

# Possessor-raising as Control\*

Seiki AYANO

## Abstract

The present paper provides evidence for Funakoshi's (2017) analysis of object possessor-raising constructions, in which the possessor undergoes movement from one  $\theta$ -position within the possessum phrase to another below  $v$ , and this raised possessor can be pronounced in the head position or in the tail. When the top copy is pronounced in derived external possession constructions (EPCs), a genitive pronoun can optionally appear in the possessum phrase. On the basis of finite control constructions in Japanese (Akuzawa 2018), this study claims that the presence of a genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase demonstrates that the construction in question involves control. In this light, it revisits other possessor-raising constructions in Japanese, namely, possessive passive (Kubo 1992, Hasegawa 2009, Ayano 2019) and complex idiomatic predicates (Kishimoto 2013).

## 1. Introduction

In parallel with raising and control in the clausal domain, possessive constructions are also considered to involve raising and control (e.g., Deal 2013, Kishimoto 2013, Funakoshi 2017). On the assumption that control as well as raising involves movement (Hornstein 1999, 2001), the difference between raising and control is reduced to whether a given element is assigned one  $\theta$ -role or more than one in the course of derivation. With regard to raising, Deal (2013) has provided arguments that in Nez Perce, the possessor undergoes movement to a non- $\theta$ -position lower than  $v$ , and that the possessor can be pronounced either in the head position or in the tail. Thus, the silent possessor in the head position can induce verbal agreement and effects on binding. As regards control in possessive constructions, drawing on Kikuchi (1994), Funakoshi (2017) has shown (i) that the possessor undergoes syntactic movement and is assigned a  $\theta$ -role in the head position, and (ii) that it can be pronounced either in the head position or in the tail. He provides evidence for the silent copy of the possessor in the head position in terms of licensing floating numeral quantifiers and secondary predication.

Given the above background on raising and control in possessive constructions, the goal of this paper is to show that the availability of an optional genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase in external possession constructions (EPCs) supports Funakoshi's (2017) treatment of object possessor-raising constructions as control. The present paper further shows that possessive passive (Kubo 1992, Hasegawa 2009, Ayano 2019) involves control, given its behavior parallel to that of the possessive construction discussed in Funakoshi (2017) and the optional appearance of a genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase. It also revisits possessor-raising in complex

---

\* Research for this paper is supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (#19K00548)..

idiomatic predicates (Kishimoto 2013).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 will provide a review of Deal (2013) on Nez Perce object possessor-raising constructions and Funakoshi (2017) on possessive constructions in Japanese and Korean. Section 3 will show that in EPCs à la Funakoshi (2017), an optional genitive pronoun can appear in the possessum phrase, and will provide an account for this fact in light of finite control clauses in Japanese (Akuzawa 2018). Section 4 will discuss the syntax of possessive passive and complex idiomatic predicates on basis of the discussion in Section 3. Finally, Section 5 concludes this paper.

## 2. Raising and control in possessive constructions

Deal (2013) has observed in Nez Perce that the possessor associated with the object can appear in either the genitive or the objective case, and, interestingly, the possessor in either morphological case controls verbal agreement. Consider (1):

- (1) a. *pro* 'a-ax-nay'-sa-qa                      'ip-ne      huukux.  
       *pro* 3OBJ-see- $\mu$ -IMPERF-REC.PAST 3SG-OBJ hair:NOM  
       'I saw her hair.'  
   b. *pro* 'a-ax-nay'-sa-qa                      'ip-nim      huukux.  
       *pro* 3OBJ-see- $\mu$ -IMPERF-REC.PAST 3SG-GEN hair:NOM  
       'I saw her hair.'

The facts in (1) show that the verb agrees with the possessor irrespective of its morphological case. In addition to the verbal agreement, the verbs in (1a) and (1b) uniformly display the object-raising marker glossed as  $\mu$  (Deal 2013). Deal claims that this marker represents a functional head merged lower than *v*, which licenses Case on the raised possessor in [Spec,  $\mu$ ], but does not assign a  $\theta$ -role since it is not an applicative head on the basis of his observation that the possessor can be either dead or inanimate and that there is no restriction on the properties of verbs that appear in possessor-raising constructions in question. To account for the facts in (1), assuming the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995), Deal proposes that the possessor raises in both (1a) and (1b), and that the higher copy of the possessor is pronounced in (1a) whereas it is the lower copy that is pronounced in (1b). The evidence for possessor-raising is based on Condition C.

First, consider (2), in which the genitive possessor *ip-nim* '3SG-GEN' associated with the external argument is coreferential with the Theme phrase *Angel-ne* 'Angel-OBJ,' which suggests that there is no possessor-raising. This is because the possessum phrase containing the genitive possessor is above *vP*. Recall that the possessor is licensed in a position lower than *v*. Thus, the absence of a Condition C effect.

- (2) 'ip-nim    ma-may'ac    paa-'ya $\hat{x}$ -taa'nix      Angel-ne    kine.  
       3SG-GEN PL-child.NOM 3/3-find-HAB.PRES.PL Angel-OBJ here  
       'Her<sub>i</sub> kids usually find Angel<sub>i</sub> here.'

In contrast to (2), the genitive possessor associated with the Goal phrase in (3) cannot be coreferential with the Theme phrase. This Condition C effect can be accounted for by positing a silent possessor in angled brackets (cf

Polinsky and Potsdam 2013).

- (3) Haacwal-nim<sub>agent</sub> pee-kiwyek-ey'-se-Ø <'ip-ne> ['ip-nim<sub>j</sub> ciq'aamqal]<sub>goal</sub>  
*boy-ERG 3/3-feed-μ-IMPERF-PRES <3SG-OBJ> [3SG-GEN dog.NOM]*  
 [Meli-nm ke'niks]<sub>theme</sub>  
*[Mary-GEN leftovers.NOM]*  
 'The boy is feeding his/\*her<sub>i</sub> dog Mary<sub>i</sub>'s leftovers.'

Turning to Japanese, Funakoshi (2017) has shown that the covert possessor outside the possessum phrase is also available in Japanese object possessor-raising constructions. Drawing on Kikuchi's (1994) observation, Funakoshi (2017) argues that facts such as (4) exhibit backward control in EPCs (see Polinsky and Potsdam (2002) for their arguments for backward control in Tsez).<sup>1</sup>

- (4) a. Ken-ga kodomotati-no tume-o kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-GEN nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 'Ken clipped children's nails.'  
 b. Isi-ga kanzya-no me-o sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM patient-GEN eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 'The doctor examined the patient's eye.'

He shows that backward control can be observed in such facts as (5), in which the genitive possessors can license the respective floating numeral quantifiers (cf Kikuchi 1994):

---

<sup>1</sup> Kikuchi (1994) has shown that of the three types of Ns, namely, event nominals (cf Grimshaw 1990), inalienable nominals and simple nominals, the first two exhibit properties of the genitive phrase that can c-command out of its host NP, i.e., "backward control" in Funakoshi's (2017) terms. The availability of backward control for event nominals, as in (i) constitutes counterevidence for Funakoshi's proposed analysis.

- (i) a. Ano daigaku-ga [ryuugakusee-no ukeire]-o sanzyuu-nin kotowat-ta.  
*that university-NOM foreign.student-GEN acceptance-ACC 30-CL refuse-PAST*  
 'That university refused the acceptance of thirty foreign students.'  
 b. Ano daigaku-ga [kyoozyu-no hon-no koonyuu]-o sen-satu kinsis-ita.  
*that university-NOM professors-GEN book-GEN purchase-ACC 1,000-CL prohibit-PAST*  
 'That university prohibited purchase of a thousand books by professors.'

As regards the apparent counterexamples in (i), Funakoshi provides the copula sentences in (ii), which suggest that the numeral quantifiers are licensed by the DPs headed by the respective event nominals. Therefore, he claims that (i) is not inconsistent with his proposal.

- (ii) a. [Ryuugakusee-no ukeire]-wa sanzyuu-nin-dat-ta.  
*foreign.student-GEN acceptance-TOP 30-CL-COP-PAST*  
 'The number of the acceptance of foreign students was thirty.'  
 b. [Kyoozyu-no hon-no koonyuu]-wa sen-satu-dat-ta.  
*professors-GEN books-GEN purchase-TOP 1,000-CL-COP-PAST*  
 'The number of purchase of books by professors was one thousand.'

- (5) a. Ken-ga kodomotati-no tume-o san-nin kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-GEN nail-ACC three-CL cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped three children’s nails.’  
 b. Isi-ga kanzya-no me-o go-nin sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM patient-GEN eye-ACC five-CL examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor examined the eyes of five patients.’

In addition to floating numeral quantifiers, a possessum-internal possessor can also license a depictive secondary predicate (cf Kikuchi 1994). Consider (6):

- (6) a. Hanako-ga katuo-no uroko-o namade kezuritot-ta.  
*Hanako-NOM bonito-GEN scales-ACC raw strip.away-PAST*  
 ‘Hanako stripped away the bonito’s scales raw.’  
 b. Hanako-ga John-no kaminoke-o deesuizyootaide kit-ta.  
*Hanako-NOM John-GEN hair-ACC dead.drunk cut-PAST*  
 ‘Hanako cut John’s hair dead drunk.’

Based on Kikuchi’s observation in (5) and (6), Funakoshi (2017) claims that the licensing of floating numeral quantifiers and secondary predicates can be accounted for by positing the covert accusative possessor external to the possessum phrase, as schematized in (7), in which NQ and SP stand for numeral quantifier and secondary predicate, respectively:

- (7) Subj Possessor-ACC [<sub>possessum</sub>P Possessor-GEN Possessee]-ACC NQ/SP V

The structure in (7) is derived by raising the possessor from within the possessum phrase and deleting the phonological features of the top copy, hence the licensing of floated numeral quantifiers and secondary predicates by the covert possessor outside the possessum phrase. According to Funakoshi (2017), the empirical support for the analysis in (7) is available in EPCs such as (8) and (9) in Korean, in which the (b) examples with the accusative possessors are as grammatical as the (a) examples with the genitive possessors.

- (8) a. Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-uy meli-lul calu-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-GEN hair-ACC cut-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu cut three students’ hair.’  
 b. Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-ul meli-lul calu-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-ACC hair-ACC cut-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu cut students’ hair.’  
 (9) a. Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-uy os-ul peski-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-GEN cloth-ACC take.off-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu took off three students’ clothes.’

- b. Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-ul os-ul peski-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-ACC cloth-ACC take.off-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu took off students’ clothes.’

Funakoshi (2017) argues that the availability of the above double accusative (or object possessor-raising) constructions in Korean exhibits the optionality of pronouncing either the top copy, i.e., the accusative possessor, or the bottom copy, i.e., the genitive possessor. Note that the floating numeral quantifier *sey-myeng* ‘three-CL’ can be licensed by the genitive possessors in (10a) and (11a) as well as by the accusative possessors in (10b) and (11b).

- (10) a. ?Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-uy meli-lul sey-myeng calu-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-GEN hair-ACC three-CL cut-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu cut three students’ hair.’  
 b. Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-ul meli-lul sey-myeng calu-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-ACC hair-ACC three-CL cut-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu cut three students’ hair.’  
 (11) a. ?Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-uy os-ul sey-myeng peski-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-GEN cloth-ACC three-CL take.off-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu took off three students’ clothes.’  
 b. Chelswu-ka haksayng-tul-ul os-ul sey-myeng peski-ess-ta.  
*Chelswu-NOM student-PL-ACC cloth-ACC three-CL take.off-PAST-DECL*  
 ‘Chelswu took off three students’ clothes.’

As opposed to Deal’s analysis of possessive constructions in Nez Perce, Funakoshi (2017) argues that the possessive constructions in Japanese in question involve control. That is, in contrast to the  $\mu$  head in Nez Perce that licenses Case on the possessor, Funakoshi proposes an applicative head that assigns a  $\theta$ -role called an inherent participant role to the raised possessor. His proposal is based on the observation that possessor-raising in (5) and (6) requires neither inalienability nor affectedness (Yoon 1990, Tomioka and Sim 2007). As regards inalienability, the facts in (12) and (13) demonstrate that although the possessor and the possessee are in an inalienable possession relationship, floating numeral quantifiers and secondary predicates cannot be licensed by the possessors.

- (12) a. \*John-ga [kodomotati-no tume]-o san-nin hirot-ta.  
*John-NOM children-GEN nail-ACC 3-CL pick.up-PAST*  
 ‘John picked up three children’s nails.’  
 b. \*[Kodomotati-no kami]-ga san-nin (yuka-ni) oti-tei-ru.  
*children-GEN hair-NOM 3-CL floor-on drop-PROG-PRES*  
 ‘Three children’s hair is on the floor.’  
 (13) a. \*Mary-ga [John-no tume]-o deesuizyootaide hirota.  
*Mary-NOM John-GEN nail-ACC dead.drunk pick.up-PAST*  
 ‘Mary picked up John’s nails while he was dead drunk.’

- b. \*[John-no kami]-ga deesuizyootaide (yuka-ni) oti-tei-ru.  
*John-GEN hair-NOM dead.drunk floor-on drop-PROG-PRES*  
 ‘John’s hair is on the floor while he is dead drunk.’

Crucially, even in the absence of inalienability, the floating numeral quantifiers and secondary predicates can be licensed, as shown in (14).

- (14) a. John-ga [yopparai-no huku]-o san-nin nugase-ta.  
*John-NOM drunks-GEN clothes-ACC 3-CL take.off-PAST*  
 ‘John took off three drunks’ clothes.’  
 b. Mary-ga [John-no huku]-o deesuizyootaide nugase-ta.  
*Mary-NOM John-GEN clothes-ACC dead.drunk take.off-PAST*  
 ‘Mary took off John’s clothes while he was dead drunk.’

An alternative explanation of the facts in (12) through (14) is affectedness, as Funakoshi (2017) has pointed out. That is, the licensing of the floating numeral quantifiers and secondary predicates in (14) is due to the possessor, *John-ga* ‘John-NOM,’ being affected by the event of having his clothes stripped off. However, as Funakoshi demonstrates, affectedness is not a feasible explanation, either, since in (15), neither *sirabe-ru* ‘examine-PRES’ nor *mi-ru* ‘see-PRES’ is an affective verb.

- (15) a. Ano isya-wa [zidoo-no me]-o sanzyuu-nin/koohunzyootaide sirabe-ta.  
*that doctor-TOP pupils-GEN eyes-ACC 30-CL/excited examine-PAST*  
 ‘That doctor examined thirty pupils’ eyes.’/‘That doctor examined pupils’ eyes while they were excited.’  
 b. John-ga [kawaii onnanoko-no usirosugata]-o san-nin/deesuizyootaide mi-ta.  
*John-NOM cute girl-GEN back-ACC 3-CL/dead.drunk see-PAST*  
 ‘John saw three cute girls’ backs.’/‘John saw cute girls’ backs while they were dead drunk.’

On the basis of the above observation, Funakoshi (2017) claims that the relevant facts can be accounted for by the Inherent-Participant Condition in (16):

(16) Inherent-Participant Condition

A possessor licenses a floating numeral quantifier and a depictive secondary predicate only if it refers to an inherent participant in the event described by the predicate that takes the possessee as its argument.

Inherent participants include all the arguments such as Agent and Theme. In addition, Funakoshi (2017) maintains that the possessor in possessive constructions, in which backward control is permitted, is also an inherent participant. In possessive constructions such as (14) and (15), an inherent participant role is assigned by an applicative head, which is below *v*, to the possessor. Section 3 will provide further evidence for his analysis on the basis of a pronoun appearing in the possessum phrase in EPCs.

### 3. Possessor-raising as control

To begin our discussion, it should be pointed out that the object possessor-raising constructions in Japanese discussed in Funakoshi (2017) also allow the overt possessor to appear outside the possessum phrase, although due to the double-*o* constraint (Harada 1973), degraded grammaticality results. Consider (17):

- (17) a. ??Ken-ga kodomotati-o tugitugito tume-o kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-ACC one.after.another nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped children’s nails one after another.’  
 b. ??Isi-ga ano-kanzya-o sintyooni me-o sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM that-patient-ACC carefully eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor carefully examined the eyes of that patient.’

The degraded grammaticality of the double-*o* constructions in (17) improves by, for example, scrambling the accusative possessor over the nominative subject (Hale and Kitagawa 1976-1977, Saito and Hoshi 2000, Funakoshi 2017). Consider (18):

- (18) a. ?Kodomotati-o Ken-ga tugitugito tume-o kit-ta.  
*children-ACC Ken-NOM one.after.another nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped three children’s nails one after another.’  
 b. ?Ano-kanzya-o isi-ga sintyooni me-o sirabe-ta.  
*that-patient-ACC doctor-NOM carefully eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor carefully examined the eyes of that patient.’

Notice that a genitive possessor can optionally appear in the possessum phrase, which is coreferential with the possessor, as illustrated in (19) and (20).

- (19) a. ??Ken-ga kodomotati-o<sub>k</sub> tugitugito karera-no<sub>k</sub> tume-o kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-ACC one. after. another they-GEN nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 ‘Kent clipped children’s nails one after another.’  
 b. ??Isi-ga ano-kanzya-o<sub>k</sub> sintyooni kare-no<sub>k</sub> me-o sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM that-patient-ACC carefully he-GEN eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor carefully examined the eyes of that patient.’  
 (20) a. ?Kodomotati-o<sub>k</sub> Ken-ga tugitugito karera-no<sub>k</sub> tume-o kit-ta.  
*children-ACC Ken-NOM one.after.another they-GEN nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped three children’s nails one after another.’  
 b. ?Ano-kanzya-o<sub>k</sub> isi-ga sintyooni kare-no<sub>k</sub> me-o sirabe-ta.  
*that-patient-ACC doctor-NOM carefully he-GEN eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor carefully examined the eyes of that patient.’

Given that these are control constructions, (19) and (20) can be taken to show that both the top copy of the pos-

essor and its bottom copy can be pronounced, and that when that happens, the bottom copy appears as a genitive pronoun. In what follows, we will pursue this possibility.

Unlike the Standard Japanese examples in (18), equivalent double-accusative constructions in the Fukuoka dialect, which is spoken in the vicinity of the city of Fukuoka on Kyushu, are not degraded at all. In this dialect, the accusative case-marker appears as *-ba*, instead of *-o* in Standard Japanese. The possessor associated with a Theme phrase can be suffixed either by the accusative case-marker *-ba* or by the genitive case-marker *-no*. Consider (21) and (22):

- (21) a. Ken-ga kodomotati-no tume-ba kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-GEN nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped the children’s nails.’  
 b. Ken-ga kodomotati-ba tume-ba kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-ACC nail-ACC cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped the children’s nails.’
- (22) a. Isya-ga kanzya-no me-ba sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM patient-GEN eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor examined the eyes of the patients.’  
 b. Isya-ga kanzya-ba me-ba sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM patient-ACC eye-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor examined the eyes of the patients.’

As the grammaticality of the (b) examples demonstrates, double-accusative constructions are permitted in this dialect of Japanese. Notice that just as in Standard Japanese and Korean, a floating numeral quantifier and a secondary predicate can be licensed by the genitive possessor as well as by the accusative possessor. Consider (23) and (24):

- (23) a. Ken-ga kodomotati-no tume-ba san-nin kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-GEN nail-ACC three-CL cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped the children’s nails.’  
 b. Ken-ga kodomotati-ba tume-ba san-nin kit-ta.  
*Ken-NOM children-ACC nail-ACC three-CL cut-PAST*  
 ‘Ken clipped the children’s nails.’
- (24) a. Isya-ga kanzya-no me-ba go-nin sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM patient-GEN eye-ACC five-CL examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor examined the eyes of the patients.’  
 b. Isya-ga kanzya-ba me-ba go-nin sirabe-ta.  
*doctor-NOM patient-ACC eye-ACC five-CL examine-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor examined the eyes of the patients.’

Provided that Funakoshi’s (2017) analysis is correct, the above facts in the Fukuoka dialect can be captured as in



(7), in which the copy in the head position is stripped of its PF features in the course of derivation.

Crucially, as in the Japanese examples in (19) and (20), double-accusative constructions permit a genitive pronoun to appear in the possessum phrase; the (b) examples in (25) and (26) illustrate this:

- (25) a. Ken-ga asoko-no warugaki-no atama-ba tata-ita.  
*Ken-NOM over:there-GEN brats-GEN head-ACC hit-PAST*  
 ‘Ken hit the brats’ heads over there.’  
 b. Ken-ga asoko-no warugaki-ba<sub>k</sub> aitura-no<sub>k</sub> atama-ba tata-ita.  
*Ken-NOM over:there-GEN brats-ACC they-GEN head-ACC hit-PAST*  
 ‘Ken hit those brats on their heads over there.’
- (26) a. Isya-ga asoko-no kanzya-no ha-ba nu-ita.  
*doctor-NOM over:there-GEN patient-GEN teeth-ACC pull.out-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor pulled out the patients’ teeth over there.’  
 b. Isya-ga asoko-no kanzya-ba<sub>k</sub> aitura-no<sub>k</sub> ha-ba nu-ita.  
*doctor-NOM over:there-GEN patient-ACC they-GEN teeth-ACC pull.out-PAST*  
 ‘The doctor pulled out the teeth of the patients over there.’

The presence of the genitive pronouns in the EPCs in (25b) and (26b) suggests that the constructions involve control, rather than raising.

I have argued in Ayano (2020) that the presence of an overt pronoun in EPCs can be accounted for in terms of parallel facts observed in finite control constructions (Akuzawa 2018). In English, control constructions are limited to non-finite clauses:

- (27) a. John tries to eat less red meat.  
 b. John promised Mary to eat less red meat.

However, crosslinguistically control constructions are not limited to the non-finite context. Landau (2004), for example, provides (28) in Hebrew, in which the embedded clause is finite, as the agreement on the embedded verb shows, and the null subject of the embedded verb is obligatorily controlled by the matrix subject *Gil*.

- (28) Gil hivti<sub>ax</sub> še yitna’heg yafe.  
*Gil promised that will-behave.3SG.M well*  
 ‘Gil promised to behave well.’

Further, the embedded subject can also be overt and coreferential with the matrix subject:

- (29) Gil<sub>i</sub> hivti<sub>ax</sub> še-hu<sub>i</sub> yitna’heg yafe  
*Gil promised that-he will-behave.3SG.M well*  
 ‘Gil promised to behave well.’

Other languages such as Korean and Japanese exhibit control in finite clauses, and in such context, overt pronouns/anaphors can appear in the embedded subject position and can be coreferential with the matrix subject (Akuzawa 2018).<sup>2</sup>

- (30) a. John-i Bill-eykey ttena-keyss-ta-ko yaksokha-yess-ta.  
*John-NOM Bill-DAT leave-VOL-DC-C promise-PST-DC*  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> promised Bill that ec<sub>i</sub> would leave.’  
 b. John-i Bill-eykey ku/caki-ka ttena-keyss-ta-ko yaksokha-yess-ta.  
*John-NOM Bill-DAT he/self-NOM leave-VOL-DC-C promise-PST-DC*  
 ‘John promised Bill that he/self would leave.’ (Lee 2009)
- (31) a. Ken-wa kossori zibun-ga gitaa-o hik-u koto-o kokoromi-tei-ta.  
*Ken-TOP secretly self-NOM guitar-ACC play-PRES C-ACC try-PROG-PAST*  
 ‘Ken<sub>i</sub> tried that he played the guitar secretly.’  
 b. Ken-wa kossori zubun-ga gitaa-o hi-ita koto-o hanseesi-ta.  
*Ken-TOP secretly self-NOM guitar-ACC play-PAST C-ACC regret-PAST*  
 ‘Ken regretted that he played the guitar secretly.’

The possessum phrase containing an overt genitive pronoun in EPCs observed in Sections 2 and 3 can be captured in parallel with the Korean and Japanese finite control clauses in (30b), (31a) and (31b). That is, under the movement theory of control (Hornstein 1999, 2001), the possessor base-generated within the possessum phrase is assigned a  $\theta$ -role and leaves its copy there, and it moves overtly to the head position where another  $\theta$ -role is assigned to it. In this configuration, the bottom copy can also be pronounced along with the top copy, but when it is pronounced, it should appear as a genitive pronoun, not as its full form in order to avoid Condition C violation. Having shown that the optional presence of a genitive pronoun within the possessum phrase supports Funakoshi’s analysis of object possessor-raising constructions, Section 4 will reexamine the syntax of possessive passive in light of the licensing of EPCs discussed in Funakoshi (2017) and the availability of a genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase, and will further discuss the nature of possessor-raising in complex idiomatic predicates (Kishimoto 2013).

#### 4. Possessor-raising in possessive passive and complex idiomatic predicates

This section will revisit the syntactic properties of possessive passive, which represents another case of possessor-raising, and will show that it exhibits behavior parallel to the possessive constructions discussed thus far. Possessive passive has been shown to involve possessor-raising from within the accusative possessum phrase (Kubo 1992, Hasegawa 2006, Ayano 2019). (33) is an example of possessive passive, in which the nominative possessor is considered to be raised out of the accusative possessum phrase; the alternation between *-ni* and *-ni-*

<sup>2</sup> The presence of a pronoun/anaphor induces pragmatic effects of “focus,” as Akuzawa (2018) has noted with reference to Hasegawa (1984/85) and Takezawa (2016). I do not go into details of the effects in question in this paper, but note here that the presence of a genitive pronoun within the possessum phrase in EPCs has similar pragmatic effects.

*yotte* demonstrates that the Agent phrase is PP, as in direct passive.

- (32) Ken-ga Eri-ni/niyotte kami-o kir-are-ta.  
*Ken-Nom Eri-by/by hair-ACC cut-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Ken<sub>k</sub> had his<sub>k</sub> hair cut by Eri.’

Note that there is one crucial difference from the other EPCs discussed in this paper, in that the bottom copy of the possessor, namely, the genitive possessor, cannot appear in the base position, as shown in (33).

- (33) \*Eri-ni/niyotte Ken-no kami-o kir-are-ta.  
*Eri-by/by Ken-GEN hair-ACC cut-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Ken had his hair cut by Eri.’

The obligatory possessor-raising in possessive passive, or a lack of optionality in pronouncing either the top copy of the possessor or the bottom one can be explained if one assumes the passive  $v$  ( $v_{\text{PASS}}$ ) above VP. The possessor must move through [Spec,  $v_{\text{PASS}}$ ] on its way to [Spec, T]. A question remains whether or not the nominative possessor is assigned a  $\theta$ -role besides the one assigned in the possessum phrase by the possessee. In what follows, I will show that the possessor-raising in possessive passive exhibits behavior parallel to that in the type of possessive construction subject to the Inherent Participant Condition reviewed in Section 2, and that a genitive pronoun can appear in the possessum phrase.

Recall that Funakoshi (2017) claims that backward control rendered by possessor-raising is subject to neither inalienability nor affectedness. First, inalienability is not a necessary condition for possessor-raising in possessive passive. Consider (34), in which although the possessor *kodomotati-ga* ‘children-NOM’ and the possessee *tume-o* ‘nail-ACC’ are in an inalienable possession relationship, the possessive passive is ill-formed.

- (34) \*Kodomotati-ga Ken-ni/niyotte tume-o hirow-are-ta.  
*children-NOM Ken-by/by nail-ACC pick.up-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘The children were picked (their) nails picked up by Ken.’

Further, (35) demonstrates that even in the absence of an inalienable possession relationship between the possessor and the possessee, the possessive passive is still well-formed.

- (35) Yopparai-ga Ken-ni/niyotte huku-o nugas-are-ta.  
*drunks-NOM Ken-by/by clothes-ACC strip.off-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Drunks had their clothes stripped off by Ken.’

The unavailability of possessor-raising with the verb *hirow-u* ‘pick.up-PRES’ in (34) and the grammaticality of (35) with the verb *nugas-u* ‘strip.off-PRES’ suggest that instead of inalienability, affectedness is a determining factor in licensing possessor-raising. However, even with the non-affecting verbs *sirabe-ru* ‘examine-PRES’ and *mi-ru* ‘see-PRES’ in (36), the possessor-raising is permitted, and the possessors can license the respective float-

ing numeral quantifiers.<sup>3</sup>

- (36) a. Zidoo-ga ano-isyā-ni/niyotte sanzyuu-nin me-o siraber-are-ta.  
*pupil-NOM that-doctor-by/-by thirty-CL eye-ACC examine-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Thirty pupils were examined the eyes.’
- b. Dooryoo-ga ano-zyoosi-ni/niyotte san-nin kozin-zyoohoo-o  
*colleagues-NOM that-boss-by/-by three-CL personal-information-ACC*  
*mir-rare-ta.*  
*see-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Twenty colleagues had their personal data seen by that boss.’

Provided that Funakoshi’s Inherent Participant Condition is correct and the possessor in the type of possessive constructions discussed in his work is assigned a  $\theta$ -role in the head position as well as in the tail, then it follows that the possessor in possessive passive should also be assigned a  $\theta$ -role in the tail position and another one somewhere on its way to [Spec, T].

---

<sup>3</sup> In (36), the floating numeral quantifiers are placed in front of the respective Theme phrases. If they are placed after the respective Theme phrases, degraded grammaticality results. Consider (i):

- (i) a. ??Zidoo-ga ano-isyā-ni/niyotte me-o sanzyuu-nin siraber-are-ta.  
*pupil-NOM that-doctor-by/-by eye-ACC thirty-CL examine-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Thirty pupils were examined the eyes.’
- b. \*?Dooryoo-ga ano-zyoosi-ni/niyotte kozin-zyoohoo-o san-nin mir-rare-ta.  
*colleagues-NOM that-boss-by/-by personal-information-ACC three-CL see-PASS-PAST*

This contrast in the possessive passive sentences is in parallel with the following double-*o* constructions in Standard Japanese with clause-internal scrambling of the Theme phrases. Placing the floating numeral quantifiers before the respective Theme phrases improves in grammaticality.

- (ii) a. \*?Zidoo-o ano isya-ga me-o sanzyuu-nin sirabe-ta.  
*pupils-ACC that doctor-NOM eyes-ACC 30-CL/excited examine-PAST*  
 ‘That doctor examined thirty pupils’ eyes.’
- b. \*?Kawaii onnanoko-o John-ga usirosugata-o san-nin mi-ta.  
*cute girl-ACC John-NOM back-ACC 3-CL see-PAST*  
 ‘John saw three cute girls’ backs.’
- (iii) a. ?Zidoo-o ano isya-ga sanzyuu-nin me-o sirabe-ta.  
*pupils-ACC that doctor-TOP 30-CL/excited eyes-ACC examine-PAST*  
 ‘That doctor examined thirty pupils’ eyes.’
- b. ?Kawaii onnanoko-o John-ga san-nin usirosugata-o mi-ta.  
*cute girl-ACC John-NOM 3-CL back-ACC see-PAST*  
 ‘John saw three cute girls’ backs.’

Interestingly, the double accusative constructions in the Hakata dialect in (23b) and (24b) are grammatical and there is not much contrast in grammaticality if the floating numeral quantifiers are placed before the respective Theme phrases. Note that it is difficult to judge non-scrambled and scrambled double-*o* constructions in Standard Japanese due to the double-*o* constraint. Although it is an interesting issue to pursue, I will leave this matter open for future research.

In addition, it should be pointed out that, as (37) illustrates, a genitive pronoun can optionally appear in the possessum phrase, indicating that the derivation involves control.<sup>4</sup>

- (37) Ken-ga<sub>k</sub> Eri-ni/niyotte kare-no<sub>k</sub> kami-o kir-are-ta.  
*Ken-NOM Eri-by/by he-GEN hair-ACC cut-PASS-PAST*  
 ‘Ken<sub>k</sub> had his<sub>k</sub> hair cut by Eri.’

Before concluding this paper, let us look at one further type of possessive construction that allows an optional genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase, namely, complex idiomatic predicates (Kishimoto 2013). Kishimoto has argued that the possessor-raising can be either overt or covert in complex idiomatic predicates. (38a) and (38b) show that the possessor can overtly appear either in the base position as a genitive possessor or in the raised position as a dative possessor, respectively.

- (38) a. Sono-koto-ga (mezurasiku) Ken-no ki-ni sawat-ta (rasii)  
*that-fact-NOM unusually Ken-GEN mind-LOC harm-PAST seem*  
 ‘(It seems that) Ken did not (unusually) like that fact.’  
 b. Ken-ni sono-koto-ga (mezurasiku) ki-ni sawat-ta (rasii)  
*Ken-DAT that-fact-NOM unusually mind-LOC harm-PAST seem*  
 ‘(It seems that) Ken did not (unusually) like that fact.’

Crucially, not only with the dative possessor but also with the genitive possessor, reflexive anaphor *zibun* ‘self’ can be bound. Consider (39):

- (39) a. Ken-ni-wa<sub>i</sub> [kinoo-no zibun-no<sub>i</sub> hatugen]-ga kioku-ni na-i.  
*Ken-DAT-TOP yesterday-GEN self-GEN speech-NOM memory-LOC NEG-PRES*  
 ‘Ken does not remember what he said.’  
 b. [Kinoo-no zibun-no<sub>i</sub> hatugen]-ga [Ken-no<sub>i</sub> kioku]-ni na-i.  
*yesterday-GEN self-GEN speech-NOM Ken-GEN memory-LOC NEG-PRES*  
 ‘Ken does not remember what he spoke yesterday.’

Kishimoto (2013) claims (i) that in (39a), the possessor undergoes overt movement to [Spec, T] via [Spec, v], while in (39b), the possessor moves at LF to [Spec, T] via [Spec, v], which allows the anaphor to be bound, and (ii) that either movement is motivated by *v* that assigns a  $\theta$ -role (experiencer/possessor) in its Spec position, which is achieved by reanalyzing the possessor in the possessum phrase as an argument of an idiomatic predicate. Notice that the dative possessor can appear with a genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase, as shown in (40).

<sup>4</sup> A non-coreferential reading is also available in indirect passive with the dative *-ni* that cannot alternate with *-niyotte*. In indirect passive, the nominative phrase, *Ken-ga* ‘Ken-NOM,’ is an experiencer, not a possessor.

- (40) Ken-ni<sub>k</sub> sono-koto-ga (mezurasiku) kare-no<sub>k</sub> ki-ni sawat-ta (rasii)  
*Ken-DAT that-fact-NOM unusually he-GEN mind-LOC harm-PAST seem*  
 ‘(It seems that) Ken did not (unusually) like that fact.’

The EPC with the genitive pronoun in the base position suggests that its derivation involves control rather than raising. In fact, as aforementioned, according to Kishimoto (2013) the alleged possessor-raising is A-movement into a  $\theta$ -position, i.e., [Spec,  $v$ ]. It may be the case that the possessor is assigned a  $\theta$ -role (possessor) in the base position and another one (experiencer) in [Spec,  $v$ ], details of which await further investigation.

## 5. Conclusion

The present paper has provided a possible account for the presence of a genitive pronoun in EPCs in Japanese and claimed that it constitutes evidence for Funakoshi’s (2017) analysis of backward control in possessive constructions in Japanese. Drawing on the movement theory of control (Hornstein 1999, 2001), Funakoshi has argued (i) that in object possessor-raising constructions, the possessor syntactically moves out of the possessum phrase to a position below  $v$ , where it is assigned a  $\theta$ -role by an applicative head, and (ii) that either the top copy in this head position or the bottom one in the tail can be pronounced. Therefore, even when the genitive possessor remains in the possessum phrase, floating numeral quantifiers and secondary predicates can be licensed by the silent top copy of the possessor outside the possessum phrase. This paper has shown that when both copies can appear, the bottom one overtly appears as a genitive pronoun. In light of the parallelism between control in the nominal domain and that in the clausal one, this presence of a genitive pronoun in EPCs indicates that the derivation involves control. This study has further examined possessive passive and shown that it exhibits behavior parallel to backward control constructions discussed in Funakoshi (2017), and that the raised overt possessor can be optionally accompanied by a genitive possessor in the possessum phrase, which can be taken to suggest that the passive in question also involves control. Finally, this paper has reviewed Kishimoto’s (2013) possessor-raising analysis of complex idiomatic predicates, and has shown the availability of a genitive pronoun in the possessum phrase, which is suggestive of a control structure.

## References

- Akuzawa, Koyo. 2018. *Kontorooru-gensyo-no toogoteki imiteki bunseki: Syubun-doosi-to hobun-keesiki-no taioo-kankee* [Syntactic and semantic investigations into control phenomena: Main verbs and complements]. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Tsukuba.
- Ayano, Seiki. 2019. Movement analysis of possessive passive in Japanese: Raised from within indeed! *Kyooyookyooyoku-in Kenkyuu-kiyoo* [Bulletin of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences] 4: 61-72.
- Ayano, Seiki. 2020. Notes on a new type of external possession construction in Japanese. *Kyooyookyooyoku-in Kenkyuu-kiyoo* [Bulletin of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences] 5: 41-54.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2013. Possessor raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44: 391-432.
- Funakoshi, Kenshi. 2017. Backward control from possessors. *Syntax* 20: 170-213.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, Kenneth L. and Chisato Kitagawa. A counter to counter equi. *Papers in Japanese Linguistics* 5: 41-61.

- Harada, S.-I. 1973. Counter Equi-NP deletion. *University of Tokyo Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics Annual Bulletin* 7: 113–147.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 1984-85. On the so-called ‘zero pronouns’ in Japanese. *The Linguistic Review* 4: 289-341.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 2009. Tyokusetu-zyudoobun to syoyuu-zyudoobun: Little *v* tosite-no *-rare* to sono sosee [Direct passive and possessive passive: *-rare* as little *v* and its features]. *Goi-no imi to bunpoo* [Lexical meaning and grammar], ed. by Yoko Yumoto and Hideki Kishimoto, 433-454. Tokyo: Kuroshio.
- Hornstein, Nobert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69-96.
- Hornstein, Nobert. 2001. *Move!: A minimalist approach to construal*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kikuchi, Akira. 1994. Extraction from NP in Japanese. *Current topics in English and Japanese*, ed. by Masaru Nakamura, 79–104. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Kishimoto, Hideki. 2013. Covert possessor raising in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31: 161-205.
- Kubo, Miori. 1992. Japanese passives. *Language and Culture* (Hokkaido University) 23: 231-302.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22: 811-877.
- Lee, Kum Young. 2009. *Finite control in Korean*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam. 2002. Backward control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 245-282.
- Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdam. 2013. Diagnosing covert A-movement. *Diagnostics in syntax*, ed. by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 210-234. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Mamoru, and Hiroto Hoshi. 2000. The Japanese light verb construction and the minimalist program. *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels and Juan Uriagereka, 261-295. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Takezawa, Koichi. 2016. Nihongo moodaru-zyutugo-koobun-no toogo-koozoo-to ziseezi-no toogoteki-yakuwari [Modal predicate constructions and syntactic function of tense in Japanese]. *Niti-ee-taisyoo bunpoo-to goi-e-no toogoteki-apurooti: Seesee-bunpoo ninti-gengogaku-to nihongogaku* [Japanese-English A comprehensive approach to grammar and lexicon: Generative grammar, cognitive linguistics and Japanese linguistics], ed. by Koji Fujita and Yoshiki Nishimura, 55-76. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Tomioka, Satoshi and Chang-Yong Sim. 2007. The event semantic root of inalienable possession. Unpublished Ms, University of Delaware.
- Yoon, James. 1990. Theta theory and the grammar of inalienable possession constructions. *NELS* 20: 502-516.

# コントロールとしての所有者上昇について

綾 野 誠 紀

## 要 旨

所有者句外置構文の被所有句内に随意的に現れる属格代名詞は、Funakoshi (2017) において提案されている後方コントロールを支持する事実であることを示す。Kikuchi (1994) では、所有者句が属格で表示され基底生成位置に留まっているにも拘らず、所有者句外置構文同様に、節内の浮遊数量詞や描写二次述語が認可される事実が提示されている。この事実について、Funakoshi (2017) は、コントロール構文の移動分析 (Hornstein 1999, 2001) に基づき、当該現象は、所有者句移動の着地点に存在する非顕示的所有者句に起因すると分析する。ただし、所有者句が移動先位置と基底生成位置との双方で顕示化する場合、基底生成位置では属格代名詞として発音される。この現象を文レベルでのコントロール構文との並行性の観点から見ると、当該構文がコントロール構造を有しているさらなる証拠として捉えることができる。本稿ではさらに、所有者受動文及び複合慣用語述部における所有者上昇についても再検討を行い、それぞれコントロール構文である可能性についても示唆した。