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NEGATION AND WH-QUESTION IN JAPANESE

Masaki Sano

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the question of how negation and wh-question in Japanese interact to yield a seemingly peculiar paradigm. Consider first the following declarative sentences involving negation:

(1a). Taroo wa paatee ni de-nai to omoi-masu
      Top party to attend-Neg COMP think-Pres
      "I think that Taro will not attend the party"

b. Taroo wa paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen
      attend-Pres think-Neg
      "I do not think that Taro will attend the party"

As the English translations indicate, the two sentences are almost synonymous with each other, the matrix predicate omoi, like its English equivalent think, being a so-called Neg-Raising predicate. In spite of the synonymy of the two, however, the corresponding wh-questions given by the substitution of dare(ga) "who" for Taroo(wa) differ markedly in acceptability:

(2a). dare ga paatee ni de-nai to omoi-masu ka
       who Nom Q
      "who do you think will not attend the party"

b. *dare ga paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen ka
      "who don't you think will attend the party"

Note that this difference in acceptability is grammatical and not stylistic, for the string omoi-masen ka is by no means odd in a simple yes/no question like the following:

(3) Taroo wa paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen ka
"don't you think that Taro will attend the party"

Note further that the following sentence, which essentially expresses what (2b) intends to express, is acceptable:

(4) 

| dare ga paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omow-anai no desu ka² |
| think-Neg COMP Cop Q |

"who is it that you don't think will attend the party" or: "who do you not think will attend the party"

Another peculiarity comes from the fact that there are basically two forms that an answer to a question like (4) can take. Usually, an answer to a wh-question is obtained from filling a wh-phrase with an appropriate value for it, with a concomitant deletion of the question marker ka at the end of the sentence. Thus the following is a possible answer to (4):

(5) 

| Taroo ga paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omow-nai no desu |
| "it is Taro that I don't think will attend the party" |
| or: "I do not think that TARO will attend the party"³ |

However, to (4) an answer of the following form is also appropriate:

(6) 

| Taroo ga paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen |

Note that (6) is exactly the form obtained by substituting Taroo for dare and deleting ka in the unacceptable wh-question form (2b). These facts clearly indicate that what is wrong with (2b) lies in the occurrence of (i) the wh-phrase, (ii) the predicate involving a negative omoi-masen, and (iii) the question marker ka that directly follows the negative; thus even if there is a wh-phrase, the sentence is acceptable if there is no negative attached to omow, as in (2a); even if
there is a negative attached to omow, the sentence is acceptable if there is no wh-phrase, as in (3); and even if a wh-phrase cooccurs with a predicate involving a negative, the sentence is acceptable if ka does not immediately follow the negative, as in (4).

Before entering directly into the problem of how the above paradigm of the interaction between negation and wh-question is to be accounted for, it is necessary to examine the basic properties of wh-questions and negative sentences in Japanese, to which the following two sections are devoted. In section 4, certain differences between simplex and complex sentences will be discussed, particularly with respect to the structural relationship between a predicate and the question morpheme ka that follows it, which will be further elaborated in section 5. In section 6, a condition on binding will be proposed which is independently necessary to block certain associations of focus with negation. It will be shown that this condition also applies to exclude certain binding possibilities of a wh-phrase, accounting for the above paradigm and other apparently complex phenomena as well.

2. Binding WH

Harada (1972) observes that a wh-phrase (WH) in Japanese must be associated with an appropriate occurrence of ka (Q), as shown by the following:

(7a) dare ga paatee ni de-masu ka
    attend-Pres Q

"who will attend the party"

b. *dare ga paatee ni de-masu

(7a) is grammatical, with dare associated with ka. But (7b) is unacceptable, lacking ka, with which WH must be associated.4 Harada further claims that the appropriate association of
WH with Q can be defined in terms of the notion of "command" (Langacker 1969): Any occurrence of WH must be commanded by some occurrence of Q. This is illustrated by the following:

(8)a. [s [s dare ga paatee ni de-ru] to omoi-masu kal]
   "who do you think will attend the party"

b. [s Taro ga [s dare ga paatee ni de-ru kal] sittei-masu]
   "Taro knows who will attend the party"

c. *[s dare ga [s Taro ga paatee ni de-ru kal] sittei-masu]

d. [s dare ga [s Taro ga paatee ni de-ru kal] sittei-masu kal]
   "who knows whether Taro will attend the party"

In (8a), although WH *dare* and Q *ka* are in different clauses, the former is commanded by the latter and the sentence is grammatical. In (8b), which is also grammatical, WH is in the same clause as, and is therefore commanded by, Q. In (8c), which is unacceptable, *dare* is not commanded by *ka*, the latter being in the clause subordinate to the clause containing the former. In (8d), although WH in the matrix clause is not commanded by Q in the embedded Q, it is commanded by the matrix Q, hence the sentence is grammatical.

With Harada's observations in mind, let us define the notion of binding as follows:

(9) \( \alpha \) is bound by \( \beta \) if \( \alpha \) is coindexed with and commanded by \( \beta \).

This definition of binding is in effect the same as Chomsky's (1981: 184) except that Chomsky's definition requires "c-command" rather than "command." We will return to this matter.
According to (9), an occurrence of WH is bound by an occurrence of Q that commands it if they are coindexed. Note that indexing is necessary to specify which occurrence of WH is associated with which occurrence of Q. To see this, consider the following example:

(10) [s Akiko wa [s dono kyouju ga dare o suisensitei-ru
which professor Acc recommend-Pres
ka] sittei-masu ka]

In (10), there are two occurrences of WH, namely dono kyouju and dare, and two occurrences of Q. Furthermore, the two wh-phrases are commanded by both occurrences of Q. Suppose that both of the two wh-phrases are associated, or construed, with Q in the embedded clause and not with Q in the matrix clause. The familiar device of coindexing to indicate construal of this sort gives the following representation:

(11) [s Akiko wa [s {dono kyouju}, ga (dare), o
suisensitei-ru {ka},, } sittei-masu ka]

Under the definition of binding given in (9), the two wh-phrases are bound by one and the same ka in the embedded clause, and ka in the matrix clause binds nothing, which means that the latter ka is simply a yes/no question marker. Under this representation, therefore, the sentence is interpreted as a yes/no question with the meaning "does Akiko know which professor recommends whom," and in fact it does have this interpretation. However, for many speakers it is also interpreted as a wh-question asking for the identity of the professor such that Akiko knows whom he recommends, in which case the wh-phrase dono kyouju is associated with the matrix, rather than embedded, ka. This interpretation is represented by coindexing of dono kyouju with the matrix ka, as in (12):
(12) [s Akiko wa [s (dono kyouju), ga (dare), o suisensitei-ru (ka), ] sittei-masu (ka), ]

Since in this case the matrix *ka* binds *dono kyouju*, the sentence is a wh-question with the interpretation "for which *x*, *x* a professor, he knows whom *x* recommends," which calls for an answer with *dono kyouju* filled filled with an appropriate value for it, as in the following:

(13) (Akiko wa) Tanaka kyouju ga dare o suisensitei-ru ka sittei-masu
"(Akiko) knows whom Professor Tanaka recommends"

Not all speakers readily accept the interpretation represented by (13), due to the so-called wh-island condition, whose effect is, as Nishigauchi (1990: 33-40) points out, not only susceptible to dialectal variation but also affected by such factors as the choice of a wh-word, intonation patterns, word order, etc. However, the point is that indexing is in any event necessary to specify which WH is bound by which Q.

3. The Scope of Negation

A negative element in Japanese is in general realized as part of a predicate or as (part of) an auxiliary; *tabe-nai* is a negative counterpart of the predicate *tabe "eat." masen* is a negative counterpart of the politeness auxiliary *mas*, *mai* is an obligatory suppletive form of "*nai-yoo "Neg-will (first person)" or an optional suppletive form of *nai-daroo "Neg-will (non-first person)," etc. Since *mas* is a suffix which must be directly attached to the adpredicative form (*"ren'youkei") of a verb, it cannot follow the negative affix (*a)*nai; *"omow-anai-mas "think-Neg-Pol(ite)" is morphologically ill-formed and the correct form is omoi-masen, where *omoi* is the adpredicative form of *omow*. Since every negative element is bound to or
dependent on some predicate or auxiliary, let us use the term "negative predicate" as a cover term for any independent predicate with a negative element in it; thus *tabe-nai, tabe-masen, tabe(-ru)-mai* are all referred to as a negative predicate, but *nai*, unless it is a negative counterpart of the verb *ar(-u) "be(-Pres)"*, is not a negative predicate since it is a bound morpheme. Likewise, auxiliaries like *masen* and *mai* are not negative predicates. Technically, we assume that a negative predicate has the feature [+neg(ative)] percolated up from a negative element; *tabe-nai* is [+neg] since the feature [+neg] of *nai* is percolated up to the entire predicate. The same is true of such negative predicates as *omow-anai, tabe-masen, omoi-masen, ari-masen* (where *ari* is the adpredicative form of *ar*), *tabe(-ru)-mai*, etc.

With this much in mind, let us consider what element can be a focus of negation. We associate a focus with negation by coindexing it with a negative predicate, which, by assumption, has the feature [+neg]. Also, a focus of negation will be sometimes marked with *wa*, a particle which marks not only a topic but also a focus. Examples follow:

(14)a. boku wa *(tuma to)*, paatee ni *(de-mai)*; 

      "I shall not attend the party with my WIFE"

b. boku wa *(tuma to)*, wa paatee ni *(de-mai)*

In both examples above, *tuma to* is intended to be a focus of negation, and in fact it can: the sentences may imply that it is not with *my* wife that I will attend the party. Now consider the following examples involving embedding:

(15)a. *[boku wa *[s *(tuma to)*, wa paatee ni de-yoo] to *(omoi-masen)*, ]

      "I don't think that I will attend the party with
my WIFE" or: "it is not with my wife that I think that I will attend the party"
b. [s Taroo wa [s (okusan to), wa paatee ni wife {de-nai}, ] to ittei-masu]
say-Pres
"Taro says that he will not attend the party with his WIFE" or: "Taro says that it is not with his wife that he will attend the party"
c. *[s (Taroo), wa [s okusan to paatee ni (de-nai), ]
to ittei-masu
d. [s (Taroo), wa [s okusan to paatee ni de-nai] to {ittei-masen}, ]
"TARO doesn't say that he will not attend the party with his wife" or: "it is not Taro that says that he will not attend the party with his wife"

The similarity of the above paradigm to the paradigm (8) suggests that the same condition that is operative in the association of WH with Q also applies to the association of a focus with negation; that is, just as an occurrence of WH must be commanded by an occurrence of Q, a focus of negation must be commanded by [+neg]. Thus in (15c) Taroo cannot be a focus of negation since de-nai, which is the only negative predicate that appears in the sentence, does not command Taroo. All other examples in (15) are well-formed since the focus of negation is appropriately commanded by a negative predicate.

Now consider the following examples:

(16)a. [s boku wa [s (daremo), (ko-nai), ] to omoi-masu]
     anyone come-Neg
     "I think that noone will come"
b. [s boku wa [s (daremo), ku-ru] to (omoi-masen), ]
     come-Pres
"I don't think that anyone will come"

_Daremo_, when it assumes the accent pattern of LHH (Kato 1985: 146–7), is a negative polarity item (NPI), requiring an associated negative. Thus a sentence like _daremo kuru_ is not acceptable unless it is a complement to a so-called Neg-Raising predicate like _omow_ or what Kato (1985) calls a bridge expression.⁶ Note that _daremo_ in (16) is commanded by _ko-nai_ or _omoi-masen_, both of which are negative predicates. If _daremo_ appears in a position that is not commanded by a negative predicate, it cannot be taken as an NPI with the accent pattern of LHH; _daremo_ in sentences like (17) below cannot be associated with the embedded negative predicate _ko-nai_:

(17)a. *[υ (daremo),] [υ Taroo ga {ko-nai},] to
omo-tei-masu]"  
"anyone thinks that Taro will not come"

b. [υ (daremo),] [υ Taroo ga ko-nai] to
{o-mo-tei-masen],]  
"no one thinks that Taro will not come"

Although all these observations indeed indicate that the structural condition involved in the association of focus with negation is the same as the one involved in the association of WH with Q, a closer examination shows that a stricter condition is at work in the association of focus with negation. Consider, for example, the following yes/no question counterparts of (16):

(18)a. *[υ (anata wa)] [υ (daremo),] (ko-nai),] to
omo-i-masu ka]  
"do (you) think that no one will come"

b. *[υ (anata wa)] [υ (daremo),] {ku-ru} to
{omo-i-masen},] ka]  
"don't (you) think that anyone will come"
Curiously enough, the yes/no question counterpart of (16b), namely (18b), is unacceptable under the intended interpretation; *daremo*, even if taken to be an NPI read with LHH, cannot be associated with the commanding negative predicate *oomoi-masen*. Note, further, that the following sentence is acceptable in sharp contrast with (18b):

(19) (anata wa) *{daremo}* i ku-ru to *{oomow-anai}* i no desu ka
"do (you) not think that anyone will come"

Since the only crucial difference between (16b) and (18b) is the absence vs. presence of *ka*, it must be that *ka* in (18b) blocks the association of *daremo* with *oomoi-masen*. This association is indeed blocked under the following assumptions:

(20) (i) Q (ka) is adjoined to the preceding independent predicate.
(ii) The scope of negation is the set of nodes c-commanded by [+neg].

The assumption (20ii) is a special case of the definition of scope given by May (1985): The scope of *α* is the set of nodes c-commanded by *α*. Since any focus of *α* must be within its scope, it follows from (20ii) that a focus of negation must be c-commanded by [+neg]. Now, it follows from the assumption (20i) that any constituent outside of a negative predicate fails to be c-commanded by its feature [+neg] if Q (ka) is adjoined to it, as is clear from the following structure:

(21)
Under the classic definition of c-command in terms of "first branching node" (Reinhart 1976), $\beta$ (and anything within it) is not c-commanded by $[+\text{neg}]$, since $\text{Pred}^*$ is branching. But suppose we adopt (22) below as the definition of c-command, along with the assumption (23) (May 1985, Chomsky 1986):

(22) $\alpha$ c-commands $\beta$ iff $\alpha$ does not dominate $\beta$ and every $\gamma$ that dominates $\alpha$ dominates $\beta$.
(23) $\alpha$ is dominated by $\beta$ only if it is dominated by every segment of $\beta$.

Under this definition of c-command also, $\beta$ in (21) is not c-commanded by $[+\text{neg}]$, since $\text{Pred}^*$, which dominates $[+\text{neg}]$, does not dominate $\beta$. Let us from now on understand "c-command" as in (22), adopting the assumption (23), which has direct relevance to adjunction structures.

In (21), since nothing outside $\text{Pred}^*$ is c-commanded by $[+\text{neg}]$, nothing is within the scope of $[+\text{neg}]$. Thus $\text{daremo}$ in (18b) fails to be c-commanded by the negative predicate $\text{omoi-masen}$, since $\text{ka}$ is adjoined to the latter. $\text{Daremo}$ is therefore outside the scope of negation and the sentence is unacceptable. Why, then, is (19) acceptable? Notice that in this sentence $\text{ka}$ is not adjoined directly to the negative predicate $\text{omow-anai}$ but rather to the copular predicate. Furthermore, no before the copula is a complementizer embedding the sentence $\text{daremo kuru to omow-anai}$. The structure for (19) is therefore something like the following:

(24) [s [s {daremo}, ku-rul] to {omow-anai}, ] no desu ka]

In this structure $\text{daremo}$ is properly c-commanded by the negative predicate $\text{omow-nai}$. The same is true of the informal version of (24) in which $\text{desu ka}$ is absent; see the last paragraph of note 2.
4. **Simplex vs. Complex Sentence**

A problem arises as to the status of a simplex sentences like (25a) below, as compared to (25b):

(25)a. (daremo), (ki-masen), ka
    come-Neg
    "will noone come"

b. (daremo), (ko-nai), no desu ka

(25b) is unproblematic; like (24), _ka_ is not adjoined to the negative predicate, which therefore c-commands _daremo_, as required. But in (25a), if the assumption (20i) is correct, _ka_ is adjoined directly to the preceding negative predicate _ki-masen_, which then does not c-command _daremo_. Under this assumption, therefore, (25a) should be barred. However, although (25a) might not sound as perfect as (25b), nonetheless it is far better than (18b). There is some evidence, in fact, that if (25a) sounds odd at all, it is not related to the negative polarity of _daremo_ per se, but to its quantificational force; the NPI _daremo_, similarly to English _anyone_, can be analyzed either as a universal quantifier that requires a negative that c-commands it but nevertheless has wider scope than the negative (perhaps via Quantifier Raising in the sense of May (1977)), or as an existential quantifier that must be within the scope of negation. Thus even if the subject of _ki-masen ka_ is not an NPI, the sentence is as odd as (25a) if the subject is quantificational; compare (26) with (27):

(26) (Taroo / kare / anata) ga ki-masen ka
    he     you
    "will {Taroo/he/you} not come"

(27) (daremo / dareka / minna) ga ki-masen ka
    everyone someone all-men
    "will {everyone/someone/all-men} not come"
There is no problem with (28), where the subject position is not filled with a quantificational expression. In (27), *daremo* is NOT an NPI if it is Case-marked with *ga*, in which case it is read as HLL with the quantificational meaning "everyone." But the sentence with *daremo ga* as subject is odd as compared with (26), although its declarative and affirmative counterparts, *daremo ga ki-masen* "everyone will not come (=no one will come)" and *daremo ga ki-masu ka* "will everyone come" are both all right. Similar remarks apply if *dareka ga* or *minna ga* is chosen as a quantificational subject. Note that it is a quantificational force of the subject and not its indefiniteness that makes sentences like (27) odd; if the subject is an indefinite without a quantificational force, the sentence is by no means odd; compare (28) with (29):

(28) (hito / gakusei / kodomo / yakuza) ga ki-masen ka
    person student child gangster
    "will (people/students/children/gangsters) not come"
(29) (ooku no / nannin ka no ) gakusei ga ki-masen ka
    many of some(-number of)
    "will (many/some) students not come"

(28), where the subject position is filled with an indefinite, is quite on a par with (26). Note in passing that we can add *sono* "the" to the subject in (28) and make it definite, as in *sono hito ga ki-masen ka*, with no change in acceptability. (29) is as odd as (27) since *hito* is modified by a quantifier, with the result that the entire subject phrase is made quantificational. As in the case of (27), the declarative and affirmative counterparts of (29) are quite fine, as in

(ooku no / nanninaka no) gakusei ga ki-masen "(many/some)
students will not come" and (ooku no / nanninaka no) gakusei ga
ki-masu ka "will (many/some) students come." It should be
noted, also, that a quantificational expression that does not
occupy the subject position does not create oddness:

(30)  (daremo / dareka / minna) ki-masen ka
(31a)  (daremo / dareka) hito ga ki-masen ka
       b.  hito ga (daremo / dareka) ki-masen ka
(32a)  nanninka hito ga ki-masen ka
       b.  hito ga nanninka ki-masen ka

If we take the Case-less quantificational expressions in (30) to be something like vocatives that do not occupy the subject position, the sentences are fine. For example, it is possible to take daremo in (30) to be referring to all the addressees, in which case it is not an NPI; the vocative-like daremo can be used without any negative, as in daremo yoku yat-ta "everyone did well," which may be used to praise every addressee or every person related to the speaker, say, those working under the speaker. Daremo/dareka in (31) is related to hito by whatever mechanism it is that may also relate nanninka in (32) to hito, but while hito, being Case-marked with ga, is clearly the subject, daremo/dareka and nanninka do not occupy the subject position, in these quite natural examples.

All these observations conspire to indicate that if there is something wrong with (25a), it has nothing to do with the negative polarity of daremo. In fact, consideration of anaphoric reference indicates that the sequence daremo ga ki-masen forms a constituent in which daremo is c-commanded by ki-masen. Observe first the following dialogue:

(33) A: Daremo ko-nai no desu ka?  (= (25b))
       ("Is it (so) that no one will come?")
B:  Hai, sou desu.  ("Yes, it is so.")

In B's response, sou is a pro-form referring back to the proper part of A's question, namely daremo ko-nai, which is definitely
a constituent, since it is a clause embedded by the complementizer no. Now observe that the same sou can be used in response to (25a), as in the following:

(34) A: Daremo ki-masen ka?
    B: Hai, sou desu.

What does sou refer back to in B's response in (34)? Naturally the question marker ka is not part of its reference, but it must refer to both daremo and ki-masen. Therefore, daremo ki-masen must be a constituent under the standard assumption that what a pro-form refers to must be a constituent. It must be, then, that ka in (25a) is not adjoined to the preceding predicate, but to the whole sequence daremo ki-masen. Note that the negative polarity of daremo and negation are irrelevant to the constituency. Thus consider the following:

(35) A: Minna ga ki-masu ka?
    B: Hai, sou desu.

Minna is not an NPI and there is no negative in A's utterance, which is quite a natural sentence in contrast to somewhat odd sentences like (25a) and (27) involving negation. But the point is that sou in B's response refers to what A said minus ka, namely minna ga ki-masu, which then must be a constituent.

Does it follow from this that the assumption (20i) is wrong? The answer is in the affirmative only in a certain class of cases. That is, in a simplex sentence in which there is no clausal complement of the sentence, ka is adjoined to the entire sentence, as suggested by the observation above, but in a complex sentence in which there is a clausal complement of the sentence, ka is adjoined to the predicate of the sentence. This latter claim also is supported by consideration of anaphoric reference. Thus consider the following dialogues:
(36) A: Ima-demo koros-are-ta koibito no koto o now-even kill-Passive-Past love(r) of thing Acc omoi-masu ka? (*Do you think of the love(r) who was killed even now?*)

B₁: Hai, omoi-masu.
B₂: *Hai, sou omoi-masu.
B₃: Hai, sou desu. #Omoi-masu.

(37) A: Ima-demo koibito ga koros-are-ta to omoi-masu ka? (*Do you think that your love(r) was killed even now?*)

B₁: Hai, omoi-masu.
B₂: Hai, sou omoi-masu.

In B₁’s response to A’s question in (36), there is an ellipsis before omoi-masu that corresponds to the NP complement koros-areta koibito no koto (o) in A’s utterance. Let us assume that there is a null complement anaphor (NCA) in the position of the occurrence of such an ellipsis. The appropriateness of B₁’s utterance in (36) indicates that the antecedent of an NCA can be an NP, and that an NCA can refer back to something in the utterance made by a discourse participant other than the speaker. The inappropriateness of B₂’s response in (36) shows that the pro-form sou cannot refer back to an NP, although it can refer back to an S, as in sou in B₂’s response in (37), which refers to the clausal complement koibito ga koros-are-ta (to). Now consider B₃’s response in (36). What does sou here refer to? Both syntactically and semantically, it cannot refer to koros-are-ta koibito (no koto); syntactically, since sou cannot refer to an NP; semantically, since if sou referred to koros-are-ta koibito (no koto), the response in question would not make sense in this discourse. It must be, then, that sou here refers to all of what A said minus the question marker ka. If so, then ka in A’s utterance in (36) must be adjoined
not to the preceding predicate omoi-masu but to the entire matrix clause, which is a simplex sentence because, while there is a relative clause modifying koibito, the koto-phrase containing the relative clause is an NP complement to the matrix predicate omow.

Note that in B1's response in (36), the continuation of omoi-masu is awkward after sou desu, although it is quite natural directly after hai, as in B1's response. On our assumption, there is an NCA before omoi-masu whose reference must be to the NP complement koros-are-ta koibito no koto (o) in A's utterance. The awkwardness of omoi-masan in this context as contrasted with the naturalness of omoi-masan in the context of B1's utterance indicates that the required referential linkage is blocked by the intervening possible antecedent for the NCA, namely sou. Notice that sou is a possible antecedent for an NCA, since although sou cannot refer to an NP but to a clause as noted above, an NCA can refer not only to an NP as in the case of B1's utterance in (36), but also to a clause, as in the case of B1's utterance in (37), where the antecedent for the NCA before omoi-masu is the clausal complement koibito ga koros-are-ta (to) in A's utterance. Assuming that an NCA must refer to the nearest possible antecedent, the NCA that we assume to be present before omoi-masu must refer to sou in B1's utterance in (36). But sou here refers, as noted, to all of what A said minus ka, which means that the reference of the NCA here includes omoi-masu, as well as its NP complement, leading to redundancy.

The examination of the reference of sou in B2's utterance in (36), as well as that of sou in a discourse like (34) and (35), has shown that ka can be adjoined to a simplex clausal constituent. Let us now turn to the case of ka following a predicate that takes a clausal complement. In (37), The NCA before omoi-masu in B1's utterance and the pro-form sou before omoi-masu in B2's refers, as noted above, to the
clausal complement koibito ga koros-are-ta (to). Now consider B3's response to A's question in (37). Unlike omoi-masu in B3's utterance in (36), the continuation of omoi-masu after sou desu in (37) is not awkward. This means that sou in B3's utterance in (37), unlike in (36), does not refer to all of what A said minus ka, indicating that what A said minus ka does not form a constituent, which is a direct consequence of the assumption (20i). Then sou here must refer only to the clausal complement koibito ga koros-are-ta (to). If so, the NCA can refer to sou without redundancy. Note that sou referring only to the predicate omoi-masu leads to redundancy, so this possibility is excluded; this is because the NCA before omoi-masu then in effect refers to the same predicate omoi-masu.

5. The Position of Q
We have seen at the latter half of the last section that the assumption (20i), namely that Q is adjoined to the preceding independent predicate, seems to be valid in a complex sentence but not in a simplex sentence. In a simplex sentence, Q seems to be in a sister-relation to the sentence. Let us therefore adopt the traditional phrase structure with S-bar expanding into S and COMP, where COMP may be occupied by the question morpheme ka, in which case COMP acquires the feature [+Q] from ka by percolation. (The following discussion should be easily translatable into the current X-bar theory in which S-bar is a projection of COMP and S is a projection of I(NFL), to which a predicate may be moved by "V-raising to I"; see Chomsky (1986).) Thus a simplex sentence has a structure of roughly the following form, where \( \alpha \neq S(-\text{bar}) \) and \( \beta \) is [+neg] or [-neg]:

\[
\begin{align*}
(38) & \\
& S \quad \text{COMP} \\
& \quad \text{Pred} \quad (\text{ka}) \\
& \quad \beta \\
& \ldots \alpha \ldots
\end{align*}
\]
If an NPI appears somewhere in S, it is properly c-commanded by a negative predicate in (38). Thus an NPI such as daremo that appears in a sentence like (25a) is within the scope of \( \beta = [+\text{neg}] \) in (38), the reason for its oddness lying elsewhere, as discussed in the previous section. Now suppose that in (38), a wh-phrase occurs somewhere in S, and it is coindexed with \( ka \) in COMP. Let us assume that the index as well as the feature [+Q] of \( ka \) is taken over to its dominating COMP. Since COMP c-commands everything in S, a wh-phrase in S is also c-commanded by COMP. We can therefore replace the definition of binding given in (9) by the more familiar definition (39):

\[
(39) \quad \alpha \text{ is bound by } \beta \text{ if } \alpha \text{ is coindexed with and c-commanded by } \beta.
\]

But we have seen that \( ka \) in a complex sentence is attached to the preceding predicate. Let us assume that this is effected by "C(OMP)-lowering to Pred (or I)," which is similar to "I-lowering to V" and whose direction is opposite to "I-raising to C" as well as V-raising to I." Cf. Emonds (1985), Chomsky (1989). Note that C-lowering to I fill in the gap that is theoretically predicted but so far has not been attested in the literature; if there is a movement that raises I to C, as well as one that either raises V to I or lowers I to V, it would be an accidental gap if there were no movement that lowers C to I.\(^n\) Now after C-lowering, the structure is something like the following:

\[
(40)
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
\ldots \text{S} \ldots \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Pred} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Pred} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{COMP} \\
\downarrow \\
\beta \\
\downarrow \\
ka
\end{array}
\]

In (40), if there is a wh-phrase coindexed with \( ka \), hence with
COMP, c-command requirement for binding still holds, since COMP is not dominated by Pred but by only one of its segments; see (22) and (23). However, a negative predicate under Pred, namely $\beta = [+\text{neg}]$, does not c-command anything (other than COMP; see below), and thus no element outside of the upper segment of Pred in (40) is within the scope of negation. This accounts for the fact that while (1a) and (1b), repeated below, are synonymous with each other, their yes/no question counterparts are not:

(1a). Taroo wa paatee ni de-nai to omoi-masu
   "I think that Taro will not attend the party"

b. Taroo wa paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen
   "I don't think that Taro will attend the party"

(41a). Taroo wa paatee ni de-nai to omoi-masu ka
   "do you think that Taro won't attend the party"

b. Taroo wa paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen ka
   
   "don't you think that Taro will attend the party"

(1a) and (1b) are synonymous with each other since, in addition to the semantic property of omoi-masun, which is a Neg-Raising predicate, the constituents in the clausal complement to omoi-masun are within the scope of negation in both examples. In contrast, (41b) is not synonymous with (41a), since, unlike in (41a), no constituents in the clausal complement in (41b) are within the scope of negation. This is confirmed by the fact that while the NPI tittomo "(not) a bit" can appear within the clausal complement to omoi-masun in (41a) as well as in (1a,b), it cannot appear in (41b):

(1)'a. Taroo wa paatee ni tittomo de-nai to omoi-masu
   "I think that Taro will not attend the party a bit"

b. Taroo wa paatee ni tittomo de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen
"I don't think that Taro will attend the party a bit"
(41'\textsuperscript{a}). Taroo wa paatee ni tittomo de-nai to omoi-masu ka
"do you think that Taro won't attend the party a bit"
b. "Taroo wa paatee ni tittomo de-ru to (wa)
omoi-masen ka
"don't you think that Taro will attend the party a bit"

Note that the only difference between (1'\textsuperscript{b}) and (41'\textsuperscript{b}) is the
absence vs. presence of ka. That the NPI \textit{tittomo} cannot
appear within the clausal complement to \textit{omow} in (41'\textsuperscript{b}) clearly
shows that the complement is not within the scope of negation,
due to the question morpheme \textit{ka} that is adjoined to the
negative predicate. The situation changes if \textit{omoi-masen ka} is
replaced by \textit{omowa-nai no desu ka}, as in (42):

(42) Taroo wa paatee ni tittomo de-ru to omowa-nai no
desu ka
"is it (so) that you don't think that Taro will
attend the party a bit"

This indicates that C-lowering does not apply if the
complementizer is \textit{no}, and (42) is acceptable for the same
reason (1'\textsuperscript{b}) is acceptable. Note that the version of (42)
without \textit{desu ka} is again acceptable, as the reader can easily
verify (note 2, esp. the last paragraph).

5. The Neg-Island Condition
In section 2 we noted that the interpretation represented by
(12) is subject to the wh-island condition. In this section
I will point out that there is a condition concerning negation
whose effect is parallel to the wh-island condition. This
condition will be referred to as the Neg-Island Condition (NIC).

To see what effect NIC has, consider the following:
(43a) \([a \{tuma to\} \text{ wa } \{Tanaka sensei ni\} \text{ wa teacher} \{aw-mai\} \text{ to omoi-masu}\) meet-wont
"I think that I wont meet Mr. TANAKA with my WIFE"

b. \([a \{tuma to\} \text{ wa } \{Tanaka sensei ni\} \text{ wa aw-oo} \text{ to } \{omoi-masen\} \text{ will }\) meet-will
"I dont think that I will meet Mr. TANAKA with my WIFE"

c. \([a \{tuma to\} \text{ wa } \{Tanaka sensei ni\} \text{ wa } \{aw-mai\} \text{ to } \{omoi-masen\} \) "it is not with my wife that I think that it is not Mr. Tanaka that I will meet"

(43a) is a well-formed representation in which both \text{tuma to} and \text{Tanaka sensei ni} are foci of the embedded negative predicate \text{aw-mai}. (43b) is also a well-formed representation in which both \text{tuma to} and \text{Tanaka sensei} are foci of the matrix negative predicate \text{omoi-masen}. However, the representation (43c) is ill-formed; \text{tuma to} cannot be a focus of the matrix negative predicate \text{omoi-masen} even though it is within its scope. Clearly the presence of the negative predicate that c-commands \text{tuma to}, namely \text{aw-mai}, blocks the association of \text{tuma to with omoi-masen}. It should be noted that the mere intervention of one negative predicate does not always block the association of focus with another, as shown by (44):

(44) \([a \{boku wa\} \text{ wa } \{Tanaka sensei ni\} \text{ wa } \{aw-mai\} \text{ to omoi-masen}\) "I dont think that I wont meet Mr. TANAKA" or:
"it is not me that thinks that it not Mr. Tanaka that I will meet"
In (46), although the negative predicate aw-mai intervenes between boku wa and omoi-masen, it does not block the interpretation of boku wa being a focus of omoi-masen. The reason is, obviously, that aw-mai does not c-command boku wa.

NIC also blocks the association of daremo with omoi-masen in an example like (45b) below:

(45)a. [s boku wa [s {daremo}, ku-ru] to (omoi-masen)]

"I don't think that anyone will come"

b. *[s boku wa [s {daremo}, ko-nai]to (omoi-masen)]

"no one is such that I think he doesn't come"

The same is true of what Kato (1985) calls bridge expressions like S+hasu da "it must be that S," S+hazu ga nai "it cannot be that S," as in the following:

(46)a. [s [s {daremo}, {ko-nai}] hazu da]
"it must be that no one will come"

b. [s [s {daremo}, ku-ru] hazu ga {nai}]
"it can't be that anyone will come"

c. *[s [s {daremo}, ko-nai] hazu ga {nai}]
"no one is such that it must be that he won't come"

Let us turn to the proper formulation of NIC. Notice that the notion of binding covers the association of focus with negation if a constituent intended to be a focus of negation is c-commanded by and coindexed with a negative predicate, as well as the association of WH with Q. We can then state NIC in the following way:

(47) The Neg-Island Condition (NIC):
Any binding of α by β is blocked if a negative predicate c-commands α and is c-commanded by β.
We assume that NIC applies after LF wh-movement, which, in Japanese, adjoins a wh-phrase to a COMP coindexed with it. The matrix predicate part of the unacceptable sentence (2b), repeated below, has the structure (48) after C-lowering and LF wh-movement, where \( \alpha \) = the negative predicate (omoi-masen):

\[
(2b) \quad ^* \text{dare ga paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omoi-masen ka}
\]

![Diagram representing the structure (48)]

In (48), if the negative predicate \( \alpha \) c-commands the wh-phrase \( \text{dare} \) and is c-commanded by \( \text{COMP}_1 \), NIC blocks the binding relation between \( \text{dare} \) and \( \text{ka} \). Although \( \alpha \) is c-commanded by \( \text{COMP}_1 \), it does not c-command the wh-phrase under the definition of c-command (22) and the assumption (23). This is because Pred, which dominates \( \alpha \), does not dominate \( \text{COMP}_1 \), which is dominated by only one of its segments. But this is against the original spirit of the notion of c-command; under the classic "first branching node" definition of c-command, \( \alpha \) does c-command the wh-phrase. Respecting the original spirit, as well as keeping to the well-motivated assumption (23) concerning adjunction structures, let us understand "c-command" as (49), using the notion "include," defined in (50):

\[
(49) \quad \alpha \text{ c-commands } \beta \text{ iff } \alpha \text{ does not dominate } \beta \text{ and every } \gamma \text{ that dominates } \alpha \text{ includes } \beta.
\]

\[
(50) \quad \alpha \text{ includes } \beta \text{ if } \alpha \text{ or some of its segments dominates } \beta.
\]

"Include" is the complement to the notion "exclude," defined by Chomsky (1986: 9):
(51) \( \alpha \) excludes \( \beta \) if no segment of \( \alpha \) dominates \( \beta \).

With the definition of c-command as in (49), Pred in (48) does c-command the wh-phrase, since the upper segment of Pred dominates the wh-phrase. Therefore NIC blocks the binding relation in question and the sentence is ruled out.

In contrast, sentences like (2a) and (4) are well-formed since after dare is moved to the COMP dominating \( ka \) at LF, the negative predicate \( de-nai \) or \( omow-anai \) does not c-command dare, and NIC does not apply.

Note that NIC does not apply to a simplex wh-question like the following:

(52) dare ga ki-masen ka
    "who will not come"

This is because C-lowering does not take place in a simplex sentence and therefore the negative predicate does not c-command COMP, hence a wh-phrase adjoined to it. If a sentence like (52) sounds somewhat odd at all, it is because the quantification nature of dare. See section 4.

NIC also exclude a certain interpretain of questions involving a wh-phrase. Thus consider the following:

(53) Akiko wa dono kyouju ga dare o suisensitei-ru ka
    sittei-masu ka

As noted in section 2, a sentence like above is ambiguous according to whether dono kyouju takes a embedded clause or a matrix clause as its scope. However, that wh-phrase cannot take the matrix scope if the matrix predicate is [+neg]:

(54) Akiko wa dono kyouju ga dare o suisensitei-ru ka
    siri-masen ka
know-Neg

The matrix scope reading of *dono kyouju* is ruled out for the same reason a sentence like (2b) is ruled out, namely by NIC. In contrast, the following sentence is still ambiguous and *dono kyouju* can take the matrix scope:

(55) Akiko wa dono kyouju ga dare o suisensitei-nai ka recommend-Neg
sittei-masu ka

The matrix reading of the wh-phrase is possible for the same reason sentences like (2a) and (4) are acceptable; NIC does not apply to cases like these since, although C-lowering does apply in the matrix clause, the matrix predicate is not negative.

NOTES

* I am grateful to Yuji Takano and Shinsuke Homma for their valuable comments and suggestions. Any errors or inadequacies are, needless to say, solely belong to me.

1 The unacceptability of a sentence like (2b) is pointed out by Harada (1972: 180). However, as far as I know, the acceptability contrast as seen in (2) has never been pointed out in the literature.

2 In informal speech, a question often ends with *no*. Thus a sentence like the following is often used in an informal conversation:

(i) Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no?
"Who will attend the party?"

I assume that in a sentence like this the copula *da* or its polite version *desu*, together with the question marker *ka*, is "deleted" after *no*. Thus consider the following sentence:
(ii)a. Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no desu ka?
b. Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no desu?
c. Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no ka?

In (ii), the a-sentence in which no "deletion" is involved is the least informal form. If ka is "deleted" from it, we have (iib). If the copula is "deleted," we have (iic). If both are "deleted," we have the informal (i). For some reason that is unclear to me, the replacement of desu with its non-polite counterpart da is impossible in (iia), but it is possible in (iib):

(iii)a. *Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no da ka?
b. Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no da?

However, (iiiia) becomes acceptable under embedding, as in (iv):

(iv) Dare ga paatee ni de-ru no da ka wakari-masen.
know-Neg

"I don't know who will attend the party."

Thus we may assume that the "deletion" of da (but not desu) is obligatory in the main clause if ka is not "deleted " as well. For some comments on the "deletion" of ka, see note 4.

If the assumption that a question ending with no is derived from, or at least related to, a corresponding question ending with no-Cop-ka is correct, then the version of (4) without desu ka should be equally acceptable, and in fact it is:

(v) Dare ga paatee ni de-ru to (wa) omow-anai no?

3 Here and below, capital letters indicate heavy stress, or a focus of the sentence. This device will not be used in a cleft sentence, as in the first version of English translation here, since what is focalized is syntactically indicated in a cleft sentence; the focus comes after it-(Aux)-be. In the case of the personal pronoun I, the italicized 'I' will be used to indicate heavy stress.

4 (7b) is acceptable if de-masu is read with a special, particularly rising, intonation. I assume that in a case like this either ka is deleted at PF or a phonetically null
question morpheme which triggers the special intonation is present in the position of Q. (This latter possibility is also suggested by Nishigauchi (1980: 18).) Note that the "deletion" of ka is possible only in a main clause and is therefore an instance of what are often called main clause phenomena (MCP):

(i) Taroo wa paatee ni de-ru no (ka)?
   "Will Taro attend the party?"

(ii) Taroo wa paatee ni de-ru no * (ka) wakari-masen.
   "(I) don't know whether Taro will attend the party."

In general, MCP result from what there is every reason to believe are marked operations; the "deletion" of ka may well be among such.

* Again, this sentence would be acceptable if read with a marked intonation, in which case it is synonymous with (8d).

* See Kato (1985: 163-4) for examples of bridge expressions that allow an NPI to occur in their complement, where it is not the predicate of the complement clause but that of the bridge expressions that involves a negative associated with an NPI.

* This sentence would be acceptable if daremo is read with HLL, in which case it is not an NPI. Whatever the accent pattern may be of daremo, however, it cannot be a focus of ko-nai.

* See Homma (1989) for an argument for I-raising to C in Japanese as well as in English.

* I am indebted to S. Homma for this English paraphrase.

* This paraphrase is also due to S. Homma.
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