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**Synopsis:** Long-distance (LD) scrambling of ‘true adjuncts’ is illicit in Japanese on its own, but it becomes acceptable when accompanied by another scrambling of arguments, as shown in (1). This paper investigates what types of movement can show this additional scrambling effect (ASE). It is argued that the ASE is best accounted for by the vP-fronting approach (Koizumi 2000).

**Boeckx&Sugisaki’s clause-mate condition:** Boeckx&Sugisaki (1998) argue for the clause-mate condition on the ASE based on (2). In (2), an accusative object has LD-scrambled from the most embedded clause. Logically speaking, there are three possibilities for the original site of an adjunct, as shown in readings (i)-(iii). (2) allows the readings (i) and (iii), but not (ii). (i) is available since it doesn’t involve LD-scrambling of the adjunct. The contrast between (ii) and (iii) then indicates ASEs arise if an argument and an adjunct originate in the same finite clause.

**Additional data:** (3) shows ASEs are observed for an argument and an adjunct which originate in the same non-finite clause. (4) is a counterpart of (2) with reading (ii) which involves a non-finite clause. It is acceptable, i.e., the clause-mate condition doesn’t hold if a lower clause is non-finite, and arguments originate lower than adjuncts. Consider next cases where adjuncts originate lower than arguments. (5) and (6) show scrambling of higher arguments cannot save LD-scrambling of adjuncts out of finite, or non-finite clauses. The patterns on ASEs are summarized in (7)-(9).

**Analysis:** I argue these properties of ASEs are predicted by the vP-fronting analysis. Koizumi (2000) argues that due to overt V-raising out of vP, a constituent that contains internal arguments and adjuncts, but not the verb, can be formed in Japanese. ASEs arise when there is scrambling of vP that contains an argument and an adjunct, as illustrated in (10).

This approach predicts ASEs arise only when an argument and an adjunct can be within the same vP. Given this, consider (11). It shows only arguments from non-finite clauses can follow matrix subjects via scrambling. I take these facts as evidence that only arguments from non-finite clauses can land in the edge of vP. Then, (4) can be derived as in (12). (12a) illustrates vP that takes an Obj₂ and a non-finite clause complement, within which an Obj₁ has moved to the edge. The Obj₁ then moves to the vP-edge in (12b). In (12c), the non-finite clause and Obj₂ move above the adjunct. Finally, in (12d), V move outside of vP. As a result of these movements, we get the boxed vP that contains the Obj₁ and the adjunct. By moving this vP, we can derive (4). Note that for this derivation to be possible, the step in (12b) is crucial. If a phrase from a lower clause cannot land in the vP-edge, we cannot get the vP that contains that phrase and another phrase. Since, in (11), we have seen only arguments from non-finite clauses can land in the vP-edge, the vP-fronting analysis correctly predicts only they show ASEs.
   reason-even without K.-NOM M.-NOM ball-ACC threw that said 
   ‘lit. Without any reason₁, Ken said [that Mari threw the ball t₁].’

b. *[Riyuu-mo naku], booru-o₂ Ken-ga [Mari-ga t₁ t₂ nageta to] itta. 
   ‘lit. Without any reason₁ the ball₂, Ken said [that Mari threw t₂ t₁].’

(2) [Riyuu-mo naku]₁ [i, ii, iii] [sono setu-o] John-ga t₁ [Mary-ga t₂i [Bill-ga t₂i t₁ shinzhita 
   reason-even without that theory-ACC J.-NOM M.-NOM B.-NOM believed to] omotta to] syutousita. 
   that thought that claimed 
   ‘lit. [Without any reason]₁ [that theory]₁, J. claimed t₁ [M. thought t₂i [B. believed t₁ t₂i]].’

   reason-even without J.-NOM M.-DAT door-ACC close 
   asked ‘Without any reason₁, John asked Mary [to close the door t₁].’

   ‘lit. Without any reason₁ the door₂, John asked Mary [to close t₂ t₁].’

(4) [Riyuu-mo naku]₂ [kono hon-o] Bill-ga [John-ga t₂ Mary-ni [t₁ yomo yooni] tanonnda 
   that said ‘lit. Without any reason₂ this book₁, Bill said that John t₂ asked Mary to read t₁.’

   reason-even without B.-DAT J.-NOM M.-NOM door-ACC closed that said 
   ‘lit. Without any reason₁ to Bill₂, John said t₂ [that Mary closed the door t₁].’

   reason-even without M.-DAT J.-NOM door-ACC close 
   asked ‘lit. Without any reason₁ Mary₂, John asked t₂ [to close the door t₁].’

(7) Arguments and adjuncts (8) Higher arguments within the same clause and lower adjuncts (9) Lower arguments and higher adjuncts

```
[CP ... [XP ... Arg Adj ]] [CP Arg [XP ... Adj ]] [CP [CP ... Adj [XP ... Arg ]]]
XP: FIN CP ✓ (1b) XP: FIN CP ✗ (5) XP: FIN CP ✗ (2ii)
XP: N-FIN CP ✓ (3b) XP: N-FIN CP ✗ (6) XP: N-FIN CP ✓ (4)
```

(10) a. [Subj [vP Adj DO V] T] b. [Subj [vP Adj DO tv] V+T] c. [[vP Adj DO tv] [Subj tvP V+T]]

   J.-NOM that book-ACC everyone-DAT M.-NOM have that said 
   ‘lit. John, that book₁, said to everyone that Mary has t₁.’ (Saito 1985:267)

   M.-NOM that book-ACC B.-DAT read, said 
   ‘lit. John, that book₁, asked Mary to read t₁.’ (Saito 1985:225)

   J.-NOM reason-even without everyone-DAT M.-NOM door-ACC closed that said 
   ‘lit. John, without any reason₁, said to everyone [that Mary closed the door t₁].’

   J.-NOM reason-even without M.-DAT door-ACC close 
   asked ‘lit. John, without any reason₁, asked Mary [to close the door t₁].’

(12) a. [vP Adj [vP Objj2 [CP Objj₁ ... tObjj] ]V] b. [vP Adj Objj₁ [vP Objj2 [CP tObjj₁ ... ]tv] V+tv]
   c. [vP Objj₂ [CP tObjj₁ ... ] [[vP Adj Objj₁ [vP tvObjj₂, tCP tv] V+tv] V+tv]
   d. [TP [vP Objj2 [CP tObjj₁ ... ] [[vP Adj Objj₁ [vP tvObjj₂, lCP tv] Vtv]] V+tv+T]