

A New Perspective on Japanese *Sika-Nai* Constructions

Koji Kawahara
University of York
kk512@york.ac.uk

The goal of this talk is to discuss the semantic nature of NP+*sika* in Japanese and propose that NP+*sika* must be treated as a class of negative concord items. *Sika* is interpreted as ‘exception of an element’ from a preceding NP denoting a set including the complement of *sika* or from a null universal quantifier. Since *sika*-phrases express unique subtraction from the established and thus strong set in their discourse, the universal quantification is derived as their default value when not preceded by an overt NP. Therefore, it is expected that *sika-nai* constructions can be captured on a par with exceptive phrases in English discussed by von Stechow (1992) and Moltmann (1995).

I will show that the proposed analysis provides the way to solve various empirical and conceptual problems discussed in the literature. First, *sika*-phrases are always followed by sentential negation marker, but they do not express negation. Therefore, *sika*-phrases have been translated into English *only* or *nothing but*. The proposal argues that what is negated by sentential negation marker is the preceding NP, not NP+*sika* and thus the proposition expressed by *sika-nai* constructions no longer poses problems from the viewpoint of compositional semantic theory. Second, since *sika*-phrases are modifiers, they can be preceded by an overt NP. The preceding NP always denotes a set of *sika* phrases, and therefore the interpretation of *sika*'s complement depends on the preceding NP [(1a-b)]. If they are preceded by an NP, which cannot be in any way associated with the complement of *sika*, they will cause semantic anomaly [(1c)]. Third, since NP+*sika* expresses unique subtraction, it cannot be conjoined and more than one NP+*sika* cannot be used in a single clause [(2)]. Fourth, the proposed analysis captures the semantic difference between *sika* and *dake*, both of which would be translated into *only*, discussed in the traditional Japanese linguistics. While NP+*sika* expresses some expectation in the discourse, NP+*dake* does not [(3)]. NP+*sika* cannot be a topic in the discourse and it can not be the antecedent of null pronoun and the utterance about someone else follows naturally. On the other hand, NP+*dake* can be a topic and can be referred to by null pronoun (cf. Kuno 1999) and the utterance about NP+*dake* follows naturally [(4-5)]. In addition, adverbs expressing unexpected events such as *ikinari* ‘suddenly’ are not compatible with NP+*sika* [(6)]. Since NP+*sika* can be preceded by a null universal quantifier and what is expressed by the predicate in *sika-nai* constructions is the denotation about the quantifier or a preceding NP, the semantic properties of *sika-nai* constructions can be explained straightforwardly.

Japanese *sika* has been treated as a negative polarity item, a counterpart of *any* in English. Watanabe (2004) argues that Japanese indefinite+*mo* compounds, which have also been regarded as negative polarity items, must be analyzed as negative concord items using the following diagnostics: (i) ability to be used in preverbal position, (ii) ability to be modified by *almost*, (iii) ability to be used in non-negative contexts, (iv) ability to be used as elliptical answers and (v) the sensitivity to the locality constraints. Watanabe claims that indefinite+*mo* compounds must be dealt with as inherently negative depending on the negativity of elliptical answers [(7a)] and offers a special treatment for a full sentence to derive negation preventing double negative [(8)]. Interestingly, the five characteristics are applied to NP+*sika*. The availability of the elliptical answers of NP+*sika* is intriguing in particular, because it indicates that negative proposition, which is not given in the discourse, is induced [(7b)]. I propose that *sika*-phrases and indefinite+*mo* compounds are licensed by syntactic movement and the negative value of elliptical answers is derived from deleted negation marker. This explains all the characteristics and supports the movement analysis of negative concord made by Haegeman (1995). *Sika*-phrases move to Spec of Neg to be outside the scopal domain of negation, and the movement is incurred by an uninterpretable focus feature and is regulated by island constraints (cf. Tanaka 1997). This also explains why *sika*-phrases are not followed by structural Case-marker, because it tends to be dropped in the focalized position (cf. pseudo-clefts vs. clefts). Therefore, a special treatment is required to derive the negative value of elliptical answers. I propose that negation can be induced if a ‘clue’ remains in overt parts. This view is challenging for the semantic deletion analysis, which assumes that given information can be deleted. (cf. Schwarzschild 1999, Merchant 2001) The investigation of the elliptical answers will give a new perspective on the analysis of deletion.

- (1) a. Taro-wa kudamono-o ringo-sika tabe-nakat-ta.
Taro-TOP fruit-ACC apple-only eat-NEG-PAST
 ‘As for fruits, Taro ate only apples.’ apple fruit
- b. Taro-wa e-o ringo-sika kaka-nakat-ta.
Taro-TOP picture-ACC apple-only write-NEG-PAST
 ‘As for pictures, Taro drew only apples.’ apple picture
- c. *Taro-wa hon-o ringo-sika yoma-nakt-ta.
Taro-TOP book-ACC apple-only read-NEG-PAST
 ‘As for books, Taro read only apples.’ apple book
- (2) a. *Taro-sika –to Hanako-sika ko-nakat-ta.
Taro-only and Hanako-only come-NEG-PAST
 ‘Only Taro and only Hanako came.’
- b. *Taro-sika MP-sika yoma-nakat-ta.
Taro-only MP-only read-NEG-PAST
 ‘Only Taro reads only MP.’
- (3) a. . Dono-gakusei-mo kuru-to omot-tei-ta-noni, Taro-sika ko-nakat-ta.
every-student-PART come-COMP think-TEIRU-PAST-though Taro-only come-NEG-PAST
 ‘Though I thought every student would come, only Taro came.’
- b. #Dono-gakusei-mo kuru-to omot-tei-ta-noni, Taro-dake(-ga) ki-ta.
Every-student-PART come-COMP think-TEIRU-PAST-though Taro-only(-NOM) come-PAST
 ‘Though I thought every student would come, only Taro came.’
- (4) Taro-sika ko-nakat-ta.
Taro-only come-NEG-PAST
 ‘Only Taro came.’
- a. #Ritigina yatu-da. b. Hoka-no minnna-wa nani-o si-teiru-no-darou?
dutiful guy-COP other-GEN everyone-TOP what-ACC do-TEIRU-GEN-will
 ‘He is dutiful.’ ‘What are others doing?’
- (5) Taro-dake(-ga) ki-ta.
Taro-only(-NOM) come-PAST
 ‘Only Taro came.’
- a. Ritigina yatu-da. b. #Hoka-no minnna-wa nani-o si-teiru-no-darou?
dutiful guy-COP other-GEN everyone-TOP what-ACC do-TEIRU-GEN-will
 ‘He is dutiful.’ ‘What are others doing?’
- (6) a. #Ikinari Taro-sika ko-nakat-ta. b. Ikinari Taro-dake(-ga) ki-ta.
suddenly Taro-only come-NEG-PAST suddenly Taro-only(-NOM) come-PAST
 ‘Suddenly only Taro came.’ ‘Suddenly only Taro came.’
- (7) Q: Nani-ka mi-ta-no? A: a. Nani-mo b. Tori-sika
what see-PAST-Q n-thing bird-only
 ‘What did you see?’ ‘Nothing’. ‘Only birds.’
- (8) Dare-mo ko-nakat-ta.
n-person come-NEG-PAST
 ‘No one came.’

Selective References: von Stechow, Kai. 1993. ‘Exceptive Constructions’, *NLS*. Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2000. ‘Negative Concord?’ *NLLT*. Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The Syntax of Negation*, Cambridge University Press. Kawahara, Koji. 2006. ‘Fragmental Answers of Negative Concord and the Theory of Ellipsis,’ paper presented at LAGB. Kuno, Susumu. 1999. ‘Dake-Sika Koubun-no Imi-to Kouzou’, in *Gengogaku-to Nihongo-kyoiku Jituyoutekigengoriron-no Koutiku-o Mezasite*, Kuroshio Publishers. Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence*, Oxford University Press. Moltmann, Friederike. 1995. ‘Exception Sentences and Polyadic Quantification’, *LP*. Schwarzschild, Roger. 1999. ‘GIVENness, Avoid F and Other Constraints on the Placement of Accent’, *NLS*. Tanaka, Hidekazu. 1997. ‘Invisible Movement in *Sika-Nai* and Linear Crossing Constraint’, *JEAL*. Teramura, Hideo. 1991. *Nihongo-no Sintakusu-to Imi III*, Kuroshio Publishers. Watanabe, Akira. 2004. ‘The Genesis of Negative Concord: Syntax and Morphology of Negative Doubling’, *LI*.