1. Introduction

(1) [watasi-ga/no yonda] hon-wa omosiroi.
[I-NOM/GEN read] book-TOP interesting
‘The book I read is interesting.’

The two case markers occur in different structures (Miyagawa 2011), where T licenses the nominative and D licenses the genitive.

The two case markers are essentially licensed by the same structure, where C licenses either the nominative or the genitive (see Hiraiwa 2005 for one difference).

(3) Dagur RC (based on Hale 2002; some details changed)

a. [[mini au -sen] mer^{v} -min^{v}] sain.
[[1sGEN buy-PERF] horse -1sGEN] good
‘The horse I bought is good.’

b. D’
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this-NOM fortunately Taro-NOM/-GEN chose ring COP
‘This is the ring that Taro fortunately chose.’

this-NOM probably Taro-NOM/-GEN chose ring COP
‘This is the ring that Taro probably chose.’
(5) Nominative

```
(5) Nominative
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(6) Genitive

```
(6) Genitive
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Harada (1971: 80)

(7) a. kodomotati-ga minna-de ikioi-yoku kake-nobotta kaidan
  children-NOM together vigorously run-climb up stairway
  ‘the stairway which those children ran up together vigorously’

  b. *kodomo-tati-no minna-de ikioi-yoku kake-nobotta kaidan
     children-GEN together vigorously run-climb up stairway

Further evidence for the difference in the size of the clause (see Sakai1994)

(8) a. Maryi-no [kinoo kanozyo-ga yatotta] gakusei
    Mary-GEN yesterday she-NOM hired student
    ‘Mary’s student whom she hired yesterday’

  b. ??Maryi-no [kinoo kanozyo-no yatotta] gakusei
     Mary-GEN yesterday she-GEN hired student

2. Challenges to the D-licensing approach

   John-TOP Mary-NOM/GEN read-PST-ADN than many-GEN books-ACC read-PST  
   ‘John read more books than Mary did.’ (Watanabe 1996:396)

   John-TOP rain-NOM/GEN stop-PRES-ADN until office-at be-PST  
   ‘John was at his office until the rain stopped.’

c. [Boku-ga/no omou ni] John-wa Mary-ga suki-ni-tigainai  
   I-NOM/GEN think-PRES-ADN -DAT John-TOP Mary-NOM like-must-PRES  
   ‘I think that John likes Mary.’

d. Kono atari-wa [hi-ga/no kureru nitsure(te)] hiekondekuru.  
   around-here-TOP sun-NOM/GEN go-down-PRES-ADN as colder-get-PRES  
   ‘It gets chillier as the sun goes down around here.’

e. John-wa [toki-ga/no tatsu to tomoni]  
   John-TOP time-NOM/GEN pass-PRES-ADN with as  
   Mary-no koto-wo wasurete-itta.  
   Mary-NOM FN-ACC forget-go-PST  
   ‘Mary slipped out of John’s memory as times went by.’

Maki and Uchibori (2008): covert nominal head

3. Temporal clause: CP or DP

(10) [kodomo-ga/*-no waratta toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.  
   child-NOM/GEN laughed when next-GEN room-in was  
   ‘When the child laughed, I was in the next room.’

(11) [Kodomo-ga/-no waratta toki]-o omoidasita.  
   child-NOM/GEN laughed when-ACC recalled  
   ‘I recalled the time when the child laughed.’

Whitman (1992): an adjunct clause headed by a word such as toki ‘when’ (or koto ‘matter’) is a CP; in argument position, toki is an N.

(12) When the kids laughed, I was in the next room.

(13) a. [Minna-ga/?-no odotta toki], nigiyaka-ni natta.
    all-NOM-GEN danced when lively became
    ‘When everyone danced, it became lively.’

    b. [Minna-ga/-no odotta toki]-ga itiban nigiyaka datta.
    all-NOM-GEN danced when-NOM most lively was
    ‘The time when every danced was very lively.’

3.1. Genitive of dependent tense

Fujita (1988) (Miyagawa 1989: 104-105): genitive subjects are allowed in this environment if the predicate is unaccusative.

(14) [Kodomo-ga/-no kita toki], tonari-no heya-ni ita.
    child-NOM/-GEN came when next-GEN room-in was
    ‘I was in the next room when the child came.’

(15) [Kaze-de doa-ga/-no aita toki] daremo kizukanakatta.
    wind-by door-NOM/GEN opened when no one noticed
    ‘When the door opened due to wind, no one noticed.’

Fundamentally different from D-licensed genitive: this genitive occurs in CP, not TP.

    this-NOM fortunately Taro-NOM/-GEN chose ring COP
    ‘This is the ring that Taro fortunately chose.’

(17) [Saiwai-ni ame-no yanda toki], minna kooen-de asonda.
    fortunately rain-GEN stopped when everyone park-in played
    ‘When the rain fortunately stopped, everyone played in the park.’

(18) [Saiwai-ni seki-no aita toki], Hanako-wa obaasan-ni osiete-ageta.
    fortunately seat-GEN opened when Hanako-TOP grandmother-DAT let.know
    ‘When a seat fortunately opened up, Hanako let her grandmother know.’

Also fine with passive:

    I-TOP child-GEN praise-PASS-PST when really happy feeling was
    ‘When my child was praised, I was really happy.’
As in the case of the genitive of unaccusative, the genitive of the passive occurs in CP.

(20) Watasi-wa [saiwai-ni kodomo-no erab-are-ta toki], hotto simasi-ta.
I-TOP fortunately child-GEN choose-PASS-PST when relieved was
‘When my child was fortunately chosen, I was relieved.’

This unusual genitive is similar to the genitive of negation in Slavic languages such as Russian (Babby, 1980, Pesetsky, 1982, Bailyn, 1997, Babyonyshev, 1996, etc.): this genitive case marking only occurs on internal arguments — the “subject” of passives and unaccusative and the direct object of transitives, but not the subject of unergatives or transitives. The following examples are taken from Pesetsky (1982, 40-50) to demonstrate this point.

Direct objects

(21)a. Ja ne polučal pis’ma.
I NEG received letters.ACC.PL

b. Ja ne polučal pisem.
I NEG received letters.GEN.PL

Subjects of passives

(22) a. Ni odna gazeta ne byla polučena.
not one newspaper.FEM.NOM.SG NEG was.FEM.SG received.FEM.SG

b. Ni odnoj gazety ne bylo polučeno.
not one newspaper.FEM.GEN.SG NEG was.NEUT.SG received.NEUT.SG

Unaccusative subjects:

(23) a. Griby zdes’ ne rastut.
mushrooms.NOM here NEG grow.3PL

b. Gribov zdes’ ne rastet.
mushrooms.GEN here NEG grow.3SG

(24) a. Otvet iz polka ne prišlo.
answer.NOM from regiment NEG arrived.MASC.3SG

b. Otveta iz polka ne prišlo.
answer.GEN from regiment NEG arrived.NEUT.3SG
Unergative subjects:

(25) a. V pivbarax kul’turnye ljudi ne p’jut. in beerhalls cultured people.NOM NEG drink.3PL

     b. *V pivbarax kul’turnyx ljuđej ne p’et. in beerhalls cultured people.GEN NEG drink.3SG

(26) a. Ni odi n rebenok ne prygnul not one child.M.SG.NOM NEG jumped.MASC.SG

     b. *Ni odnogo rebenka ne prygnulo not one child.M.SG.GEN NEG jumped.NEUT.SG

Transitive subjects (regardless of their agentivity):

(27) a. Studenty ne smotrjat televizor. students.NOM NEG watch.PL TV

     b. *Studentov ne smotrit televizor. students.GEN NEG watch.SG TV

As H. Takahashi (2010) notes, some of the examples that Hiraiwa (2001, 2002) gives as counterexamples to D-licensing are the Fujita-type examples involving an unaccusative verb.

    ‘John was at his office until the rain stopped.’

(29) John-wa [ oo goede Mary-ga/?*no wara-u -made] odotteita. John-TOP loudly Mary-NOM/GEN laugh-PRES until was.dancing
    ‘John was dancing until Mary laughed loudly.’

Miyagawa (1993) (see also Ochi 2001)

(30) a. [[Taro-ka Hanako]-ga kuru] riyuu-o osiete. Taro-or Hanako-NOM come reason-ACC tell.me
    ‘Tell me the reason why either Taro or Hanako will come.’
    reason > Taro or Hanako, *Taro or Hanako > reason

     b. [[Taro-ka Hanako]-no kuru] riyuu-o osiete. Taro-or Hanako-GEN come reason-ACC tell.me
    ‘Tell me the reason why Taro or Hanako will come.’
    reason > Taro or Hanako, Taro or Hanako > reason
(32) a. Someone thinks [CP every boy will come].  (May 1977)
    b. Someone wants [TP to order every item in the catalogue].

H. Takahashi (2010) observes that in the temporal adjunct clause, scope relations are fundamentally different.

    [John-or Mary]-NOM come -until wait-let.us
    ‘Let’s wait until the time when John or Mary comes.’
    *‘Let’s wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.’

    [John-or Mary]-GEN come -until wait-let.us
    ‘Let’s wait until the time when John or Mary comes.’
    *‘Let’s wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.’

If we change (34) so that there is an overt nominal head, scope ambiguity returns with the genitive subject. This is D-licensed no.

    [John-or Mary]-NOM come time-until wait-let.us
    ‘Let’s wait until the time when John or Mary comes.’
    *‘Let’s wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.’

    [John-or Mary]-GEN come time-until wait-let.us
    ‘Let’s wait until the time when John or Mary comes.’
    ‘Let’s wait until the time John comes or the time Mary comes.’

(35) *Ame-no futta.
    rain-GEN fell
    ‘It rained.’
Dependent tense (Ogihara 1994)

(36) a. [Hanako-ga te-o ageta toki] kore-o watase kudasai.
Hanako-NOM hand-ACC raised when this-ACC give please
‘Please hand this (to her) when Hanako (lit.) raised her hand.’

b. [Hanako-ga te-o ageru toki] kore-o watase kudasai.
Hanako-NOM hand-ACC raise when this-ACC give please
‘Please hand this (to her) when Hanako (lit.) raises her hand.’

(37) Genitive subjects in Japanese are contained in a TP headed by T that is not fully specified as independent tense.

(38) Genitive of dependent tense (GDT)
The combination of weak $v+$ dependent tense licenses genitive case in Japanese.

(39) In Russian, the combination of weak $v+$ negation licenses genitive case.

4. Temporal adjuncts vs. other types of adjuncts

_toki/made:_ dependent tense

(40) Hanako-no kaeru toki/made, uti-ni ite-kudasai.
Hanako-GEN come.home when/until home-at be-please
‘When/until Hanako comes home, please be at home.’

(41) [Taro-ga/-no kuru made] matte-ita.
Taro-NOM-GEN come until wait-PAST
‘I waited until Taro came.’

_kara/nara:_ non-dependent tense

(42) Hanako-ga kekkon-suru/*kekkon-sita kara/nara,
Hanako-GEN marry/married because/if
boku-wa kanozyo-no kekkonsiki-ni de-tai.
I-TOP her wedding-DAT attend-want
‘Because/if Hanako is getting married/was married, I’d like to attend her wedding.’

(43) a. Hanako-ga/-no kuru kara, uti-ni ite-kudasai.
Hanako-NOM/-GEN come because home-at be-please
‘Because Hanako will come, please be at home.’

b. Ame-ga/*-no futta kara, miti-ga nurete-iru.
rain-NOM/GEN fall because street-NOM wet-is
‘Because it rained, the streets are wet.’
(44) a. Hanako-ga/*-no kuru nara, uti-ni ite-kudasai.  
    Hanako-NOM/-GEN come if home-at be-please  
    ‘If Hanako is coming, please be at home.’

    b. Ame-ga/*-no furu nara, dekake-na-i.  
    rain-NOM/GEN fall if because go.out-NEG-PRESENT  
    ‘If it rains, I won’t go out.’

5. Objects and the genitive case

Direct objects

(45)a. Ja ne polučal pis’ma.  
    I NEG received letters.ACC.PL

    b. Ja ne polučal pisem.  
    I NEG received letters.GEN.PL

(46) *[Hanako-ga tegami-no okutta] hito  
    Hanako-NOM letter-GEN sent person  
    ‘the person to whom Hanako sent a letter’

(47) Hanako-ga eigo-ga hanas-e-ru.  
    Hanako-NOM English-NOM speak-can-PAST  
    ‘Hanako can speak English.’

When we put this in a temporal adjunct clause, the following pattern of judgment emerges.

(48)a. [Ziroo-ga eigo-ga wakar-anakat-ta toki]  
    Jiro-NOM English-NOM understand-NEG-PAST when  
    Hanako-ga tasuke-ta.  
    Hanako-NOM help-PAST  
    ‘When Jiro didn’t understand English, Hanako helped out.’

    b. *[Ziroo-no eigo-ga wakar-anakat-ta toki]  
    Jiro-GEN English-NOM understand-NEG-PAST when  
    Hanako-ga tasuke-ta.  
    Hanako-NOM help-PAST

    c. ?*[Ziroo-no eigo-no wakar-anakat-ta toki]  
    Jiro-GEN English-GEN understand-NEG-PAST when  
    Hanako-ga tasuke-ta.  
    Hanako-NOM help-PAST
d. [Ziroo-ga eigo-no wakar-anakat-ta toki]  
   Jiro-NOM English-GEN understand-NEG-PAST when  
   Hanako-ga tasuke-ta.  
   Hanako-NOM help-PAST  

Let us now look at the same construction, but in an environment where the genitive may be D-licensed. Unlike the GDT case above, all four possibilities are essentially fine (Miyagawa 1993).

(49) a. Hanako-ga furansugo-ga hanas-e-ru koto (NOM-NOM)  
    Hanako-NOM French-NOM speak-can-PRS fact  
    ‘the fact that Hanako can speak French’

   b. Hanako-no furansugo-ga hanas-e-ru koto (GEN-NOM)  
      Hanako-GEN French-NOM speak-can-PRS fact

   c. Hanako-no furansugo-no hanas-e-ru koto (GEN-GEN)  
      Hanako-GEN French-GEN speak-can-PRS fact

   d. Hanako-ga furansugo-no hanas-e-ru koto (NOM-GEN)  
      Hanako-NOM French-GEN speak-can-PRS fact

(50) a. saiwai-ni Hanako-ga furansugo-ga hanas-e-ru koto (NOM-NOM)  
    fortunately Hanako-NOM French-NOM speak-can-PRS fact  
    ‘the fact that Hanako fortunately can speak French’

   b. *saiwai-ni Hanako-no furansugo-ga hanas-e-ru koto (GEN-NOM)  
      fortunately Hanako-GEN French-NOM speak-can-PRS fact

   c. *saiwai-ni Hanako-no furansugo-no hanas-e-ru koto (GEN-GEN)  
      fortunately Hanako-GEN French-GEN speak-can-PRS fact

   d. saiwai-ni Hanako-ga furansugo-no hanas-e-ru koto (NOM-GEN)  
      fortunately Hanako-NOM French-GEN speak-can-PRS fact

The relative clause in examples (b) and (c), which contain a genitive subject, is a TP, while in (a) and (d), which have a nominative subject, the clause is a CP.

(51) Genitive of dependent tense  
    The combination of weak \( v + \) dependent tense licenses genitive case in Japanese.

5. Two remaining exceptions  

Watanabe (1996) gave the following as a counterexample to the D-licensing approach.
(52) John-wa [Mary-ga/no yonda yori] takusan-no hon-o yonda.
     John-TOP Mary-NOM/GEN read-PST-ADN than many-GEN books-ACC read-PST
     ‘John read more books than Mary did.’ (Watanabe 1996:396)

Covert nominal head: Maki and Uchibori (2008), and from a different, semantic point of

This leaves the following counterexample (Hiraiwa 2002).

(53) [Boku-ga/no omou ni] John-wa Mary-ga suki-ni-tigainai
     I-NOM/GEN think-PRES-ADN -DAT John-TOP Mary-NOM like-must-PRES
     ‘I think that John likes Mary.’
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