**Japanese Genitive Subject: A Comparison with Uyghur**

**Synopsis:** Drawing upon the analysis of Uyghur by Asarina and Hartman (2011), I propose that the genitive subject in the Nominative/Genitive alternation (NGA) in Japanese appears in CP-level clauses and is licensed by D. This claim integrates the two previous accounts of the Japanese genitive subject: D-licensing (Miyagawa, to appear) and C-licensing (Hiraiwa, 2005). Evidence for this analysis is provided by defective C head -no, compared with non-defective C head -ka, in addition to the possibility of CP adverbs (Cinque, 1999).

**Background:** NGA in Japanese is a case alternation between the nominative case marker ga and the genitive case marker no on the subject in adnominal clauses (1). Miyagawa’s (to appear) D-licensing hypothesis assumes that the nominative structure contains a CP level whereas the genitive does not. The genitive subject is licensed by D when C does not occur between the genitive and D. On the other hand, the C-licensing hypothesis assigns the same structure, which contains a CP level, to both the nominative and genitive structures, and adds a categorial feature [+N] in C to license the genitive subject (Hiraiwa, 2005). Asarina and Hartman (2011) apply D-licensing to account for the genitive subject in Uyghur. They propose that the genitive structure contains a CP level with an overt C head -liq, which contrasts with D-licensing as argued by Kornfilt (2008) and Miyagawa (to appear). In addition, Asarina and Hartman claim that the genitive subject is uniformly licensed by D regardless of the placement of agreement (whether on external N (2a) or verbal complex (2b)), assuming the existence of null N with D as a nominal head when it does not explicitly appear (2b). To circumvent a possible issue with phasehood (Phase Impenetrability Condition; Chomsky (1998)), since case licensing occurs across a phase head C (3), they provide a hypothesis that -liq is an instance of defective C (Chomsky, 1998). When C is defective, it does not create a phase and the case licensing from D is not blocked.

**Analysis:** [1] The Japanese genitive subject can occur with CP adverbs (evaluative, evidential) in the same clause (4a), including the CP adverb saiwai-ni ‘fortunately’ (4b). Contrary to Miyagawa (to appear), a structure like (4b) is acceptable when an appropriate context is given. In addition, the occurrence of the genitive subjects in cleft constructions with the C head -no suggests the existence of CP in the genitive structure (5a). Therefore, CP-level clauses can contain the genitive subject in Japanese, as Hiraiwa’s (2005) C-licensing hypothesis predicts. [2] Hiraiwa (2000) claims that the existence of the genitive subject in clefts (5a) supports his C-licensing hypothesis. However, the cleft can be modified by a genitive phrase, specifically when the focus of the cleft is a wh-phrase (5b), which is the same as the relative clauses (5c) (Kuroda, 1999). This indicates that there is an external D head to check the genitive Case, and therefore, I argue for D-licensing for Japanese. [3] Based on the above two observations, the Japanese genitive subject is comparable to Uyghur, where the genitive structure contains a CP-level and the genitive is licensed by D across C. With respect to the phase issue, different C heads in Japanese provide good evidence to support the defective C analysis. With the exception of -no as a C head, the genitive subject is not allowed in CP clauses with an overt C head, such as a clause with the Q-particle -ka. Like -no clauses, -ka clauses can also be arguments with a case marker. However, -ka clauses cannot take the genitive subject (6). I claim that the C head -ka is not a defective C because it contains a semantic function as a Q-particle. Conversely, -no is a defective C because it functions as a genuine nominalizer and does not contain any particular semantic content. Therefore, Japanese reveals an explicit relationship between defectivity of C and the genitive subject.
(1) [kyonen Ken-\text{ga/no} kyotta] gakkoo
   last.year Ken-Nom/Gen went school
   ‘the school where Ken went last year’

(2) a. [men-iŋ ket-ken-(liq)] heqiqt-im muhim
   I-Gen leave-RAN-(LIQ) fact-1sg.poss important
   ‘the fact that I left is important’

b. Ötkür [Ajgül-nun ket-ken-(lik)]-O\text{N-i-ni} bil-i-du/di-d-i.
   Ötkür Aygül-Gen leave-RAN-(LIQ)-O\text{N-3.poss-Acc know-impf-3/say-past-3}
   ‘Ötkür knows/said that Aygül left.’

(Asarina and Hartman, 2011)

(3) … D … \text{[CP C [TP subjectgen … ]]}

(4) a. [un’yoku/tasikani Ken-\text{ga/no} ukatta] siken
   luckily/evidently Ken-Nom/Gen passed exam
   ‘the exam which luckily/evidently, Ken passed’

b. Boku-wa [saiwai-ni hitoziti-\text{ga/no} tasukatta] ziken-o oboeteiru.
   I-Top fortunately hostage-Nom/Gen got.out.of.trouble case-Acc remember
   ‘I remember the case where fortunately, the hostage was saved.’

(5) a. [Konoaida Ken-\text{ga/no} sikar-are-ta]-no-wa ano kooen-de da.
   the.other.day Ken-Nom/Gen scold-Pass-Past-C-Top that park-at Copula
   ‘It is at the park that Ken was scolded the other day.’

b. Konoaida-no, [Ken-\text{ga/no} sikar-are-ta]-no-wa doko-de dat-ta?
   the.other.day-Gen Ken-Nom/Gen scold-Pass-Past-C-Top where-at Copula-Past
   ‘Where was it that Ken was scolded the other day?’

c. Shinzyuku-no, [Keisatu-\text{ga/no} tukamaeta] gootoo-wa dore-desu-ka?
   Shinjuku-Gen police-Nom/Gen caught burglar-Top which-Copula-Q
   ‘Which one is the burglar in Shinjuku who the police caught?’

(6) [Kinoo Ken-\text{ga/*no} kita]-ka-ga mondai-da.
   yesterday Ken-Nom/Gen came-Q-Nom problem-Copula
   ‘The problem is whether Ken came yesterday.’
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