

Notes on Adverb Positions*

Ryuichi Washio

1. In Tamil, an adverb cannot appear to the right of a tensed verb and must appear to its left, separating the tensed verb from its direct object (if the verb is transitive). Thus, (1a) and (1b), from Authier (1992), constitute a minimal pair in Tamil :

- (1) a. avan saaraayam aDikaDi kuDipaan
 he liquor often drinks
 “He often drinks liquor.”
 b. *avan saaraayam kuDipaan aDikaDi
 he liquor drinks often

Japanese is like Tamil in this respect :

- (2) a. kare-wa sake-o yoku nom-u.
 he-Top liquor often drinks
 “He often drinks liquor.”
 b. *kare-wa sake-o nom-u yoku.
 he-Top liquor drinks often

In Authier’s analysis, the relative order of the Adverb and Verb observed in (1) is a consequence of Verb Movement to Agr (to T), which he assumes, following Pollock (1989), to be possible only if Agr is “strong” (as is the case in French, but not in English, according to Pollock). Thus, (1) is regarded as being essentially parallel to the following well-known French pair discussed by Pollock :

- (3) a. Jean embrasse souvent Marie.
 Jean kisses often Marie
 b. *Jean souvent embrasse Marie.
 Jean often kisses Marie.

In Authier's analysis, then, (1a)/(2a) would be derived in the following manner :

- (4) he [_{AgrP} [_{VP} [_{VP} liquor *t_i*] often] [_{Agr} *t_i*]] [_T drink_i ...

This analysis has the following crucial consequence for Authier : if Agr is strong in a given language and V raises to T(ense) through Agr in a tensed clause in that language, then, in Authier's system, the Case determined by the V can be realized either on the head of the TP or in the original position. In the latter case, a lexical NP is licensed in the thematic object position, but in the former case, the object position is Caseless, which can only be filled by a *pro* in Authier's theory.

A *pro* in object position can receive either a definite interpretation or a non-definite interpretation in Authier's analysis, and with the latter interpretation, it is identified as the so-called arbitrary null object, which is known to exist in languages like Italian, but not in English (cf. Rizzi (1986)). Arbitrary null objects are also possible in French and Tamil, as can be seen from the following examples from Authier (1992) :

- (5) a. paśi [e] kuTram paNNa vekkar-di.
 hunger mistakes to do keep-Generic (Caus)
 "Hunger forces__to make mistakes."
 b. inda mirindi [e] paitiyam aakum.
 this drug insane make (Generic)
 "This drug makes__insane."
 c. Ce gouvernement autorise rarement [e] à vendre des armes.
 This government rarely authorizes__to sell arms."

- d. Souvent, cette drogue rend [e] fou.
 “Often, this drug renders__insane.”

Thus, Authier’s claim is that the possibilities of arbitrary null objects and Verb Movement are conditioned by the same factor—the “Strong” value of the Strong vs. Weak Agr Parameter of Pollock (1989)—hence, it is no accident in Authier’s theory that French and Tamil have both Verb Raising and arbitrary null objects whereas English lacks both.

2. Japanese is like Tamil and French, and unlike English, with respect to the possibility of arbitrary null objects.¹ Consider the following paradigm discussed in Authier (1989), which we extended by including a Japanese example in (c):

(6)

- a. L’ambition amène__à [PRO commettre des erreurs].
 b. *Ambition leads__ [PRO to make mistakes].
 c. tokitosite, yasin-wa __ [PRO tumi-o okas-] -ase-ru.
 sometimes ambition-Top crime-Acc commit cause-Prs
 “Sometimes, ambition makes (people) commit a crime.”

The matrix verbs here—*amener*, *lead* and (*s*) *ase*—all take an NP that functions as the controller of the embedded subject (cf. “L’ambition amène *les gens* à commettre des erreurs,” Ambition leads *people* to make mistakes,” and “yasin-wa *hito-ni* tumi-o okas-ase-ru,” corresponding to (6a), (6b) and (6c), respectively) but only in French and Japanese can that NP be missing from the surface. The missing element, the arbitrary null object first noted for Italian by Rizzi, receives an arbitrary interpretation in a sentence that “has a generic time reference” (Rizzi 1986: 503). Although the direct Japanese counterparts of the Italian examples containing arbitrary null objects discussed by Rizzi (or the French examples discussed by Authier) are not always grammatical or natural, which we interpret to mean that there is still some unknown factor involved in the overall li-

censing of arbitrary null objects, we can nevertheless find in Japanese many grammatical examples containing such objects. Given below are some of the relevant examples :

- (7) a. Komedian-wa __ waraw-ase-ru no-ga sigoto-da.
 comedian-Top laugh-cause-Prs N-Nom job-is
 “A comedian’s job is to make __ laugh.”
- b. nihon-no kyoosi-wa __ yosyuu-o sase sugi-ru.
 Japan-of teacher-Top preparation-Acc do too much
 “Teachers in Japan make __prepare for lessons too much.”
- c. yoi ongaku-wa __ rirakkusus-ase-te kure-ru
 good music-Top relax-cause benefit
 “Good music makes __relax.”
- d. nihon seihu-wa __ kome-o hitotubu-mo
 Japan government-Top rice-Acc grain-even
 yunyuus-ase-nai hoosin-da.
 import-cause-not policy-is
 “The Japanese government’s policy is not to let __import
 even a grain of rice.”

These are all examples of the causative construction, and in each case, what is missing from the surface is the thematic object of the causative verb. As is well-known, arbitrary null objects are also found in the French causative construction, as in (8a) from Authier (1992), whose Japanese counterpart given in (8b) is also grammatical :

- (8) a. Ce film fait pleurer __.
 this film makes cry __
- b. kono eiga-wa __ nak-ase-ru.
 this film-Top cry-make-Prs

¹¹Arbitrary null objects are not always possible in Japanese, however.

In fact, they are usually excluded from direct object positions of transitive verbs, as observed by Saito (1982), Kuroda (1983) and others. It seems that arbitrary null objects in Japanese are most typically found in constructions containing the causative verb, which is also what Authier (1992) reports to be the case in KiNande, a Bantu language, and something similar seems to be going on in French/Italian as well. Although arbitrary null objects can appear with syntactically non-causative verbs in French/Italian, it seems that such verbs are analyzable as semantic causatives in many cases, judging from the data discussed by Authier and Rizzi. In any case, as Rizzi (1986: section 5.2) demonstrated, arbitrary null objects are subject to some restriction, even in Italian, that is best stated in thematic terms. Rizzi's hypothesis is that "affectedness" is the crucial factor, i.e., arbitrary null objects are possible only with affected θ -roles, which include, to illustrate with the English counterparts of Rizzi's Italian verbs, Experiencer (*frighten* __), Benefactive/Malefactive (*promote/punish* __), Goal (in control structures) (*induce* __), Source/Goal (*deprive/endow* __), Location (*cover* __ (with something)), and one kind of theme, Theme₁ (*photograph* __), but not the other kind, Theme₂ (*meet/find/see* __). Note that, except for Theme₁ and some verbs listed under Benefactive (e.g., *thank*), Rizzi's class of verbs do in fact look like semantic causatives, suggesting the possibility that arbitrary null objects in Italian/French and KiNande/Japanese might be governed by essentially the same principle, with certain possible cross-linguistic variations. If it turns out that the core cases are captured by something like the notion "affected causee," then they form a very natural class at the level of Conceptual Structure in the sense of Jackendoff (1990).

Thus, although there are some details that must be worked out, it is clear that Japanese also has the two crucial properties Authier noted for Tamil, viz., the impossibility of clause-final adverbs and the possibility of arbitrary null objects.

3. Since Japanese is exactly like Tamil with respect to the two crucial properties Authier discusses, we can in principle evaluate Authier's analy-

sis of Tamil by applying it to Japanese.

As mentioned above, an adverb may not appear after a tensed verb in Japanese. Let us illustrate this again with different examples :

- (9) a. kare-ga susi-o tamani tabe-ru/kinoo tabe-ta
 he-Nom fish-Acc sometimes eat-Prs/yesterday eat-Pst
 “He sometimes eats sushi/ate sushi yesterday.”
 b. *kare-ga susi-o tabe-ru tamani/tabe-ta kinoo

Consider now the following well-known facts. The particle *-wa*, which is best-known as a Topic-marker, can also function as a marker of “contrast.” When a sentence contains more than one *wa*-marked phrase, it is typically the case that the first one is interpreted as a Topic and the rest as contrastive (cf. Kuno (1973)).² In (10a), the first *wa*-phrase is a Topic but the second one (*susi-wa*) is contrastive. In (10b), the contrastive *-wa* is attached to the adverb, which semantically contrasts “sometimes” with “always” or “yesterday” with “other days” :

- (10) a. kare-wa susi-*wa* tamani tabe-ru/kinoo tabe-ta
 b. kare-wa susi-o tamani-*wa* tabe-ru/kinoo-*wa* tabe-ta

As is well-known, the particle *-wa* can also make the verb contrastive. When this happens, however, *-wa* cannot be attached to the tensed verbal complex as in (11a). Rather, it must appear attached to the verbal stem, separating it from the tense element, as in (11b) :

- (11) a. *kare-wa susi-o tabe-ru-*wa*
 b. kare-wa susi-o tabe-*wa* su-ru

In (11b), the verb *tabe-* ‘eat’ is tenseless (being a *renyookei* form phonetically identical with the root form in this case, but cf. *yom-u* ‘to read’ vs. *yom-i-wa su-ru*, where *-wa* is clearly attached to the *renyookei* form *yom-i* distinct from the root form), and the tense element *-ru* (Prs) is supported

by the dummy verb *su-* ‘do’ (cf. Kuno (1980) and Kuroda (1981) for extensive discussion). In this construction, it is clear that the verb *tabe-* is not in the Tense position. If it is in the original position, then an adverb should be possible in the position between *tabe-* and the DO-supported Tense. It appears, however, that the adverb must still appear to the left of the verb:³

- (12) a. kare-wa susi-o tabe-wa *?*tamani* su-ru/**kinoo* si-ta
 b. kare-wa susi-o *tamani* tabe-wa su-ru/*kinoo* tabe-wa si-ta

Given Authier’s analysis of the Tamil paradigm given in (1), which should extend to Japanese (given the crucial properties it shares with Tamil), the position of the Adverb should be as in (12a), and (12b) is quite unexpected, if the verb is indeed in the d-structure position.

The only possibility of explaining (12) under Authier’s analysis, it seems, is to claim that the verb in (12b) has “short-moved,” landing in the Agr position, as in the following structure:

- (13) kare-wa [_{AgrP} [_{VP} [_{VP} susi-o *t_i*] *adverb*] [_{Agr} tabe-wa_i]] [_T su-*tense*...

Note that this analysis forces us to assume that V-to-Agr movement is obligatory even when the V is marked with a particle of contrast such as *-wa*. If this analysis is tenable, we can still maintain Authier’s basic claim.

4. Consider then the following facts. As is well-known, Japanese has so-called “complex predicates,” consisting of a verbal root, followed immediately by another bound verbal morpheme such as *sase* ‘Causative’, *rare* ‘Passive’, etc. Such a complex stem is then followed by a Tense element, producing a sequence V₁-V₂-...-Tense. Following the standard analysis, let us assume that each V in the verbal sequence heads its own maximal projection in d-structure.⁴ As for the category that V₂ and other bound morphemes are subcategorized for, there are two possibilities compatible with Authier’s analysis: either it is a VP or AgrP, leading to one of the

following two simplified d-structures.⁵

- (14) a. $[_{TP} [_{AgrP} [_{VP2} [_{VP1} NP V_1] V_2] Agr] T]$
 b. $[_{TP} [_{AgrP} [_{VP2} [_{AgrP} [_{VP1} NP V_1] Agr] V_2] Agr] T]$

In (14a), V_2 is subcategorized for a VP whereas in (14b), it is subcategorized for an AgrP. We will consider both of these possibilities below.

With this much background, consider the following paradigm :

- (15) a. *tabe-rare-ta*
 eat-Pass-Pst
 b. *tabe-rare-sae si-ta (keredo)*
 eat-Pass-Even DO-Pst (although)
 c. *tabe-sae s-(r)are-ta (keredo)*
 eat-Even DO-Pass-Pst (although)
 d. **tabe-sae rare si-ta (keredo)*
 eat-Even Pass DO-Pst (although)
 f. **tabe-sae rare-ta (keredo)*
 eat-Even Pass-Pst (although)

(15a) is a complex verb of the form V_1 - V_2 -Tense ‘eat-Passive-Past’. In (15b), a particle of contrast *-sae* ‘even’ is attached to the complex V_1 - V_2 , and DO is inserted to support Tense. In (15c), the same particle is attached to V_1 , separating it from V_2 . In this case, DO appears with V_2 (the passive *-rare*), and not with Tense; supporting Tense instead of *rare* is impossible as in (15d), nor is it possible to omit DO, as in (15f).

Thus, DO Support in Japanese does not only support Tense. Rather, it supports a bound verbal morpheme, which includes Voice morphemes and Tense elements. These elements need a verbal stem to attach to. When they are stranded, DO is inserted to support them. The Tense-supporting function mentioned above is thus a special case of this more general function of DO Support in Japanese.

One more piece of information on Japanese, and we will return to

Authier's analysis. Suppose we make both V_1 and V_2 contrastive in the sequence V_1 - V_2 -Tense. In (15c), for example, we can add the particle *-mo* to the passive morpheme, separating it from Tense. Since the Tense morpheme would then be stranded, another DO shows up to support it, deriving (16):

- (16) *tabe-sae s-(r)are-mo si-ta (keredo)*
 eat-Even DO-Pass-Even DO-Pst (although)

Now, what is the structure of this verbal sequence? If we assume the structure shown in (14a) in Authier's framework, the DO-supported passive verb in (16) can be assumed to be in the Agr position, but, crucially, the first verb *tabe-sae* must be in the original position because there is no available slot for this verb to move into. Thus, (17a) must be the s-structure of (16), which is derived from (17b):

- (17) a. ..._{[AgrP} [_{VP} [_{VP} ... *tabe-sae*] *t_i*] [_{Agr} *s-(r)are-mo_i*] [_T *si-ta...* (keredo)]
 b. ..._{[AgrP} [_{VP} [_{VP} ... *tabe-sae*] *s-(r)are-mo*] [_{Agr}] [_T *si-ta...* (keredo)]

That is, the passive morpheme short-moves into Agr, though the first V must be in the original position. And this makes the prediction in Authier's theory that an adverb can appear between the two verbs, i.e., between the trace and Agr in (17a). Thus, examples of the following sort are crucial:

- (18) a. *?*otooto-ni oyatu-o tabe-sae tamani s-(r)are-mo*
 brother-by snack-Acc eat-Even sometimes DO-Pass-Even
si-ta (keredo)
 DO-Pst (although)
 "Although sometimes I had my snack eaten by my brother,..."
 b. *?*otooto-ni oyatu-o tabe-sae kinoo s-(r)are-mo*
 brother-by snack-Acc eat-Even yesterday DO-Pass-Even

si-ta (keredo)

DO-Pst (although)

“Although I had my snack eaten by my brother yesterday,...”

These are highly unnatural, though perhaps not as impossible as a similar example with an adverb in the clause-final position. If we put all the relevant examples in one place and compare them, a clear pattern can be observed :

- (19) a. boku-wa ototoo-ni *tamani* oyatu-o tabe-sae
 I-Top brother-by *sometimes* snack-Acc eat-Even
 s-are-mo si-ta
 do-Pass-Even do-Pst
 “I sometimes had my snack eaten by my brother.”
- b. boku-wa ototoo-ni oyatu-o *tamani* tabe-sae s-are-mo si-ta
- c. *?boku-wa ototoo-ni oyatu-o tabe-sae *tamani* s-are-mo si-ta
- d. *?boku-wa ototoo-ni oyatu-o tabe-sae s-are-mo *tamani* si-ta
- f. *boku-wa ototoo-ni oyatu-o tabe-sae s-are-mo si-ta *tamani*

(19a) contains the adverb to the left of the direct object. This is the most natural order, but, as mentioned above, (19b) is also perfectly acceptable with the adverb placed in the position separating the direct object and the verb. (19c) has the same word order as (18), and sounds highly unnatural. In (19d), the adverb has been moved further to the right, being in the position between V_2 and Tense (supported by DO). This is as bad as (19c). Finally, (19f) has the adverb in the clause-final position, which is totally impossible. Thus, a clear dividing line seems to exist between (19b) and (19c).

In Authier’s analysis of Tamil, which we have been trying to extend to Japanese, an adverb such as *tamani* ‘sometimes’ is generated in a position right-adjoined to the VP immediately under AgrP, and the Verb Movement to Agr must be obligatory even when the verb is marked with a particle of contrast. Thus, if we adopt the structure (14a), with an adverb position specified as in (20), V_2 must move to Agr crossing over Adv :

(20) [TIP [AgrP [VP₂ [VP₁ NP V₁] V₂] Adv] Agr] T]

It is thus predicted that the order “V₁-particle Adv DO-V₂-particle DO-Tense” is possible whereas the order “V₁-particle DO-V₂-particle Adv DO-Tense” is not (the latter because the movement of V₂ to Agr is obligatory). In other words, the prediction is that (19c) should be as good as a simple transitive clause such as (2a) with the order Subj Obj Adv V-Tense, but (19d) should be impossible, which is not the case in fact, as we saw above.⁶

It should be clear that even if we adopt the structure shown in (14b), with an extra-AgrP between the two VPs, essentially the same problem arises. The relevant structure would be exactly like (20) except that there is an AgrP between V₂ and V₁, where V₂ must move to the higher Agr, producing the order “V₁-particle Adv DO-V₂-particle DO-Tense,” which makes the same false prediction as the analysis above based on (20).⁷

5. Leaving Authier’s analysis for now, let us consider the following generalization concerning the possible adverbial positions in Japanese. As the examples discussed so far, as well as many others such as the following suggest, an adverb in Japanese is free to appear anywhere so long as it does not come to the right of a verbal element :

- (21) a. {kinoo/itumo/honki-de} Taroo-wa Hanako-o
 {yesterday/always/seriously} Taroo-Top Hanako-Acc
 home-ta.
 praise-Pst
- b. Taroo-wa {kinoo/itumo/honki-de} Hanako-o home-ta.
 c. Taroo-wa Hanako-o {kinoo/itumo/honki-de} home-ta.
 d. Taroo-wa Hanako-o home-wa {*kinoo/*?itumo/*honki-de} si-ta.
 e. Taroo-wa Hanako-o home-ta {*kinoo/*itumo/*honki-de}.

Notice that we are familiar with a similar generalization elsewhere in Japanese grammar, viz., the word order in a clause is free in Japanese so

long as the verb stays in the clause-final position. This freedom of word order is of course what is called the Scrambling effect, which is usually attributed to Move α (cf. Saito (1985) and many others). The paradigm in (21) would thus follow in a straightforward manner if we assume that a clause in Japanese can only have an adverb *left-adjoined* to some constituent; possible surface positions that an adverb can occupy can then be attributed to Scrambling: we can either assume that nominal constituents scramble over an adverb, or that an adverb itself undergoes Scrambling (the choice between them is not relevant to our discussion).⁸ (21d-e) would not arise under this account because, to derive them, we must either Scramble a verb, or Scramble an adverb rightward over a verb, both of which are independently assumed to be impossible.⁹

For this very simple, almost trivial, analysis to be possible, however, we need to assume that there is no Adverb position *right-adjoined* to VP or other constituent in Japanese (otherwise (21d-e) would be generated). This, of course, is in direct conflict with Authier's analysis.

To explain (21a-c), something like the above analysis (i.e., a left-adjoined Adverb position *plus* Scrambling)¹⁰ seems to be necessary even in Authier's analysis. As just mentioned, if we assume there is no right-adjoined Adverb position, then (21d-e) also follow immediately. However, Authier crucially assumes an Adverb position right-adjoined to VP. This explains the ill-formedness of (21e) by the (obligatory) Verb Raising to Agr (to T). To explain (21d), we must then assume that Verb+Particle obligatorily short-moves to Agr there, crossing over the adverb. As already noted, however, this analysis makes the wrong prediction that examples of the following sort are fully acceptable:

- (22) *?Hanako-wa Taroo-ni home-sae e_i tamani
 Hanako-Top Taroo-by praise-Even sometimes
 s-are-mo; si-ta
 DO-Pass-Even DO-Pst

“Hanako was sometimes even praised by Taroo.”

6. So the “left-adjunction-only” analysis of Japanese adverbs seems to be simpler and more adequate than the alternative Authier proposed (for Tamil). However, there are at least two questions that remain to be answered. First, why can Japanese adverbs be generated only in left-adjoined positions? We cannot fully answer it at present, but it seems natural to relate this restriction to another independent restriction, viz., Specifiers in Japanese also basically appear on left branches. Thus, if adverbs appear in a Spec position of adjunction structures, i.e., [_{XP} Adv XP], then the “leftness” restriction is not surprising.

The second question that we need to answer is the status of examples like (22). As mentioned above, (22) is highly unnatural. However, it is not as impossible as (23):

(23) *Hanako-wa Taroo-ni home-sae s-are-mo si-ta *tamani*

So far, we have not provided any account of this contrast.

The fact that (22) and similar examples are not absolutely impossible may be related to the following observation. Consider first the following examples:

- (24) a. * kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae kinoo si-ta.
 he-Top sushi-Acc eat-Even yesterday DO-Pst
 “He even ate sushi yesterday.”
- b. kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae kinoo-wa si-ta.
- c. *?kare-wa warai (-sae)-mo kodomo-no koro si-nakatta.
 he-Top laugh (-Even)-Even child-of time DO-not-Pst
 “He didn’t even laugh in his childhood.”
- d. kare-wa warai(-sae-)mo kodomo-no koro-wa si-nakatta.

(24a) is unacceptable as expected, with the adverb *kinoo* ‘yesterday’ separating V from T. (24b), which is identical with (24a) except that the adverb is marked with *-wa*, is acceptable and quite natural. Similarly, (24c) and (24d) are identical except that the former has a “bare” adverb be-

tween V and T, whereas the latter has a *wa*-attached adverb in the same position, this slight surface difference resulting in the sharp contrast shown above.

As already mentioned, *-wa* can function either as a Topic-marker or as a marker of contrast. The nature of the *wa*-marked adverbs that appear in examples such as (24b) and (24d) is not very clear. Whatever the precise semantic interpretation of these adverbs might be, one thing is clear, and that is that (24b) and (24d) do not display any significant change in meaning if the *wa*-marked adverb is put in the clause-initial position, as in (25):

- (25) a. kinoo-wa kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae si-ta.
 b. kodomo-no koro-wa kare-wa warai(-sae)-mo si-nakatta.

The only clear difference between (25a-b) and (24b-d) is that the latter examples are stylistically highly marked (though natural and acceptable as such) whereas the former examples are stylistically neutral. In fact, this stylistic markedness is precisely what we find in the so-called “downgrading” cases, such as (26):

- (26) a. boku-wa kare-wa Tokyo-ni ikitagatte iru no da-to omou.
 I-Top he-Top Tokyo-to go-want be Comp think
 “I think that he wants to go to Tokyo.”
 b. kare-wa Tokyo-ni *boku-wa* ikitagatte iru no da-to omou.
 c. kare-wa Tokyo-ni ikitagatte iru no da-to *boku-wa* omou.

In (26b), the *wa*-marked NP is “downgraded” to the status somewhat similar to that of a parenthetical expression. (26c) can be analyzed in a similar fashion. Of course, it is possible to claim that (26b) and (26c) result from Scrambling (or Complement Preposing in the case of (26c)), but we assume with Harada (1977) and others (cf. Kuroda (1988: 36) for reference) that “downgrading” or its equivalent exists in Japanese as an independent process. Not surprisingly, a downgraded NP may also appear in a posi-

tion between V and T, like the adverb under discussion :

- (27) a. *boku-wa kare-wa warai-sae si-nai-to omou.*
 I-Top he-Top laugh-Even DO-not-Comp think
 “I think that he would not even laugh.”
 b. *kare-wa warai-sae boku-wa si-nai-to omou.*

Given that the process of downgrading independently exists in Japanese, it is rather natural to suppose that (25a-b) and (24b-d) are related by the same process. Notice that certain types of sentential adverbs (those expressing a speaker’s judgment in particular) can also undergo this process :

- (28) a. *kare-wa susi-o tabe-wa { *?tamani/*yukkuri }*
 he-Top sushi-Acc eat-Even {sometimes/slowly}
su-ru (-ga ...).
 DO-Prs (-although...)
 “(Although) he eats sushi sometimes/slowly...”
 b. *kare-wa susi-o tabe-wa {osoraku/tabun}*
 he-Top sushi-Acc eat-Even {probably/maybe}
su-ru daroo (-ga ...).
 DO-Prs maybe (-although...)
 “(Although) he would probably eat sushi...”
 c. **kare-wa warai-sae asita si-te kure-ru kamo sirenai.*
 he-Top laugh-Even tomorrowDO give-Prs maybe
 “He might Even laugh (for us) tomorrow.”
 d. *kare-wa warai-sae umakusuruto si-te kure-ru*
 he-Top laugh-Even if-successful DO give-Prs
kamo sirenai.
 maybe
 “He might even laugh (for us) if we are succesful.”

So the generalization seems to be that a V-wa DO-Tense string can be

separated only by an adverb essentially functioning as a parenthetical phrase. And it is a matter of degree whether (or to what extent) a given adverb can be used parenthetically. Thus, as the following examples show, manner adverbs as well as time and location adverbs are impossible as parentheticals, adverbs like “sometimes” or “always” are unnatural, but maybe not impossible, and adverbs expressing speaker’s judgment as well as *wa*-marked adverbs are rather natural :

- (29) a. *kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae yukkuri su-ru daroo-ga... (slowly)
 b. *kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae asita su-ru daroo-ga... (tomorrow)
 c. *kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae kauntaa-de su-ru daroo-ga... (at the counter)
 d. *?kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae tamani su-ru daroo-ga... (sometimes)
 e. *?kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae syottyuu su-ru daroo-ga... (always)
 f. kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae osoraku su-ru daroo-ga... (probably)
 g. kare-wa susi-o tabe-sae asita-wa su-ru daroo-ga... (tomorrow-*wa*)
 “Although he would even eat sushi slowly, tomorrow, etc.”

Thus, our answer to the question raised above—viz., why (22) and other examples such as (29d) are not absolutely impossible—can be stated as follows: (29d), for example, should be impossible if *tamani* is meant to be an ordinary adverb (because it appears in a position where an adverb cannot appear, under our analysis), but since it is in a position where a parenthetical adverb may appear, we can force a parenthetical reading on the adverb; however, it so happens that *tamani* belongs to the class of adverbs that permit such a reading only with great difficulty, hence the near (but maybe not total) impossibility of (29d) and similar examples.

7. Authier (1992) argues that the possibility of arbitrary null objects and the impossibility of clause-final adverbs in Tamil should be related to the Strong Agr in Tamil. Since Japanese is exactly like Tamil in these respects, we can in principle evaluate Authier’s interesting analysis by applying it to Japanese.

As we observed above, the fact that an adverb cannot appear to the

right of a tensed verb in Japanese can be explained without having recourse to Verb Movement to Agr (to T). All we need is a fairly natural assumption that an Adverb in Japanese can be generated only in left-adjoined positions, which is likely to be a special case of a more general property of Japanese phrase structure (SPECs are also on the left in Japanese). This, together with some independently necessary assumptions (such as the existence of “downgrading” in Japanese), can explain the basic distribution of adverbs in Japanese in a fairly straightforward manner.

On the other hand, an analysis of the distribution of adverbs in Japanese that makes crucial use of Verb Movement to Agr (assuming Strong Agr in Japanese) makes some wrong predictions about possible adverb positions. Therefore, direct application of Authier’s argument based on Tamil word order to Japanese does not demonstrate that Japanese has Strong Agr. This, of course, is not to say that we should not assume Strong Agr in Japanese. It only says that the argument based on word order does not give us any strong reason to do so.

Notes

*This paper was originally written in 1993 and remained unpublished until now. It is therefore outdated in many respects. Some of the observations made here, however, still seem to me to be relevant to some non-trivial issues in linguistic analysis—enough so, hopefully, to be worthy of being printed here.

¹ Cf. Washio (1994). Reference to this work has been updated.

² Kuroda (1988) claims that this generalization is not correct, but this point is not relevant to our discussion.

³ A qualification is necessary concerning the ill-formedness of (12). See section 6 below.

⁴ See Kitagawa (1986) for an interesting alternative.

⁵ Authier assumes Chomsky’s (1989/1992) analysis of the structure of IP. In this analysis, IP has the structure [_{IP} ··· [_I [AGR-S [_{FP} F [_{AGRP}[AGR-O [_{VP} V NP]]]]]]]. What we refer to as Agr, T and TP in the following discussion correspond to AGR-O, F and FP that are used in Authier’s paper.

⁶ If we assume the structure given in (20), it does not really matter whether the adverb is in the VP₁-adjoined position or in the VP₂-adjoined position. In the former case, the order V₁ Adv DO-V₂ DO-Tense is automatically produced. In the latter case, the same order should also show up because DO-V₂ obligatorily moves to Agr (cf.(17)).

⁷ Assuming there is AgrP between V₁ and V₂, if the adverb is generated in the VP₁-adjoined position, then the correct order "Adv V₁ DO-V₂ DO-Tense" can be derived after V₁-to-Agr movement. But the point is that nothing prevents an adverb from being generated in the position adjoined to the highest VP.

⁸ We are not excluding the possibility that there may be more than one Adverb position.

⁹ More generally, rightward Scrambling does not seem to exist in Japanese: thus, "Taroo-ga home-ta, Hanako-o" is stylistically highly marked, and usually not considered as the result of right-ward Scrambling of the accusative NP; if (17e) is to be accepted at all, it must be interpreted with the same stylistic markedness. If we assume Kuroda's (1988) theory, then rightward Scrambling cannot exist in Japanese.

¹⁰ As mentioned above, there may be more than one Adverb position.

References

- Authier, J.-M. (1989) "Arbitrary Null Objects and Unselective Binding," in O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.).
- Authier, J.-M. (1992) "A Parametric Account of V-governed Arbitrary Null Arguments," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*10, 345-374.
- Chomsky, N. (1989/1991) "Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation," in R. Freidin (ed.) *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Harada, S. I. (1977) "Nihongo ni henkei wa hituyoo da," *Gengo*6.1-12.
- Jackendoff, R. (1990) *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Jaeggli, O. and K. Safir, eds. (1989) *The Null Subject Parameter*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Kitagawa, Y. (1986) *Subjects in Japanese and English*. Ph.D dissertation, University of Massachusetts. Amherst.
- Kuno, S. (1973) *The Structure of the Japanese Language*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kuno, S. (1980) "Comments on Lekach's Paper," in Y. Otsu and A. Farmer (eds.) *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*2, MIT.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1981) "Some Recent Trends in Syntactic Theory and the Japanese Language," in A. Farmer and C. Kitagawa (eds.) *Coyote Papers*2, University of Arizona.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1983) "What Can Japanese Say about Government and Binding," *WCCFL* 2,

Stanford University.

- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1988) "Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Syntax of English and Japanese," *Linguistic Investigations*12, 1-47.
- Pollock, J.-Y. (1989) "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP," *Linguistic Inquiry*20, 365-424.
- Rizzi, L. (1986a) "Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*," *Linguistic Inquiry*17, 501-557.
- Saito, M. (1982) "Case Marking in Japanese: A Preliminary Study," ms. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Saito, M. (1985) *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Consequences*, Ph.D dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Washio, R. (1994) "Does French Agree or Not?," *Linguisticae Investigationes*18, 377-414.