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1. Introduction

In Japanese, Nominative Case is indicated by the Case-particle, ga. In complex predicate, Transitive, and Unergative constructions, the external argument gets the Nominative Case. Let’s take a look at the complex predicate constructions first. A complex predicate consists of a main verb and a suffix, or a compound of two main verbs. In this paper, we deal with Passives, Causatives and Benefactives, which are shown in (1a) through (1c) respectively.

(1)  

a. Taro-o ga Hanako-ni tatak-are -ta.  
   -Nom    -Dat hit -Pass-Past  
   ‘Taro was hit by Hanako.’

b. Taro-o ga Hanako-ni hatarak-ase -ta.  
   -Nom    -Dat work -Cau -Past  
   ‘Taro made Hanako work.’

c. Taro-o ga hahaoya-ni dakko-shi-te mora -tta.  
   -Nom   mother -Dat hold -do -Ger Benef-Past  
   ‘Taro asked and got (his) mother to hold him.’

These sentences in (1) are the complex predicate constructions, and the subject Taro is the external argument marked with the Nominative Case.
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The sentence (2) is a simple Transitive construction.

(2) Taro-o ga ringo-o tabe-ta.
   -Nom apple-Acc eat -Past

   ‘Taro ate an apple.’

In (2), the subject Taro is the external argument, and it is marked with the Nominative Case.

The example in (3) is considered to have a simple Unergative construction.

(3) Taro-o ga kawa-de oyo-o -da.
   -Nom river-at swim-Past

   ‘Taro swam in the river.’

In (3), the Nominative Case appears on the external argument Taro.

In a simple Unaccusative construction, on the other hand, the internal argument is marked with the Nominative Case as in (4).

(4) Fune-ga shizun -da.
   ship -Nom sink -past

   ‘A ship sunk.’

In (4), the internal argument fune ‘a ship’ is marked with the Nominative Case.

It has been reported in Murasugi and Machida (1998) that a Japanese-speaking child of 4 years old erroneously marks the subject with the Dative Case ni in the complex predicate constructions. One of the example sentences is given in (5).

(5) Onee-tyan-*ni otoosan-ni shika-rare -ta. (4;7-4;9) (adult form(A); Onee-tyan-ga)
   sister -Dat father -Dat scold-Pass-Past

   ‘(My) sister was scolded by (my) father.’

   (Murasugi and Machida 1998: 381)(our translation)

The sentence in (5) is a complex predicate construction with the Passive morpheme -rare. In the adult form, the Nominative subject should appear, but in (5), the Dative is assigned to the subject Onee-tyan ‘(my) sister’ erroneously.

Murasugi and Machida (1998) analyze that these errors reflect an intermediate acquisition stage where children do not move the VP-internal subject to TP-SPEC. Since the subject does not move to TP-SPEC, nothing can assign any Case to the subject. When there is
no other way to assign Case, the Dative Case *ni is assigned as a default Case2 to satisfy the Case Filter.3 In (5), the Nominative Case is failed to be assigned, so the default Case appears on the subject.

In fact, the erroneous *ni in the production of the Japanese-speaking children is found in the Transitive constructions as well. Suzuki (2002) reports that a Japanese-speaking child erroneously marks the subject with the Dative *ni in the Transitive constructions as in (6).

(6) A-tyan-*ni tabe-tyauyo. (2;7) (A: A-tyan-ga)

-Dat eat

‘A-tyan will eat.’ (Suzuki 2002: 48)(our translation)

The sentence (6) is considered to have a simple Transitive construction. The subject A-tyan is erroneously marked with the Dative Case *ni.

Furthermore, we find the similar errors in the sentence with a Unergative verb as well. The sentence in (7a) is a simple Unergative construction, and the sentence in (7b) is a simple Transitive construction. In the Aki corpus from 1;5 to 3;0 (Miyata 2004a), the Jun corpus from 0;6 to 3;8 (Ishii 2004), the Ryo corpus from 1;4 to 3;0 (Miyata 2004c) and the Tai corpus from 1;5 to 3;1 (Miyata 2004b), which are transcribed in the CHILDES format third edition (MacWhinney 2000), the erroneous Dative marking on the subject in the Transitive and Unergative constructions is reported.

(7) a. Kangaruu-*ni basu. (2;5) (A: Kangaruu-ga)

kangaroo -Dat bus

‘The kangaroo got on the bus.’ (aki35.cha)(our translation)

b. Okaasan-*ni yon-da. (2;8) (A: Okaashan-ga)

mother -Dat read-Past

‘Mother, please read this.’ (aki40.cha)(our translation)

In (7a) and (7b), the subject is erroneously marked with the Dative Case *ni.

Interestingly, however, although we find the errors in the complex predicate, Transitive and Unergative constructions, we never find this kind of errors in the Unaccusative constructions.

According to Kuno (1973) and Yatsushiro (1999), among others, in the complex

---

2 Following Takezawa (1987) among others, Murasugi and Machida (1998) assume that the particle *ni can be inserted into the subject position when no other way of assigning Case to it is available.

3 Case Filter: *[Npα] if α has no Case and α contains a phonetic matrix or is a variable. (Chomsky 1981; 175)
predicate, Transitive and Unergative constructions, Tense assigns the Nominative Case to the subject. In contrast, in the Unaccusative constructions, each verb assigns the Nominative Case to the subject. The child errors discussed above can be summarized below with this analysis.

Table 1: The Nominative Case assigner and the child Case-marking errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Children’s erroneous marking on the subject</th>
<th>The type of the constructions</th>
<th>Nominative Case assigner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The errors are observed. (Murasugi and Machida 1998, Suzuki 2002 and CHILDES)</td>
<td>Complex Predicates Transitives Unergatives</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>No errors are observed.</td>
<td>Unaccusatives</td>
<td>Each verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The child errors are found in the complex predicate, Transitive, and Unergative constructions. In these constructions, the Nominative Case is assigned by Tense. On the other hand, the errors are never observed in the Unaccusative constructions, in which the Nominative Case is assigned by each verb.

In this paper, we provide a piece of supportive evidence for the proposal made by Murasugi and Machida (1998). According to their analysis, the erroneous *ni* found in the complex predicates, such as Passives, can be considered to reflect an intermediate acquisition stage where children do not move the subject to TP-SPEC. Hence, the default Case, or the Dative Case *ni*, is inserted to the subject position to satisfy the Case Filter.

We extend their analysis to the Transitive and Unergative constructions, arguing that the subject cannot get the Nominative Case VP internally in those cases. As Murasugi and Machida (1998) discuss, the erroneous *ni* is found in the sentences with the Transitive and the Unergative verbs, because the subject does not move to TP-SPEC, and hence, the default Case, or the Dative Case *ni*, is inserted to the subject to satisfy the Case Filter.

We further argue that their analysis provides an elegant explanation for the lack of the errors in the Unaccusative constructions. In the Unaccusative constructions, the verb assigns the Nominative Case to the subject inside VP. Therefore, even if the subject does not move to TP-SPEC, the Nominative Case is assigned VP internally.

In the next section, we introduce the Japanese Nominative Case assignment system. In section 3, we will provide a piece of supporting evidence for Murasugi and Machida’s (1998) analysis on the erroneous Dative Case marking on the subject. Section 4 concludes this paper.

2. The Nominative Case Assignment in the Adult Grammar

In this section, we discuss the Japanese Nominative Case assignment system. We show how the Nominative Case is assigned in each construction; complex predicate, Transitive, Unergative and Unaccusative constructions.
(8a) is an example of the complex predicate constructions with the Passive morpheme -\textit{rare}. Following Hoshi (1994a, 1994b, 1999), Murasugi and Machida (1998) analyze that the NP, which is marked with the Nominative Case in complex predicate constructions, is the external argument.\footnote{It is widely considered that the Passive and Unaccusative constructions have the same Case assignment pattern because the argument NP, which is marked with the Nominative Case \textit{ga}, is the internal argument in these constructions. On the other hand, Hoshi (1994a, 1994b, 1999) proposes that the argument, which is marked with \textit{ga}, in the Passive constructions is the external argument.}

It is derived as in (8b).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Taroo-ga} Hanako-ni \textit{tatak-are} -\textit{ta}. (=\textit{(1a)})
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Taro was hit by Hanako.}'
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{b. Derivation}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{vP}
\item \textbf{TP}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Taro\textsubscript{i-ga} T'}
\item \textbf{Taro\textsubscript{i-} T'}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Hanako V'}
\item \textbf{Hanako-ni V'}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{PRO\textsubscript{i} V}
\item \textbf{PRO\textsubscript{i} V'}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{tata\textit{k-} (cf. Hoshi 1999: 212)}
\item \textbf{tata\textit{k-}}
\end{enumerate}

The subject moves to TP-SPEC and gets the Nominative Case from Tense.

The same Nominative Case assignment system is used in the Transitive and Unergative constructions. The derivation is given in (9) and (10) respectively.
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In (9) and (10), Tense assigns the Nominative Case to the subject at TP-SPEC.

Now, let's take a look at the Nominative Case assignment system in the Unaccusative constructions.
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(11) a. Fune-ga shizun-da. (=4)
    ship -Nom sink -past
    ‘The ship sunk.’

b. 

(11) is an example of the Unaccusative constructions. As Kuno (1973) and Yatsushiro (1999), among others, propose, the Unaccusative predicates assign the Nominative Case to the subject. Therefore, the subject gets the Nominative from the verb in the VP.

The Nominative Case assignment system in the adult grammar is summarized as follows;

(12) The mechanism of the Nominative Case assignment in Japanese;

a. In the complex predicate, Transitive and Unergative constructions, the Nominative Case is assigned to the subject by Tense after it moves to TP-SPEC.

b. In the Unaccusative constructions, the Nominative Case is assigned to the subject by each verb in the Verb Phrase.
   (Kuno 1973 and Yatsushiro 1999, among others).

The subject gets the Nominative Case from Tense after it moves to TP-SPEC in the complex predicate, Transitive and Unergative constructions. In contrast, in the Unaccusative constructions, the subject gets the Nominative Case from the verb in VP (Kuno 1973 and Yatsushiro 1999, among others).

---

5 Belletti (1988) and Lasnik (1992, 1995) propose that the Unaccusative verbs assign the Partitive Case to their object in Finnish, Italian and English. Based on their conclusion, Yatsushiro (1999) proposes that Japanese has the similar Case Licensing system of the Unaccusatives although, in Japanese, the Unaccusative verbs license the Nominative Case to their object rather than the Partitive Case. Her proposal is based on the scope relation between the Locative phrase and the Nominative phrase. (See Yatsushiro 1999; ch.2)

6 Watanabe (2007, in preparation) assume that, following Pesetsky and Torrego (2001), the movement of the subject to TP-SPEC is signaled by the EPP feature of T. Furthermore, she stands on the hypothesis that the strong EPP feature of T plays the important role in the Japanese Nominative Case assignment. See Watanabe (in preparation) for the details.
3. \textit{Ni Errors in Complex Predicate Constructions and in Simple Sentences}

In this section, we examine the erroneous Dative marking on the subject, which are originally reported by Murasugi and Machida (1998). Murasugi and Machida (1998) argue that these errors reflect the intermediate acquisition stage where a subject NP does not move from VP internal position to TP-SPEC in the complex predicate constructions. We report, in this section, that such erroneous \textit{ni} is found not only in the complex predicate constructions, but also in the simple sentences.

3.1. \textit{Ni Errors in Complex Predicate Constructions (Murasugi and Machida 1998)}

Murasugi and Machida (1998) conduct the observational and experimental studies on a Japanese-speaking child, \textit{Yuuko}, from 4;7 to 4;9. They report that the child erroneously marks the subject with the Dative in the complex predicate constructions, as shown in (13).

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{a.} Onee-tyan-*ni otoosan-ni shika-rare-ta.(4;7-4;9)=(5) (A: Onee-tyan-ga)
\begin{flushright}
\text{\textquoteleft(My) sister was scolded by (my) father.'}$
\end{flushright}
\item \textit{b.} Yuu-tyan-*ni neko-tyan-ni osakana tabe-sase-ta.(4;7-4;9) (A: Yuu-tyan-ga)
\begin{flushright}
\text{\textquoteleft(Yuu-tyan made a cat eat fishes.'}$
\end{flushright}
\item \textit{c.} Yuuko-tyan-*ni otoosan-ni dakko-shi-te morat-ta.(4;7-4;9) (A: Yuuko-tyan-ga)
\begin{flushright}
\text{\textquoteleft(Yuuko-tyan asked and got (my) father to hold her.'}$
\end{flushright}
\end{enumerate}

(13a) is a Passive construction, and \textit{Onee-tyan ‘(my) sister’} is the subject. (14b) is a Causative construction, and \textit{Yuu-tyan} is the subject. (14c) is a Benefactive construction with \textit{Yuuko-tyan} as the subject. In each utterance, the subject is erroneously marked with the Dative, instead of the Nominative.

Based on the experimental and observational studies, Murasugi and Machida (1998) closely examine the stage where the child erroneously marks the subject of the complex predicates with the Dative Case. Interestingly, they found three pieces of evidence that show the child has, in fact, already acquired the system of the Nominative Case assignment in both the simple and the complex predicate constructions.

First, their results obtained from the picture identification task indicate that the child comprehended the structure of the complex predicates “correctly”. They show that the child identified the agent of the matrix and embedded predicate “correctly” in the complex predicate constructions. The sentence in (14) is one of the test sentences of this task.
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In (14), *Kithi-tyan*, which is marked with the Nominative, is the agent of the matrix verb *morau* ‘Benefactive’. On the other hand, *wantyan*, which is marked with the Dative, is the agent of the embedded verb *yomu* ‘read’. The child interpreted *Kithi-tyan* as the agent of the matrix verb, and *wantyan* as the agent of the embedded verb “correctly”. Based on Chomsky’s (1995) proposal that “thematic roles are conceived of as assigned to XP positions within a VP-shell (Manzini and Savoia 1997:2),” Murasugi and Machida (1998) conjecture that the child in this stage knows the structure of the VP-shell, which is the minimum requirement for the 0-role assignment.

Secondly, just at the time that the child makes the Case marking errors, the child shows the adult knowledge of the Nominative Case assignment. Based on the repetition task, Murasugi and Machida (1998) find that the child assigned the Nominative Case to the subject in the complex predicates “correctly” as shown in (15).

(15) a. *Yuu-tyan-ga neko-tyan-ni home -rare -ta.* (4;8)
              -Nom cat   -Dat praise -Pass-Past

   ‘Yuu-tyan was prized by the cat.’

b. *Yuu-tyan-ga hon -o yom-ase -ta Aririn-ni.* (4;8)
              -Nom book-Acc read -Cau-Past  -Dat

   ‘Yuu-tyan made Aririn read a book.’

c. *A-tyan-ga Yuu-tyan-ni pantsu kashi -te morat-ta.* (4;8)
              -Nom  -Dat pants borrow -Ger Benef -Past

   ‘A-tyan asked and got Yuu-tyan to borrow her pant.

   (Murasugi and Machida 1998: 405)(our translation)

(15a) is a Passive construction with *Yuu-tyan* as the subject. (15b) is a Causative construction, where *Yuu-tyan* is the subject. (15c) is a Benefactive construction, where *A-tyan* is the subject. In each case, the child assigned the Nominative to the subject “correctly.” Recall here that the child at this stage erroneously marks the subject with the Dative in the complex predicate constructions as in (13), repeated in (16).

---

7 This Chomsky’s (1995) proposal is based on Larson (1988) and Hale and Keyser (1993).
The contrast between (15) and (16) indicates that the child makes the errors on the Nominative Case assignment although she has already acquired the Nominative Case assignment system.

Finally, Murasugi and Machida (1998) show an interesting piece of evidence for the hypothesis that the child in fact has the knowledge of the Nominative Case Assignment at the time when the child makes the erroneous ni. They report that the child has already known the system of Case omission (Kuno 1973, Saito 1983, and Kageyama 1993). It has been observed that in the adult Japanese, the Nominative marker on the object can be omitted, but the Nominative marker on the subject cannot be omitted (Kuno 1973, Saito 1983, and Kageyama 1993). The contrast is given in (17).

     -Top snack -Nom eat -want
     ‘Taro wants to eat snacks.’

    b. Nominative Case on the Subject: dare-*(ga) ki -ta no?
       who-*(Nom) come-Past Q
       ‘Who came?’

(Saito 1983: 252)

Murasugi and Machida (1998) made a detailed observation, and found that the child omitted the Nominative Case on the object, but not the Nominative Case on the subject. Some of the examples are given in (18).

(18)  a. Yuu-tyan-ga otechudai chu-ru.(4;8)
     -Nom help do -Pres
     ‘Yuu-tyan does help.’
b. Yuu-tyan-wa nani -φ wakaru no? (4;7-4;9)
   -Top what-(Nom) understand Q

‘What does Yuu-tyan understand?’

(Murasugi and Machida 1998: 429-431)(our translation)

As shown in (18b), the child omitted the Nominative Case on the object, but she never omitted the Nominative Case on the subject as in (18a).

Hence, Murasugi and Machida (1998) conclude that at the time when the child produces the erroneous Dative Case marking on the subject of the complex predicate constructions, she in fact knows the adult system of the Nominative Case assignment. Therefore, they conclude that those errors in (16) are not due to the lack of the knowledge of the Nominative Case assignment.

Furthermore, Murasugi and Machida (1998) report some crucial features of the errors. First, the argument, which the child erroneously marks with the Dative, is the external argument of the complex predicates. In addition, the child makes the errors only in the complex predicates, and she never makes the errors in the simple clauses. Recall that the external argument gets the Nominative Case from Tense at TP-SPEC in the complex predicate constructions. Thus, they propose that the case errors are found when the child fails to move the external argument to TP-SPEC. Murasugi and Machida’s (1998) proposal are summarized as in the hypothesis given in (19).

(19) a. A subject NP does not move to TP-SPEC.

   b. Therefore, the subject NP remains inside the Verb Phrase and cannot get the Nominative Case from Tense.

   c. To satisfy the Case Filter, the subject NP gets the default Case, or the Dative ni.


When children form a complex predicate construction, the subject NP does not move to TP-SPEC, but it remains inside the Verb Phrase. Thus, Tense cannot assign the Nominative Case to the subject. Since the complex predicates do not assign the Nominative to the subject either, the subject fails to get the Nominative Case. Consequently, the default Case, namely, the Dative Case ni, is inserted to the subject position. Hence, we get the Dative Case errors.

We call the hypothesis in (19) as “Subject-Raising Deficit Hypothesis”, and call those errors in (16) as “Subject-Raising Deficit Errors” in this paper.

---

8 Murasugi and Machida (1998) propose that the subject NP does not move to TP-SPEC because a complex predicate does not move to T.
In the next sub-section, we introduce Suzuki (2002). He reports that the Dative Case errors are observed in the Transitive constructions. We discuss that his findings would be able to be elegantly explained by the Subject-Raising Deficit Hypothesis as well.

3.2. **Ni Errors in Transitive Constructions**

Suzuki (2002) conducts an observational study on a Japanese-speaking child from 1;10 to 3;6. Although he does not analyze the data, his data contains a lot of the errors frequently made by the Japanese-speaking child. Some of the examples he reported are given in (20).

(20) a. A-tyan-*ni tabe-chauyo.(2;7)  
    (A: A-tyan-ga)(=6)  
    -Dat eat  
    ‘A will eat.’

b. mama -*ni suupu ire -ta-no.(2;9)  
    mother-Dat soup pour-Past  
    ‘Mother poured soup.’

c. mama -*ni dame tte i -tta.(3;1)  
    mother-Dat no that say -Past  
    ‘Mother said no.’

d. chichi-*ni A-tyan-o chuusha -shi -ta.(3;7)  
    father-Dat -Acc injection -do -Past  
    ‘(My) father did injection to A-tyan.’  
    (Suzuki 2002: 48)(our translation)

The sentences in (20) are the Transitive constructions. Note that the child erroneously marks the subject with the Dative Case *ni.*

Just like Murasugi and Machida’s (1998) subject, Suzuki’s (2002) subject showed the knowledge of the Nominative Case assignment system even before the child started to make the errors. The examples in (21) are some examples of Suzuki’s (2002) child’s utterances. Here, the child marks the subject with the Nominative Case “correctly”.

(21) a. konna-tokoro-ni basu-ga i -ta.(2;4)  
    such -place -at bus -Nom be-Past  
    ‘Bus is being here.’  
    (Suzuki 2002: 44)(our translation)

b. A-tyan-ga mi -ru.(2;7)  
    Nom see -Pres  
    ‘A-tyan sees.’  
    (Suzuki 2002: 48)(our translation)
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c. kore A-tyan-ga ki -ta yatsu dayo.(2;9)
   this -Nom wear-Past that be-Pres
   ‘This is what A-tyan wore.’ (Suzuki 2002: 40)(our translation)

   d. A-tyan-ga   mama   -ni panchi-sare-chauyo.(3;0)
      -Nom mother-Dat punch -Pass
      ‘A-tyan is punched by mother.’ (Suzuki 2002: 47)(our translation)

The sentence in (21a) has an Unaccusative construction. The subject *busu* ‘a bus’ is marked with the Nominative Case as in the adult way. The sentence in (21b) is considered to have a Unergative construction and the sentence in (21c) is considered to have a Transitive construction. Here, the subject is marked with the Nominative Case “correctly”. The sentence in (21d) has a Passive construction. The subject *A-tyan* is marked with the Nominative, just like adults do. These facts indicate that this child has already acquired the Nominative Case assignment system before the Dative Case errors are observed. Therefore, the errors shown in (20) are also categorized as the Subject-Raising Deficit Errors.

3.3. *Ni* Errors in Unergative and Unaccusative Constructions

So far, we have overviewed that the Subject-Raising Deficit Errors are observed in the production of the sentences with a complex predicate and a Transitive verb. Table 2 summarizes the findings of Murasugi and Machida (1998) and Suzuki (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructions</th>
<th>Dative Case marking errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complex Predicates</td>
<td>Observed (Murasugi and Machida 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitives</td>
<td>Observed (Suzuki 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unergatives</td>
<td>Not examined yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaccusatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note here that we have not checked whether or not the children erroneously mark the subject with the Dative in the Unergative and Unaccusative constructions as well. Do the Japanese-speaking children make the errors in the Unergative and Unaccusative constructions? Recall here Murasugi and Machida’s (1998) hypothesis.

(22)=(19)

   a. A subject NP does not move to TP-SPEC.

   b. Therefore, the subject NP remains inside the Verb Phrase and cannot get the Nominative Case from Tense.

   c. To satisfy the Case Filter, the subject NP gets the default Case, or the Dative *ni*.
With this hypothesis in mind, in this sub-section, based on the corpus analysis, we examine whether or not the Japanese-speaking children make the Subject-Raising Deficit Errors in the Unergative and Unaccusative constructions as well. We examine four corpora, the Aki corpus from 1;5 to 3;0 (Miyata 2004a), the Jun corpus from 0;6 to 3;8 (Ishii 2004), the Tai corpus from 1;5 to 3;0 (Miyata 2004b) and the Ryo corpus from 1;4 to 3;0 (Miyata 2004c). They are transcribed in the CHILDES format third edition (MacWhinney 2000). The CLAN program (KWAL) was run to identify the relevant child utterances.

We, in fact, found some case errors in the Transitive and Unergative constructions, but not in the Unaccusative constructions. The utterances in (23) are those errors in the Transitive constructions.

(23) The errors in the Transitive constructions

a. Aki-tyan-*ni.(2;7) -Dat
   ‘Aki-tyan did take that.’ (A: Aki-tyan-ga)
   (aki37.cha)(our translation)

b. Okaasan-*ni yon -da.(2;8) mother -Dat read-Past
   ‘Mother, please read this.’
   (A: Okaashan-ga) (= (7b)) (aki40.cha)(our translation)

c. Dore-*ni tsukut-ta no?(2;10) who -Dat make -Past Q
   ‘Who made (this) ?’
   (A: Dore-ga) (aki51.cha)(our translation)

d. Otoosan-*ni.(2;9) father -Dat
   ‘Father must repair this.’
   (A: Otoosan-ga) (20915.cha)(our translation)

e. Okaasan-*ni.(2;9) mother -Dat
   ‘Mother bought this.’
   (A: Okaashan-ga) (20920.cha)(our translation)

f. Ojii-tyan -*ni. Kat-taa.(3;0) grandfather-Dat buy-Past
   ‘Grandfather bought.’
   (A: Ojii-tyan-ga) (30016.cha)(our translation)

g. Mama-*ni. Mama-*ni. Mama-*ni.(2;2) mother-Dat mother-Dat mother-Dat
   ‘(My) mother ate (that).’
   (A: Mama-ga) (r20229.cha)(our translation)
In (23), the arguments, which are marked with *ni, are considered to be the subjects based on the context. Therefore, we conjecture that those children erroneously marked the subject with the Dative Case, instead of the Nominative Case.

The utterances in (24) have some errors of the Unergative constructions.

(24) The errors in the Unergatives constructions

a. Kore-wa neko-tyan-*ni tori -ni ikunda-tte.(2;3) (A: neko-tyan- ga)
   this -Top cat -Dat fetch-for go -Comp
   ‘This is that the cat will fetch.’

   Neko-tyan-*ni ikunda-tte.(2;3) (A: Neko-tyan-ga)
   cat -Dat go -Comp
   ‘The cat will go.’

   (t940623.cha)(our translation)

b. Kangaruu-*ni basu.(2;5) (A: Kangaruu-ga)(=7a)
   kangaroo -Dat bus
   ‘The kangaroo got on the bus.’

   (aki30.cha)(our translation)

c. Papa -*ni it -ta.(2;3) (A: Papa-ga)
   father -Dat go -Past
   ‘(My) father’s car) went.’

   (20320.cha)(our translation)

d. piipo -*ni it -ta kara.(2;4) (A: piipoo-ga)
   ambulance-Dat go-Past because
   ‘Because the ambulance went,’

   (20407.cha)(our translation)

In (24), the Dative marked arguments are considered to be the subjects. Thus, these utterances are also regarded as the Dative Case marking errors.

In order to see if the errors in (23) and (24) are the Subject-Raising Deficit Errors or not, we examine whether or not those children have the knowledge of the Nominative Case assignment system. We examine the same four corpora, and found that Aki, Jun, Ryo and Tai have the knowledge. The data is given in (25) through (28).

(25) The correct Nominative Case assignment reported in Aki corpus (Miyata 2004a)

a. aki-tyan-ga kit -ta.(2;4)
   -Nom cut-Past
   ‘Aki cut that.’

   (aki28.cha)(our translation)
b. Kaatyan-ga ne -ta.(2;3)
mother -Nom sleep-Past

‘(My) mother went to the bed.’  (aki23.cha)(our translation)

(26) The correct Nominative Case assignment reported in Jun corpus (Ishii 2004)

a. Jun-ga kowashi-ta.(2;3)
   -Nom break -Past

‘Jun broke that.’  (20327.cha)(our translation)

b. ookii buubuu-ga ki -ta.(2;2)
   big car -Nom come-Past

‘A big car came.’  (20205.cha)(our translation)

(27) The correct Nominative Case assignment reported in Tai corpus (Miyata 2004b)

a. mikkii-tyan-ga ato huk -u.(1;9)
   Mickey -Nom rest wipe-Pres

‘Mickey will wipe the rest.’  (t940204.cha)(our translation)

b. kocchi-ga ik-u.(1;9)
   this -Nom go-Pres

‘This will go.’  (t940204.cha)(our translation)

(28) The correct Nominative Case assignment reported in Ryo corpus (Miyata 2004c)

a. oneetyan-ga motte-iru.(1;11)
   sister -Nom bring-be

‘(My) sister brings that.’  (r11118.cha)(our translation)

b. kocchi-ga toora -nai.(2;0)
   here -Nom go through-not

‘This does not go through here.’  (r20317.cha)(our translation)

From (25) through (28), (a) has a simple Transitive construction, and (b) has a simple
Unergative constructions. In each sentence, those four children assigned the Nominative Case
to the subject “correctly”. These data indicate that, when Aki, Jun, Ryo and Tai make the
Dative Case marking errors, they have the knowledge of the Nominative Case assignment
system. Thus the errors in (23) and (24) are the instances of the Subject-Raising Deficit
Errors.

As the result, we found the Dative Case marking errors in the Transitive constructions
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and the Unergative constructions, but we did not find the errors in the Unaccusative constructions. The descriptive findings are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3: The descriptive findings of the child errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Types of constructions</th>
<th>Subject-Raising Deficit Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>Complex Predicates</td>
<td>Observed (Murasugi and Machida 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitives</td>
<td>Observed (Suzuki 2002, CHILDES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unergatives</td>
<td>Observed (CHILDES)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>Unaccusatives</td>
<td>Not Observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, the Subject-Raising Deficit Errors are observed only in the complex predicate, Transitive, and Unergative constructions. However, we never find the errors in the Unaccusative constructions. The Subject-Raising Deficit Hypothesis can explain why there found the Dative Case marking errors in the complex predicate, Transitive and Unergative constructions. As Murasugi and Machida (1998) analyze, the subject that does not move to TP-SPEC cannot get the Nominative Case from anything. Therefore, the Dative Case is inserted as default to the subject position in order to satisfy the Case Filter. Furthermore, if we employ the Nominative Case assignment system in the Unaccusative constructions by Kuno (1973) and Yatsushiro (1999), among others, we can explain why it is the case that the errors are not observed in the Unaccusative constructions. This is because the subject can get the Nominative Case from each verb even if it does not move to TP-SPEC.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we studied the erroneous Dative marking on the subject found in the intermediate acquisition stage of the Japanese-speaking children. Our descriptive study was based on the longitudinal studies reported in the previous literatures (Murasugi and Machida 1998 and Suzuki 2002), and the analysis of CHILDES databases (MacWhinney 2000). Our starting point was Murasugi and Machida’s (1998) reporting that a Japanese-speaking child erroneously assigns ni on the subject in the complex predicates at the stage where she has already acquired the adult Nominative Case assignment system. They analyze that the Dative marking errors in the complex predicate constructions reflect the intermediate acquisition stage where the subject does not move to TP-SPEC.⁹

We reported that there are ni errors found in the Transitive and Unergative constructions as well. Those children who showed the erroneous ni-marking already had a good command of ga-marking, as Murasugi and Machida (1998) discussed. In addition, we found no ni errors in the Unaccusative constructions. By employing the analysis on the Nominative Case

---

⁹ Platzack (1997, 2002) discusses that EPP is parameterized; the strong EPP feature and the weak EPP feature. Watanabe (in preparation), in her MA thesis, discusses the possibility that Japanese-speaking children make the Subject-Raising Deficit Errors because they may wrongly assume that the Japanese EPP feature of T is weak. See Watanabe (in preparation) for the details.
assignment in the Unaccusatives by Kuno (1973) and Yatsushiro (1990), among others, we discussed in this paper that we can elegantly explain the lack of the *ni* errors in the Unaccusative constructions under the hypothesis proposed by Murasugi and Machida (1998).

References


Miyata, Susanne. (2004a) The Aki-Corpus-Longitudinal Speech Data of a Japanese Boy aged 1;5-3;0, (available through CHILD Language Data Exchange System).


Miyata, Susanne. (2004c) The Ryo-Corpus-Longitudinal Speech Data of a Japanese Boy aged 1;4-3;0, (available through CHILD Language Data Exchange System).


