



Subject-to-Subject Raising in the Nai-de Iru Construction

Kishimoto, Hideki

(Citation)

神戸言語学論叢, 6:44-55

(Issue Date)

2009-01

(Resource Type)

departmental bulletin paper

(Version)

Version of Record

(JaLCOI)

<https://doi.org/10.24546/81001520>

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/81001520>



SUBJECT-TO-SUBJECT RAISING IN THE *NAI-DE IRU* CONSTRUCTION

Hideki Kishimoto

Kobe University

1. INTRODUCTION

In Japanese, the aspectual marker *-te iru* is formed morphologically by combining *-te* and the verb *iru*, and can express a variety of aspectual meanings, which may differ according to the semantic property of its host verb. The *-te iru* construction has a complex structure with complementation, and interestingly, negative *nai* can either precede or follow *-te iru*. The negative expression where *nai* follows *-te iru* is construed as a simply negated form of *-te iru*. But when *nai* is positioned to the left of *-te iru*, a semantic restriction is imposed on the choice of the subject. Owing to the constraint that is imposed on *nai-de iru*, Takezawa (2004) analyzes the *nai-de iru* construction as having a subject-control structure, but in this paper, it is argued that the *nai-de iru* construction should involve subject-raising rather than control.

2. SOME PECULIAR PROPERTIES OF *NAI-DE IRU*

In Japanese, the aspectual expression *-te iru* consists of the morpheme *-te* and the verb *iru* ‘be’. This maker can express a number of different meanings, which are largely determined depending on the host verb to which it attaches.¹ The complex expression *-te iru* can be combined with any type of verb.

- (1) a. *John-ga hasit-te i-ru.*
John-NOM run-PTCP be-PRES
‘John is running.’
b. *Musi-ga sin-de i-ru.*
insect-NOM die-PTCP be-PRES
‘The insect has died.’

One of the controversial issues in the Japanese literature concerns the question of what interpretation can be assigned to *-te iru*. For the purpose of the present paper, however, this is not relevant, but rather, we are concerned with the question of what structure *-te iru* has when it is negated taking the form of *nai-de iru*.

When sentences with *-te iru* are negated, the negative marker *nai* most typically follows *-te iru*, as shown in (2).

- (2) a. *John-ga hasit-te i-na-i.*
 John-NOM run-PTCP be-NEG-PRES
 ‘John is not running.’
 b. *Musi-ga sin-de i-na-i.*
 insect-NOM die-PTCP be-NEG-PRES
 ‘The insect has not died.’

Since no peculiar constraints are imposed on this type of negation, the negative sentences where *nai* follows *-te iru* can be formed without any restriction. This is not the only form of negation, however. The negative *nai* may precede the verb *iru*, in which case the complex expression *nai-de iru* is formed, as seen in (3).

- (3) a. *John-ga mada hasira-nai-de i-ru.*
 John-NOM yet run-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘John has not been running yet.’
 b. *Musi-ga mada sina-nai-de i-na-i.*
 insect-NOM yet die-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘The insect has not died yet.’

Some semantic restrictions are imposed on this type of negative clause. In particular, it has been observed (e.g. Takahashi 1969, Kinsui 2000) that when the negative *nai* appears in the *nai-de iru* form, subjects are most typically confined to animate entities. Thus, the following sentences, which contain inanimate subjects, are odd.

- (4) a. **Ishi-ga ugoka-nai-de i-ru.*
 stone-NOM move-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘The stone has not moved.’
 b. **Kono-zyaguti-kara-wa mizu-ga de-nai-de i-ru.*
 this-facet-from-TOP water-NOM come.out-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘Water has not been coming out from this facet.’

It goes without saying that this kind of animate restriction is not observed when *nai* follows *-te iru*.

- (5) a. *Ishi-ga ugoi-te i-na-i.*
 stone-NOM move-PTCP be-NEG-PRES
 ‘The stone is not moving.’
 b. *Kono-zyaguti-kara-wa mizu-ga de-te i-na-i.*
 this-facet-from-TOP water-NOM come.out-PTCP be-NEG-PRES
 ‘Water is not coming out from this facet.’

Takezawa (2004) claims that the animacy restriction that constrains the choice of the subject can be attributed to the *nai-de iru* construction’s having a control structure like (6).

- (6) [_{TP} DP_i-ga [_{TP} PRO_i V-nai-de] i-ru]

At first sight, this analysis looks plausible, since it is well-observed that an animacy restriction is imposed on control constructions. However, the semantic requirement imposed on the *nai-de iru* construction possesses certain properties which differ crucially from those observed in control constructions. In the light of this fact, we propose that the *nai-de iru* construction does not involve control. Furthermore, by looking at the behavior of NPIs, it is claimed that the *nai-de iru* construction should instead fall into a type of subject-raising construction.² We will turn to this discussion in the next section.

3. *NAI-DE IRU* AS A RAISING CONSTRUCTION

Let us start with the discussion of the structure of the *nai-de iru* construction. One of the notable properties of this construction is that negative *nai* precedes *-te iru*. Zanuttini (1997) argues that in order to project NegP, a clause needs to have a TP projection as well. This means that TP is a prerequisite for the presence of NegP. Given this, we can reasonably assume that there are two instances of TP in the *nai-de iru* construction, as depicted in (7b).

- (7) a. *John-ga hon-o yoma-nai-de i-ru.*
 John-NOM book-ACC read-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘John has not been reading books.’
 b. [_{TP} John-ga [_{TP} hon-o yoma-nai-de] i-ru]

For the sake of exposition, let us assume that Zanuttini’s generalization holds in Japanese, and further, that the morpheme *-te* serves as a T-head which projects TP (see Takezawa and Whitman 1998).³ Now, if, as discussed by Takezawa (2004), the *nai-de iru* construction involves control, (8a) should be posited for (7a). On the other hand, if (7a) involves raising, it should have the structure (8b).

- (8) a. [_{TP} John-ga [_{TP} PRO hon-o yoma-nai-de] i-ru]
 b. [_{TP} John-ga [_{TP} ~~John-ga~~ hon-o yoma-nai-de] i-ru]

The question to be addressed is which structure should be posited for the *nai-de iru* construction. In the following discussion, we will argue that (8b) should be the right structure.

There are a number of reasons why the *nai-de iru* construction should not involve control. A first one has to do with the fact that the animacy effect observed for the *nai-de iru* construction differs from what we observe for genuine control constructions. As is often noted in the literature, the subject of the *nai-de iru* construction is generally confined to an animate one, but we can nevertheless find exceptions, as in (9) (see Kinsui 2000).

- (9) *Imadani sora-ga hare-nai-de i-ru.*⁴
 yet sky-NOM clear-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘The sky has not been clear yet.’

Note that weather expressions like *sora-ga hareru* ‘the sky clears up’ are not compatible with control constructions. This is illustrated in (10).

- (10) a. **Sora-ga hare-ta-i.*
 sky-NOM clear-want-PRES
 ‘The sky wants to clear up.’
 b. **Sora-ga hare-wasure-ta/hare-sokone-ta.*
 sky-NOM clear-forget-PAST/clear-fail-PAST
 ‘The sky forgot/failed to clear up.’
 c. ?**Watasi-wa sora-ni hare-te hosi-i.*
 I-TOP sky-DAT clear-PTCP want-PRES
 ‘I want the sky to clear up.’
 d. **Sora-ga hare-ru tumori-da.*
 sky-NOM clear-PRES intend-COP
 ‘The sky intends to clear up.’

The examples in (10), all of which we can assume involve control complements, are unacceptable if the expression *sora-ga hareru* ‘the sky clears up’ is embedded as complement. In Japanese control constructions, inanimate subjects are excluded due to the animacy restriction. Nevertheless, (9) is acceptable. If the data in (9) and (10) are compared, it is easy to see that the semantic restriction imposed on (9) differs in nature from the animacy constraint pertaining to control constructions.

Another reason for not opting for the control analysis for the *nai-de iru* construction comes from the fact that the *nai-de iru* construction allows potential predicates to appear in the complement clause, as shown in (11).

- (11) a. *Imadani John-ni ronbun-ga kake-nai-de i-ru.*
 yet John-DAT paper-NOM write.can-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘John has not written a paper yet.’
 b. *Imadani John-ga ronbun-o kake-nai-de i-ru.*
 yet John-NOM paper-ACC write.can-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘John has not written a paper yet.’

Potential verbs can take either a dative-nominative or a nominative-accusative case pattern, and as shown in (11), both case arrays are compatible with the *nai-de iru* construction. This obviously differs from what we find in control constructions. The examples in (12) show that potential verbs are excluded when they take the dative-nominative case pattern.

- (12) a. **John-ni ronbun-ga kake-ta-i.*
 John-DAT paper-NOM write.can-want-PRES
 ‘John wants to be able to write a paper.’
 b. **John-ni ronbun-ga kake-wasure-ta/kake-sokone-ta.*
 John-DAT paper-NOM write.can-forget-PAST/write.can-fail-PAST
 ‘John forgot/failed to be able to write a paper.’
 c. **John-ni ronbun-ga kake-ru tumori-da.*
 John-DAT paper-NOM write.can-PRES intend-COP

‘John intends to be able to write a paper.’

Even when they take the nominative-accusative case pattern, they are excluded from control constructions, as can be seen in (13).

- (13) a. **John-ga ronbun-o kake-ta-i.*
 John-NOM paper-ACC write.can-want-PRES
 ‘John wants to be able to write a paper.’
 b. **John-ga ronbun-o kake-wasure-ta/kake-sokone-ta.*
 John-NOM paper-ACC write.can-forget-PAST/write.can-fail-PAST
 ‘John forgot/failed to be able to write a paper.’
 c. **John-ga ronbun-o kake-ru tumori-da.*
 John-NOM paper-ACC write.can-PRES intend-COP
 ‘John intends to be able to write a paper.’

The examples in (12) and (13) suggest that potential predicates cannot be embedded under control clauses. Note, however, that when the potential verb is embedded under *hosii* ‘want’, the sentence is acceptable.

- (14) *Watasi-wa John-ni ronbun-ga kake-te hosi-i.*
 I-TOP John-DAT paper-NOM write.can-PTCP want-PRES
 ‘I want John to be able to write a paper.’

At first sight, it might look as though (14) falsifies the present claim that potential predicates are not compatible with control complements, but in fact, it does not. The acceptability of (14) comes from the fact that the sentence does not involve control, but rather has simple embedding of the subordinate clause.

- (15) a. *Watasi-wa John-ni [PRO ronbun-ga kake-te] hosi-i.*
 b. *Watasi-wa [John-ni ronbun-ga kake-te] hosi-i.*

As discussed in Kishimoto (2005), *hosii* ‘want’ does not have to select a control complement, hence, its complement clause is often not sensitive to the animacy constraint. In particular, when the subject of a stative predicate is marked with dative case, two different construals are possible: On the one hand, the dative phrase could be construed as located in the main clause while controlling PRO in the embedded clause. On the other, it could also be construed as appearing as the embedded subject, in which case no control construal should be involved. This ambiguity does not arise if the object is marked in the accusative case.

- (16) ?**Watasi-wa John-ni ronbun-o kake-te hosi-i.*
 I-TOP John-DAT paper-ACC write.can-PTCP want-PRES
 ‘I want John to be able to write a paper.’

In (16), only the control structure is available. The reason is that in Japanese, a stative predicate cannot take a dative-accusative pattern owing to the nominative case

requirement, which requires the presence of a nominative phrase per clause. This can be easily seen in the example (17).

- (17) **John-ni ronbun-o kake-ru.*
 John-DAT paper-ACC write.can-PRES
 ‘John can write a paper.’

Thus, the sentence in (16) cannot involve simple embedding, but rather it must have a control structure. Nevertheless, (16) turns out to be ill-formed, due to the fact that a potential predicate cannot appear in the control configuration. Note that in (16), unpronounced PRO corresponds to the nominative argument of *kakeru* ‘can write’. This makes it possible for the embedded clause not to comprise an overtly realized nominative phrase. We can easily confirm that a nominative phrase can be missing, at least phonetically, if it serves as PRO by looking at (18).

- (18) *Watasi-wa John-ni [PRO ronbun-o kai-te] hosi-i.*
 I-TOP John-DAT paper-ACC write-PTCP want-PRES
 ‘I want John to write a paper.’

In (18) the embedded clause lacks an overtly realized nominative phrase, but still, the sentence is acceptable. In the light of the acceptability of (18), we can easily see that (16) is not ruled out by virtue of the nominative case requirement. The nominative case requirement constrains the embedded clause in (18), but it looks as though this requirement is voided on the surface, due to the fact that invisible PRO, which corresponds to the nominative phrase, is included in the embedded clause.

The availability of idiom interpretations for clausal idioms provides further confirmation for the analysis taking the *nai-de iru* construction to involve subject-to-subject raising rather than subject control. To be concrete, consider (19), which contains a clausal idiom *men-ga wareru* ‘be identified’.

- (19) *Mada, supai-no men-ga ware-nai-de i-ru.*
 still spy-GEN mask-NOM break-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘Still the spy’s identify has not been revealed.’

In (19) the idiomatic meaning of *men-ga wareru* is available. Ordinary control constructions do not pattern with the *nai-de iru* construction, in that they do not preserve the idiomatic meaning, as seen in (20).

- (20) a. **Supai-no men-ga ware-ta-i.*
 spy-GEN mask-NOM break-want-PRES
 ‘The spy wants to be identified.’
 b. **Supai-no men-ga ware-wasure-ta/ware-sokone-ta.*
 spy-GEN mask-NOM break-forget-PAST/break-fail-PAST
 ‘The spy forgot/failed to be identified.’
 c. ?**Watasi-wa supai-no men-ni ware-te hosi-i.*
 I-TOP spy-GEN mask-DAT break-PTCP want-PRES
 ‘I want the spy to be identified.’

- d. **Supai-no men-ga ware-ru tumori-da.*
 spy-GEN mask-NOM break-PRES intend-COP
 ‘The spy intends to be identified.’

Since the retention of idiomatic meanings for clausal idioms is one of the characteristic properties of raising constructions, it is reasonable to state that the *nai-de iru* construction involves subject-to-subject raising.

Finally, but not in the least, we can have a piece of structural evidence which supports the view that the *nai-de iru* construction should involve subject-to-subject raising rather than control. To be concrete, let us consider (21).

- (21) *Kodomo-ga hon-o yoma-nai-de i-ru.*
 child-NOM book-ACC read-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘The child has not been reading books.’

As pointed out by Takezawa (2004), this construction displays a subject-object asymmetry in NPI licensing. Thus, we can have a contrast in acceptability between (22a) and (22b).

- (22) a. ?**Kodomo-sika hon-o yoma-nai-de i-ta.*
 child-only book-ACC read-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘Only the child has been reading books.’
 b. *Kodomo-ga hon-sika yoma-nai-de i-ta.*
 child-NOM book-only read-NEG-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘The child has been reading only books.’

The data in (22) indicate that the subject lies outside the scope domain of *nai*. In the *nai-de iru* construction, the negative *nai* precedes the higher verbal predicate *iru*, which means that the negative is located within the embedded clause. We can assume that the scope of *nai* extends only over the embedded clause (see Kishimoto 2007a, 2008). Thus, in the light of the unacceptability of (22a), we can postulate that the subject is located in the matrix clause. Given this, we can posit either (23a) or (23b) for the *nai-de iru* construction (21).

- (23) a. [Kodomo-ga [~~Kodomo-ga~~ hon-o yoma-nai-de] i-ru]
 b. [Kodomo-ga [PRO hon-o yoma-nai-de] i-ru]

It is important to keep in mind here that it is not possible to decide whether (21) has a raising or a control construal merely on the basis of the subject-object asymmetry in NPI licensing in (22). Nevertheless, we can adduce some empirical evidence for subject raising from oblique-subject constructions (see e.g. Nitta 1980, 1997). To illustrate, consider (24), where the subject is marked with *de* ‘with’.

- (24) *Sensei-tati-de sono-koto-o hanasi-ta.*
 teacher-PL-with that-matter-ACC speak-PAST
 ‘The teachers spoke about that matter.’

Semantically, the subject marked with *de* must refer to a group of individuals which are construed as the agents of the action denoted by the verb. As discussed in Kishimoto (to appear), one notable fact of oblique-subject constructions is that the subjects remain in vP-internal position.⁵ In this regard, oblique subjects stand in contrast with ordinary nominative subjects, which undergo raising to Spec of TP from within vP. The structural difference between two types of subjects can be assessed, for instance, by looking at whether the subject falls under the scope of *mo* ‘also’ attached to the verb.

- (25) a. *Gakusei-tati-de sono-koto-o hanasi-ta, sosite*
 student-PL-with that-matter-ACC speak-PAST and
 ‘The students spoke about that matter, and...’
 b. *Sensei-tati-de sono-koto-o hanasi-mo si-ta.*
 teacher-PL-with that-matter-ACC speak-also do-PAST
 ‘The teachers, too, spoke about that matter.’

When (25a) counts as a preceding sentence, (25b) can be understood as meaning that the teachers are the additional members of the group who participate in talking. The data suggest that *mo* can be associated with the *de*-marked subject. If the subject is marked with nominative case, this interpretation is not available.

- (26) a. *Gakusei-tati-ga sono-koto-o hanasi-ta, sosite*
 student-PL-NOM that-matter-ACC speak-PAST and
 ‘The students spoke about that matter, and...’
 b. *Sensei-tati-ga sono-koto-o hanasi-mo si-ta.*
 teacher-PL-NOM that-matter-ACC speak-also do-PAST
 ‘The teachers also spoke about that matter.’

As discussed in Kishimoto (2007b), *mo* takes scope over vP, which means that any constituent within vP can be counted as the focus of *mo*. If the possibility of *mo*-focusing on the two types of subjects is derived from a difference in their structural position, we can say that the *de*-marked subject remains in vP-internal position, while the nominative-marked subject is raised to Spec of TP. Thus, we can posit the following structures for the two types of sentences.

- (27) a. [_{TP} [_{vP} Sensei-tati-de sono-koto-o hanasi] ta]
 b. [_{TP} Sensei-tati-ga [_{vP} ~~Sensei-tati-ga~~ sono-koto-o hanasi] ta]

The important point to be noted here is that the *de*-marked subject does not appear in Spec of TP, which counts as a clause-level subject position.

Now, given that the subject-raising operation at issue moves a subject located in the lower TP to the matrix one, we would expect that the *de*-marked subject—which resides in a vP-internal position lower than TP—should not undergo subject-to-subject raising. This in turn leads to the prediction that an NPI subject marked with *de* should fall under the scope of *nai* located in the embedded clause. This prediction is borne out.

- (28) *Sensei-tati-de-sika sono-koto-o hanasa-nai-de i-ru.*
 teacher-PL-with-only that-matter-ACC speak-NEG-PTCP be-PRES

‘Only the teachers spoke about that matter.’

The acceptability of (28) indicates that the *de*-marked subject falls inside the scope of *nai* occurring to the right of *iru*, hence, must reside in the embedded clause, as illustrated in (29).

(29) [TP [TP sensei-tati-de sono-koto-o hanasa-nai-de] i-ru]

This construal would not be expected if the *nai-de iru* construction involved control. In control constructions, a control predicate selects an argument that controls PRO. If the *nai-de iru* construction possessed a control structure, we would expect that the *de*-subject in (28) should appear in the matrix clause, rather than the embedded clause, and that the sentence should be excluded as unacceptable. This is not in keeping with the facts, so we conclude that the *nai-de iru* construction involves subject raising.

We can further confirm the adequacy of the present analysis by embedding *nai-de iru* sentences under a control construction. For illustration, let us consider a control construction with the predicate *morau* ‘get’. First, the examples in (30) suggest that this construction involves control.

- (30) a. *Watasi-wa sensei-ni hanasi-te morat-ta.*
 I-TOP teacher-DAT speak-PTCP get-PAST
 ‘I got the teacher to speak.’
 b. **Watasi-wa ame-ni hut-te morat-ta.*
 I-TOP rain-DAT fall-PTCP get-PAST
 ‘I got the rain to fall.’

Since the animacy constraint observed in other control constructions also obtains in the *-te morau* construction, we can plausibly assume that (30a) has a control structure depicted in (31).

(31) [*Watasi-wa sensei-tati_i-ni* [PRO_i *hanasi-te*] *morat-ta*]

In (31), the predicate selects an argument that controls the subject of the embedded clause. This leads to the prediction that if the controller is turned into an NPI, the sentence should be illegitimate, since the controller NPI lies outside the scope of *nai* located in the embedded clause. This prediction is borne out.

- (32) **Watasi-wa sensei-ni-sika hanasa-nai-de morat-ta.*
 I-TOP teacher-DAT-only speak-NEG-PTCP get-PAST
 ‘I got only the teacher to speak.’

Note that in the *-te morau* construction, a *de*-subject is allowed to appear as a phrase controlling PRO (see Kishimoto 2005).

- (33) *Watasi-wa kodomo-tati-de ason-de morat-ta.*
 I-TOP child-PL-with play-PTCP get-PAST
 ‘I got the children to play.’

In this construction, even if the subject marked with *de* is turned into an NPI, it is not licensed by *nai*, as shown in (34).

- (34) **Watasi-wa kodomo-tati-de-sika asoba-nai-de morat-ta.*
 I-TOP child-PL-with-only play-NEG-PTCP get-PAST
 ‘I got only the children to play.’

The data regarding NPI licensing in (32) and (34) show that the subject controlling PRO resides in the matrix clause regardless of its morphological marking.

- (35) [TP kodomo-tati-ni/kotomo-tati-de [TP PRO asoba-nai-de] mora-u]

The important fact is that when PRO serves as the subject of the negated embedded clause, its controller is located in a higher clause.⁶

Recall here that in (28) the *de*-marked subject can be licensed by a negative marker *nai* located in the lower clause, but the nominative subject in (22a) cannot. This shows that subjects are located in different clauses depending on their morphological marking.

- (36) a. [TP Kodomo-ga [TP ~~Kodomo-ga~~ nai-de] i-ru]
 b. [TP [TP Kodomo-tati-de ... nai-de] i-ru]

Notably, the *de*-marked subject, unlike the nominative subject, remains in vP-internal position of the embedded clause. In this case, no subject-to-subject raising into a higher clause is implemented. In the case of the nominative subject, it resides in Spec of TP in the embedded clause, so it is raised to the main clause. This difference would not be expected if the subject in the *nai-de iru* construction were generated in the main clause. The data on the asymmetry of NPI licensing observed in (32) and (34) offer us substantial empirical evidence that the *nai-de iru* construction involves raising rather than control.

To summarize, we have seen that there are at least four pieces of evidence indicating that the *nai-de iru* construction involves subject-to-subject raising rather than subject control. First, it has been argued that the animacy constraint imposed on the subject of the *nai-de iru* construction differs from what we observe for control constructions. Second, the fact that potential predicates can be embedded under *nai-de iru* suggests that this construction should not involve control structure. Third, the fact that the *nai-de iru* construction allows a clausal idiom to appear while preserving its idiomatic meaning lends further support to the analysis taking this construction to involve subject-to-subject raising, rather than control. Finally, we have provided structural evidence indicating that the subject of the *nai-de iru* construction starts out from within the subordinate clause. These facts naturally lead to the conclusion that the *nai-de iru* construction invokes the raising of a subject in the lower clause to the matrix clause.

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article, we have presented several arrays of empirical evidence showing that the *nai-de iru* construction involves subject-to-subject raising rather than subject control.

We have argued that the animacy restriction imposed on the *nai-de iru* construction crucially differs from the constraint we observe for control constructions, and that the facts pertaining to potential predicates and clausal idioms display properties characteristic of subject-raising constructions. Furthermore, NPI data provide structural evidence for the raising analysis for the *nai-de iru* construction. One of the important consequences of the present analysis is that the animacy constraint imposed on this construction does not come from a structural factor, contrary to what is claimed by Takezawa (2004).

NOTES

¹ The predominant meaning that can be assigned to (1a) is a progressive one, which expresses the meaning of ‘John is in the process of running’. On the other hand, (1b) has the predominant perfective meaning of ‘the insect has already died’. The negative sentences express the meaning that the relevant event described by the verb does not happen.

² This does not mean that all *V-nai* forms followed by *-te* involve a raising construction. As the reader can easily verify, forms like *na-ide oku* ‘decide not to’ and *nai-de miru* ‘try not to’ have control structures.

³ The view that *-te* constitutes a head that projects an independent maximal projection gains support from (i).

- (i) John-ga hasiri-mo si-te i-ru.
 John-NOM run-also do-PTCP be-PRES
 ‘John is also running.’

As seen in (i), *-te* can be separated from the main verb if *mo* is added to the verb stem. In this case, the supportive verb *suru* ‘do’ is inserted to the left of *-te*. The fact that *-te* can stand independently of the main verb indicates that *-te* should constitute a functional element which stands independently of the verb in the syntax.

⁴ This expression seems to be accepted on the grounds that the sky is seen as an entity to undergo a certain change which is expected to take place in the natural course of the event.

⁵ In this paper, we adopt the split vP structure. see Chomsky (1995) for discussion on this hypothesis.

⁶ The two subjects should occupy different syntactic positions within the matrix clause, but the difference does not make any difference in the NPI licensing at issue, since both fall outside the scope of negation.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, Noam. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 Kishimoto, Hideki. (2005). *Toogokoozoo-to Bunpookankei*. Tokyo: Kurosio.
 Kishimoto, Hideki. (2007a). “Negative scope and head raising in Japanese.” *Lingua* 117, pp. 247-288.
 Kishimoto, Hideki. (2007b). “Notes on syntactic compound verb constructions in Japanese.” *Kobe Working Papers in Linguistics* 5, pp. 93-109.
 Kishimoto, Hideki. (2008). “On the variability of negative scope in Japanese.” *Journal of Linguistics* 44, pp. 379-435.
 Kishimoto, Hideki. (to appear). “Subject raising in Japanese.” In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics* (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics).

- Kinsui, Satoshi. (2000). "Toki-no hyoogen." In Satoshi Kinsui, Naoko Kudoo, and Yoshiko Numata, *Toki-Hitei-to Toritate*, pp. 3-92. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Nitta, Yoshio. (1980). *Goironteki Toogoron*. Tokyo: Meijishoin.
- Nitta, Yoshio. (1997). *Nihongo Bunpoo Kenkyuu Zyosetsu*. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Takahashi, Taro. (1969). "Sugata-to mokuromi." In Haruhiko Kindaichi (ed.) *Nihongodoosi-no Asupekuto*, pp. 115-153. Tokyo: Mugi Shyobo.
- Takezawa, Koichi. (2004). "Nihongo hukugoo-zyutugo-ni-okeru hiteizi-no iti-to setu-koozoo." *Nihongo Bunpoo Gakkai Dai-go-kai Taikaihappyo Ronbunshuu*, pp. 175-184. Nihongo Bunpoo Gakkai.
- Takezawa, Koichi, and John Whitman. (1998). *Kaku-to Gozyun-to Toogokozoo*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella. (1997). *Negation and Clause Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.