'Neg-sensitive' Elements, NEG-c-command and Scrambling in Japanese

This paper argues, contrary to what is widely accepted in the literature, that not all items in Japanese that must occur with sentential negation (henceforth 'Neg-sensitive' elements=NSE) obey the general condition in [A] (Klima 1964).

[A] An NSE must be c-commanded by NEG at LF.

More specifically, it argues that (i) XP-sika, a frequently discussed NSE in Japanese ((1)) and assumed to be necessarily c-commanded by NEG at LF in works such as Kato 1994, 2002, Kuno 1995, must c-command NEG at LF, rather than being c-commanded by NEG at LF, while (ii) another type of NSE, rokuna-N (2), obeys [A].

The crucial evidence comes from the 'scrambling construction'. The 'scrambling construction' in Japanese has been considered to be structurally ambiguous in two ways; at LF either the subject c-commands the object or the object c-commands the subject (Saito 1992, Ueyama 1998). I argue that the object in the latter case, i.e., so-called A-scrambling, occupies the position which is not c-commanded by -nai. First, with the intended binding, (3a) must be an instance of 'A-scrambling'.

As indicated in (3b), the object QP in that case cannot be in the scope of -nai; cf. (9), where the subject QP can be in the scope of -nai. Second, it is observed that 'A-scrambling' allows 'resumption' but not the other type of 'scrambling' ((4)) (Hoji 2003). (The shaded NP is the 'resumption' in (4) and (5).)

When the sentence is felicitous with 'resumption', the object QP cannot be in the scope of -nai ((5b)). We are thus led to conclude that the 'scrambled' object in the 'A-scrambling' is outside the c-command domain of -nai, given the general assumption that the scope of α is its c-command domain.

With this result, we can turn to rokuna-N and XP-sika. As shown in (6) and (7), rokuna-N cannot occur in that position while XP-sika can, thereby leading us to conclude that the former is, but the latter is not, subject to [A].

It would not be possible to confirm/disconfirm the validity of [A] if we only considered sentences of the Subject-Object-V order, under the assumptions generally held about Japanese. [A] is motivated by the observations in English, where the subject is independently argued to be outside the c-command domain of not (8)).

In Japanese, on the other hand, every NP can be c-commanded by -nai, given the general assumptions that the subject NP does not obligatorily raise up to [Spec, IP] from its θ-position inside the VP (or vP in the recent framework) at LF, and that the negative element -nai is a sister to the VP (or vP) at LF (following Pollock 1989). The distribution of Japanese NSEs, which do not exhibit subject/non-subject asymmetry (2), could never be problematic to [A]; and it is for this reason that [A] has been generally assumed to hold also in Japanese. As noted above, an examination of a certain type of the 'scrambling construction', has revealed that XP-sika is in fact not subject to [A] but rokuna-N is.

Though the scope relation between QP and -nai is ambiguous ((9)) (Kuno 1980), a QP which is c-commanded by XP-sika cannot take wide scope over -nai ((10a)). Furthermore, a QP which c-commands XP-sika cannot be in the scope of -nai ((10b)). Finally, rokuna-N cannot c-command XP-sika if they co-occur in the same clause and are 'related with' the same negation ((11)). These observations would be unexpected if they were both subject to [A], thus providing additional confirmation for the conclusion reached above that rokuna N is, but XP-sika is not, subject to [A].

In order to account for the ambiguity in (9), I assume, following Hasegawa 1991, that Quantifier Raising (QR) can either be an IP-adjunction (whose landing site is a position c-commanding -nai) or a VP-adjunction (whose landing site is a position c-commanded by -nai). For its empirical effects, the Scope Rigidity Principle is widely accepted in the field for languages like Japanese, which disallows the c-command relation between two maximal projections to be altered by LF movement (Huang 1982, Hoji 1985). Given this, if QP1>>XP-sika>>Q2 (where α>>β is a c-commands β) is established before QR, the same c-command relations must therefore hold after QR. Consider again (10); their scope interpretations are limited as indicated. While (10a-ii), (10b-ii), and (10b-iii) fall under the Scope Rigidity Principle, (10a-iii) does not. The generalization is that a QP is disallowed to occur between XP-sika and -nai at LF. Adopting that -nai is in the sister position of the VP at LF (Pollock 1989, Masuoka 1989), I thus propose that XP-sika must be located in NegP-Spec at LF (cf. Aoyagi & Ishii 1994.) XP-sika, however, should be treated separately from Negative Concord items in Italian or Spanish (Zanuttini 1991) since XP-sika alone cannot induce negation, even in an ellipsis context, with negation in the first 'conjunct' (11).

Finally, the 'scrambled' counterparts of examples like (11) exhibit the expected patterns of judgments, depending upon the presence/absence of 'resumption', providing further support for the proposal. (The relevant examples are not supplied here.)
anybody-else come-Neg-Past-Q Taro-all but come-Neg-Past / Taro-all but come-Past / Taro-all but
'Didn't anybody else come?' 'Nobody but Taro come.'

(2) a. Saikin rokuna-gakusei-ga ronbun-o okutte-ko-nai / *okutte-kuru.
recently good-student-NOM paper-ACC submit-Neg / submit
'Since recently, no good students submit a paper.'

b. Taro-wa itumo rokuna-koto-o {si-nai / *suru}
Taro-TOP always good-thing-ACC do-Neg / do
'Taro always does damn things.'

(3) a. [Itutuizyoo-no ginkoo]-ni soko-no torihikisaki-ga Nissan-o suisensi-ta.
ok5-or-more-GEN bank-DAT it-GEN client-NOM Nissan-ACC recommend-Past
'To [each of five or more banks], its client recommended Nissan.'

b. [Itutuizyoo-no ginkoo]-ni soko-no torihikisaki-ga Nissan-o suisensi-na-katta.
*(5-or-more>nai, *nai>5-or-more
'To five or more banks, Nissan did not recommend.'

'To its, client, [five or more banks], Nissan to it'.

b. [Itutuizyoo-no ginkoo]-ni soko-no torihikisaki-ga soko-ni Nissan-o suisensi-ta.
'To [each of five or more banks], its client recommended Nissan to it.'

(5) a. [Itutuizyoo-no ginkoo]-ni Toyota-ga Nissan-o suisensi-na-katta.
'To five or more banks, Toyota did not recommend Nissan.'

b. [Itutuizyoo-no ginkoo]-ni Toyota-ga soko-ni Nissan-o suisensi-na-katta.
'To five or more banks, Toyota did not recommend Nissan to it.'

(6) a. *Mosi [rokuna-ginkoo]-ni soko-no torihikisaki-ga syootaizyoo-o okura-na-katta-ra, if
good-company-DAT it-GEN client-NOM invitation-ACC send-Neg-Past-1f
b. *Mosi rokuna-ginkoo-ni Mitubisi-ga soko-ni syootaizyoo-o okura-na-katta-ra, if
good-company-DAT Mitsubishi-NOM it-DAT invitation-ACC send-Neg-Past-if

(7) a. Mosi [Tokyoginkoo-ni-sika], soko-no torihikisaki-ga syootaizyoo-o okura-na-katta-ra,
'If, to any company except Bank of Tokyo', its client did not send an invitation'

b. Mosi Tokyoginkoo-ni-sika Mitubisi-ga soko-ni syootaizyoo-o okura-na-katta-ra,
'If, to any company except Bank of Tokyo, Mitsubishi did not send there an invitation'

(8) a. He didn't [ invite anybody. ] / b. *Anybody didn't [ come.]

(9) [5-or-more-GEN student-NOM that-GEN book-ACC read-Neg-Past (Comp)
Five or more students did not read that book.'

Yamada-professor-all but 3-or-more-GEN student-ACC Mitsubishi-DAT introduce-Neg (Comp)
(Roughly) 'All professors but Prof. Yamada do not introduce three or more students to Mitsubishi.'
(i) *XP-sika>-nai>Q1, (ii) QP1>XP-sika>-nai, (iii) QP1>XP-sika>-nai
b. [3ninizyoo-no sensei-ga] ga gakusei-o Mitubisi-ni-sika syookaisi-nai (koto)
'Three or more professors do not introduce any student to any company but Mitsubishi.'
(i) *QP2>XP-sika>-nai, (ii) *XP-sika>-nai>QP2, (iii) *XP-sika>-Q2

(11) a. [Yamada-sensei-sika] [rokuna-kaisya-o] gakusei-ni syookaisi-nai (koto)
Yamada-professor-all but good-company-ACC student-DAT introduce-Neg (Comp)
(Roughly) 'All professors but Prof. Yamada do not introduce decent companies to students.'

b. *[Rokuna-sensei-ga] [dansi-gakusei-sika] Mitubisi-ni syookaisi-nai (koto)
good-professor-NOM male-student-all but Mitsubishi-DAT introduce-Neg (Comp)
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