On two types of Nagara clauses

On two types of *Nagara* clauses[†]

YAMASHINA, Miyuki

【要　旨】

　日本語の副詞節の中で「〜ながら」節は付帯状況と逆接という二つの解釈が可能であるが、この二つの解釈がどのような条件下で可能かという問題に関しては議論が多い。この論文では先行研究を概観しつつ、生成文法の枠組みの中で「〜ながら」節の統語論、意味論的特徴を捉えなおす。和田（2013）の提案をもとに逆接の解釈が文脈から派生するものと「〜ながら」節そのものの意味から派生するものに分けることによって、Koizumi（1991,1993）−佐藤（1997）の主張である、意味の違う2種類の「〜ながら」節は統語構造上に生起する場所が違うという主張が維持可能であることを示す。さらに「ながら節」の意味分析を英語のbutの分析を参考にし更に発展させる可能性を示した。

【キーワード】ながら節　生成文法　統語論　意味分析

0. Introduction

This paper examines Japanese adjunct clauses headed by *nagara* 'while.' Like its seeming English counterpart *while*, a clause headed by *nagara* has two interpretations: a simultaneous reading and an adversative reading. Previous works (Morita 1980, Minami (1974), Horikawa (1994), Wada (2013) among others) on this clause centered around the question when the *nagara* clause has a simultaneous reading and when it has an adversative reading. However, whether a clear-cut line can be drawn between the two kinds was left unsettled. In this paper I reexamine the nature of the adjunct clause and propose that there are two formally distinct *nagara* clauses.

　　Section 1 gives a brief overview of some characteristics of the *nagara* clauses in need of explanation. Following the insight of Wada (2013), section 2 shows that there are two sources for the adversative reading. A rough sketch of a semantic analysis of the adversative *nagara* clauses will be given and a direction for further research will be discussed in section 3.

1. Semantics and Syntax of *Nagara* clauses

Nagara clauses give rise to two different ways of being understood, as shown in (1).

(1)　　a Taro-wa　　hashiri-nagara te-o　　　　fut-ta
　　　　Taro-TOP　run-while　　　hand-ACC　wave-PAST
　　　　"Taro waved his hand while running.

b　Taro-wa　　30km-mo　　hashiri-nagara　ase-hitotsu　kaitei-nai
　Taro-TOP　30km-even　run-while　　　　sweat-one　sweat-NOT
　"Taro is not sweating a drop of sweat, despite that he has run even 30km."

<div align="right">Horikawa (1994 p.37)</div>

In (1a), the event of (Taro's) running is understood to have occurred simultaneously with the event of his waving his hand.　(1b) is understood as indicated in the English translation.　That is, there is a feeling of unexpectedness to the fact that the event denoted by the *nagara* clause is followed by the event denoted by the main clause. Following the standard in the literature, I call this an adversative reading.　Note that in (1b) the running event is most naturally construed as having occurred before the sweating. That is, the event time denoted by the *nagara* clause is taken to precede the one denoted by the main clause. Hence in this case, it is not necessary for the sentence to have a simultaneous reading in addition to the adversative reading.

　　It has been claimed that what divides the two readings seen in (1) is the choice of predicate in the *nagara* clause.　Namely, when the predicate of the *nagara* clause is a stative predicate, including negated verbs and perfective clauses, it cannot be interpreted as having only a simultaneous reading[1].

(2)　　a　Taro-wa byoki-deari-nagara benkyo-shita
　　　　　Taro-TOP sick-be-while study-PAST
　　　　　#"Taro studied while being sick."
　　　　　"Taro studied despite being sick.

　　　　b　Taro-wa hashira-nai-nagara te-o fut-ta
　　　　　Taro-TOP run-NOT-while　hand-ACC wave-PAST
　　　　　#"Taro waved his hand when he was not running."
　　　　　"Taro waved his hand even though he did not run.

　　　　C　Taro-wa Hanako-o sasotte-oki-nagara Mary-ni-mo koe-o kake-ta
　　　　　Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC invite-PFT-while Mary-DAT-also ask out-PAST
　　　　　#"Taro also asked Mary out, while inviting Hanako."
　　　　　"Even though (he) had invited Hanako, Taro also asked Mary out."

In the examples in (2), the predicate in the *nagara* clause is stative[2], and the sentences imply some kind of unexpectedness as shown in their English translations.

　　In addition to the difference in predicate types, sentences with the two readings seem to show a structural difference as well (Koizumi(1991,1993), Sato(1997))[3]. Koizumi(1991,1993) argues that there are three kinds of adjuncts in Japanese with respect

to their syntactic base position. He shows that the base position of the *nagara* clause with a simultaneous reading is within the maximal projection of the main verb. He uses several tests such as the clauses' scope interactions with operators such as *sae* "even" and negation to show his point. Sato (1997) applies Koizumi's tests to *nagara* clauses with an adversative meaning and shows that they have different syntactic behavior from *nagara* clauses with a simultaneous reading.

Let us first see Koizumi's arguments in detail. Consider Koizumi's example in (3).

(3)　TV-o　　mi-nagara　　benkyoo sae　shi-ta
　　　TV-ACC　watch-while　study　　 even　do-PAST
　　　"(I) even studied while watching TV."

<div align="right">Koizumi (1993 p412 (7a))</div>

The focus particle *sae* 'even' is attached to the main verb in (3). This sentence can be interpreted in the following ways with respect to the particle "sae".

1　Of all things I did while watching TV (e.g., eating pizza, talking with my friend on the phone), studying was the least expected for me to do.

2　Of all things I did (e.g., eating pizza while taking a shower, talking with my friend on the phone while writing a letter), studying while watching TV was the least expected for me to do.

Following a widely accepted assumption that a focus operator can be associated with constituents in its c-command domain but not with elements outside of that domain, the fact that example (3) can be interpreted as 2 suggests that the particle *sae* 'even' that attaches to the VP can operate over the elements dominated by the VP, and hence that the *nagara* clause must be within the VP on this interpretation.

Koizumi also tests the *nagara* clause with a simultaneous reading for substitutability by the proform *soo*. Observe that in sentence (4b) below, [chokoreeto-o tabe-ta] in sentence (4a) was substituted by the proform *soo*.

(4)　a　Taro-wa　　[chokoreeto-o　　tabe-ta]　　daroo
　　　　Taro-TOP　 chocolate-ACC　 eat-PAST　 probable
　　　　"As for Taro, probably, he ate chocolate."

　　　b　Mary-mo　soo　daroo
　　　　Mary-too　so　　probable
　　　　"As for Mary, I think so, too. (she ate chocolate)"

Koizumi (1991, 1993) argues that *soo* in examples such as (4b) substitutes for IP, since the proform replaces the content [chokoreeto-o tabe-ta] which includes tense information. He further shows that *soo* does not substitute for ModalP, a maximal projection dominating IP. His argument is based on examples such as (5), (6) and (7).

(5) a Kiyomi-wa   [TV-o   mi-nagara]   benkyosuru daroo
         Kiyomi-TOP   TV-ACC   watch-while   study   probable
         "As for Kiyomi, I think s/he will study while watching TV."

     b Masami-mo   soo daroo
         Masami-also so   probable
         "As for Masami, I think so, too. (i.e. I think s/he will study while watching TV too)."

(6) a Kiyomi-wa   [koohi   mame-ga   nakunara-nai-kagiri]
         Kiyomi-TOP   coffee   beans-NOM   run out-not-unless
         kaimono-ni ika-nai daroo
         shopping-to go-not   probable
         "As for Kiyomi, I think s/he will not go shopping unless coffee beans run out."

     b Masami-mo soo daroo
         "As for Masami, I think so, too.(i.e. I think s/he will not go shopping unless she runs out coffee, too)."

(7) a Kenkyuusitu-no denki-ga   kieteiru-kara,
         Office-GEN   light-NOM   turned off-because
         Kiyomi-wa   moo   kaet-ta   daroo
         Kiyomi-TOP   already   go home-PAST   probable
         "As for Kiyomi, I think s/he has gone home, because the lights in her office are out."

     b *Masami-mo soo daroo
         "As for Masami, I think so, too. (i.e. I think she has gone home because the light in her office is out, too)."

(5b) and (6b) suggest that the adjunct clauses have to be included in the interpretation of the proform *soo,* whereas in (7b) the lack of the interpretation indicated in the English translation suggests that the adjunct clause headed by *kara* should not be so included. Based on this, Koizumi concludes that the first two adjunct clauses in (5) and

(6) are within the IP and the adjunct clause in (7) is generated outside the IP.

　　If his hypothesis is correct, it is predicted that only adjuncts which are generated above IP can escape substitution by the proform *soo*. This is borne out by the following set of examples.

(8)　a　Kiyomi-wa　　[TV-o　　mi-nagara]　benkyosuru　daroo
　　　　Kiyomi-TOP　TV-ACC　watch-while　study　　　　probable
　　　　"As for Kiyomi, I think s/he will study while watching TV."

　　　b　*Masami-wa　　　[razio-o　　kiki-nagara]　soo　daroo
　　　　Masami-CONTR　radio-ACC　listen-while　so　probable
　　　　"As for Masami, I think so, too listening to the radio (i.e. I think s/he will study while listening to the radio.)

(9)　a　Kiyomi-wa　　[koohi　mame-ga　　nakunara-nai-kagiri]
　　　　Kiyomi-TOP　coffee　beans-NOM　run out-not-unless
　　　　kaimono-ni　ika-nai　daroo
　　　　shopping-to　go-not　probable
　　　　"As for Kiyomi, I think s/he won't go shopping unless coffee beans run out."

　　　b　*Masami-mo　[orenji　juusu-ga　　nakunara-nai-kagiri]　soo　daroo
　　　　Masami-also　orange　juice-NOM　run out-not-unless　so　probable
　　　　"As for Masami, I think so, too not unless orange juice runs out." (i.e. I think s/he won't go shopping unless orange juice runs out).

(10)　a　Kenkyuusitu-no　denki-ga　　kieteiru-kara,
　　　　Office-GEN　　　　light-NOM　off-because
　　　　Kiyomi-wa　　　moo　　　kaetta　　　　daroo
　　　　　　-TOP　　already　return-PAST　probable
　　　　"Since the light of her/his office is off, as for Kiyomi, I think, s/he has come home."

　　　b　[Kuruma-ga　nai-kara]　　　Masami-mo　　soo　daroo
　　　　car-NOM　　　isn't-because　Masami-also　so　probable
　　　　"Since her/his car isn't (in the parking lot), as for Masami, I think so, too." (i.e. I think s/he came home too)

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Koizumi (1993) p416 (21-23))

Note that only the adverbial *kara* clause in (10) is excluded from the interpretation of

the proform *soo* and hence (10a) and (10b) can have independent *kara* clauses. This is explained if we assume that adjunct clauses such as the simultaneous *nagara* clause exemplified in (8) and the *kagiri* clause exemplified in (9) are generated within the IP, while the *kara* clause in (10) is generated outside the IP, escaping proform substitution. This conclusion is compatible with the conclusion drawn from the *sae* 'even' data that simultaneous *nagara* clauses are positioned at the VP.

Extending these tests to *nagara* clauses with an adversative meaning, Sato (1997) shows that this type of *nagara* clause occurs in a higher position than the *nagara* clause with a simultaneous reading. Consider the examples in (11).

(11) a Taro-ga　　chichi-ga　　byoki deari-nagara, gakko-ni ki-ta
　　　　Taro-NOM　father-NOM　sick　　be-while,　　　school-to come-PAST
　　　　"Taro came to school, despite his father being sick."

　　　b Taro-ga　　chichi-ga　　byoki deari-nagara, gakko-ni ki-sae-shi-ta
　　　　Taro-NOM　father-NOM　sick　　be-while,　　　school-to come-sae-do-PAST
　　　　"Taro even came to school, despite his father being sick."

<div align="right">(Sato 1997 (7) p65)</div>

In (11a), with the stative *byoki deari* 'being sick' as the *nagara* clause predicate, the example only has an adversative reading. Now consider Sato's example in (11b). The focus operator *sae* 'even' is attached to the main clause predicate. This sentence has the interpretation expressed in 1.

　　1 Of all things Taro did despite his father's sickness, what he did was come to school and that was the most surprising thing to do.

The sentence lacks the following interpretation 2.

　　2 Of all things Taro did, what he did was come to school despite his father's sickness and that was the most surprising thing.

The lack of interpretation 2 shows that the *nagara* clause cannot be in the scope of the operator *sae* 'even,' i.e. that it is not in the operator's c-command domain. Sato concludes that the clause should be analyzed, in contrast with simultaneous *nagara* clauses, as occupying a position higher than the VP of the main clause.

Sato also applies the *soo* proform substitution test to identify the position of the *nagara* clause with an adversative reading[4].

(12) *Taro-wa　　[mitsumori-no teishutu-ga　　ari-nagara], kinou　　kaisya-ni
　　　 Taro-TOP　estimate-POSS turn-in-NOM　have-while, yesterday　company-to
　　　 konakat-ta　　　shi, Jiro-mo [settai-no　　　junbi-ga　　　　　ari-nagara],
　　　 come not-PAST and, Jiro-also　welcome-GEN　preparation-NOM　have-while
　　　 soo　da
　　　 so　COP
　　　 "Taro did not come to work yesterday, while he had a duty to turn in an estimate,
　　　 and neither did Jiro, while he had a preparation for welcoming his clients."

Compare the ungrammatical (12) with the grammatical (13).

(13) Taro-wa　　[mitsumori-no teishutu-ga　　　ari-nagara], kinou　　kaisya-ni
　　　 Taro-TOP　estimate-POSS turning in-NOM　have-while,　yesterday company-to
　　　 konakat-ta-shi,　　　　Jiro-mo　　soo　da
　　　 come not-PAST-and,　Jiro-also　so　COP
　　　 "Taro did not come to work yesterday, while he had a duty to turn in, and neither
　　　 did Jiro."

Applying the same argument to the examples in (8), (9) and (10), we can see that
nagara clauses with an adversative reading should be positioned within the IP (TP for
Sato). Though the precise position for the *nagara* clause with an adversative reading
has to be yet made clear, coupled with Koizumi's conclusions, the above examples sug-
gest that the *nagara* clause with an adversative reading should be generated above VP,
but not higher than IP, unlike its simultaneous counterpart.

　　　 Koizumi(1991,1993) and Sato(1997)'s works show that *nagara* clauses with a si-
multaneous reading and those with an adversative reading should be considered to be
base generated in different positions syntactically. According to their analyses, a clear-
cut line can be drawn between the simultaneous *nagara* clause and the adversative
nagara clause at the syntactic level.

　　　 Horikawa (1994) calls into question the above-mentioned view based on the fol-
lowing example.

(14) Choko-o　　　　tabe-nagara,　yase-tai-to　　　　　　　kobosu
　　　 chocolate-ACC　eat-while,　　lose weight-want-COMP　complain
　　　 "While eating chocolate, (he) whines that he wants to lose weight."

<div align="right">(Horikawa 1994 (p36))</div>

Example (14) appears to have both a simultaneous reading and an adversative reading
at the same time. Note that in this example the predicate of the *nagara* clause is neither

a state verb, nor a negated verb, nor perfective like example (1a), and so given the assumption above that occurrence of such a predicate is both a necessary and sufficient condition for generating an adversative reading we would expect (14) to only have a simultaneous reading. However, it also has a clear adversative implication. Based on this example, Horikawa suggests the trichotomy below.

> Horikawa's Classification of *Nagara* Clauses
> 1. Nagara clauses with a simultaneous reading
> 2. Nagara clauses with both a simultaneous and an adversative reading
> 3. Nagara clauses with an adversative reading.

This situation poses a problem for the Koizumi-Sato hypothesis that a *nagara* clause is associated with a different base-generated structural position depending on whether it is simultaneous or adversative, since no element can be base generated in two different positions simultaneously.

2. Two sources of the adversative reading

In this section I'll argue that the adversative interpretations for examples such as (14) on the one hand, and for examples like (2) on the other, come from different sources, and that we can still maintain the Koizumi-Sato dichotomy for *nagara* clauses.

Wada (2015) looks extensively at *nagara* clauses and claims that depending on the type of predicate that a *nagara* clause takes, a particular reading will appear[5]. She further suggests that the seeming adversative reading in the second case of Horikawa's trichotomy comes from the context the sentence is in, whereas the adversative reading in examples (1b) and (2) comes from their structure itself. She does not spell out her suggestion or give evidence for her position. However, I will argue that we can maintain the Koizumi-Sato dichotomy by following her insight. First observe the pair of examples below.

(15) a Choko-o　　　　　tabe-nagara,　yase-tai-to　　　　　　　kobosu　　　(=14)
　　　　　Chocolate-ACC　eat-while,　　lose weight-want-COMP　complain
　　　　　"Even though (he) eats chocolate, (he) complains that he wants to lose weight at the same time."

　　　　b Konnyaku-o　　　tabe-nagara,　yase-tai-to　　　　　　　kobosu
　　　　　konnyaku-ACC　eat-while,　　lose weight-want-COMP　complain
　　　　　"While eating konnyaku, (he) complains that he wants to lose weight."

Native speakers detect an adversative reading in (15a), but not in (15b) where the per-

son eats *konnyaku*, a zero calorie food. In the latter case, it is not unexpected for someone who wishes to lose weight to eat that food. The availability of the adversative reading in the examples in (15) depends on the choice of food and our background knowledge related to the matter. It is plausible to conclude that the adversativity does not come from the sentence's structurally determined meaning alone, but is rather an implicature that depends on the content of the sentence and the context in which it is uttered.

The standard example of conversational implicature is the quantity implicature induced by numerals, as in (16).

(16) I ate two apples yesterday. In fact, I ate three apples.

When the first sentence in (16) is uttered, it implicates that the speaker ate no more than 2 apples the day before. The difference between such an implicature and a semantic meaning is that a conversational implicature can be cancelled. If the "no more than 2" understanding implicit in the first sentence of (16) were part of the conventional meaning of the sentence, then the second sentence in that example should result in a contradiction. That it does not do so supports the assumption that this understanding is a conversational implicature instead.

Following Wada(2013), I claim that the adversative interpretation in sentences like (15a), which has at the same time a simultaneous reading, is a conversational implicature. On the other hand, the adversative interpretation in sentences like (2) I take to come from the conventional meaning of the *nagara* clause. We can test the hypothesis, since a conversational implicature, but not a conventional part of the meaning of an expression, can be cancelled.

(17) a Chokoreto daietto-ga hayatte-iru-rashii
         Chocolate   diet-NOM   popular-be-seem
         "I heard that chocolate diet is in fad."

      b Nanode, Mary-wa   chokoreto-o   tabe-nagara, yase-tai-to
         so,   Mary-TOP chocolate-ACC eat-while,   lose weight-want-COMP
         kobosu
         complain
         "So, Mary complains that she wants to lose weight, while eating chocolate."

In the context set up in (17), eating chocolate is taken to be a natural thing to do if someone wants to lose weight. In this context, there is no adversative reading in the second sentence. (17b) only means that the event of Mary's eating chocolate and the

event of Mary's complaining co-occur. Now consider the following conversation in (18).

(18) a Chokoreto   daietto-ga   hayatte-iru-rashii
   Chocolate   diet-NOM   popular-be-seem
   "I heard that chocolate diet is in fad."

  b #Nanode, Mary-wa   chokoreto-wo   tabete-oki-nagara,   yase-tai-to
   so,   Mary-TOP chocolate-OJB eat-PERFECT-while, lose weight-COM
   kobosu
   saying
   "So, Mary's saying she wants to lose weight, even though she has eaten chocolate."

The second sentence in example (18) differs from its counterpart in (17) only in that in (18) an auxiliary verb *oku* expressing perfectivity is attached to the verb *tabe* 'eat'. This forces the interpretation in which the event denoted by the *nagara* clause precedes the event denoted by the main clause, hence lacking a simultaneous reading. The sentence generates an obligatory adversative reading which clashes with the context set by (18a) resulting in anomaly.

  To sum up, the adversative reading for the *nagara* clause which co-occurs with a simultaneous reading can be canceled, while the adversative reading for the *nagara* clause with no added simultaneous reading cannot be canceled even with adjustment of context. This distinction needs to be accounted for in a semantic analysis of the *nagara* clauses and so positing two different sources for the adversative reading seems to be on the right track.

3. Semantic analysis of the adversative *nagara* clause

Now let us turn to the semantics of the adversative type of *nagara* clause in a little more detail. The core meaning of a sentence with a *nagara* clause seems similar to that of the concessive sentences conjoined by *but* in English.

(19) It was raining, but John took his dog for a walk.

The sentence in (19) conventionally implicates roughly that given the event described in the first conjunct, the event described in the second conjunct is surprising. The traditional analysis given to this construction roughly is as follows.

(20) Meaning of concessive sentences
  "P, but Q" is true iff

P is true and Q is true, and
normally P → ~Q

Let us first try to adopt this analysis as the meaning of sentences containing the adversative type of *nagara* clause. That is, suppose the conventional meaning of *P-nagara Q* is defined as in (21).

(21) Meaning of *nagara* clause sentences
    "P-*nagara*, Q" is true iff
        P is true and Q is true, and
        normally P → ~Q

This does not seem to correctly capture our intuitions about (22).

(22) John-wa   ishade ari-nagara, tabako-o   suu
    John-TOP   doctor be-while,   cigarette-ACC smoke
    "John smokes even though he is a doctor."

According to (21), (22) is true iff *John is a doctor* is true and *John smokes* is true, and normally if *John is a doctor* is true, then *John does not smoke* is true. Rather, the adversative interpretation in (22) is something like that for most cases in which a person has a property of being a doctor, he does not have a property of smoking and hence John's case is unexpected.
    Suppose (22) has the following LF representation (23).

(23) [John_i-wa [_TP e_i [_AdvP PRO_i [_VP[_V'ishade ari]] -nagara] [_VP tabako-o suu]]]

For the at-issue meaning (literal semantic meaning) of a sentence containing a *nagara* clause, the *nagara* clause with PRO controlled by *John* corresponds to the first proposition and the TP with a trace of the subject bound by *John* corresponds to the second proposition. The at-issue meaning, then, is defined such that the sentence containing a *nagara* clause is true iff both propositions are true. For the conventional implicature part of the meaning, "normally" can be analyzed as an adverb of quantification that binds the PRO and the trace. Though the details need to be worked out, this approach seems promising.
    In this paper, a Japanese adjunct clause headed by *nagara* was examined. I argued that the problematic case for the Koizumi(1993)-Sato(1997)'s claim that *nagara* clauses with a simultaneous reading and those with an adversative reading should be considered to be base generated in different positions syntactically can be explained by

positing two different sources from which an adversative interpretation can derive. I have shown that the *nagara* clauses with the two different readings should be analyzed separately, since they show differences both syntactically and semantically. The precise semantic analysis of both types of *nagara* clauses was not given here, but I hope to take that up for my future research.

----

1 Note that in example (2a), naturally the time during which Taro is sick and the time when he went to school are considered to overlap. The crucial distinction between examples such as (1a) and those in (2) is that for the former the overlapping of the event times is required and no adversative relation is implied, while for the latter an adversative relation is obligatorily implied and overlapping of the event times is optional.

2 In (2c) the predicate of the *nagara* clause contains the auxiliary verb *oku* 'having done' attached to the main verb *sasou* 'to invite', which makes the predicate perfective.

3 Minami (1974) categorizes adverbial clauses in Japanese into 3 groups with respect to their ability to include one another. According to his criteria, simultaneous *nagara* clauses are in a different group from the adversative ones. He points out the following differences between the two *nagara* clauses.

(1) Simultaneous *nagara* clauses cannot have an independent subject from the one in the main clause, but this is not the case for adversative *nagara* clauses.

(2) In adversative *nagara* clauses, negation can appear, while it cannot do so in simultaneous ones.

(3) Sentences containing an adversative *nagara* clause cannot be imperative or intentional.

4 Sato(1997) posits Pollock(1989) style phrase structures and claims that the *nagara* clause with an adversative reading is generated within NegP. A precise mechanism of the proform substitution was not spelled out, but Sato seems to assume that *soo da*, not just *soo*, substitutes for NegP or TP, but not VP. (1a) is where *soo da* substitutes for the whole TP [kaisya-ni ko-nakat-ta] and the NegP [kaisha-ni ko-nakat] was replaced by *soo da* in (1b). (1c) shows that *soo da* cannot substitute for a TP while leaving a negation inside.

(1) a Taro-wa [$_{TP}$ kaisya-ni ko-nakat-ta]-shi,   Jiro-mo [$_{TP}$ soo da]
       Taro-TOP Company-to come-NOT-PAST-and, Jiro-also so   COP
       "Taro did not come to work, and neither did Jiro.

     b Taro-wa [$_{TP}$ [$_{NegP}$ kaisya-ni   ko-nakat]-ta]-shi,   Jiro-mo [$_{NegP}$ soo
       Taro-TOP   Company-to come-NOT-PAST-and, Jiro-also   so

da]-ta
COP-past.
"Taro did not come to work, and neither did Jiro.

c　*Taro-wa　[kaisya-ni　　ko-nakat-ta]-shi,　　　Jiro-mo　[soo　dewa]-nai
　　Taro-TOP　Company-to　come-NOT-PAST-and,　Jiro-also　so　　COP-NOT.
　　"Taro did not come to work, and neither did Jiro.

d　*Taro-wa [TP[NegP[VP　kaisya-ni　　　　ko]-nakat]-ta]-shi,　　　Jiro-mo [VP　soo
　　Taro-TOP　　　　　　Company-to　come-NOT-PAST-and,　Jiro-also　　　　so
　　dewa]-nakat-ta
　　COP-NOT-past.
　　"Taro did not come to work, and neither did Jiro.

The ungrammaticality of (1d) shows that *soo da* cannot substitute for VP.　(2) is used to show that adversative *nagara* clauses must be adjoined within NegP.

(2)　Taro-wa　　[mitsumori-no　teishutu-ga　　　　ari-nagara],　kinou
　　Taro-TOP　estimate-POSS　turning in-NOM　have-while,　yesterday
　　kaisya-ni　　　konakat-ta-shi,　　　　Jiro-mo　　soo　dat-ta
　　company-to　come not-PAST-and,　Jiro-also　so　copula-PAST
　　"Taro did not come to work yesterday, while he had a duty to turn in, an estimate
　　and neither did Jiro."

(2) does not have the interpretation that Taro did not come to work yesterday even though he had to turn in an estimate and Jiro did not come to work either (without the concessive part).　This suggests that the *nagara* clause should be inside the NegP which is substituted by *soo da*, otherwise, *soo da* would be allowed to simply substitute for [kinou kaisya-ni konakat] "did not come to work yesterday".
[5]　Wada (2013) claims that what divides the *nagara* clauses is the aspect type of the predicates they contain. If the predicate type is perfect, it gives rise to an adversative reading.　She further claims that the event denoted by the *nagara* clause should precede the event denoted by the main clause.　Her dichotomy of nagara clauses is given below.

	Aspect (Types of predicate in the *nagara* clause)	Taxis
Nagara clauses with a simultaneous reading	Continuation (progressing of actions and changes) Maintaining of the result, repetition	Two events occur simultaneously
Nagara clauses with an adversative reading	Perfect	*Nagara*-clause precedes the main clause

Her categorization is inaccurate, since the *nagara* clause with an adversative reading allows stative predicates as discussed in section 1. Furthermore, her description that in the adversative case, the event denoted by the *nagara* clause always precedes the event denoted by the main clause does not cover all the cases. Consider example (1).

(1)　　Tanaka-wa　　ima-de-wa　　　　rippana　isha-nagara,　mukasi-wa
　　　　Tanaka-TOP　now-at-CONTR　great　　doctor-while,　old days-CONTR
　　　　fudatsuki-no-furyo　　　　　　dat-ta
　　　　notorious-GEN-delinquent　　be-PAST
　　　　"Tanaka, while he is a great doctor now, he was a notorious delinquent in the old days."

In example (1) the state described by the *nagara* clause is in the present and the state described by the main clause is in the past. The grammaticality of this example shows that her categorization is incomplete.

List of abbreviations

TOP　　　= Topic
NOM　　　= Nominative
ACC　　　= Accusative
GEN　　　= Genetive
AUX　　　= Auxiliary
PAST　　　= Past tense
PRFCT　= Perfective
CONTR　= Contrastive
COMP　　= Complimentizer
COP　　　= Copula

References

Horikawa, T.(1994) "Bun no kaisokozo wo kangaerukoto no imi," *Nihogo nihonbunka kenkyu 4* Osaka Foreign Language University Nihongo koza pp.31-44

Koizumi, M. (1991) "Syntax of Adjuncts and the phrase structure of Japanese, MA these, The Ohio State University

Koizumi, M. (1993) "Modal Phrases and Adjuncts," Patricia Clancy (ed.) *Japanese/ Korean Linguistics 2*, Stanford Linguistics Association pp.409-428

Minami, Fujio. 1974 Gendai Nihongo-no Kozo. Tokyo: Taishukan

Morita, Y. (1980) *Kisonihongo 2*, Kadokawa shoten

Pollock, J-Y. 1989 "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP," *Linguistics Inquiry 20*:pp365-424

Sato, N. (1997) "Nihongo no Nagara setsu no imi to ichi no Soukan", *Gengokagakuronshu* Vol.1 pp.63-74

Wada, R. (2013) "Juzokusetu niokeru asupekuto no kenkyu," PhD dissertation, Kumamoto Prefectural University

On two types of *Nagara* clauses

YAMASHINA, Miyuki

In this paper a Japanese adjunct clause headed by *nagara* 'while' was examined. The adjunct clause headed by *nagara* seems to have two different interpretations; a simultaneous reading and an adversative reading, but the question which interpretation arises when has not been clearly accounted for. This paper reexamined the nature of the adjunct clause headed by *nagara* 'while' and proposes that there are two formally distinct *nagara* clauses based on Koizumi(1991,93)-Sato(1997)'s claim that *nagara* clauses with a simultaneous reading and those with an adversative reading should be considered to be base generated in different positions syntactically. Following Wada (2013), I argued that the problematic case for the Koizumi(1991,93)-Sato(1997)'s claim can be explained by positing two different sources from which an adversative interpretation can derive. I have shown that the *nagara* clauses with the two different readings should be analyzed separately, since they show differences both syntactically and semantically. Then a rough sketch of a semantic analysis of the adversative *nagara* clauses was given and a direction for further research was suggested.