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Abstract

This paper examines three different constructions in Japanese (relative clauses, cleft constructions, and right dislocation). It is shown that these constructions do not display subjacency when the head phrase lacks a Case-marker, but show full subjacency effects when the head is Case-marked. After listing empirical data, we show that even these sentences that do not display subjacency effects derive through movement. We then point out that these constructions display properties of topicalised sentences, and are derived from topicalised sentences.

1. Introduction

Relative clauses (RCs) and cleft constructions (CCs) have been explored extensively across languages within the generative tradition. The general consensus is that both involve operator movement, and hence, are sensitive to island constraints (Chomsky 1977, 1981, among many others). However, Japanese RCs and CCs do not exhibit island effects, as shown in (1) and (2).  

(1) a. [Taro-ga [sinya-ga e1 kitei-to] itsa] fuku

Taroo-Nom gentleman-Nom wear-C said suit

'The suit that Taro said that the gentleman wore'

b. [e1 e2 kitei] fuku-ga yogoretei ru sinya (Kano (1973)

wear suit-Nom is-dirty gentleman

'The gentleman whose suit is dirty'

(2) a. [Taro-ga [sinya-ga e1 kitei-to] itsa-no-wa

Taro-Nom gentleman-Nom wear-C said-Nm-Top

no-fuku-datta

that suit was

'It was the suit that Taro said that the gentleman wore.'

b. [e1 e2 kitei] fuku-ga yogoretei ] no-wa

wear suit-Nom is-dirty Nm-Top

no-sinya-datta.

that gentleman-was

'It was the gentleman whose suit is dirty.'

The sentences in (1a) and (2a) show that the (underlined) head NP of the RC and the focus of the CC can be associated with a position, e1, inside the complement clauses, showing that the head and its thematic position is potentially unbounded. Furthermore, the head of these constructions can be associated to a position in a complex NP, as shown in (1b) and (2b). One might therefore argue that Japanese RCs and CCs do not involve any movement at all. Along this line, one possible account of these constructions is to assume remnant pronoun strategies, and maintain that subjacency is not at work since they are not derived through
movement. This paper demonstrates that despite apparent lack of island sensitivity, unbounded dependencies in RCs and CCs involve movement. In addition to these two constructions, we also claim that right-dislocation constructions (RDCs), exemplified in (3), are derived in the same manner.

(3) a. [Taro-o ga] [saxis-ga] e, kiteiru-to] ittta-]yo
    Taro-Nom gentleman-Nom wear-C said
    ‘Taro said that the gentleman wore it, the suit.’

b. [e e, kiteiru ] fokut-ga yogoreteiru-]yo ano-sinsi,
    suit-Nom is-dirty that gentleman
    ‘His suit is dirty, that gentleman’

(3) shows that RDCs manifest the same property: the relation between the dislocated item and its thematic position can be unbounded (3a), and even free from the complex NP constraint (3b). To our knowledge, this property of RDCs has not been reported in the literature. Since the head of RCs, the focus phrase in CCs, and the right-dislocated phrase behave in the same way, for the purpose of exposition, we will refer to these items as heads.²

This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 shows that in contrast to the case discussed above, the three constructions in question exhibit subcategorisation effects when the head is Case-marked. Section 3 presents empirical support for our claim based on the facts of reconstruction effects that even in the absence of subcategorisation, the three constructions involve movement. Section 4 provides further evidence for the dichotomy of case-marked NPs and bare NPs by looking at interactions of two operator-variable relations. Section 5 discusses theoretical implications of our analysis. Section 6 is a summary.

2. Complex NP Constraint

Japanese complex NPs constitute an island for scrambling (Saito 1985 and many others), as shown below:

(4) a. *Taro-o ga [w [y Hanako-o ga e, ano ronbun-o ageta] hito]-]o
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom that paper-Acc gave person-Acc
    Saisagiteita.
    was-looking-for
    ‘Taro was looking for the person who Hanako gave that paper.’

b. *Ano ronbun-o, Taro-o ga [w [y Hanako-o ga e, ageta] hito]-]o
    that paper-Acc Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom gave person-Acc
    Saisagiteita.
    was-looking-for
    ‘(lit.) That paper, Taro was looking for the person, who Hanako gave (it) (to him).’

The object of the embedded clause in (4a), ano ronbun-o ‘that paper-Acc,’ is scrambled out of the RC to the top of the matrix sentence in the ungrammatical (4b). Bearing in mind the fact that a complex NP constitutes an island, let us examine the three constructions in question:

(5) a. *Tarou-o ga [w [y Hanako-o ga e, ageta] hito]-]o
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom gave person-Acc
    Saisagiteita, ano ronbun-o.
    was-looking-for-FF that paper-Acc
    ‘(lit.) That paper, Taro was looking for the person, who Hanako gave (it) to him.’

b. Taro-o ga [w [y Hanako-o ga e, ageta] hito]-]o
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom gave person-Acc
    Saisagiteita, ano ronbun-o.
    was-looking-for-FF that paper
    ‘(lit.) That paper, Taro was looking for the person, who Hanako gave (it) to him.’

CCs in Japanese manifest the same dichotomy.

(6) a. *Taro-o ga [w [y Hanako-o ga e, ageta] hito]-]o
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom gave person-Acc
    Saisagiteita-no-va
    anuronbun-o.
    was-looking-for-Nom-Top that paper-Acc-Cop
    ‘(lit.) It was that paper, that Taro was looking for the person, who Hanako gave (it) to him.’

b. Taro-o ga [w [y Hanako-o ga e, ageta] hito]-]o
    Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom gave person-Acc
    Saisagiteita-no-va
    anuronbun-da.
    was-looking-for-Nom-Top that paper-Cop
    ‘(lit.) It was that paper that Taro was looking for the person, who Hanako gave (it) to him.’

In both sentences in (6), the object NP within the complex NP is clefted. They are different in that the head (or focused/clefted NP) is marked by o in (6a) whereas it is a bare NP in (6b). The former obeys subcategorisation but the latter does not. This observation is in (Hoji 1990) that observes the same dichotomy is present for CCs in Japanese.²

As we have already seen in the previous section, relativising an element within a complex NP does not yield ungrammaticality. Let us consider the following sentences. The sentence (1b) is repeated here as (7a):

(7) a. [w [w [w [y e, e, kiteiru ] fokut-ga yogoreteiru ] sinsi]-]o
    wear suit-Nom is-dirty gentleman
    ‘The gentleman whose suit is dirty’

b. [w [y e, e, channoroo-](o-sita) hito]-]o
    download person-Nom die
    ‘paper
    ‘(lit.) The paper, which the person who downloaded (it) will die’
In (7a), the subject, \( e_i \), of the most deeply embedded RC is associated with the higher head, \( \text{sinc} \), and in (7b), the object, \( e_j \), of the most deeply embedded RC (7b) is linked to the higher head, \( \text{renbun} \). Unlike RDCs and CCSs, however, the head of the relative clause does not occur with a Case-marker. The head of the RCs can be associated with the element inside the complex NP, and hence, Japanese RCs are insensitive to constraints on movement, just like RDCs and CCSs with a bare NP head.

The generalisation we can draw is that when a Case-marker is not attached to the head, subjacency effects disappear, but with a Case-marker on the head, the sentences display subjacency effects. One possible interpretation of this fact, assuming that subjacency is a derivational constraint, is that without Case-marker, these three constructions, RCs, CCSs, and RDCs, are not derived via movement. However, the next section demonstrates that this is not the case.

3. Reconstruction Effects

Section 2 has shown that when a case is not overtly marked on the head, the sentences do not observe subjacency. One possible interpretation of this fact is that no movement takes place in these constructions. However, reconstruction phenomena in these constructions show that this is not true. \( \text{Zibun}, \) 'self', is a long-distance anaphor in Japanese. Its antecedent must be a subject but not necessary the one within the same clause, as shown in (8a):

(8a) a. \( \text{Toro-go [\{\text{Hano-go} \text{ Ziroo-kara zibun-go no renbun-o moratta to} \} itta.} \)
Taro-Nom Hano-Ko-Nom Ziroo-from self-Gen paper-Acc received C said 'Taro said that Hanako received self's paper from Ziroo.'

b. \( \text{Zibun-go no renbun-o Toro-go [\{\text{Hano-Ko} \text{ Ziroo-kara ti moratta to} \} itta.} \)
self-Gen paper-Acc Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom Ziroo-from received C said 'It was self's paper that Taro said that Hanako received.'

(8a) has a complement clause, which contains the long-distance anaphor, \( \text{zibun}. \) \( \text{Zibun} \) can be bound either by the matrix subject, \( \text{Toro}, \) or the embedded subject, \( \text{Hano-Ko}. \) This ambiguity is preserved even if the embedded object phrase containing \( \text{zibun} \) scrambles to the top of the sentence, as in (8b). The fact that the scrambled \( \text{zibun} \) behaves with respect to the binding theory as if it has not scrambled shows that scrambling is an instance of movement. Let us first examine how RDCs behave with respect to reconstruction.

(9a) a. \( \text{Toro-go [\{\text{Hano-Ko} \text{ Ziroo-kara ti moratta to} \} itta-go,} \)
Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom Ziroo-from received C said-FP self-Gen paper-Acc 'It was self's paper, Taro said that Hanako received (it) from Ziroo.'

b. \( \text{Toro-go [\{\text{Hano-Ko} \text{ Ziroo-kara ti moratta to} \} itta-go,} \)
Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom Ziroo-from received C said-FP self-Gen paper-Acc 'It was self's paper, Taro said that Hanako received (it) from Ziroo.'

In (9a), the Case-marked object in the complement clause containing \( \text{zibun} \) is dislocated rightward. \( \text{Zibun} \) can be bound by either the matrix subject, \( \text{Taro}, \) or the embedded subject, \( \text{Hano-Ko}. \)
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\( \text{Hanako}, \) just like the sentences in (3). Interestingly enough, the same interpretation is hard to obtain for the dislocated bare NP in (9b); \( \text{zibun} \) in this example can be bound by the matrix subject, \( \text{Taro}, \) but not by the embedded subject, \( \text{Hanako}. \) The same observation holds true for the following RDC with a bare NP head containing a complex NP.

(10) \( \text{Toro-go [\{\text{Hanako-go} \text{ ti ageta} \} hito-go no sagasita-ya,} \)
Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom gave person-Acc was-looking-for-FP [\{\text{zibun-go no renbun-o} \}]
self-Gen paper 'It was self's paper, Taro was looking for the person who Hanako gave (it) to him.'

The right-dislocated head, \( \text{zibun-no renbun}, \) lacks its Case-marker in (10). In this example, the embedded subject \( \text{Hanako} \) cannot bind \( \text{zibun}, \) just like (9b). These observations lead us to the conclusion that when the dislocated element has a Case-marker, it reconstructs fully to its thematic position, whereas when it is a bare NP, it does not reconstruct to the base position but to some intermediate position: the edge of the complement clause. This shows that even when the head is not Case-marked, the head (or an operator for the head) has moved from a position lower than its surface position, if not from the thematic position.

CCs pattern exactly the same. The sentences in (11) have a clefted complement object, \( \text{zibun-no renbun}, \) containing \( \text{zibun}. \)

(11a) a. \( \text{Taro-go [\{\text{Hanako-go} \text{ Ziroo-kara ti moratta to} \} itta-no-ya} \)
Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom Ziroo-from received C said-poss [\{\text{zibun-no renbun-o} \}]-data,
said-Nom-Top self-Gen paper-Acc-Cop 'It was self's paper that Taro said that Hanako received.'

b. \( \text{Toro-go [\{\text{Hanako-go} \text{ Ziroo-kara ti moratta to} \} itta-no-ya} \)
Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom Ziroo-from received C said-poss [\{\text{zibun-go no renbun-o} \}]-data,
said-Nom-Top self-Gen paper-Cop 'It was self's paper that Taro said that Hanako received.'

When the focus NP containing \( \text{zibun} \) has a Case-marker, as in (11a), \( \text{zibun} \) can be bound by either the higher subject \( \text{Taro} \) or the lower subject \( \text{Hanako}, \) but the clefted bare focus NP in (11b) is unambiguous, and can only be bound by the matrix subject, \( \text{Taro}. \) This is parallel to what we have observed in (9)-(10); bare NPs only partially reconstruct.

We turn to RCs. When \( \text{zibun} \) is contained in the head NP relativised out of an embedded RC, reconstruction to the thematic position is not possible, as in (12):

(12) *\( \text{ga [\{\text{Hanako-go} \text{ daunoto-ko-si} \} hito-go \text{ sondaime}] ga sondaime} \)
download person-Nom dire [\{\text{zibun-go no renbun-o} \}]
self-Gen paper 'It was self's paper, anyone who downloads it, will die.'

If the head NP, \( \text{zibun-no renbun} \) 'self's paper', were to reconstruct to its theta position within the RC, the sentence in (12) would be grammatical. The ungrammaticality of this conforms to the facts we saw in the previous section: Japanese RC heads do not reconstruct to the thematic position.
In (13) below, the head of the RC is associated with the object in the complement clause. Zibun can only refer to the higher subject, Taro.

(13) [no [n Tareo-ga [cp Hanako-ga a, Ziro-kara moratta to] iita] Taro-Nom Hanako-Nom Ziro-from receives C said [zibun-te no robun]]
self-Gen paper

Self's paper that Taro said that Hanako received (from Ziro).

The observation here is equivalent to the zibun interpretations in the long-distance RDC and NC in (10) and (11b). When the head or dislocated NP is not marked by a Case-marker, reconstruction is only possible self-way through, but not fully to the thematic position. Based on this observation, we propose that when bare NPs are dislocated, movement does not take place from the thematic position but from some intermediate position. For our purpose, we assume that this intermediate position is the edge of the embedded CP. This can nicely explain the example sentences we have seen; the anaphors (zibun) in (9b), (10), (11b) and (13) can only be bound by the matrix subject since movement takes place from the position adjacent to the complement CP. In this position, zibun can be bound only by its matrix subject but not by the embedded subject, Hanako. The ungrammaticality of (12) also gets a straightforward explanation. Since the relative clause head originates in the subject position, there is no possible antecedent which can bind zibun in the position adjacent to the TP. Based on these facts of reconstruction effects, we claim that these constructions involving bare NPs are derived in part by 'short' movement from the position adjacent to the embedded CP.

Our proposal can be summarized as follows. (14a) is the structure when the head is not Case-marked, while (14b) is the structure when the head has a Case-marker.

(14a) a. Op [... e 4 [c [c ... pro ...]] ...] HEAD NP
b. Op [... e 4 [c ... u ...]] ...] HEAD NP-case

We assume that the structure in (14a) contains pro in the thematic position of the head/dislocated NP but the null operator, base generated in position adjacent to the complement CP and co-indexed with pro, moves to the higher position to be licensed with the heads/dislocated NP. (14b), on the other hand, involves movement from the thematic position of the head/dislocated NP. The structures in (14) can account for the distinct grammaticality of bare NP and case-marked NP dislocation. (14a) manifests a mixed chain similar to those in Selayarese (Finer 1997) and Irish (McClovery 2002). In the next section, we will further justify our proposals in (14).

4. Two Operator-Variable Relations

Given the schematic structures in (14), we expect to find some interaction with other operator-variable relations (the structure with a bare NP head and the one with a case-marked NP head) but slightly in a different way. Here, we adopt Linear Crossing Constraint (LCC) (Tanaka 1997), according to which two operator-variable relations may not have crossing dependencies. Let us first consider the basic sentences involving two operator-variable relations. (15a) is the sentence with canonical word order in Japanese, and (15b) is its scrambled counterpart. The NP marked by zibun 'only' is a negative polarity item (NPI), which forms an A-dependency with its negative head. As shown in (15b), the two dependencies are nested, and the sentence (15a) is grammatical.

(15a) Daro-ga ano robun-sika yoma-nai-no?
who-Nom that paper-only read-Neg-Q
"Who read only that paper?"

b. [cp no (v) dare-ga ano robun-sika] yoma-nai

On the contrary, the sentence in (16a) is the scrambling counterpart of (15a). As illustrated in (16b), the two A'-association cross, and the sentence is ruled out.

(16a) *[ano robun-sika] dare-ga 4, yoma-nai-no?
that paper-only who-Nom read-Neg-Q

b. *[ano robun-sika] dare-ga 4, yoma-nai-np]

Let us now apply the LCC to constructions in question. Consider the following RDC. We would expect that if a head NP with a Case-marker forms an operator-variable relation with its thematic position, the NPI and the Neg head in the matrix clause cause ungrammaticality. This is, however, contrary to the fact. The grammaticality of (17a) shows that the dependency between the dislocated phrase, ano-robun, and its thematic gap position is not that of an operator variable structure; if it was, (17a) would be ruled out, since it violates the LCC as shown in (17b).

(17a) Taro-sika [cp Hanako-ga a, yonda to] emotte-inai-yo, ano robun-o.
Taro-only Hanako-Nom read C think-Neg-FP that paper-Adv
"(ib) That paper, only Taro thinks that Hanako read (it)."

b. Taro-sika [cp Hanako-ga a, yonda to] emotte-inai-yo, ano robun-o

This is, we argue, not a problem. Tanaka (2001) shows that RDCs with a dislocated case-marked NP do not involve operator movement but scrambling. If this analysis is correct, the representation of (17a) should be the one in (18) rather than (17b).

(18) Taro-sika [cp Hanako-ga 4, yonda to] emotte-inai-yo,
Taro-only Hanako-Nom read C think-Neg-FP
ano robun-o

Taro-sika [cp Hanako-ga a, yonda to] emotte-inai-yo that paper-Adv Taro-only Hanako-Nom read C think-Neg-FP
"(ib) Only Taro thinks that Hanako read it, the paper, only Taro thinks that Hanako read it."

Tanaka (2001), following Kuno (1973), argues that there exist two identical sentences in a single RDC. The second sentence involves scrambling and deletion, which leaves the dislocated NP behind. (18) illustrates the representation after deletion; the dislocated NP, ano robun-o, is scrambled from within the second sentence. The rest of the sentence after scrambling delete under identity with the first sentence. This analysis explains why (17a) is
not ruled out, because the structure does not contain two A' association lines, and so the LCC is irrelevant, as shown in (19).

(19)  Taroo-sika  
[Hanako-ga  
na  yonda  to]  omotte-ina-yo,  ano  ronbun-o

Let us consider the RDCs in which a bare NP is dislocated. (20a) is not grammatical when the dislocated NP is not marked by a Case-marker:

(20a)  ??Taroo-sika  
[Hanako-ga  
pro,  yonda  to]  omotte-ina-yo,  ano  ronbun.
Taroo-only  Hanako-Nom  read  C  think-Neg-FP  that  paper
'(lit.) That paper, only Taroo thinks that Hanako read (it).'

b.  Taroo-sika  
[Hanako-ga  
pro,  yonda  to]  omotte-ina-yo,  ano  ronbun

The contrast between (17a) and (20a) conforms to our current proposal; a dislocated bare NP is created by movement from the position adjacent to the complement CP. As (20b) illustrates, two operator association lines cross, and therefore, the ungrammaticality of the sentence can be accounted for. The facts in (19) and (20) tell us that the RDC with a dislocated bare NP does not share the same type of structure of the RDC with a dislocated case-marked NP. The former involves operator movement just like RCs and CCs, whereas the latter does not involve any operator movement but scrambling.

If our analysis is on the right track, we expect that the RDC becomes grammatical when the complement CP in (20) scrambling to the initial position of the sentence. This expectation is actually borne out, as shown in the following sentence:

(21a)  [Hanako-ga  
pro,  yonda  to]  Taroo-sika  5  omotte-ina-yo,
Hanako-Nom  read  C  Taroo-only  think-Neg-FP
ano  ronbun.
that  paper

b.  [Hanako-ga  
pro,  yonda  to]  Taroo-sika  5  omotte-ina-yo,  ano  ronbun

Compared to (20), (21) is substantially more grammatical. As the structure (21b) shows, the two association lines are nested, which explains the grammaticality of the sentence.

Let us examine further examples of right-dislocation of a bare NP. Unlike (17) and (20), the contrast disappears between the dislocated bare NP and case-marked NP when the NPI and its head both occur within the complement clause, as shown in (22) and (23).

(22)  Taroo-ga  
[Hanako-ga  
Ziroo-ni-sika  pro,  age-anak-atta  to]  
Taro-Nom  Hanako-Nom  Ziro-Dat-only  give-Neg-Past  C
omotteiryo,  ano  ronbun-o.
think  FP  that  paper-Acc
'(lit.) That paper, Taroo thinks that Hanako gave (it) only to Ziroo.'

Thus, (25) is a crucial piece of evidence for one of the aspects of our analysis in (14a): the dislocated bare NP is bare-generated at the left edge of the complement CP.

Next, let us examine CCs containing an NPI. As Hoji (1990) and many others argue, CCs with a case-marked head involve some kind of operator movement, and therefore, unlike case-marked RDCs, we would expect LCC effects. If (14a) is correct, even CCs with a bare head may exhibit the same effects for relevant cases. Let us consider the following CCs.
(26a). *Taro-sika [w3Hanako-ga ti, yon-da to] omotte-inai-no-wa
   Taro-only Hanako-Nom read-Past C think-not-Nom-Top
   (ano ronbun-o)-data.
   that paper-Acc Cop
   'It was that paper that only Taro thinks that Hanako read.'

b. *On, Taro-sika [w3Hanako-ga ti, yon-da to] omotte-inai-no-wa (ano ronbun o)-data.

The CC in (26a) is ruled out by the LCC because the two dependency lines cross as illustrated in (26b). Here, the null operator moves from the thematic position within the complement clause to the highest spec of CP. The operator is co-indexed with the nominalizer head, no, which in turn licenses the focus NP by predication.

Interestingly, even when the focus position is occupied by a bare NP, grammaticality remains the same. This is not expected if the CCs with a bare NP focus do not involve any operator movement. Let us look at (27):

(27a). *Taro-sika [w3Hanako-ga ti, yon-da to] omotte-inai-no-wa
   Taro-only Hanako-Nom read-Past C think-not-Nom-Top
   (ano ronbun)-data.
   that paper-Cop
   'It was that paper that only Taro thinks that Hanako read.'

b. *On, Taro-sika [w3Hanako-ga ti, yon-da to] omotte-inai-no-wa (ano ronbun)-data.

The sentence in (27a) is ruled out just like (26a). Our explanation is that the two dependencies are crossed, as shown in (27b), violating the LCC. In fact, these two sentences would improve substantially when the complement clause is scrambled to the top of the sentence, as in (28a):

(28a). [w3Hanako-ga ti, yon-da to] Taro-sika omotte-inai-no-wa
   Taro-only Hanako-Nom read-Past C think-not-Nom-Top
   (ano ronbun)-data.
   that paper-AccCop
   'It was that paper that only Taro thinks that Hanako read.'


The LCC straightforwardly captures the contrast in (29), and gives additional support to our analysis in (14).

Finally, let us consider how RCs interacts with operator constructions under the LCC.

(31a) is grammatical, but (31b) is not.

(31a). [w3Tarou-ga [w3[wat w, o, daurudo-sita] hito]-ga simu to]
   Taro-Nom downloaded person-Nom die C
   omotteiri ronbunj
   think paper
   'The paper that Taro thinks that the person who downloaded (it) will die'

b. *[w3Tarou-sika [w3[wat w, o, daurudo-sita] hito]-ga simu to]
   Taro-only downloaded person-Nom die C
   omotteiri ronbunj
   think not paper
   'The paper that only Taro thinks that the person who downloaded (it) will die.'

Our analysis explains the facts in (31); as in (32) below, the two A'-association lines in (31b) are crossed and hence, (31b) violates the linear crossing constraint.
Before answering (35), let us examine the basic property of the null operator in (34a). Japanese has so-called topic constructions, which are assumed to have base-generated topic phrase in sentence-initial position. Saito (1985) argues that topic phrases are licensed by a so-called "aboutness relation". The topic phrase serves as the topic about the rest of the sentence, in particular, a topic does not need to bind a gap, as illustrated below:

(36)  

\[ \text{As flowers, cherry blossoms are good.} \]

Since such sentences do not have a gap corresponding to the topic, they do not have non-topicalisation counterparts. Such gapless relative clauses share properties in common with RCs, CCs, and RDCs without Case-marker, in that i) the topic phrase has no Case-marker, ii) the topic phrase is not embedded in a VP (Kuno 1973). Gapless relative clauses can appear in an apparent long-distance relation, as shown below:

(37)

\[ \text{As for flowers, cherry blossoms are good.} \]

It is, then, reasonable to conclude that RCs, CCs, and RDCs are derived from such a topicalisation constructions. The RDC counterpart of (37) is correctly expected to be grammatical.

(38)

\[ \text{As for flowers, cherry blossoms are good.} \]

However, RCs and CCs counterparts are not grammatical.

(39)

\[ \text{The flowers that Taroo said that cherry blossoms are good.} \]

However, a functional explanation is available to rule out these cases. Kuno (1973) observes that examples similar to (39-41) are ungrammatical, but they improve substantially in a particular context. (41) is a topicalised sentence. (42) shows that relativising the topic phrase in (41) gives rise to an ungrammatical output, but (43) shows that (42) improves substantially in a more specific context.

(41)

\[ \text{As for fish, snappers are good.} \]

(42)

\[ \text{Fish that snappers are good.} \]
differently from the usual type of wh-operator. The null topic operator is generated by Merge in the position adjoining to the embedded clause, licenced through the aboutness condition.

Notes

1 Examples are glossed as follows; Acc=accusative, C=complementiser, Cop=Copula, Dist=distative, FP=final particle, Gen=genitive, Neg=negation, Nom=nominaliser, Q=question marker, and Top=topical marker. Throughout this paper, we use the conventional X'-theory, but this choice is largely for expositional purposes.

2. The above sentences show the absence of island effects in three different constructions. Note that none of the constructions in (1)-(3) is the head marked with a Case-particle. It is possible to put a Case-particle on the head (see, for example, (6) below). Hajo (1985, 1990) examine the lack of subjacency in CCs in detail, and conclude that CCs, if the head is Case-marked or PPs, are constrained by subjacency. We argue that the asymmetry between bare NPs and case-marked NPs/PPs holds also in CCs and RDCs. Our analysis contrasts with Hajo (1990) in that we assume that regardless of the type of the heads (i.e., whether it is a bare NP or a case-marked NP/PP), these constructions involve movement. More specifically, we claim that the long-distance dependencies between the bare NP head and its thematic position involve mixed chains: resumptive binding and movement although the movement is too 'short' to induce island sensitivity.

3. Hajo (1990) also shows that the focus PP behaves in the same way as the case-marked NP:

   (i) *Taro-nom [ma[ma Hanako Nom kara da] o sagase-te-te-ni wa]

   Taro-nom Hanako received received ACC was-looking-for-Nom-Top

   Ziro-Top

   Ziro-Top

   (lit. It was from Ziro that Taro was looking for the paper that Hanako received.)

   In the present paper, we examine the instances of case-marked NPs and bare NPs as a priority matter, but will come back to the case of PP later.

4. This paper does not need to take any particular analysis of reconstruction. We use 'reconstruction' as a descriptive term and do not necessarily imply the adoption of literal reconstruction (Chomsky 1970).

5. What we call a topic phrase is the NP or PP marked by 'Top', which can be interpreted either contrastively or thematically. We are concerned with thematic topics only in the present paper.
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