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1. Introduction

One of the issues of generative theorizing in Japanese concerns the existence of V-raising to T. The studies which offer and support for V-raising to T are Otani and Whitman (1991), Koizumi (2000), Miyagawa (2001), among others. On the other hand, the studies against this head movement are Fukui and Takano (1996), Sakai (1998), Watanabe (1999) and Takano (2005). This argument has continued for decades, and is still going on. During this time, Chomsky (1995) has proposed that there is a light verb $v$, which assigns Agent-role to an external argument of its maximal projection. In this so-called “light verb hypothesis,” Chomsky assumes that V moves to $v$ overtly. This makes things more complicated. If there is V-to-T raising, then we can easily predict that V-to-$v$ raising occurs before V gets to T, for $v$ is located between V and T. But if there is no V-to-T raising, then we need to know whether V may stay in situ, or raise to $v$ either overtly or covertly. For researchers who oppose V-to-T raising (the syntactic V-raising to T does not exist, and the amalgam is the result of “morphological merger”), no positive argument has ever been presented for the existence of the V-raising to $v$. So far these researchers have accepted the assumption of V-raising to $v$, along with Chomsky (see Kishimoto (2001), Hirata (2005), Ogawa (2007), among others). This is the very point which this paper will focus on, with the intention of making it clear that Japanese has the overt V-raising to $v$, making use of indeterminate pronoun binding in the sense of Kishimoto (2001).

2. Data to be examined

2.1. Indeterminate Pronoun Binding

In Japanese, indeterminate pronouns (henceforth IPRNs) such as dare ‘anyone’ and nani ‘anything’, when they precede the Q particle mo, act as negative polarity items (McGloin (1976)):

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Taroo-wa nani-mo kaw-ana-katta.
\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Taroo-Top} anything-Q buy-Neg-Past
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘Taroo did not buy anything.’
\end{tabular}
\item b. Dare-mo sono hon-o kaw-ana-katta.
\end{enumerate}
anyone-Q that book-Acc buy-Neg-Past

‘No one bought that book.’

The Q particle *mo*, however, is not necessarily preceded directly by IPRNs, though there are some restrictions on its use, as illustrated below.

(2)  

(a) Taroo-wa nani-o kai-mo si-na-katta.

    Taroo-Top anything-Acc buy-Q do -Neg -Past

    ‘Taroo did not buy anything.’

(b) * Dare-ga Hanako-o home-mo si-na-katta.

    Anyone-Nom Hanako-Acc praise-Q do-Neg-Past

    ‘No one praised Hanako.’

When the IPRN is accusative case-marked and *mo* is attached to V, as in (2a), the sentence is acceptable. On the other hand, when the subject is an IPRN and *mo* is attached to V, the sentence is ruled out, as shown in (2b). This amounts to illustrating that the object in a simple clause, but not the subject, is within the domain of *mo*, which is a condition of indeterminate pronoun binding (henceforth IPB). In addition, when *mo* is attached to the complementizer *to* in the embedded CP, both subject and object in the embedded clause can be IPRNs, as illustrated below:

(3)  

(a) Hanako-wa Taroo-ga nani-o kat-ta to-mo omowa-na-katta.

    Hanako-Top Taroo-Nom anything-Acc buy-Past Comp-Q think-Neg-Past

    ‘Hanako did not think that Taroo bought anything.’

(b) Taroo-ni-wa dare-ga Masao-o home-ta to-mo omo-e-na-katta.

    Taroo-Dat-Top anyone-Nom Masao-Acc praise-Past Comp-Q think-can-Neg-Past

    ‘Taroo could not think anyone praised Masao.’

This is because the domain of *mo* covers the entire embedded clause.

Based on these facts, Kishimoto (2001: 601) proposes that the scope of *mo* is defined by the notion of domain given below:

(4)  

Y is in the domain of a head X if it is contained in Max (X), where Max(X) is the least full-category maximal projection dominating X. 

This means that, when *mo* is attached to V, the scope of *mo* is defined as the VP. If V head-moves into v, the scope of *mo* is extended up to vP. Furthermore, if *mo* is attached to the embedded C, the embedded clause is within the scope of *mo*.

Keeping this in mind, observe the following sentences.

(5)  

(a) watasi-wa dare-ni koi to-mo ittei-nai
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I-Top anyone-Dat come Comp-Q said-have-Neg
‘I have not said to anyone to come.’ (Takano (2003: 803))

b. watasi-wa dare-ni sono sigoto-wo suru to-mo
I-Top anyone-Dat that job-Acc do Comp-Q
promise-have-Neg
‘I have not promised anyone to do the job.’ (Takano (2003: 803))

c. Taroo-wa dare-ni Hanako-ga ayasii to-mo
Taroo-Top anyone-Dat Hanako-Nom suspicious Comp-Q
said-Neg-Past
‘Taroo did not tell anyone that Hanako was suspicious.’

In these examples the verbs select/subcategorize dative IPRNs, which are generally assumed to be within the matrix VP. According to the domain of \( mo \) proposed by Kishimoto, the dative IPRN \( dare-ni \) is located outside the domain of \( mo \), which is the entire embedded CP. Sentence (5a), for example, has the structure shown in (6).

If we adopt the definition of the binding domain of \( mo \) in (4), this sentence could be ungrammatical, for the dative IPRN \( dare-ni \) is outside the domain of \( mo \), i.e., CP. This surprising phenomenon is a case in which the overt V-raising to \( v \) is involved. Before explaining what this type of example has to do with the V-raising to \( v \), let us observe another similar phenomenon, in which the similarity might provide a clue to a problematic case like (5).

2.2. Raising to Object and IPB

In this section we will consider the interaction between the Raising-to-Object (henceforth RTO) and the IPB, which results in the same kind of problem observed in the previous section.

Let us examine RTO with IPB.

Masao-Nom anyone-Nom genius Cop Comp-Q think-Stat-Neg
'Masao does not believe that anyone is a genius.'


Anyone-Nom Masao-Nom genius Cop Comp-Q think-Stat-Neg

'No one believed Masao to be a genius.'

In (7a) *mo is attached to the embedded C and the scope of *mo should be extended to cover the embedded CP. That is why (7a) is grammatical. (7b), on the other hand, is ruled out because the subject NP in the matrix clause cannot be within the scope of *mo. But when it comes to the following sentence (8), a serious problem occurs.


Masao-Nom anyone-Acc genius Cop Comp-Q think-Stat-Neg

'Masao does not believe anyone to be a genius.'

An IPRN with accusative case, *dare-o, is in the matrix clause according to RTO (see Kuno (1976) for the arguments for RTO). At the same time, *mo is attached to C and the scope of *mo is limited to the embedded clause. This means that *dare-o cannot be bound by *mo, and the sentence is predicted to be ungrammatical. Nevertheless, sentence (8) is grammatical. Let us refer to this problem as the RTO-IPB paradox in this paper.³

Notice that this RTO-IPB paradox has the same type of problem as we observed in our original case (5), where the dative IPRN *dare-ni is in the matrix VP and outside the domain of *mo, but is still grammatical. Therefore it may be worthwhile examining how previous studies have treated this paradox in order to get some hints for solving our original problem.

We will examine two representative studies which deal with this RTO-IPB paradox: one is Hiraiwa’s (2005) CP-edge analysis, and the other Ogawa’s (2007) C-to-V incorporation analysis. First let us examine Hiraiwa (2005). Following Rizzi (1997), Hiraiwa assumes that a CP does not have a single head but consists of many heads, which is currently termed a CP-zone.

(9) [Force p Force0 [Focus p Focus0 [Finite p Finite0 [TP ...]]]]

He also assumes Chomsky’s (2001) Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC), along with Bruening (2001), proposing that the accusative IPRN *dare-o moves to the edge of CP, for its case feature cannot be checked-off/assigned within the CP, which is a (strong) phase. Hiraiwa’s suggestion is that the CP in question is lower than other Cs, one of which the the particle Q *mo adjoins to. Because of the split-CP, even if *dare-o is at the edge of the CP, it is guaranteed to be in the domain of *mo, which adjoined to the higher complementizer, as illustrated below.
Thus, Hiraiwa solves the RTO-IPB paradox, with the split-CP hypothesis and the PIC.

Now let us turn to Ogawa’s (2007) analysis. To resolve the paradoxical situation in which the IPRN in question must be raised out of the embedded clause and is still not outside of the scope of mo, Ogawa (2007) claims that the head of the embedded CP in the RTO construction undergoes incorporation into the verb in the matrix clause. The partial structure is schematized as below:

The complementizer to, along with the particle mo, incorporates into the selecting verb in the matrix clause. Then V raises to v, which helps to extend the scope of mo up to the matrix vP. Ogawa (2007) presents the following contrast to support his proposal.

It is known that the bound pronoun soitu ‘that guy/he’ must be c-commanded by its antecedent. This contrast demonstrates that in (12a) soitu has a proper antecedent as a result of RTO, while in (12b) it does not, as illustrated in (13).
Thus, Ogawa claims that the contrast in (12) can be explained by C-to-V incorporation.

(13)  a. 

3. Applicability

In this section we will consider whether the two analyses can be applicable to our original data in (5).
First, Hiraiwa’s analysis may be effective to solving the RTO-IPB paradox, but we cannot expect that his analysis could extend to our original case (5), for the dative IPRN *dare-ni* is located within VP, not at the edge of the lower CP, as he assumes in the RTO case. The IPRN *dare-ni*, subcategorized by the matrix verb, is higher than the embedded CP, even if we accept Rizzi’s (1997) split-CP hypothesis and the highest C is adjoined by *mo*. Therefore Hiraiwa’s analysis fails to apply to our data (5).

Second, Ogawa’s intriguing mechanism might be a plausible way to solving the problem in (5), although his analysis restricts itself to the RTO construction and matrix verbs are mainly the so-called ‘thinking’ types, such as *omou* ‘think’, *kanziru* ‘feel’, etc., which do not require a dative object. As reported in Mihara and Hiraiwa (2006: 242), however, some speakers may use the verbs of ‘saying’ for the RTO construction, in which case a dative DP appears within their projections. Therefore we believe that it may not be so far-fetched to consider the applicability of this analysis.

Considered closely, however, Ogawa’s analysis reveals an empirical problem. Let us examine the sentence (14) carefully. Ogawa’s analysis would predict it to be grammatical, because the IPRN *dare-no* in the PP is within the domain of *mo* as a results of C-to-V incorporation, as shown in (15), and we expect it to be grammatical. But it is judged as ungrammatical. 4
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(14) *Taroo-wa Ziroo-o kasikoi to-mo dare-no
gendou-kara kanzi-na-katta.
‘Taroo did not feel Ziroo to be smart, based on anyone’s speech and behavior.’

(15)

If this observation is correct, the analysis of C-to-V incorporation remains to be reexamined/revised, and it is advisable that we should suspend the application to our data in (5).

In sum, we have seen that these previous analyses for the RTO-IPB paradox cannot be extended to our case. 5

4. Toward a solution

In the previous section, we saw that neither Hiraiwa’s (2005) analysis nor Ogawa’s (2007) can be applicable to our original data in (5). Then how can this problem be solved? Our suggestion is that it is the morpho-syntactic property of the particle Q mo that counts. This particle mo is also known as a Focus Particle (henceforth FP), and conventionally the FPs have been thought to be suffixed to the head X (=X'0). Aoyagai (1998), however, proposes that these particles should be characterized as adjunct clitics. Adopting the so-called Bare Phrase Structure Theory proposed in Chomsky (1994), which guarantees that a syntactic object can turn out to be both maximal and minimal at the same time, Aoyagai claims that Japanese FPs are functional heads which do not project, and which function as adjuncts. That is, FPs are heads adjoining to a category of any type or any “size” (or any bar-level, in a more conventional sense). Furthermore, the characterization of FPs as clitics requires them to rely on a host in PF. Kishimoto (2007: 38) also suggests that another FP, dake ‘only’ adjoins to XP at LF, though it is suffixed to the head X at the Spell-Out. His analysis, based on the focus interpretation of dake, does not seem to be incompatible with Aoyagi’s proposal that the adjunction occurs in overt syntax. Therefore, it may be said that Kishimoto’s analysis is supporting evidence for Aoyagi’s. If Aoyagi’s analysis is on the right track, the partial clause structure for our data is as follows:
If this structure is expressed as it is, the sentence (17) would appear as:

(17) watasi-wa dare-ni koi to ii-mo si-tei-nai.

'I do not tell anyone to come.'

This sentence is not what we want. To get our target sentence, V needs to be raised to \( v \). The partial structure is shown below:

(18)

Notice that \( mo \) is an adjunct, which is not expected to invoke the Head Movement Constrain. Thus, our data in (5) can be explained with overt V-raising to \( v \).

5. Conclusion

To conclude, we have shown that Japanese has V-raising to \( v \) in overt syntax. Without this, sentences like (5) would remain unexplained. In reference to two previous approaches to the RTO-IPB paradox, we have found that they are not applicable to our data in (5). Adopting Aoyagi’s (1998) proposal on the particle \( mo \) (= FP) as adjunct clitics, we have seen that the data (5) can be explained with the assumption that the particle \( mo \) adjoins to VP, and that V is raised to \( v \) overtly, because of which \( mo \) turns to be suffixed to the complementizer \( to \) in overt syntax. Although the dative IPRN \( dare-ni \) subcategorized by the matrix V appears to be outside the domain of \( mo \), which would make a sentence ungrammatical, the overt V-raising to \( v \) enables the IPRN at issue to be within the domain of \( mo \).
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NOTES

1) As pointed in Hiraiwa (2005: 100), Kishimoto adopts the m-command in this definition, which is assumed to be artificial because it cannot be derived by the fundamental operation: merge. Although we adopt the definition of (4) as a descriptive generalization, in the end we will propose the analysis which is based on the c-command relation.

2) Hiraiwa (2005: 105) judges the similar example to be ungrammatical, as follows:

Taroo-Top Indet-Dat MIT-Dat go-Comp-Q recommend-Neg-Past
‘Taroo did not recommend that anyone go to MIT.’

Takano (2003: 803), however, gives a different judgement, as shown in the text. Though he indicates the ‘?’ (i.e., not perfect, but grammatical/acceptable) for (5a) and (5b), his judgment is different from Hiraiwa’s. These sentences are quite perfect to our ears.

3) Sakai (1998) argues that the trace of a raised DP left in the embedded clause suffices for the accusative IPRN dare-o to be licensed by the particle mo in (8). But this is not convincing. In (2b) the subject is base-generated in Spec-v and raises to Spec-T, leaving a trace in the original position. Although this trace is within the scope of mo, the sentence is ruled out.

4) Note that Ogawa claims that the head movements (both C-to-V and V-to-v) occur overtly, though C-mo must be pronounced at C because of Pesetsky’s (1991) “C-Peripherality Condition”.

5) Another problem is the fact that Ogawa (2007) adopts m-command along with Kishimoto (2001). As noted in Footnote 1, in the current minimalist program the configurational relation is restricted to being derived from merge: the most simple and natural operation admitted in the narrow syntax. The concept of c-command follows this reasoning, but m-command is regarded as stipulative.

6) One thing to be noted is the focus interpretation of mo. We adopt Aoyagi’s (1998) analysis on FPs as adjunct clitics in terms of their syntactic behavior. When it comes to the interpretation of focus, the independent mo, which is found in (19b, c), might be different from the mo used in the separate type of IPB which we have discussed in the text. Aoyagi (1998, 2006), following Kuroda (1965), claims that in sentence (ii), a natural continuation to (i) will allow an event, inclusive of a subject, to be focused. Actually, even if the FP is adjoined to the object, as in (iii), the same wide focus exists.

(i) *kinoo-no paatii-de-wa Mary-ga odot-ta dake-de naku ...
yesterday-Gen party-at-Top Mary-Nom dance-Past not-only but ...
‘At yesterday’s party, not only Mary danced, but …’

(ii) John-ga piano-o hiki-mo/sae si-ta.
John-Nom piano-Acc play-also/even do-Past
‘It also happened that John played the piano.’

(iii) John-ga piano-mo/sae hik-ta.
John-Nom piano-also/even play-Past
‘(lit.) John played also piano.

This amounts to saying that the FP adjoined to V (which can be taken as adjoined to vP eventually) can focus on a subject of the minimal prepositional category (= vP). However, there are speakers who do not accept this interpretation. Kishimoto (2007: 30) claims that a subject is excluded from the focus scope of FP adjoining to V. Leaving this issue open for future research, we only mention that there might be a possibility that the independent mo might be different from the mo used in the separate type of IPB in term of focus interpretation, though the morpho-syntactic properties may be the same. (See Sano (2001) for the scopal properties of other FPs including sae ‘even’.)
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