. (15b) is legitimate as well, obtaining the interpretation that Ken seems to talk about a small number of things since the object NPI falls under the scope of negation.

The *soo-da* sentences in (14) and (15) are raising constructions where the embedded subject is raised to the matrix clause, as depicted in (16).

(16) [$_{TP}$ **SUBJ** [$_{TP}$ ~~SUBJ~~ **OBJ** V **Neg**]-*soo da*]
negative scope

As discussed by Kishimoto (2017b), the negative *nai*, which initially appears in NegP, takes scope over the subject if it undergoes Neg-head raising to TP. The negator in (14) is placed in the embedded clause, so it takes scope over the embedded TP. Thus, the NPI subject raised to the matrix clause in (14a) is not licensed. The object falls under the scope of negation, and is licensed in (14b).

No subject-asymmetry in NPI licensing is observed in (15) since the scope of negation extends over the matrix TP when the negator follows the auxiliary *soo-da*, as (17) illustrates.

(17) [$_{TP}$ SUBJ-NOM [$_{TP}$ ~~SUBJ-NOM~~ OBJ-ACC V]-*soo ni* NEG-T]
negative scope

In this case, the NPI is licensed regardless of whether it occurs in subject position or in object position. Accordingly, both sentences in (15) are acceptable.

With the licensing condition of the NPI *amari ooku-no* and its relative scope interpretation in mind, let us proceed to consider data on the nominative-genitive conversion. (18) is a case where the subject appearing in the noun-complement clause is marked with nominative case.

(18) [[***Amari ooku-no*** *gakusei*]-***ga*** *hanasa-**nakat**-ta*] *kanoosei-ga* *ar-u*.
very many-GEN student-NOM talk-NEG-PAST possibility-NOM be-PRES
'There is the possibility that a small number of students talked.'

In (18), the NPI *amari ooku-no* is licensed under the scope of embedded negation, and the embedded clause can have the interpretation that a small number of students talked. This fact shows that the nominative subject in (18) resides in Spec-TP in the finite noun-complement clause.

In contrast, the embedded genitive subject in (19) is not licensed under the embedded negation, and hence (19) does not have a legitimate interpretation that a small number of students talked.

(19) *[[***Amari ooku-no*** *gakusei*]-***no*** *hanasa-**nakat**-ta*] *kanoosei-ga* *ar-u*.
very many-GEN student-GEN talk-NEG-PAST possibility-NOM be-PRES
(lit.) 'there is the possibility that very many people did not talk.'

The absence of the intended interpretation shows that the genitive subject falls outside the scope of the embedded negator, which takes scope over the embedded TP.

A comparison of (18) and (19) shows that the genitive subject is located in a higher position than the nominative subject. Since negative scope extends over TP in the noun-complement clause, it can be stated that the genitive subject appears in CP, as illustrated in (20).

(20) [$_{CP}$ SUBJ-GEN [$_{TP}$ SUBJ-NOM……Neg-T] C]
negative scope

The NPI appearing in a structural position below the nominative subject is licensed by the clausal negation. Importantly, the NPI *amari ooku-no* is not licensed by negation if it is marked with genitive case, whereas it is licensed if marked with nominative case. It is easy to see then that the genitive subject is located in a higher position than the nominative subject.

It is worth noting that both genitive and nominative subjects undergo A-movement when direct passivization applies. This can be confirmed by appealing to subject-oriented reflexive *zibun* 'self'.

(21) a. *[*Sensei-ga* ***Eri**$_i$**-o*** ***zibun**$_i$**-no*** *heya-de* *sikat-ta*] *kanoosei-ga*
teacher-NOM Eri-ACC self-GEN room-in scold-PAST possibility-NOM
ar-u.
be-PRES
(lit.) 'There is the possibility why the teacher scolded Eri$_i$ in self'$_i$s room.'

b. [***Eri**$_i$**-{ga/no}*** ***zibun**$_i$**-no*** *heya-de* *sikar-are-ta*] *kanoosei-ga*
Eri-{NOM/GEN} self-GEN room-in scold-PASS-PAST possibility-NOM
ar-u.
be-PRES
(lit.) 'There is the possibility that Eri was scolded by self'$_i$s room.'

(21a) shows that the object of a transitive clause does not serve as the antecedent of *zibun*. Nevertheless, if the object is rendered as the passive subject by direct passivization, it can antecede *zibun* regardless of whether it is marked with genitive or nominative case, as seen in (21b).

When an argument undergoes A′-movement (such as topicalization) or scrambling, no change of grammatical relation takes place. Thus, the moved object in (22b-c) cannot be the antecedent of *zibun*.

(22) a. **Sensei-ga* ***Eri$_i$-o*** ***zibun$_i$-no*** *heya-de* *sikat-ta*.
teacher-NOM Eri-ACC self-GEN room-in scold-PAST
'The teacher scolded Eri in self's room.'
b. ****Eri$_i$-o*** *sensei-ga* ***zibun$_i$-no*** *heya-de* *sikat-ta*.
Eri-ACC teacher-NOM self-GEN room-in scold-PAST
'Eri, the teacher scolded in self's room.' (fronting by scrambling)
c. ****Eri$_i$-wa*** *sensei-ga* ***zibun$_i$-no*** *heya-de* *sikat-ta*.
Eri-TOP teacher-NOM self-GEN room-in scold-PAST
'As for Eri, the teacher scolded in self's room.' (fronting by topicalization)

A comparison of (21) and (22) shows that the passive subject undergoes A-movement from its original object position irrespective of whether it is marked with nominative case or genitive case.

In Japanese, negative scope extends over TP in verbal clauses (Kishimoto 2017b). The nominative subject appears in Spec-TP and hence the NPI subject is licensed under the scope of negation. By contrast, the unacceptability of (19) shows that the genitive subject is located outside the scope of negation, which suggests that it undergoes A-movement to Spec-CP. Both nominative and genitive subjects undergo A-movement by the clausal subject requirement, i.e. the EPP requirement, but they stop at different positions in clause structure.

Chomsky (2008) suggests that an EPP feature is assigned to the phase head of C, and that this feature can be inherited by T. Given this, it is reasonable to postulate that the genitive subject differs from the nominative subject in the locus where the EPP feature attracts the subject.[2] In the nominative-subject construction, the EPP feature assigned to C is inherited by T, so that the subject is moved to Spec-TP. In this case, the Case feature is also inherited by T, and T Case-licenses the subject. In the genitive-subject construction, C retains the EPP feature, and thus the subject moves into Spec-CP. T does not inherit the formal features when a Case feature is not assigned to C. Accordingly, the genitive Case on the genitive subject is Case-licensed by D.

2.3. Non-subject arguments with genitive case

In the present analysis, both genitive and nominative subjects undergo A-movement by the EPP requirement. Given that the subjects are moved by the EPP requirement, it is expected that non-subject arguments will not undergo A-movement regardless of their case marking.

With a view to verifying the claim that non-subject arguments do not undergo A-movement, I will look into adjectival clauses, which, as Kishimoto (2019) discusses, do not extend the negative scope over TP. This fact can be confirmed by the unacceptability of (23) with the intended interpretation that a small number of papers were interesting.

---

[2] This is in line with the D-licensing approach. The C-licensing approach (Hiraiwa 2001, 2005) is not adopted in this paper since there is not a strict correlation between the genitive case marking on the subject and the predicate inflection. For reasons of space, I will not discuss this point in this paper.

(23) *[***Amari ooku-no*** *ronbun*]-ga *omosiroku* ***nakat****-ta.*
very many-GEN paper-NOM interesting NEG-PAST
(lit.) 'Very many papers were not interesting.'

(23) shows that negative scope does not extend over TP in adjectival clauses. The adequacy of this view is reinforced by the adjective clause in (24), which has a transitive adjective as its predicate. In the case of transitive adjectives, a subject-complement asymmetry is observed in NPI licensing, as seen in (24).

(24) a. *[***Amari ooku-no*** *hito*]-*ga* *kare-ni* *yasasiku* ***nakat****-ta*.
very many-GEN person-NOM he-DAT nice NEG-PAST
(lit.) 'Very many people was not nice to him.'
b. *Ken-wa* [***amari ooku-no*** *hito*]-*ni* *yasasiku* ***nakat****-ta*.
Ken-TOP very many-GEN person-DAT nice NEG-PAST
'Ken was nice to a small number of drinks.'

The transitive adjective *yasasii* 'nice' takes a nominative subject and a dative complement. When the NPI *amari ooku-no* is included in the subject, the sentence cannot have the interpretation that a small number of people were nice to him. But when the dative argument comprises the NPI, the sentence can have the interpretation that Ken was nice to a small number of people. The interpretive facts suggest that the negator does not undergo head movement to T, and thus negative scope does not extend over TP in the adjectival predicate construction (Kishimoto 2019).

The same holds true of another type of transitive adjective *hosii* 'want', which takes two nominative arguments.

(25) a. *[***Amari ooku-no*** *hito*]-*ga* *nomimono-ga* *hosiku* ***nakat****-ta*.
very many-GEN person-NOM drink-NOM want NEG-PAST
(lit.) 'Very many people did not want drinks.'
b. *Ken-wa* [***amari ooku-no*** *nominono*]-*ga* *hosiku* ***nakat****-ta*.
Ken-TOP very many-NOM drink-NOM want NEG-PAST
'Ken wanted a small number of drinks.'

In (25a), the NPI is contained in the first argument, i.e. the subject, and the NPI is not licensed. Thus the sentence cannot have the interpretation that a small number of people wanted drinks. In (25b), the NPI occurring inside complement to the adjective predicate is licensed. Thus (25b) has the interpretation that Ken wanted a small number of drinks.

The transitive predicate *hosii* 'want' takes a nominative-nominative case pattern. Accordingly, the second argument of *hosii* can undergo the nominative-genitive conversion. (26a) shows that the NPI complement is licensed under the scope of negation regardless of whether it bears the nominative or genitive marking and has the interpretation that Ken wanted a small number of drinks.

(26) a. [*Ken-ga* [***amari ooku-no*** *nomimono*]-{***ga/no***} *hosiku* ***nakat-ta***]
Ken-NOM very many-GEN drink-{NOM/GEN} want NEG-PAST
kanoosei-ga *ar-u*.
possibility-NOM be-PRES

'There is the possibility that Ken wanted a small number of drinks.'

b. *[[***Amari ooku-no*** *hito-**{ga/no}*** *nomimono-ga* *hosiku-**nakat**-ta*]
very many-GEN man-{NOM/GEN} drink-NOM want-NEG-PAST
kanoosei-ga *ar-u*.
possibility-NOM be-PRES
(lit.) 'There is the possibility that very many people did not want drinks.'

When the NPI appears in the first argument, it is not licensed by the embedded negator, as seen in (26b).

The important fact is that the NPI appearing in the second argument, but not the first argument, i.e. the subject, of transitive adjectives is licensed under negation. The interpretive facts of the transitive adjective *hosii* 'want' follow given that negative scope extends only over the adjectival predicate without Neg-head raising, as depicted in (27).

(27) [$_{CP}$ SUBJ-GEN [SUBJ-NOM [$_{NegP}$ [$_{aP}$ ARG-NOM/GEN…a-A] Neg] T]

negative scope

If the negator remains in NegP, its scope extends over only aP. Hence the NPI in the subject position is not licensed in the adjectival clauses. The second argument stays in situ. Thus, the NPI appearing in the second argument is licensed regardless of its case marking even when the negator in the adjectival clause extends its scope only over aP.

2.4. How is genitive Case licensed?

The facts of the transitive adjective construction raise the question of how genitive Case on the complement is licensed. In the present perspective, genitive Case on the genitive subject is licensed by D. If a genitive complement stays in situ, the question arises as to how D licenses its genitive Case. Since the arguments can be subject to nominative-genitive conversion only when they are embedded under nominals, it looks as if genitive Case on the complement of a transitive adjective is sanctioned by the Case-licensing D-head at a distance in violation of the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2004). On the contrary, the genitive complement is moved up to CP at LF, so that Case licensing is implemented by observing the PIC.

Empirical evidence in favor of the present view can be adduced from the facts of association with focus by *dake* appearing at the clause end. Observe that in (28), the focus interpretation differs depending on the subject marking.

(28) [[*Ken**{ga/*no}*** *kono* *nomimono-ga* *hosikat-ta*] ***dake**-no*]
Ken-{NOM/GEN} this drink-NOM want-PAST only-COP
kanoosei-ga *ar-u*.
possibility-NOM be-PRES
'There is the possibility that **only Ken** wanted this drink.'

In (28), the focus particle *dake* 'only' can be associated with the subject *Ken*, and can have the interpretation that only Ken wanted this drink when it is marked with nominative case, but not genitive case. Given this, the presence or absence of the subject focus interpretation is naturally expected if the nominative subject resides in TP, and the genitive subject in CP.

The same distribution is observed for the second argument of the transitive adjective *hosii* 'want', as illustrated in (29).

(29) [[*Ken-ga* *kono* *nomimono-*{***ga/*no***} *hosikat-ta*] ***dake-****no*]
Ken-NOM this drink-{NOM/GEN} want-PAST only-COP
kanoosei-ga *ar-u*.
possibility-NOM be-PRES
'There is the possibility that Ken wanted **only this drink**.'

Crucially, (29) lacks the interpretation where the focus of *dake* falls on the second complement argument if it is marked with genitive case, but this interpretation is permitted if it bears nominative marking.

As argued by Kishimoto (2009), *dake* takes TP as it focusing domain and the possibility of *dake*-focusing is fixed at the LF level. Since the genitive complement of *hosii* remains in aP in overt syntax, it can be stated that the genitive complement argument is moved into CP at the LF level.

(30) a. The genitive subject is moved to CP overtly by the EPP feature assigned to C.
Overt Syntax: [$_{CP}$ SUBJ-GEN [$_{TP}$ [$_{vP}$ ~~SUBJ-GEN~~ Arg-GEN V-v]T]C]
b. The non-subject argument in the genitive case is moved to CP by LF raising.
LF: [$_{CP}$ SUBJ-GEN Arg-GEN [$_{TP}$ [$_{vP}$ ~~SUBJ-GEN~~ ~~Arg-GEN~~ V-v]T]C]

The overall generalization is that the genitive arguments whose case marking is made available via nominative-genitive conversion are Case-licensed by moving into CP. Given that D is a Case-licenser of genitive Case, and that the arguments moved into the edge of CP are accessible to D, it can be stated that the Case-licensing of the genitive arguments observe the PIC.

Miyagawa (2011) suggests that the genitive arguments derived by nominative-genitive conversion are licensed by D within vP due to the small clause size lacking CP, but the data on the NPI licensing suggest that the clause size should not be so small. The new data considered in this section suggest that genitive Case on the genitive argument is licensed with a local relation at LF even if it appears in a position that is not accessible to D in overt syntax.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued for the following points: (A) Genitive subjects derived via nominative-genitive conversion occur in CP in overt syntax, while nominative subjects appear in TP. (B) Genitive subjects undergo A-movement to CP, and this movement is motivated by an EPP feature assigned to C and their genitive Case is licensed by D. (D) Genitive complements derived via nominative-genitive conversion are not subject to overt A-movement. Nevertheless, they are raised to CP by LF movement and their genitive Case is licensed by D.

References

Bedell, George (1972). On *no*. *UCLA Papers in Syntax 3: Studies in East Asian Syntax*, 1–20.

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*, 89–155. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Chomsky, Noam (2001). Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Chomsky, Noam. (2004). Beyond explanatory adequacy. In Adriana Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond*, 104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Chomsky, Noam (2008). On phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizaretta (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 133–166. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
Harada, S. I. (1971). Ga-no conversion and idiolectal variation in Japanese. *Gengo Kenkyu* 60, 25–38.
Hiraiwa, Ken (2001). On nominative-genitive conversion. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 39, 65–123.
Hiraiwa, Ken (2005). *Dimensions of Symmetry in Syntax: Agreement and Clausal Architecture*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2005). *Toogo-koozoo-to Bunpoo-kankei* [Syntactic Structures and Grammatical Relations]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2009). Topic prominency in Japanese. *The Linguistic Review* 26, 465–513.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2017a). Remarks on nominative-genitive conversion in Japanese. *Nanzan Linguistics* 12, 1–27.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2017b). Negative polarity, A-movement, and clause architecture in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17, 109–161.
Kishimoto, Hideki (2019). Nihongo-no hitei-kyokusesi-hyoogen-to toogo-koozo [Negative polarity expressions in Japanese]. In Osamu Sawada, Hideki Kishimoto, and Ikumi Imani (eds.) *Kyokusei-Hyoogen-no Koozoo, Imi, Kinoo* [Polarity-sensitive Expressions: Their Forms, Meanings and Functions, 50–79. Tokyo: Kaitakushya.
Maki, Hideki, and Asako Uchibori (2008) *Ga/no* conversion. In Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 192–216. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Miyagawa, Shigeru (2011). Genitive subjects in Altaic and specification of phase. *Lingua* 121, 1265–1282.
Miyagawa, Shigeru (2013). Strong uniformity and *ga*/*no* conversion. *English Linguistics* 30, 1–24.
Ochi, Masao (2016). Meishi-syuushoku-ni-okeru kaku-no kootai-genshoo [Case alternation phenomena in noun-modifying constructions]. In Keiko Murasugi, Mamoru Saito, Yoichi Miyamoto, and Kensuke Takita (eds.) *Nihongo Bunpoo Handobukku* [The Japanese Grammar Handbook], 146–188. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
Saito, Mamoru (2004). Genitive subjects in Japanese: Implications for the theory of null objects. In Peri Bhaskararao and Karumuri Venkata Subbarao (eds.) *Non-Nominative Subjects: Volume 2*, 103–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Sakai, Hiromu (1994). Complex NP constraint and case-conversions in Japanese. In Masaru Nakamura, (ed.) *Current Topics in English and Japanese*, 179–203. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
Sawada, Osamu, Hideki Kishimoto, and Ikumi Imani (2024). Some empirical and theoretical issues in polarity-sensitive expressions. In Osamu Sawada, Hideki

Kishimoto, and Ikumi Imani (eds.) *Polarity-Sensitive Expressions: Comparisons between Japanese and Other Languages*, 3–25. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Watanabe, Akira (1996). Nominative-genitive conversion and agreement in Japanese: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 5, 373-410.