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1. Introduction

This paper addresses Japanese metalinguistic negation and Negative Polarity Items (henceforth NPIs). In the course of discussion, we clarify a different morphology between descriptive use of negation and metalinguistic one. Section 2 shows that Japanese made ‘until’ functions as an NPI. Section 3 introduces English cleft sentences with until in their focus position. After a brief introduction, we observe some Japanese translations of the cleft sentences. In section 4, after the demonstration of English metalinguistic use of negation, Japanese metalinguistic negation is illustrated and its interaction with NPIs is discussed. Section 5 offers some concluding remarks.

2. Made in Japanese Negative Sentences

In this section, we will examine the relation between negation and made in Japanese. Consider first the following pair:¹

(1) a. John-wa yuugata made mat-ta.
   John-TOP evening until wait-PAST
   ‘John waited until the evening.’

   John-TOP evening until wait-NEG-PAST
   ‘John didn’t wait until the evening.’

(1a, b) describe durative situations with the predicate matu ‘wait.’ (1a) demonstrates that John’s waiting continued up to the evening, while in (1b) it stopped sometime before the evening. The pair reveals that made with the durative predicate matu is not sensitive to polarity. Further examples are shown in (2) with the durative predicate nemuru ‘sleep’:

(2) a. John-wa hiru made nemut-ta.
   John-TOP noon until sleep-PAST

---

* The present article is based on the part of the paper read at the 2nd Linguistic Battle Workshop held at the University of Tsukuba on December 20-1, 2001. My deepest gratitude goes to Yasuhiro Kato and Ryuichi Washio for their helpful comments and suggestions. Needless to say, any remaining inadequacies are entirely my own.

¹ The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of example sentences: ACC = accusative case marker, DAT = dative case marker, GEN = genitive case marker, NEG = negative morpheme, NOM = nominative case marker, PAST = past tense morpheme, QUOT = quotative particle, TOP = topic marker.
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‘John slept until noon.’

b. John-wa hiru made (-wa) nemur-anakat-ta.
John-TOP noon until (TOP) sleep-NEG-PAST
‘John didn’t sleep until noon.’

Irrespective of polarity, made with the durative predicate nemuru is acceptable in (2). These pairs in (1) and (2) demonstrate that made with durative predicates is insensitive to polarity.

Let us now consider the following pair:

(3) a. *John-wa kinyoobi made run bun-o teisyutu-si-ta.²
John-TOP Friday until paper-ACC submit-PAST
‘*John submitted the paper until Friday.’

John-TOP Friday until paper-ACC submit-NEG-PAST
‘John didn’t submit the paper until Friday.’

With the punctual predicate teisyutu-suru ‘submit,’ negative (3b) is acceptable while positive (3a) is not. Further examples are shown in (4):

John-TOP night-late until start-PAST
‘*John started until late at night.’

John-TOP night-late until start-NEG-PAST
‘John didn’t start until late at night.’

With the punctual predicate syuppatu-suru ‘start,’ made is acceptable under negation in (4b) but not in the positive context as in (4a). These examples remind us of the following contrast in English:

(5) a. John waited until the evening.

b. John didn’t wait until the evening.

(6) a. *John submitted the paper until Friday.

b. John didn’t submit the paper until Friday.

The sentences in (5) are English counterparts of (1), and those in (6) are English versions of (3). Until in (5) with the durative predicate wait is acceptable irrespective of polarity. With the punctual predicate submit, however, until in negative sentence (6b) is acceptable while it is not the case in positive (6a), which demonstrates that until with punctual predicates functions as an NPI. It is reasonable to say that the same holds true in Japanese cases. Made with punctual

---

² With made-ni ‘by’ instead of made, (3a) and (4a) become acceptable.
predicates *teisyutu-suru* ‘submit’ in (3b) and *syuppatsu-suru* ‘start’ in (4b) is acceptable in the negative sentences. This indicates that the Japanese *made* with punctual predicates functions as an NPI.3

3. Until in Cleft Sentences and The Japanese Counterparts

Before going into the analysis of Japanese negative sentences, it is important to examine English cleft sentences. Consider the following examples:

(7) John wore a white suit at the dance last night.
(8a) It was John that wore a white suit at the dance last night.

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{b. Yuube-no dansu-de siroi suutu-o last night-GEN dance-at white suit-ACC}
\text{kitei-ta-no-wa John-da.}
\text{wear-LAST-GEN-TOP John-be}
\end{array} \]

(8a) is an English cleft sentence and (8b) its Japanese counterpart. In (8a), the subject *John* of (7) is focused and the proposition *someone wore a white suit at the dance last night* is presupposed. In Japanese (8b), the focused constituent *John-da* appears at the end of the sentence, and the presupposed content *yuube-no dansu-de siroi suutu-o kitei-ta-no-wa* occurs before the focused constituent. This indicates that the Japanese translation of the English cleft sentence *it is X that Y is Y-wa X-da*, where Y is presupposed:

(9) It is X that Y.
(10) Y-wa X-da.

Y-TOP X-be

Consider now the cases where a negative morpheme appears in the scope of cleft sentences. Let us first examine the following:

(11) John didn’t beat his wife because he loved her.

Sentence (11) is ambiguous as in (12).

(12a) John’s loving his wife is the reason why he didn’t beat his wife.

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{b. John beat his wife not because he loved her but because of some other reason.}
\end{array} \]

In the case of interpretation (12a), the scope of negation in (11) is limited only to the main clause *John didn’t beat his wife*, while in (12b) it extends to the whole sentence. The ambiguity in (11), however, disappears when the negation occurs in the focus position of the cleft sentence:

---

3 There is a vast amount of literature as to the distribution of NPIs. See Klima (1964), Ladusaw (1979), Linebarger (1980), Kato (1985), McGloin (1986), Progovac (1994), van der
(13) It was not because he loved her that John beat his wife. In (13), John’s beating his wife is presupposed and the reason why he did so is negated. In other words, sentence (13) has only the (12b) reading. From these observations, it is now clear that when negation appears in the focus position of a cleft sentence, the scope of negation is limited only to the focus position of the sentence.

Let us now consider the following case, where negation appears together with until in the focus position of a cleft sentence:

(14) It was not until I went to university that I discovered myself. As we have just observed, the scope of negation in this case is limited to the focus position and does not extend to the whole sentence. Also, as we have confirmed in (9) and (10), the Japanese translation of the form it is X that Y is Y-wa X-da. Following this, (14) should be translated into (15):

(15) *zibun to-yuu mono-ga wakat-ta-no-wa
    self QUOT-say thing-NOM discover-PAST-GEN-TOP
    daigaku-ni iku made de-wa-nakat-ta.
    university-DAT go until be-TOP-NEG-PAST

The sentence might be improved with the topic marker wa in de-wa-nakat-ta but even with it, (15) is not a natural Japanese sentence. An appropriate translation of (14) is shown in (16):

(16) daigaku-ni it-te hazimete
    university-DAT go first
    zibun to-yuu mono-ga wakat-ta.5
    self QUOT-say thing-NOM discover-PAST

Sentence (16) describes the situation without using the Japanese negative nai despite the appearance of not in the original sentence in (14). Note also that made with the punctual predicate wakaru ‘discover’ fails to function as an NPI in (15). Further examples may be useful:

(17) a. It was not until afterward that I realized I had lost it.

b. *sore-o naku-ita koto-ni kidu-ita no-wa
    it-ACC lose-PAST fact-DAT realize-PAST GEN-TOP


4 Examples (14), (16), (17a, c), and (18a, c) are cited from The Kenkyusha Dictionary of English Collocations on CD-ROM. The Japanese translations are slightly changed.

5 This is what is called the actualization interpretation in the sense of Declerck (1995). For discussion of this reading, see Tanaka (1995, 1998) and Declerck (1996).
ato-ni naru made de-wa-nakat-ta.
afterward-DAT become until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
c. ato-ni natte sore-o naku-ita
afterward-DAT become it-ACC lose-PAST
koto-ni kido-ita.
fact-DAT realize-PAST

(18) a. It was not until 1980 that any definite move was made in this
direction.
b. *kono hoomen de-no ugoki-ga gutai-ka-si-ta
this direction at-GEN movement-NOM shape-become-PAST
no-wa 1980 nen-ni naru made de-wa-nakat-ta.
gen-TOP 1980 year-DAT become until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
c. 1980 nen-ni natte yatto kono hoomen
1980 year-DAT become finally this direction
de-no ugoki-ga gutai-ka-si-ta.
at-GEN movement-NOM shape-become-PAST

(15), (17b) and (18b) illustrate that the translation of *it was X that Y, with not
occurring in the focus position X, into the form Y-wa X-dat-ta is not acceptable and
mades do not function as NPIs.\(^6\)

Sentence (19) is another case in point:

(19) It was not until nine that John slept.

(19) is ambiguous between the two interpretations of the verb *sleep.\(^7\) One is a
punctual reading; John finally fell asleep at nine o'clock. The other is a durative
interpretation; John kept on sleeping until sometime before nine o'clock. The
translations of (19) into the form Y-wa X-dat-ta show the following contrast:

(20) a. *John-ga nemuri-ni-tu-ita no-wa
John-NOM sleep-DAT-fall-PAST GEN-TOP
9-zi made de-wa-nakat-ta.
9 o'clock until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
b. John-ga nemuri-tude-te-ta no-wa
John-NOM sleep-keep-PAST GEN-TOP
9-zi made de-wa-nakat-ta.
9 o'clock until be-TOP-NEG-PAST

---

\(^6\) Declerck (1995) observes that when not until appears in the focus position of a cleft
sentence, an actualization interpretation is obtained. This motivates the translations in (16), (17c)
and (18c).

\(^7\) Example (19) and its interpretations are from Declerck (1995).
Sentence (20a) alone might not be clear, but the contrast between the pair clearly reveals that (20a) with the punctual predicate nemuri-ni-tuku ‘fall asleep’ is hardly a natural Japanese sentence. On the contrary, (20b) with the durative predicate nemuri-tudukeru ‘keep sleeping’ is perfect. This observation also demonstrates that made with punctual predicates does not always function as an NPI in negative sentences.

To summarize, made with punctual predicates can function as an NPI. However, mades with such punctual predicate as wakaru ‘discover’ in (15), kiduku ‘realize’ in (17b), gutaika-suru ‘get shaped’ in (18b), and nemuri-ni-tuku ‘fall asleep’ in (20a) are not licensed in negative sentences. In what follows, we will discuss this point in detail.

4. Made in Negative Sentences

4.1. Japanese Negative Morpheme: de-wa-nai vs. nai

This section discusses why some mades with punctual predicates cannot be licensed by negation. As we have shown in the previous section, mades with the predicates wakaru, kiduku, gutaika-suru, and nemuri-ni-tuku fail to function as NPIs. Mades with these predicates, however, can be licensed by negation. Let us observe the following sentences:

(21) a. *zibunto-yuu mono-ga wakat-ta no-wa
   self QUOT-say thing-NOM discover-PAST GEN-TOP
daigaku-ni iku made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=15)
   university-DAT go until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
b. zibunto-yuu mono-wa daigaku-ni
   self QUOT-say thing-TOP university-DAT
iku made wakar-anakat-ta.
go until discover-NEG-PAST
‘I didn’t discover myself until I went to university.’

(22) a. *sore-o naku-ita koto-ni kido-ita no-wa
   it-ACC lose-PAST fact-DAT realize-PAST GEN-TOP
ato-ni naru made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=17b)
   afterward-DAT become until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
b. ato-ni naru made sore-o
   afterward-DAT become until it-ACC
naku-ita koto-ni kiduk-anakat-ta.
   lose-PAST fact-DAT realize-NEG-PAST
‘I didn’t realize I had lost it until afterward.’
(23) a. *kono hoomen de-no ugoki-ga gutaika-si-ta
this direction at-GEN movement-NOM shape-become-PAST
no-wa 1980 nen-ni naru made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=18b)
gen-TOP 1980 year-DAT become until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
b. 1980 nen-ni naru made kono hoomen
1980 year-DAT become until this direction
de-no ugoki-wa gutaika-si-nakat-ta.
at-GEN movement-TOP shape-become-NEG-PAST
‘No definite move in this direction was made until 1980.’

(24) a. *John-ga nemuri-ni-tu-ita no-wa
John-NOM sleep-DAT-fall-PAST GEN-TOP
9-zi made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=20a)
9 o’clock until be-TOP-NEG-PAST
b. John-wa 9-zi-ni naru made
John-TOP 9 o’clock-DAT become until
tenemuri-ni-tuk-anakat-ta.
sleep-DAT-fall-NEG-PAST
‘John didn’t fall asleep until 9.’

The sentences in (21) share the same predicate wakaru, in (22) kiduku, in (23) gutaika-suru, and in (24) nemuri-ni-tuku. Unacceptable (a) sentences all end with the negative expression de-wa-nakat-ta. On the contrary, acceptable (b) examples share the negative nakat-ta at the end of the sentences. This contrast between de-wa-nai and nai, which seems to determine the acceptability of the sentences, reminds us of metalinguistic uses of negation in English.

4.2. Metalinguistic Negation in English

Descriptive truth-functional negation operates over a proposition. Metalinguistic negation (henceforth MN), on the other hand, is a special non-truth-functional use of a negation operator. Horn (1989:363) states that ‘[MN is] a device for objecting to a previous utterance on any grounds whatever, including the conventional or conversational implicata it potentially induces, its morphology, its style or register, or its phonetic realization.’ His examples are cited below:

(25) a. Chris didn’t manage to solve some of the problems—he managed to solve all of them.
b. I didn’t manage to trap two mongeese—I managed to trap two mongooses.
c. Grandpa isn’t feeling lousy, Johnny, he’s just a tad indisposed.
d. He didn’t call the [pólis], he called the [pólis].
What is objected by the metalinguistic use of negation in these examples are:
conversational upper limit implication in (25a), plural morphology in (25b),
stereotypical assumptions or connotations that come up with a particular word in
(25c), and the accent position in (25d).

Properties of metalinguistic use of negation are summarized in Noh
(2000:105-6). One relevant feature of MN here is that it ‘fails to trigger negative
polarity items.' Consider the following examples from Horn (1989):

(26) a.* She did NOT lift a finger to help.
   b.* She did NOT get up until 12:00.

These sentences, with the emphasis on not and rising intonation, are interpreted as
involving MN. Under the MN interpretation, the NPIs lift a finger and until are
not licensed and the sentences are unacceptable. This is supported by the very
nature of the metalinguistic use of negation: ‘[MN is] a device for objecting to a
previous utterance,’ which means that the previous utterances must be appropriate
in order for the MN to object to. (27a, b) illustrate, however, that both of the
presumed previous utterances are inappropriate.

(27) a.* She lifted a finger to help.
   b.* We got up until 12:00.

This is why the cases in (26) are not acceptable.

4.3. Metalinguistic Negation in Japanese

Bearing the contrast between descriptive and metalinguistic uses of negation
in mind, let us now go back to Japanese negative sentences. First consider the
cases with the Japanese NPIs sika ‘only’ and namimo ‘anything’ in (28) and (29):

(28) a. Taro sika  araware-nakata.
   Taro only appear-NEG-PAST
   ‘Only Taro appeared.’
   b.* Taro sika  araware-ta.
   Taro only appear-PAST

   Hanako-TOP anything eat-NEG-PAST

---

8 Other properties summed up in Noh are: (a) [MN] is non-truth-functional. (b) [MN] is
followed by a correction clause. (c) [MN] occurs as a rejoinder to a corresponding affirmative
utterance, which can be glossed as “I object to U,” or “U is not assertable.” (d) [MN] involves the
‘contradiction’ intonation counter (final-rise within the negated clause) and contrastive stress on
the offering item and its replacement. (e) [MN] quotes/mentions the previous utterance, and what
is quoted is sealed off, so that; (i) [MN] fails to be morphologically incorporated, (ii) [MN]
excludes the logical law of double negation.
‘Hanako didn’t eat anything.’

b.* Hanako-wa nanimo tabe-ta.

Hanako-TOP anything eat-PAST

These examples demonstrate that the NPIs *sika* and *namimo* are licensed by the ordinary descriptive negation *nai*. Consider then the cases where they cooccur with another negative expression *de-wa-nai*:

(30) a.* Taro sika araware-ta no-de-wa-nakat-ta.

Taro only appear-PAST GEN-be-TOP-NEG-PAST

b.* Hanako-wa nanimo tabe-ta no-de-wa-nakat-ta.

Hanako-TOP anything eat-PAST GEN-be-TOP-NEG-PAST

The examples in (30) show that the NPIs are not licensed by the negative expression *de-wa-nai*. The contrast between (28a) and (29a) on the one hand and (30) on the other illustrates that the negative expressions *nai* and *de-wa-nai* are completely different in terms of NPI licensing. This difference is explained in the same way as in the cases of English MN. While *nai* functions as a Japanese descriptive negation, *de-wa-nai* is an MN expression objecting to previous utterances. The presumed previous utterances are shown in (31):

(31) a.* Taro sika araware-ta.

Taro only appear-PAST

b.* Hanako-wa nanimo tabe-ta.

Hanako-TOP anything eat-PAST

These utterances are far from natural and therefore the objections with *de-wa-nai* are not allowed in (30). From these observations, it is now reasonable to claim that *de-wa-nai* functions as a Japanese metalinguistic negative expression.9

Let us now go back to the problematic cases:

(21) a.* zibun to-yuu mono-ga wakat-ta-no-wa daigaku-ni iku made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=15)

(22) a.* sore-o nakus-ita koto-ni kido-ita no-wa ato-ni naru made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=17b)

(23) a.* kono hoomen deno ugoki-ga gutaika-si-ta no-wa 1980 nen-ni naru made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=18b)

9 Note that the negative expression *de-wa-nai* is not limited to a metalinguistic use. It is also used in contrastive negation:

(i) John-wa ronbun de-wa-naku zassi-o yon-da.

John-TOP paper be-TOP-NEG magazine-ACC read-PAST

‘John read not the paper but the magazine.’

The discussion of this ambiguity is not undertaken in the present paper.
(24) a. *John-ga nemuri-ni-tu-ita no-wa
    9-zi made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=20a)

All these unacceptable sentences end with the metalinguistic negative expression
de-wa-nakat-ta. The unacceptability is explained by the fact that the
consequent ‘objected’ utterances are unnatural:

(32) a. *zibun toyyu mono-ga wakat-ta-no-wa
daigaku-ni iku made dat-ta.
    b. *sore-o nakus-ita koto-ni kidu-ita no-wa
    ato-ni naru made dat-ta.
    c. *kono hoomen deno ugoki-ga gutaika-si-ta
    no-wa 1980 nen-ni naru made dat-ta.
    d. *John-ga nemuri-ni-tu-ita no-wa
    9-zi made dat-ta.

In passing, made with a durative predicate is acceptable in an MN sentence.
Consider (20b), repeated here as (33a):

(33) a. John-ga nemuri-tuduke-ta no-wa
    9-zi made de-wa-nakat-ta. (=20b)
    b. John-ga nemuri-tuduke-ta no-wa
    9-zi made dat-ta.

This is because made with the durative predicate nemuri-tuduke-ru does not
function as an NPI and has nothing to do with negation for its occurrence.

5. Summary

This paper discusses some aspects of Japanese temporal expression made
‘until.’ Made can function as an NPI when it cooccurs with punctual predicates.
In this case, it is licensed by the descriptive negative morphology nai. Some
mades, on the other hand, fail to work as NPIs even when they appear with punctual
predicates. In the course of discussion, we have demonstrated metalinguistic uses
of English negation and employed the notion to explain the problematic Japanese
cases. De-wa-nai can function as a metalinguistic use of negation and fails to
permit NPIs.
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