

What can the Mitsukaido dialect case system tell about syntactic theory?*

Kan Sasaki[†]

Keywords: oblique subject, experiencer, control, biclausal structure

1 Introduction

Phonological variations of Japanese dialects have attracted theoretical attention and have provided data serving for theoretical developments for the past three decades (e.g., Haraguchi's 1977 accentual study for the development of non-linear phonology). On the other hand, syntactic studies have concentrated mostly on the data from Standard Japanese and the dialectal data have been almost ignored. This tendency is not limited to the generative literature but is also found in the traditional Japanese studies (called *Kokugo-gaku*) with few exceptions. The aim of this paper is to argue that the syntactic data from Japanese dialects can make a theoretical contribution. I will use the examples of oblique subject constructions in the Mitsukaido dialect of Japanese to illustrate this point.

Oblique subject constructions are not typologically unusual. However, the languages with a case for oblique subject are rare. The Mitsukaido dialect of Japanese, spoken in the southwestern part of Ibaraki prefecture, is such a language. This

*This paper is based on the talk presented at the 11th international conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies held at the University of Vienna, 1st September, 2005. I am grateful to the Mitsukaido people who offered me a lot of information on the Mitsukaido dialect, especially to Mr. Nisaku Otaki, who showed extraordinary patience with my lengthy research. Thanks also go to Daniela Caluianu for her valuable comments. All errors and shortcomings are my own. My research is supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No.17520273) from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture in Japan.

[†]Sapporo Gakuin University

dialect has a case form specific to oblique subject, NP-*ngani*. The case forms for core arguments in the Mitsukaido dialect are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Case forms of the Mitsukaido dialect core arguments

	Subject	Object
Direct	NP- \emptyset (nominative)	NP- <i>godo</i> / \emptyset (accusative)
Oblique	NP- <i>ngani</i> (experiencer case)	NP- <i>nge/sa</i> (dative)

I will argue that the Mitsukaido dialect case system provides implications for syntactic theory, on at least two points, namely the classification of grammatical relations (or functions) and structural status of oblique elements functioning like subject in certain biclausal structures.

The formal properties and the syntactic behavior of the NP-*ngani* in the Mitsukaido dialect provide an answer to the linguistic puzzle regarding the syntactic status of the oblique subject. Many languages have so-called oblique subjects that are formally identical with indirect objects. Many accounts of such oblique subjects involve some relation between the oblique subject and the indirect object (Perlmutter 1979, Belletti & Rizzi 1988 and Alsina 1996 to name a few). In the Mitsukaido dialect, the two are formally distinct, the oblique subject being marked with *-ngani* and the indirect object marked with *-nge* or *-sa*. I will offer some syntactic arguments showing that the NP-*ngani* functions as oblique subject and cannot be regarded in any sense as an indirect object.

The data from the Mitsukaido dialect also provides an answer to the question of the status of the oblique element corresponding to the embedded subject in biclausal constructions. There are two alternative accounts schematized as in (1a) and (1b). The structure (1a) is advocated by Nakau (1973) and Matsumoto (1996) and the structure (1b) by Harada (1977) and Takezawa (1987). In (1a) the oblique element controls the embedded subject. In (1b) the oblique element is analyzed as an oblique subject inside the embedded clause.

b. *Transitive sentence with an inanimate direct object*

mango *garasu* *waQ-ta*
 grandchild-NOM glass-ACC_(inanimate) break-PAST
 ‘The grandchild broke the glass.’

(3) a. *Intransitive sentence with an animate subject*

mango *hadarae-de-ru*
 grandchild-NOM work-PROG
 ‘The grandchild is working.’

b. *Intransitive sentence with an inanimate subject*

mizu *ko:Q-ta*
 water-NOM freeze-PAST
 ‘The water froze.’

The goal or recipient arguments in ditransitive sentences are prototypical indirect objects. They are marked in dative case. The case forms of the indirect objects depend on their animacy. They are marked with the case particle *-nge* when they are animate, and with the case particle *-sa* when they are inanimate, as illustrated in the sentences in (4).

(4) a. *Ditransitive sentence with an animate indirect object*

sengare *kono nimozu* *siNsegi-nge* *oguQ-ta*
 son-NOM this package-ACC relative-DAT_(animate) send-PAST
 ‘The son sent a package to a relative.’

b. *Ditransitive sentence with an inanimate indirect object*

ora *saNkasjo-no hjsaetsj-sa*
 I.TOP 3 place-GEN disaster-stricken area-DAT_(inanimate)
gieNkiN *oguQ-ta.*
 contribution-ACC send-PAST
 ‘I sent contributions to 3 disaster-stricken areas.’

The dative is not only used for indirect object, but also for the theme argument in some constructions with psychological predicates and the causee in causative constructions. What is important for the present discussion is that the dative particle is never used for the marker of experiencer in psych constructions, or oblique agent in passive constructions. The oblique experiencers are marked with the experiencer case particle *-ngani*. See the example in (5). This type of oblique nominal functions as an oblique subject as described in the following section.

- (5) *are-nganja* *ome-godo* *wagaN-me*
 S/he-EXP.TOP you-ACC understand-may not
 ‘S/he may not understand you.’

The demoted agent in passive constructions is case marked with the locative case particle *-ni*. See the example in (6).

- (6) *Locative case marked demoted agent in passive*
gakse: *sense:-ni* *igim-are-da*
 student-NOM teacher-LOC scold-PASS-PAST
 ‘The student was scolded by the teacher.’

In Standard Japanese, indirect object, oblique experiencer and demoted agent in passive are all case marked with the dative. Compared to Standard Japanese, the Mitsukaido dialect can be said to have a more elaborate oblique case system. For the detailed description of oblique cases in this dialect, the reader may refer to Sasaki (2001) and Sasaki (2004a).

The languages with a case marker specific to oblique experiencer are typologically rare. The languages of this type I can list up beside the Mitsukaido dialect are a few Caucasian languages, namely Andi (Comrie 1981) and Godoberi (Kibrik 1996), and Bhojpuri (Verma 1990) spoken in India. This is not an exclusive list. However, most of the languages which have oblique experiencer constructions tend to mark oblique experiencers with some case markers which have central

usages other than the marker for the oblique experiencers, i.e., dative, locative, accusative, and genitive. The European languages with oblique experiencer constructions are of this type. It is easy to list up the languages of this type in other areas of the world, Standard Japanese, Quechua, Choctaw, etc. What is important for the present discussion is the fact that some researchers made a universal characterization of oblique experiencer as indirect object based on the case syncretism between indirect object and oblique experiencer found in the majority of languages with oblique experiencer constructions. The universality of this characterization will be criticized in Section 4.

3 Syntax of oblique experiencer constructions

In the Mitsukaido dialect, the oblique subject can be found in constructions with stative predicates. The same is true in Standard Japanese and the other languages. This section illustrates the syntactic traits of the oblique subject constructions.

3.1 Case frames

The Mitsukaido dialect oblique experiencer construction is different from that in Standard Japanese not only in the case form for oblique experiencer but also in the case frame for the entire construction.

In Standard Japanese, nominative is required in every tensed sentence. The non-subject elements, such as the theme argument in the oblique experiencer constructions, are marked in nominative when the subject is marked in the dative. This is considered to be a reflection of the obligatoriness of nominative elements. Shibatani (1977) proposed the Surface Case Canon for capturing this generalization.

The nominative element is not obligatory in tensed sentences in the Mitsukaido dialect. The case frames without nominative elements are found in some oblique experiencer constructions. In the example (7), the experiencer argument is case marked with the experiencer case particle *-ngani* and the theme argument is marked with the accusative case particle *-godo*.

- (7) *are-nganja ome-godo wagaN-me*
 S/he-EXP.TOP you-ACC understand-may not
 ‘S/he may not understand you.’

The example (8) is a construction with a one argument predicate. The sole argument is the experiencer, the holder of emotion, and it is case marked with experiencer case particle *-ngani*. The existence of this type of non-canonical construction indicates that the nominative requirement is inert in this dialect.

- (8) *ore-ngani-mo komaQ-pe-na.*
 I-EXP-too be embarrassed-will-??
 ‘I will be embarrassed.’

Of course, this does not mean that this dialect has no constraints on case frames. The verb *komar-* ‘be embarrassed’ has two case frames, namely a monadic case frame as in the example (8) above and a dyadic case frame illustrated in the example (9) below. The dyadic case frame of (9) employs nominative for the experiencer argument. The theme argument is marked in the locative case. The experiencer case marking for the experiencer argument is prohibited in this construction. This indicates a certain constraint for multiple occurrences of oblique case elements.

- (9) *ore{-Ø/*-ngani}-mo so:oN-ni komaQ-ter-u*
 I-{NOM/*EXP}-too noise-LOC be embarrassed-PROG-PRES
 ‘I am embarrassed with the noise.’

However, the multiple oblique case elements in a tensed clause do not always result in ungrammaticality. The potential construction derived from the construction with oblique complements exhibits multiple oblique elements. See the example (10).

(10) *Potential with multiple oblique elements*

ome-nganja *jane-sa* *nobor-e-Q-ka*
 you-EXP.TOP roof-DAT climb-POT-PRES-Q
 ‘Can you climb the roof?’

Thus, the matter is not simple. Concerning the constraint on multiple occurrence of oblique elements including experiencer case marked nominals, see Sasaki (2004b).

3.2 Syntactic behavior

The experiencer case marked nominal (NP-*ngani*) shares some syntactic properties with nominative case marked subjects. They have no properties common to the indirect object. This section introduces the syntactic properties of oblique case marked nominals.

3.2.1 Subject properties

In this paper, I assume that the transitive subject is the subject prototype and that its syntactic properties can be regarded as subject properties. The syntactic properties found in both subject prototype and object prototype (direct object in transitive clause) are not regarded as subject properties but properties for direct arguments. Subject properties in this dialect are listed in (11)

(11) *Subject properties in the Mitsukaido dialect*

Antecedent of reflexive pronoun
 Controller of missing subject in adverbial clause
 Case alternation
 Host for floating quantifiers

The examples in (12)-(18) are an illustration of the subject properties. The subject is interpreted as an antecedent of the reflexive pronoun as shown in (12). The examples for case alternation (voice phenomena) need some explanations. The

subject in a transitive sentence corresponds to the locative nominal in passive and benefactive constructions, and to the dative nominal in causative and optative constructions. See examples in (13)-(17).

- (12) *Antecedent of reflexive pronoun*

are_i zibuN_i-no kuruma naosi-ta
 s/he-NOM self-GEN car-ACC repair-PAST
 ‘S/he repaired her/his own car.’

- (13) *Anaphoric control into nangara clause*

ora_i [e_i arugi-nangara] paN kuQ-ta.
 I.TOP walk-while bread-ACC eat-PAST
 ‘I ate bread while walking.’

- (14) *Passive: target of demotion to locative*

ano kodomo sense:-ni igim-are-da
 that child-NOM teacher-LOC scold-PASS-PAST
 ‘That child was scolded by the teacher.’

Cf. *sense: ano kodomo-godo igiN-da*
 ‘The teacher scolded that child.’

- (15) *Benefactive: locative agent corresponding to the active subject*

ora mango-ni siNbuN jon-de moraQ-ta
 I.TOP grandchild-LOC newspaper-ACC read-COMP get-PAST
 ‘I had my grandchild read the newspaper for my benefit.’

- (16) *Causative: Causee corresponding to the active subject*

ora mango-nge siNbuN jom-ase-da
 I.TOP grandchild-DAT newspaper-ACC read-CAUS-PAST
 ‘I made my grandchild read the newspaper.’

- (17) *Optative: expectee corresponding to the active subject*

ora ziNsa-nge haNniN-godo taeho sj-te morae de:
 I.TOP policeman-DAT criminal-ACC arrest-COMP get-want
 ‘I want the policeman to arrest the criminal.’

Quantifier float related to subject host is limited to a ‘flip’ type, i.e., post nominal quantifier adjacent to the host nominal. See the example (18). Floating quantifier separated from its host nominal by another constituent is not found. Subject prototype and oblique subject show different behavior on this phenomenon.

(18) *Host for floating quantifiers*

<i>kodomora_i</i>	<i>saNniN_i</i>	<i>naQto:</i>	<i>kuQ-ta</i>
children-NOM	3 human	natto-ACC	eat-PAST
‘Three children ate natto.’			

Thus, subject plays a central role in several morphosyntactic phenomena. The next section shows that the oblique experiencers, namely NP-*ngani*, in stative constructions share some subject properties, and they can be regarded as oblique subjects.

3.2.2 Syntactic properties of oblique experiencers

The oblique nominal with experiencer case particle behaves like the subject prototype except for quantifier float. See the examples below. The experiencer case marked nominal is interpreted as an antecedent of the reflexive pronoun as shown in (19). In case alternation phenomena, the experiencer case marked nominals behave in the same way with the subject, i.e., they are targets of case alternation. See the examples in (20)-(24). Concerning the quantifier float, the experiencer case marked nominal behaves differently from the subject prototype. It cannot launch floating quantifiers. See the example in (25).

(19) *Antecedent of reflexive pronoun*

<i>are_r-nganja</i>	<i>zibuN_r-no megada</i>	<i>wagaN-me</i>
s/he-EXP.TOP	self-GEN weight-ACC	understand-may not
‘S/he may not know her/his weight.’		

(20) *Anaphoric control into nangara clause*

are_i-nganja [*e_i ame name-nangara*]
 3SG-EXP:TOP candy-ACC lick-while
ojong-e-ru
 swim-able-NONPERF
 ‘S/he can lick a candy while swimming.’

(21) *Passive*

ome-ni wagar-are-de (tamaQ-ka)
 you-LOC understand-PASS-COMP endure-PRES-Q
 ‘I cannot stand being understood by you.’
 Cf. *ome-ngani wagaN-me.*
 ‘Maybe you cannot understand.’

(22) *Benefactive*

naNtoga are-ni wagaQ-te moraQ-ta
 one way or another s/he-LOC understand-COMP get-PAST
 ‘One was or another, I had her/him understand it.’

(23) *Causative*

are{-nge/-ngani} moNdae wagar-ase-N-no*
 s/he {-DAT/*-EXP} problem-ACC understand-CAUS-PRES-COMP
te:heN-da
 hard-copula
 ‘It’s difficult to make her/him understand the problem.’

(24) *Optative*

ora ome-nge sore-ngure: wagaQ-te morae-de.
 I.TOP you-DAT it-ACC-at least understand-COMP get-want
 ‘(I) want you to understand that much.’

(25) *Host for floating quantifiers (ungrammatical)*

**ano kodomora_i-nganja saN-niN_i natto ku-e-me.*
 that children-EXP.TOP 3 human natto eat-POT-may not

The inability of being a host for floating quantifiers is a property found in other oblique nominals. See the example (26).

- (26) *gakse*:_i *seNse:ra*_j-*ni* *saNniN*_{i/*j} *igim-are-da*.
 student-NOM teacher.PL-LOC 3 human scold-PASS-PAST
 ‘Three students were scolded by the teachers.’

The argument case marked with direct cases, i.e., nominative and accusative, can launch floating quantifiers. The examples with accusative nominal are presented below.

- (27) a. *nego* *nezumi*_i-*godo* *saNpjki*_i *kuQ-ta*
 cat-NOM rat-ACC 3 animals eat-PAST
 ‘The cat ate three rats.’
 b. *mango-nge* *ame*_i *saN-ko*_i *jaQ-ta*.
 grandchild-DAT candy-ACC 3 entity give-PAST
 ‘(I) gave three pieces of candy to my grandchild.’

Thus, the inability of being a host for floating quantifiers can be regarded as an oblique nominal property.

The oblique experiencer shares syntactic properties with both subject and oblique nominals. The properties presented above indicate that the experiencer case marked nominal functions as an oblique subject.

The other oblique nominals subcategorized by the predicate do not show the syntactic properties found in the experiencer case marked nominals. The only exception is prohibition of being a host for floating quantifiers.

As shown in example (28), the indirect object in the dative case cannot be interpreted as an antecedent of the reflexive pronoun.

(28) SUBJECT NOT INDIRECT OBJECT AS ANTECEDENT OF REFLEXIVE PRONOUN

ora_i are_j-nge zibuN_{i/nj}-no tomodazi-godo sjo:kae sj-ta.
 1SG-TOP 3SG-DAT self-GEN friend-ACC introduce-PAST
 ‘I introduced my friend to him.’

The indirect object with a dative case particle and the experiencer case marked nominal behave differently in case alternation. In biclausal constructions such as causative and benefactive constructions, the embedded experiencer case marked nominal is a target of control by the element in the matrix clause, whereas the indirect object in the embedded clause is not. The example (29) is a causative construction based on the ditransitive verb, which illustrates the stability of dative case in biclausal control structures.

(29) *Causative based on ditransitive*

ora sengare-nge kono nimozu siNsegi-nge ogur-ase-da
 I.TOP son-DAT this package-ACC relative-DAT send-CAUS-PAST
 ‘I made my son send this package to a relative.’

In the formation of passive constructions, the experiencer case marked nominal is a target of demotion (the demotion from the experiencer case to the locative case is found only in indirect passive). Contrary to this, the indirect object is a candidate of promotion, which can correspond to the subject in passive constructions. See the examples in (30).

(30)a. PASSIVE (SUBJECT = GOAL NOMINAL)

ora mango-ni neNgazjo: ogur-are-da.
 1SG-TOP grandchild-LOC New Year card-ACC send-PASS-PAST
 ‘I was sent a New Year card by my grandchild.’

b. CORRESPONDING ACTIVE

mango *ora-nge* *neNgazjo:* *oguQ-ta.*
 grandchild-NOM ISG-DAT New Year card-ACC send-PAST
 ‘My grandchild sent me a New Year card.’

The syntactic behavior of the indirect object is similar to that of the direct object. The accusative case marking of direct object remains intact when it is embedded in a complement clause of the control predicate. The accusative case marked direct object is a prototypical candidate for promotion to subject.

The only property the indirect object shares with the experiencer case marked nominal is the inability of being a host for floating quantifiers. See the example (31).

(31) * *mango_i-nge* *saNniN_i* *ame* *jaQ-ta.*
 grandchild-DAT 3 human candy-ACC give-PAST

However, this property is found not only in the indirect object and the experiencer case marked nominals but also in the other oblique nominals.

3.3 Case differentiation according to grammatical relations in oblique arguments

The syntactic traits of the oblique experiencer constructions presented in this section indicate that the experiencer case marked nominal, i.e., NP-*ngani*, can be regarded as an oblique subject. The experiencer case marked nominals do not show any object properties.

For direct core arguments, many languages differentiate subject and object with case marking. Accusative languages employ nominative case for transitive and intransitive subjects and accusative case for objects. Ergative languages employ ergative case for transitive subjects and absolutive case for intransitive subjects and objects. However, for indirect core arguments, namely, indirect objects and

oblique subjects, most languages do not exhibit case differentiation according to the grammatical relations.

The Mitsukaido dialect is a language where both oblique subject and indirect object have specific case markers, the experiencer case particle *-ngani* for oblique subjects and the dative case particles *-nge/-sa* for indirect objects. Thus, this dialect differentiates case marking according to grammatical relations in oblique arguments. Languages with this type of case differentiation are typologically rare as mentioned above, but this type of case system should not be ignored because it is found in genetically unrelated languages. Previous analysis proposed for oblique experiencer constructions cannot handle the languages of this type. The failure comes from overgeneralizations. The next section criticizes two analyses based on overgeneralizations and proposes an appropriate analysis for oblique experiencer constructions.

4 Theoretical implications

There are three types of analyses for oblique experiencer constructions, i.e.,

- (i) Analysis identifying oblique experiencer with indirect object
- (ii) Analysis identifying oblique experiencer constructions with double subject constructions
- (iii) Analysis regarding oblique experiencers as oblique subjects.

This section examines these analyses based on the data from the Mitsukaido dialect.

4.1 Oblique experiencer as indirect object

Perlmutter (1979) proposed an analysis treating oblique experiencer as indirect object based on the data from Italian, Standard Japanese and Quechua. Perlmutter argued that the oblique experiencer bears initial subject relation and final indirect object relation. The syntactic behaviors shared with subject are considered to be reflections of the initial grammatical relation. In his analysis on Standard Japanese,

the final indirect object status is established on the basis of the dative case marking of the oblique experiencers and the inability of launching floating quantifiers. The demotion from subject to indirect object assumed for the oblique experiencers is called Inversion. Inversion analyses are proposed for other languages in Relational Grammar literature (Davies 1986 for Choctaw, Harris 1981 for Georgian, Legendre 1989 for French, among others).

The analyses regarding oblique experiencer as indirect object in a certain representation are found not only in Relational Grammar literature but also other frameworks. Belletti & Rizzi's (1988) analysis in Principle and Parameter approach on Italian psychological predicates and Alsina's (1996) analysis on Catalan oblique experiencer constructions based on the formalism of Lexical Functional Grammar are of this category.

The analysis assuming that oblique experiencer is an indirect object is not applicable to the Mitsukido dialect data, because the experiencer case marked nominal, NP-*ngani*, does not behave like the indirect object in any sense. The criteria on case marking are not fit for the oblique experiencer in this dialect. The experiencer case marked nominal and the indirect object in dative case share the property concerning floating quantifiers. However, this does not guarantee the viability of the Inversion analysis. As presented above, oblique nominals other than oblique experiencers and indirect objects also cannot be a host for floating quantifiers. The data from the Mitsukaido dialect casts a doubt on the universality of the analysis assuming that oblique experiencers are indirect objects.

The failure of the Inversion analysis for the languages with an oblique case specific to the experiencer argument comes from the overgeneralization based on the morphological similarity between oblique experiencers and indirect objects. In the majority of the languages with oblique experiencer constructions, the dative case marks both indirect object and oblique experiencer. However, the dative nominals behave differently, depending on their syntactic status. The language of the Mitsukaido dialect type codes this syntactic difference into the case marking.

21 years after advocating the Inversion analysis, Perlmutter relativized the universality of the Inversion analysis in a co-authored article (Moore & Perlmutter

2000). According to Moore & Perlmutter, the languages with oblique subjects are divided into two categories, the languages where Inversion analysis is tenable and the languages where oblique experiencers are subject bearing oblique cases and cannot be indirect object in any level. The recognition of the system where Inversion analysis is not tenable can be considered to be on the right track. The Mitsu-kaido dialect is in the second type.

4.2 Oblique subject construction as double subject construction

Recently, Shibatani (2001) proposes a new analysis for the non-canonical constructions. In his proposal, the oblique experiencer construction falls into a type of double subject construction. The classic double subject construction exemplified in (32) and the oblique experiencer construction in (33) are considered to have the same clause structure where NP1 is a subject for the clausal predicate S2 and NP2 is a subject for the predicate.

(32) *Zoo-wa hana-ga nagai* (Standard Japanese)
 [_{S1} NP1 [_{S2} NP2 Pred.]]
 ‘Elephants have a long nose.’

(33) *Boku-ni-wa sore-ga wakar-u* (Standard Japanese)
 [_{S1} NP1 [_{S2} NP2 Pred.]]
 ‘I can understand it.’

There is a criticism that this analysis is not tenable even for the Standard Japanese data. See Kishimoto (2004). The following part of this section examines the viability of this analysis for the Mitsukaido dialect.

The subject status of oblique experiencers is not problematic. As shown in the discussion so far, the oblique experiencer in this dialect possesses subject properties.

The problem lies in the subject status of NP2. The internal argument in oblique experiencer constructions does not show any properties shared with the subject prototype. This indicates that there is no reason to regard the internal argument in

the oblique experiencer constructions as a subject. The situation is much worse for this analysis when we consider the word order and the generalization of case marking for nominals.

The oblique experiencer constructions in this dialect can be found with both morphologically underived predicates such as *wagar-* ‘understand’ and potential predicate. The case frame with *wagar-* is ⟨EXP.-ACC.⟩. See the example (7). The case frame of potential construction is ⟨EXP.-X⟩ where X is the case of the internal argument of the predicate embedded in the potential predicate. In other words, the case marking of the internal argument remains intact in the formation of potential constructions in this dialect. The multiple oblique case frame found in the example (10) is a reflection of this case preservation tendency. If we assume that the internal argument of the oblique experiencer constructions is a non-subject, the following generalization can be made.

- (34) a. The nominative and the experiencer case are cases for subject.
 b. The accusative and the dative are cases for non-subject arguments.

The application of the double subject analysis advocated by Shibatani misses this generalization.

The oblique experiencer constructions in this dialect do not share the constraint on word order with the double subject constructions. The double subject construction in this dialect is a possessor ascension type. This type of construction lacks word order flexibility. The permutation of the two nominals results in ungrammaticality.

- (35) a. *zo:-wa hana nangae*
 elephant-TOP nose-NOM long
 ‘The elephants has a long nose.’
 b. **hana(-wa) zo: nangae*
 nose-NOM(-TOP) elephant-NOM long

On the other hand, the oblique experiencer constructions show word order flexibility. The permutation of subject and non-subject does not result in ungrammaticality.

- (36) a. *ome-ngani e:ngo wagaQ-ka*
 you-EXP English-ACC understand.PRES-Q
 ‘Can you understand English?’
- b. *e:ngo ome-ngani wagaQ-ka*
 English-ACC you-EXP understand.PRES-Q

This syntactic difference indicates that the two constructions belong to distinct construction types. The lack of word order flexibility is also found in a type of double accusative construction. Unlike Standard Japanese, due to the existence of two morphologically distinct accusative case markers, this dialect permits double accusative constructions (Sasaki 1998, 2002). Among the double accusative constructions, the possessor ascension type shows word order freeze. The order of possessor and possessee constituents is fixed as <possessor-possessee>. The inverse order results in ungrammaticality.

- (37) a. *ano sense: kodomo-godo hoppeda buQ-ta*
 that teacher-NOM child-ACC_(animate) cheek-ACC_(inanimate) hit-PAST
 ‘That teacher hit the child on the cheek.’
- b. **ano sense hoppeda kodomo-godo buQta*
 that teacher-NOM cheek-ACC_(inanimate) child-ACC_(animate) hit-PAST

The double accusative possessor ascension construction and the double subject construction share the structure of NP-external possessive relation. The inflexibility of word order should be regarded as a common property of the construction with NP-external possession.

The internal argument of the oblique experiencer construction is not considered to be a subject. The data from the Mitsukaido dialect casts a doubt on the universality of the double subject analysis for oblique experiencer constructions.

The failure must be due to the overgeneralization derived from the formal and semantic commonality. Both double nominative constructions and oblique experiencer constructions have non-canonical case frame in that they do not have <nominative-accusative> case frame even though they have two participants. Both of them are stative in their aspectual property. However, this does not mean that they are the same construction type. What is necessary is the investigation of the subtypes of stative constructions.

4.3 The analysis conforming to MD case system

The analysis treating the oblique experiencer as subject and the other constituents as non-subject conforms to the data from the Mitsukaido dialect. This type of analysis has already been proposed for other languages (Andrews 1982 for Icelandic, Kuno 1973 for Standard Japanese, and Mohanan 1982 for Malayalam, to name a few). This type of analysis enables us to capture the fact that the case system of the Mitsukaido dialect reflects the distinction of grammatical relations not only in direct arguments but also in oblique arguments.

5 Oblique elements functioning alike subject in biclausal structure

The oblique elements sharing syntactic properties with subject are not limited to the oblique experiencers. The following section discusses the other oblique element behaving like the subject.

The oblique case marked controllers of some biclausal constructions may exhibit some subject properties such as reflexive binding. The syntactic status attributed to this oblique element varies from researcher to researcher.

Japanese dialects, including Standard Japanese, have constructions with oblique elements corresponding to the embedded subject, such as causative, benefactive, optative and so on. The oblique element corresponding to the embedded subject

shows some properties common to the ordinary subject. There are two types of analyses proposed for the grammatical status of this element. Some researchers regard it as an element in the matrix clause and the controller of the missing subject in the complement clause. Other researchers regard it as an oblique subject in the complement clause.

As far as the data is provided from the languages where indirect object and oblique experiencer are marked in the same case, the superiority of either analysis is hard to determine. The case system of the Mitsukaido dialect is useful for choosing the superiority of the analysis.

Due to the limitation of time, I restrict the discussion to one type of biclausal construction, namely complex optative construction where the predicate is in the form of *V-te morae de*.

5.1 Two analyses for oblique elements corresponding to the embedded subject

Before presenting the data from the Mitsukaido dialect, I will sketch the previous analyses for the biclausal constructions with oblique controllers in order to clarify the point of discussion.

As mentioned above, there are two types of analyses for the constructions. One is the analysis assuming the oblique element is a complement of the matrix clause and it controls a phonologically null subject in the embedded clause. I will call this analysis ‘Oblique Controller analysis’. The analysis was advocated by Nakau (1973), Matsumoto (1996), among others. The structure posited in this analysis for the biclausal construction can be schematized in (38).

- (38) *Oblique Controller Analysis*
 $[_{S1} \dots kare-ni [_{S2} [\quad]_{Subj.} ki-te] hosii]$
└──────────┘
 ‘I want him to come.’

The other analysis assumes that the oblique element is in the subject position of the embedded clause. Harada (1977) and Takezawa (1987) advocated this type of analysis. In this analysis, the position of the oblique elements corresponding to the embedded subject is exactly the same with that of oblique subject in stative constructions. We call this analysis as ‘Oblique Subject Analysis’. The structure posited in this analysis can be schematized in (39).

- (39) *Oblique Subject Analysis*
 [S₁ ... [S₂ *kare-ni*_{subj} *ki-te*] *hosii*]
 ‘I want him to come.’

Under the Oblique Subject Analysis, the morphological appearance and syntactic behavior of oblique subject and the oblique element corresponding to the embedded subject is expected to be the same. As far as the data from Standard Japanese is concerned, the prediction is almost right. However, the situation is different in the Mitsukaido dialect, as shown below.

5.2 Syntax of biclausal constructions

This subsection introduces the morphological and syntactic traits of the complex optative construction in the Mitsukaido dialect. The structure of the predicate complex is assumed to be right-branching, [[V-*te*] [*morae de*]]. The meaning of the construction is almost parallel to the Standard Japanese optative construction in which the predicate is *V-te hosii*. There are two elements corresponding to subject because this construction is biclausal. The Matrix subject is a holder of expectation. I will call the matrix subject ‘expecter’. The expectation is directed to the embedded event or it is transferred metonymically to the subject of the embedded clause. I call the element corresponding to the embedded subject as ‘expectee’.

5.2.1 Case alternation of expectee

The complex optative construction has two case frames. They differ in the case marking of the expectee. The expectee is marked with dative case or the case identical to that of subject of the embedded predicate in its isolated usage. I call the former case frame ‘dative case frame’ and the latter ‘non-dative case frame’.

When an intransitive predicate is embedded, the expectee is marked in nominative case in the non-dative case frame and it is marked in dative in the dative case frame. See the examples in (40).

(40) a. Non-Dative Case Frame (intransitive-based optative)

ora ome sogo-ni e-de morae-de
 I.TOP you-NOM there-LOC be-COMP get-want
 ‘I want you to be there.’

b. Dative Case Frame (intransitive-based optative)

ora ome-nge sogo-ni e-de morae-de
 I.TOP you-DAT there-LOC be-COMP get-want
 ‘I want you to be there.’

When a predicate selecting the experiencer case marked subject is embedded, the expectee is marked in experiencer case in the non-nominative case frame and it is marked in dative in the dative case frame. See the examples in (41).

(41) a. *Expectee with experiencer case particle*

ora ome-ngani sore-ngure: wagaQ-te morae-de.
 I.TOP you-EXP it-ACC-at least understand-COMP get-want
 ‘I want you to understand that much.’

b. *Expectee with dative case particle*

ora ome-nge sore-ngure: wagaQ-te morae-de
 I.TOP you-DAT it-ACC-at least understand-COMP get-want
 ‘I want you to understand that much.’

This indicates that the case marking of the expectee in the non-dative case frame reflects the case of the subject of the predicate in isolated usage. The most straightforward analysis is to assume a control structure for dative case frame and the structure without control for non-dative case frame.

(42) a. *Dative Case Frame*

[_{S1} ... NP-DAT [_{S2} []_{Subj.} V-*te*] *morae de*]
└──────────┘

b. *Non-Dative Case Frame*

[_{S1} ... [_{S2} NP-*{NOM/EXP}*] V-*te*] *morae de*]

In the non-dative case frame, the expectee takes the same case with the matrix subject due to the lack of control from the matrix sentence. Therefore, the nominative--experiencer case variation is possible for the embedded subject. On the other hand, control structure of dative case frame prohibits the expectee from taking cases other than dative, because the dative is selected by the matrix clause. The analysis proposed here is a version of the Oblique Controller Analysis. The syntactic traits of the complex optative construction are also explained successfully with this analysis as presented below.

5.2.2 Antecedent of reflexive pronouns

In both case frames, the expectee is a potential candidate for the antecedent of the reflexive pronoun in the non-subject of the embedded clause. See the examples in (43)

- (43) a. *ora_i are_j-nge zibuN_{ij}-no taziba wagaQ-te*
 I.TOP s/he-DAT self-GEN situation-ACC understand-COMP
morae-de
 get-want
 ‘I want her/him to understand her/his situation.’

- b. *ora_i are_j-ngani zibuN_{ij}-no taziba wagaQ-te*
 I.TOP s/he-EXP self-GEN situation-ACC understand-COMP
mora_e-de
 get-want
 ‘I want her/him to understand her/his situation.’

Thus, not only matrix subject but also the expectee exhibits a subject property. This leads Takezawa (1987) to the postulation of Oblique Subject Analysis.

However, the fact is also explained under the Oblique Controller Analysis. In the non-dative case frame, the antecedent interpretation of the expectee is predicted because the expectee in this case is in the position of a subject of the embedded clause. In the dative case frame, the antecedent interpretation of the expectee is achieved through the controlled subject of the embedded clause.

Both analyses are equally successful for the interpretation of the antecedent of reflexive pronoun.

5.2.3 Negative polarity items

The negative polarity items in this dialect are clause bound, in that it requires clause mate negative element. See the examples in (44). The negative element *-ne*: in the embedded clause does not license the negative polarity item in the matrix clause.

- (44) a. *ora [dare-mo ki-ne:-Qte] omoQ-ta*
 I.TOP anyone come-NEG-COMP think-PAST
 ‘I didn’t think any one came.’
 b. **dare-mo [are ki-ne:-Qte] omoQ-ta*
 anyone-NOM s/he-NOM come-NEG-COMP think-PAST

What is crucial for the present analysis is the negative polarity item licensed by the negative element in the embedded clause. If the Oblique Subject Analysis is correct, the negative polarity item in the position of expectee can always be li-

censed by the negative element in the embedded clause irrespective of the case frame. However, the prediction fails. See the examples in (45). The negative polarity item in dative expectee position cannot be licensed by the negative element in the embedded clause, while that in non-dative expectee position can.

- (45) a. **ora dare-nge-mo ki-ne:-de morae de*
 I.TOP anyone-DAT come-NEG-COMP get-want
 b. *ora dare-mo ki-ne:-de morae de.*
 I.TOP anyone-NOM come-NEG-COMP get-want
 ‘I don’t want anyone to come.’

The data above indicates that the non-dative expectee is an element within the embedded clause while the dative expectee is an element outside the embedded clause. The distribution of the negative polarity item conforms to the Oblique Controller Analysis.

5.3 Applicability of the analyses

The ability of the two analyses presented above to make the correct predictions for the syntactic phenomena related to the complex optative construction is summarized as in (46).

(46)	Oblique Subject Analysis	Oblique Controller Analysis
Variation of case of non-dative expectee	NO	OK
Antecedent of reflexive pronouns	OK	OK
Negative polarity item	NO	OK

Now, the superiority of the Oblique Controller Analysis is clear. The data from the Mitsukaido dialect includes a phenomenon which is not found in Standard

Japanese, i.e., the case distinction of the expectee in the non-dative case frame. This is possible only in a language with the case marker specific to experiencer arguments. The visibility of the variation is due to the distinction between dative and experiencer case. If this distinction does not exist, the dative marking of the experiencer argument in the optative construction with a psych verb is ambiguous in its syntactic status. Whether its dative case is due to the embedded predicate or due to being the complement of the matrix clause is not obvious in a system like Standard Japanese. A rich morphological case system provides us a solution for syntactic ambiguity.

6 Concluding remarks

This paper provides arguments for the subject status of the experiencer case marked nominal (NP-ngani) in the Mitsukaido dialect. This nominal cannot be regarded in any sense an indirect object. The data from the Mitsukaido dialect casts a doubt on the universality of the Inversion analysis advocated by Perlmutter (1979). Shibatani's (2001) analysis identifying the oblique experiencer construction with the double subject construction also meets with difficulties in the application to this dialect.

The analysis proposed for the oblique experiencer in this paper assumes the notion of oblique subject. Recent syntactic theories tend to deny the independent status of oblique subject. Relational Grammar is a theory where grammatical relations play a central role. In this theory, oblique subjects are regarded as a type of mixed category, namely final indirect object bearing initial subject relation. This type of analysis is not tenable for the Mitsukaido dialect data, as shown above. The recent version of Lexical Functional Grammar (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989) decomposes grammatical relations into two features, i.e., [\pm o(bjective)] and [\pm r(estricted)] and there is no place for oblique subject, as pointed out by Andrews (1990). Being a subject and being an oblique element are contradictory because the feature matrix of subject is [$-$ o, $-$ r] and that of oblique is [$-$ o, $+$ r].

Linguistic theory has to be rich and restrictive at the same time in order to predict the structures of all human languages. The theories which have no place for

oblique subjects are too restrictive to predict the case system with distinct morphological case for indirect object and oblique subject. In order to capture the morphological coding of grammatical relations in human languages, linguistic theory has to have a place for oblique subject. The feature system for the classification of grammatical relations which can deal with the Mitsukaido dialect data has to be able to distinguish four core grammatical relations, namely subject, oblique subject, direct object and indirect object. Sasaki (2004a) proposed a system with three privative features [subject], [object] and [oblique]. This system can distinguish all the four elements mentioned above.

The case system where four core grammatical relations have each morphological case is typologically rare. However, the linguistic theories, if they are alleged to be a reflection of universal grammar, have the task of explaining this type of case system.

The case system of the Mitsukaido dialect also makes a contribution to the analysis of a certain type of clause structure. This is presented in Section 5. The same type of case variation is also found in a biclausal construction in Godoberi (Kibrik 1996). In Godoberi, the element corresponding to the embedded subject takes concessive, the case for causee in transitive-based causative constructions, or affective when the embedded predicate selects an experiencer argument case marked with affective, a case specific to oblique experiencer. The situation is parallel to the biclausal constructions in the Mitsukaido dialect. It is important for the linguistic theory that genetically unrelated languages show such a constructional similarity when the case system has a certain commonality.

A language with a case marker specific to oblique experiencer will make a contribution to constructing an appropriate linguistic theory for case and grammatical relations.

References

Alsina, Alex (1996) *The role of argument structure in grammar: Evidence from Romance*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Andrews, Avery (1982) 'The representation of case in Modern Icelandic'. In: Joan Bresnan (ed.) *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, 427-503. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Andrews, Avery (1990) 'Case structures and control in Modern Icelandic'. In: Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.) *Syntax and semantics 24: Modern Icelandic syntax*, 187-234. New York: Academic Press.
- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi (1988) 'Psych verbs and θ -theory'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 291-352.
- Bresnan, Joan and Jonni Kanerva (1989) 'Locative inversion in Chichewa: A case study of factorization in grammar'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 1-50.
- Comrie, Bernard (1981) *The languages of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, William (1986) *Choctaw verb agreement and universal grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Harada, Shin-Ichi (1977) 'The derivation of unlike-subject desideratives in Japanese'. *Descriptive and Applied Linguistics* 10: 131-46.
- Haraguchi, Shosuke (1977) *The tone pattern of Japanese: An autosegmental theory of tonology*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Harris, Alice (1981) *Georgian syntax: A study in relational grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kibrik, Alexandr (1996) *Godoberi*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Kishimoto, Hideki (2004) 'Transitivity of ergative case-marking predicates in Japanese'. *Studies in Language* 28: 105-136.
- Kuno, Susumu (1973) *The structure of Japanese language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Legendre, Geraldine (1989) 'Inversion with certain French experiencer verbs'. *Language* 65: 752-82.
- Matsumoto, Yo (1996) *Complex predicates in Japanese*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- Mohanan, K. P. (1982) 'Grammatical relations and clause structure in Malayalam'. In: Joan Bresnan (ed.) *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, 504-89. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Moore, John and David Perlmutter (2000) 'What does it take to be a dative subject?' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 373-416.
- Nakau, Minoru (1973) *Sentential complementation in Japanese*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Perlmutter, David (1979) 'Working 1s and inversion in Italian, Japanese, and Quechua'. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 5: 277-324.
- Rumsey, Alan (1987) 'Was Proto-Indo-European an ergative language?' *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 15: 19-37.
- Sasaki, Kan (1997) 'Possessive, genitive and adnominal locative in the Mitsukaido dialect'. In: Tooru Hayasi and Peri Bhaskararao (eds.), *Studies in possessive expressions*, 117-41. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Sasaki, Kan (1998) 'Mitsukaido hogen no taikaku [Accusatives in the Mitsukaido dialect]'. *Nihongo Kagaku* 4: 99-120.
- Sasaki, Kan (2001) 'The grammatical function of oblique elements in the Mitsukaido dialect of Japanese'. In: Shigeru Sato and Kaoru Horie (eds.) *Cognitive-functional linguistics in an East Asian context*, 175-205. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Sasaki, Kan (2002) 'The double accusative possessor ascension construction in the Mitsukaido dialect of Japanese'. In: Tasaku Tsunoda (ed.) *Basic materials in minority languages 2002*, 91-114. Faculty of Informatics, Osaka Gakuin University.
- Sasaki, Kan (2004a) *Mitsukaido hogen ni okeru kaku to bunpokankei [Case and grammatical relations in the Mitsukaido dialect]*. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
- Sasaki, Kan (2004b) 'Derived environment effect in the case marking system: A case of the Mitsukaido dialect of Japanese'. In: Brian Nolan (ed.) *RRG 2004 Book of Proceedings*, 280-94.
- <http://wings.buffalo.edu/linguistics/research/rrg.html>

- Sasaki, Kan and Daniela Caluianu (1997) 'Mitsukaido hogen no rentaisushokukaku [Adnominal case particles in the Mitsukaido dialect]'. *Gengo Kenkyu* 111: 59-83.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1977) 'Grammatical relations and surface cases'. *Language* 53: 789-809.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (2001) 'Non-canonical constructions in Japanese'. In: Alexandra Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon and Masayuki Onishi (eds.) *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*, 307-354. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Takezawa, Koichi (1987) 'A configurational approach to case marking in Japanese'. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Verma, Manindra (1990) 'Experiencer subjects in Bhojpuri and Magahi'. In: Manindra Verma and K.P. Mohanan (eds.) *Experiencer subjects in South Asian languages*, 85-103. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

水海道方言の格体系の 統語理論上の意義

佐々木 冠

本稿は水海道方言の格体系の持つ統語理論上の意義に関する考察である。本稿では、この方言の経験者格名詞句に焦点を当て、この問題について論じる。他の斜格要素との対比を通して水海道方言の経験者格名詞句の振る舞いを明らかにすることは、文法関係の分類と二重節的構造で主語と似た機能を果たす斜格要素の構造上の位置づけに関して統語理論への貢献が期待できる。

斜格主語はあるレベルでの間接目的語として分析されることがあるが、水海道方言の経験者格名詞句は、斜格主語として機能するにもかかわらず間接目的語と全く形式的な共通性を持たないため、こうした分析の普遍性に疑問を投げかける要素と言える。また、経験者格名詞句を含む構文の統語的な特性は、斜格主語構文を二重主語構文とする分析の妥当性に疑問を抱かせる。

二重節的構造で主語と似た機能を果たす斜格要素については、これまでその要素を主節の要素であり補文の主語をコントロールしているとする分析と補文の斜格主語であるとする分析が提唱されてきた。水海道方言の二重節的な構文の統語特性はコントロール分析を支持する。

Faculty of Commerce

Sapporo Gakuin University

111 Bunkiyodai, Ebetsu, Hokkaido 069-8555, Japan

E-mail: ksasaki@sgu.ac.jp