Contents
It is usually assumed that long-distance scrambling (LDS) of adjuncts and subjects is impossible in Japanese (Saïto 1985; however, see Kuno 1980, Yamashita 2013, and references cited therein for the claim that LDS of subjects is indeed possible).

(1) a. *naze Ken-ga [t_i Mari-ga yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?
   why K.-NOM M.-NOM slowly ball-ACC threw-C said-Q
   ‘Why did Ken say [Mari threw the ball slowly t_j].’

   slowly K.-NOM M.-NOM ball-ACC threw-C said-SFP
   ‘Ken said [Mari threw the ball slowly].’

c. *Mari-ga Ken-ga [naze t_k yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?
   ‘(same as (1a))’

   ‘(same as (1b))’

Koizumi (2000:241–243) observes, however, that the otherwise illicit LDS of adjuncts becomes possible if it is accompanied by another clausemate phrase which can undergo LDS on its own.

(2) a. naze booru-o Ken-ga [t_i Mari-ga yukkuri-to t_i nageta-to] itta-no?
   ‘(same as (1a))’

b. yukkuri-to booru-o Ken-ga [Mari-ga t_j t_i nageta-to] itta-yo.
   ‘(same as (1b))’

Furthermore, as Fukui and Sakai (2003:335) and Agbayani et al (2009:4.1.2.) observe, even LDS of subjects becomes possible under the same circumstances.

(3) a. Mari-ga booru-o Ken-ga [naze t_k yukkuri-to t_i nageta-to] itta-no?
   ‘(same as (1a))’

b. Mari-ga booru-o Ken-ga [t_k yukkuri-to t_i nageta-to] itta-yo.
   ‘(same as (1b))’

Note, however, that the upgrading effects in (2)–(3) can be subsumed under additional scrambling effects which Boeckx and Sugisaki (1999) argue to be an instance of Richards’ 1998 Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC); there is licit LDS of an object that “saves” the otherwise illicit LDS of adjuncts and subjects.

Consider now the following examples, which involve the combination of LDS of multiple adjuncts ((4a)) and adjunct and subject ((4b) and (5)). Quite surprisingly, these
multiple LDS are significantly much better than the single LDS of adjuncts ((1a,b)) and subjects ((1c,d)).

(4)  
a.  naze, yukkuri-to, Ken-ga [t_i Mari-ga t_j booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?  
   ‘(same as (1a))’

b.  naze, Mari-ga, Ken-ga [t_i, t_j yukkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?  
   ‘(same as (1a))’

(5)  
  yukkuri-to, Mari-ga, Ken-ga [t_i, t_j booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo.  
   ‘(same as (1)b)’

The hitherto unnoticed upgrading effects in (4)–(5) do not fall under Boeckx and Sugisaki’s PMC-based additional scrambling effect since the participants here cannot undergo LDS on its own. (4)–(5) show us that the upgrading effect emerges in the case of multiple LDS even when it is composed of illicit LDS, meaning that some sort of a PMC-independent but “generalized” additional scrambling effect is at work.

It remains to be seen how we can explain why the deviance of LDS of adjuncts and subjects significantly improves when another scrambling takes place, even when the additional scrambling is LDS of adjuncts and subjects. I hope that the effect discussed here can help us to better understand the nature of Japanese (-type) scrambling, whose nature is still subject to ongoing and lively debate.
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