

## **Raising-to-Object: From a Different Plane**

The so-called "Raising-to-Object (henceforth RTO)" construction is both interesting and problematic, in that it apparently allows exceptional interactions of A- and A'-movement, where an embedded constituent apparently undergoes A'-movement to feed A-movement for Case-licensing in the matrix clause. Such cross-clausal movement for Case has been claimed to be illicit, violating the Uniformity Condition on chains (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993). In addition to the movement and the base-generation approaches, a third approach has become possible in the recent framework (Chomsky 2000, 2001), which crucially assumes that the NP in question is in the "edge" position, that is, a position accessible to operations from both the matrix clause and the embedded clause (Hiraiwa 2002a, b and Bruening 2001a, b, among others). However, a closer examination of the data reveals that RTO does not necessarily interact with syntactic operations such as Move or Agree. In this talk, I re-examine the data on RTO in Japanese and analyze the factors involved in this rather limited construction. I then claim that RTO sentences emerge when the embedded predicate allows the "predication" relation (Heycock 1993), which is independent of its theta-role properties. Assuming the phrase-structure theory of Chomsky 2001, I show how Case licensing and Linearization processes interact to yield an apparently "raised" accusative phrase in the construction under discussion.