

On the Interpretation of Japanese and Korean Multiple Negative Polarity Item Constructions

KangHun Park

Keywords: Negative Polarity Item, Multiple NPIs, Argument·adjunct asymmetry, Ambiguous interpretation, Non-NPI

0. Introduction

In this paper, I discuss problems with past attempts to account for the interpretation of Japanese and Korean Multiple Negative Polarity Item Constructions and present alternative analyses.

Negative Polarity Items (hereafter, NPIs) in Japanese and Korean appear only in negative sentences as in (1).

(1) (J) Taro ·shika ringo-o tabe-na·katta (*tabe-ta).
·shika apple·Acc eat·Neg·Past eat·Past
'Only John ate an apple.'

(K) Taro bakk-e¹ sagwa-leul meog-ji anh-ass-da² (*meog-eoss-da).
bakk-e apple·Acc eat·Comp Neg·Past·Decl eat·Past·Decl

NPIs in Japanese and Korean correspond to each other as shown in (2).

(2) NPIs in Japanese and Korean

Japanese NPIs	Korean NPIs
a. <i>shika</i>	<i>bakk-e</i> 'only'
b. Indeterminate·mo (<i>any</i> -type):	Indeterminate·do (<i>any</i> -type):

¹ The Korean Romanization system is based on the one declared (2000·8) by the Korean Ministry of Culture and Tourism in July 7th, 2000.

² Korean Negation can be expressed in three different ways, as in (i).

(i) a. Long·Form Negation, e.g., *meog-da* 'eat' → *meog-ji anh-da* 'do not eat'

b. Short·Form Negation, e.g., *meog-da* 'eat' → *an meog-da* 'do not eat'

c. Lexically negative verbs, e.g., *eobs-da* 'not exist', *molu-da* 'not know'

In this paper, only (i a) (Long·Form Negation) and (i c) (Lexically negative verbs) are presented.

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|
| | <i>dare-mo, nani-mo, dokoni-mo</i> | <i>amu-do, amugeos-do, amude-do</i> |
| | | ‘anyone, anything, anywhere’ ; <i>-mo (do)</i> means ‘even’ |
| c. | 1·Classifier· <i>mo (even-type)</i> : | 1·Classifier· <i>do (even-type)</i> : |
| | <i>hitori-mo, hitotsu-mo, etc</i> | <i>han salam-do, hana-do, etc</i> |
| | | ‘even a person, even a thing’ |
| d. | Adverbial NPI : | Adverbial NPI : |
| | <i>kessite, etc</i> | <i>gyeolko, etc</i> ‘never’ |

Park (2007a, to appear a) suggests that Japanese and Korean multiple NPI constructions (hereafter, MNCs) can be licensed by one single Neg³. Consider the following sentences.

- (3) (J) Kono biru-wa chika 10 kai-made aru-ga chika 5 kai-
 this building-Top basement 10th floor-up to exist-but basement 5th floor-
 made-shika dare-mo itta-koto-ga nai⁴.
 up to·*shika anyone* go·experience-Nom Neg-Pres
 ‘This building has 10 floors underground but everyone has been down
 only down to 5th floor underground⁵.’
- (K) I bilding-eun jiha 10 cheung-kkaji iss-neunde jiha
 this building-Top basement 10th floor-up to exist-but basement
 5 cheung -kkaji bakk-e amu-do gabon jeog-i eobs-da.
 5th floor up to *bakk-e anyone* go experience-Nom Neg-Pres-Decl
- (4) (J) Watashitachi-wa uta-de -shika nani-mo kaese-nai-kara
 we -Top song-with -*shika anything* pay back-Neg-because
 saiko-no-mono-o mise-yo-ze.
 best-Gen-thing-Acc show-let us-Modal
 ‘Let’s show our best because we can’t pay [them] back with anything but a song.’
- (K) Ulideul-eun nolae-lo bakk-e amugeos-do gap-eul su eobs-eunikka
 we -Top song-with *bakk-e anything* pay back Neg-because
 choego-ui geos-eul bo-yeojudolog ha-ja.
 best-Gen thing-Acc show-let us-Modal

³ However, Park (to appear a, b) argues that there exist some syntactic and semantic constraints on Japanese and Korean MNCs. See Park (to appear a, b) for more details.

⁴ The Japanese and Korean data that I report here are based primarily on judgments I received from up to 50 Japanese and Korean native speakers majoring in linguistics.

⁵ English translation in all examples is all mine.

In (3) and (4), *shika (bakk-e)* occurs with *Indeterminate-mo (do)* within one single Neg.

Unlike the MNCs in (3) and (4), the following MNCs from Sells (2001) seem to be somewhat different.

- (5) (J) Taro·*shika* nani·mo tabe·na·katta⁶.
·*shika anything* eat·Neg·Past
Interpretation (i): ‘Except for Taro, no one ate anything (Only Taro ate something).’
Interpretation (ii): ‘Only Taro didn’t eat anything.’
- (K) Taro *bakk-e amugeos-do* meog·ji *anh-ass-da*.
bakk-e anything eat·Comp Neg·Past·Decl
- (6) (J) Dare·mo kore·*shika* yoma·na·katta.
anyone this thing·shika read·Neg·Past
Interpretation (i): ‘Everyone read only this book.’
Interpretation (ii): ‘No one read only this book.’
- (K) Amu·do igeos *bakk-e* ilg·ji *anh-ass-da*.
anyone this thing bakk-e read·Comp Neg·Past·Decl

MNCs in (5, 6) and (3, 4) are similar in that *shika (bakk-e)* and *Indeterminate-mo (do)* occur within a single Neg. On the other hand, we can notice a difference in interpretation between them. Japanese and Korean speakers allow only one interpretation for (3, 4), although there exist two different kinds of interpretations in (5) and (6)⁷. What kind of factor brings about the interpretive difference between (5, 6) on the one hand and (3, 4) on the other hand? I examine the factors involved.

The paper consists of three sections. In Section 1, I summarize previous approaches for the interpretation of Japanese and Korean MNCs and indicate problems with them. In Section 2, I attempt to explain the syntactic factors involved in the interpretation of MNCs and the reason why there are two different kinds of interpretations. In Section 3, I summarize my observations and hypotheses.

1. Review of Previous Approaches

Nishioka (2000:174) argues that the following Japanese MNCs are acceptable and have only one interpretation.

⁶ I do not agree with Sells’ argument that Japanese *shika* in argument position can occur with other NPIs such as *Indeterminate-mo* within one single Neg. See section 1.

⁷ Sells (2001) mentions that there is almost no one who allows both interpretations. In other words, the speakers follow either interpretation (i) or (ii).

- (7) a.(?)Eigo-shika dare-mo hanas-ana-katta.
 English-shika anyone speak-Neg-Past
 'No one spoke only English.'
- b.(?)John-shika nani-mo hanas-ana-katta.
 ·shika anything say-Neg-Past
 'No one but John said anything.'

Similarly, Kataoka (2006:223-224) observes that there is only one interpretation in the Japanese MNCs in (8).

- (8) a. Yasai-o nani-mo Hanako-shika tabe-na-katta.
 vegetable-Acc anything ·shika eat-Neg-Past
 'Hanako ate every vegetable but others except Hanako did not eat anything.'
- b. (Gakusei-ga) dare-mo manga-shika yoma-nai.
 student anyone comics ·shika read-Neg-Pres
 'Every student reads only comics.'

Kuno and Whitman (2004:223-224) also suggest that the Korean MNCs below have only one interpretation.

- (9) a. Insu bakk-e amugeos-do malha-ji anh-ass-da.
 bakk-e anything tell-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
 'Only Insu said anything to anyone.'
- b. Amu-do i geos bakk-e ilg-ji anh-ass-da.
 anyone this thing bakk-e read-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
 'Everyone read only this.'

Nishioka (2000), Kataoka (2006) and Kuno and Whitman (2004) are similar in that they indicate that Japanese and Korean MNCs have only one interpretation.

On the other hand, Sells (2001:8-9) argues that Korean and Japanese MNCs have two different kinds of interpretations as illustrated in (10) and (11).

- (10) (K) Amu-do igeos bakk-e ilg-ji anh-ass-da.
 anyone this thing bakk-e read-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
 Interpretation (i): 'Everyone read only this book.'

Interpretation (ii): ‘No one read only this book.’

(J) Dare·mo kore·shika yoma·na·katta.
anyone this thing·*shika* read·Neg·Past

(11) (K) Taro *bakk·e amugeos·do* meog·ji *anh·ass·da*.
bakk·e anything eat·Comp Neg·Past·Decl

Interpretation (i): ‘Except for Taro, no one ate anything (Only Taro ate something).’

Interpretation (ii): ‘Only Taro didn’t eat anything.’

(J) Taro·*shika nani·mo* tabe·na·katta.
·shika anything eat·Neg·Past

I agree with Sells’ (2001) observation that there are two interpretations for (10) and (11)⁸. Sells argues that there are two different kinds of interpretations because *bakk·e* and *Indeterminate·do* have two different usages, an NPI and a Non-NPI, as shown in (12) and (13)⁹.

(12) *bakk·e* : a. *bakk·e* + Neg = *man* ‘only’ → NPI
b. *bakk·e* = *man* ‘only’ → Non-NPI

(13) *Indeterminate·do* :
a. *amu·do* = anyone, *amugeos·do* = anything → NPI
b. *amu·do* = everyone, *amugeos·do* = everything → Non-NPI

bakk·e in (12a) is an NPI and this forms a construction with the meaning of ‘only’ with negation, for example, ‘*bakk·e · haji anhda* ‘not do’ → ‘*man* ‘only’ – *hada* ‘do’’. In contrast, *bakk·e* in (12b) is a Non-NPI and this forms a construction with the meaning of ‘only’ without negation. In other words, the negative predicate is not transformed into affirmative, for example, ‘*bakk·e · haji anhda* ‘not do’ → ‘*man* ‘only’ – *haji anhda* ‘not do’’. In this usage, *bakk·e* behaves the same as ‘*man* ‘only’’. Let us check these two different usages of *bakk·e* in examples in (10) and (11). We can see the usage of *bakk·e* as an NPI in interpretation (i) of (10) and (11), namely, *igeos bakk·e ilg·ji anh·ass·da*, ‘read only this’ (*bakk·e* + negative predicate) → *igeos man ilg·eoss·da*, ‘read only this’ (*man* + affirmative predicate) in interpretation (i)

⁸ Nevertheless, I do not agree on the judgment of Japanese MNCs in (10) and (11) (See Park (2007b)). Sells (2001) seems to suggest that *shika* and *bakk·e* behave exactly the same, however the two expressions are not identical as Park (2007a) argues. However, the difference is not relevant for the present discussion.

⁹ Sells (2001) mainly explains Korean MNCs.

of (10) and *Taro bakk-e meog-ji anh-ass-da*, ‘Only Taro ate’ (*bakk-e* + negative predicate) → *Taro man meog-eoss-da*, ‘Only Taro ate’ (*man* + affirmative predicate) in interpretation (i) of (11). In contrast, we can see the usage of *bakk-e* as a Non-NPI in interpretation (ii) of (10) and (11), namely, *igeos bakk-e ilg-ji anh-ass-da*, ‘read only this’ (*bakk-e* + negative predicate) → *igeos man ilg-ji anh-ass-da*, ‘not read only this’ (*man* + negative predicate) in interpretation (ii) of (10) and *Taro bakk-e meog-ji anh-ass-da*, ‘Only Taro ate’ (*bakk-e* + negative predicate) → *Taro man meog-ji anh-ass-da*, ‘Only Taro did not eat’ (*man* + negative predicate) in interpretation (ii) of (11).

Indeterminate-do in (13a) behaves as an NPI with the meaning of existential quantifier, whereas in (13b) it behaves as a Non-NPI with the meaning of universal quantifier. Sells (2001) also argues that this universal interpretation comes from the Free Choice Interpretation of *Indeterminate-do*. With the English NPI *anybody*, we can see a Free Choice interpretation as in (14) below.

- (14) a. Did Ariadne talk to anybody?
 b. Anybody can solve this problem.

Giannakidou (2001:659) argues that *anybody* in (14a) seems to be an existential quantifier. We can paraphrase (14a), as (15).

- (15) Is there an x, such that x is a person and Ariadne talked to x?

Namely, *anybody* in (14a) is an NPI. On the other hand, *anybody* in (14b) seems to be interpreted as a universal quantifier as paraphrased in (16).

- (16) Every person x is such that x can solve this problem.

Anybody in (14b) has been characterized as a free choice item (See Giannakidou (2001)). Let us check these two different usages of *Indeterminate-do* in (10) and (11). We can see the usage of *Indeterminate-do* as a Non-NPI in interpretation (i) of (10) and (11), namely, *amu-do* → everyone, *amugeos-do* → everything. In contrast, *Indeterminate-do* is an NPI in interpretation (ii) of (10) and (11), namely, *amu-do* → anyone, *amugeos-do* → anything.

According to Sells’ argument, there is only one actual NPI in Korean and Japanese MNCs as shown in (17).

- (17) a. *NPI NPI NEG
 b. NPI *NPI NEG
 (*: Non-NPI)

Sells argues that there is only one real NPI in Korean and Japanese MNCs and second occurrence is a Non-NPI. Consider Sells' argument in the Korean instances of (18) and (19) again.

- (18) (K) Amu·do igeos bakk·e ilg·ji anh·ass·da.
 anyone this thing *bakk·e* read-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
- Interpretation (i) : Non-NPI NPI NEG (hereafter, [Type A])
 → 'Everyone read only this book.'
- Interpretation (ii): NPI Non-NPI NEG (hereafter, [Type B])
 → 'No one read only this book.'
- (19) (K) Taro bakk·e amugeos·do meog·ji anh·ass·da.
 Taro·*bakk·e* *anything* eat-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
- Interpretation (i): NPI Non-NPI NEG (hereafter, [Type C])
 → 'Except for Taro, no one ate anything.'
- Interpretation (ii): Non-NPI NPI NEG (hereafter, [Type D])
 → 'Only Taro didn't eat anything.'

There is only one NPI in the MNCs of (18) and (19)¹⁰. Sells' analysis seems to be correct in that it can explain the Korean and Japanese MNCs in (18) and (19). I will call interpretation (i) and interpretation (ii) of (18) and (19) [Type A]–[Type D].

¹⁰ Sells argues that the mechanism for the interpretation of (18) is as in (i) below and for (19) is as shown in (ii).

- (i) a. Amudo-Free Choice [bakke-except V Neg] [Type A]
 'Everyone read nothing, except this. (= Everyone read only this.)'
 (= No matter who you pick, that person read only this.)
- b. [[Amudo-NPI bakke-only V] Neg] [Type B]
 'No one read only this. (If anything was read, it was not only this.)'
- (ii) a. [bakke-except amugeosdo-NPI V Neg] [Type C]
 'Except for Taro, no one ate anything. (= Only Taro ate something.)'
- b. bakke-only [amugeosdo-NPI V Neg] [Type D]
 'Only Taro did not eat anything.'

Moreover, he argues that there is only one NPI because of the *Intervention Constraint* between NPIs.

- (iii) *Intervention Constraint*: A quantificational element may not intervene hierarchically between a negative polarity item N and negation which scopes over N.

Sells also assumes two different structures for high and low negation in Korean MNCs.

Nevertheless, the following Japanese and Korean MNCs cannot be explained in Sells' analysis.

- (3) (J) Kono biru-wa chika 10 kai-made aru-ga chika 5 kai-
 this building-Top basement 10th floor-up to exist-but basement 5th floor-
 made-*shika* dare-mo itta-koto-ga nai.
 up to-*shika* anyone go-experience-Nom Neg-Pres
 'This building has 10 floors underground but everyone has been down
 only down to 5th floor underground.'
- (K) I bilding-eun jiha 10 cheung-kkaji iss-neunde jiha
 this building-Top basement 10th floor-up to exist-but basement
 5 cheung -kkaji bakk-e amu-do gabon jeog-i eobs-da.
 5th floor up to bakk-e anyone go experience-Nom Neg-Pres-Decl
- (4) (J) Watashitachi-wa uta-de -*shika* nani-mo kaese-nai-kara
 we -Top song-with -*shika* anything pay back-Neg-because
 saiko-no-mono-o mise-yo-ze.
 best-Gen-thing-Acc show-let us-Modal
 'Let's show our best because we can't pay [them] back with anything but a song.'
- (K) Ulideul-eun nolae-lo bakk-e amugeos-do gap-eul su eobs-eunikka
 we -Top song-with *bakk-e* anything pay back Neg-because
 choego-ui geos-eul bo-yeojudolog ha-ja.
 best-Gen thing-Acc show-let us-Modal

Consider the interpretations of (3) and (4). There is only one interpretation in (3) and (4) even though they are MNCs with *bakk-e* (*shika*) and *Indeterminate-do* (*mo*) within a single Neg. We can see that the MNCs in (3) are [Type A] but the ones in (4) do not belong to any types. If Sells' analysis were correct, we should expect that (3) should also have [Type B] and (4) should also have [Type C, D] shown in (20).

- (20) a. [Type B of (3)] → 'No one has been down only down to 5th floor underground.'
- b. [Type C of (4)] → #'Let's show our best because we can't pay [them] back with anything but a song and no one paid back with anything.'
- [Type D of (4)] → #'Let's show our best because we can't pay [them] back with anything only with a song.'

However, the inter predictions in (20) are not observed. This shows that (3) and (4) are different from (18) and (19).

Furthermore, I do not agree with Sells' analysis of *amugeos-do* 'anything', in [Type C] of (19). Sells mentions that it is used as a Non-NPI, analogous to the Free Choice Interpretation of *amu-do* 'anyone' in [Type A] of (18). Instead, I argue that *amugeos-do* 'anything' is used as an NPI because it cannot have the interpretation of 'everything' but only the interpretation of 'anything' in [Type C] of (19). The correct interpretation in [Type C] of (19) should be as follows.

- (21) Only Taro ate something and the other people didn't eat anything.

This suggests that the NPIs, *shika* (*bakk-e*) and *nani-mo* (*amugeos-do*) 'anything' in (4) can behave as real NPIs simultaneously in the same construction.

The next section discusses why there is only one interpretation for the MNCs in (3, 4) unlike (18, 19) and the kind of syntactic environment that brings about ambiguous interpretations.

2. Argument-adjunct asymmetry of *bakk-e* (*shika*)

In the preceding section, I have argued against Sells' analysis concerning the interpretation of Korean and Japanese MNCs. In this section, I present a syntactic factor which brings about the ambiguous interpretation of MNCs.

I propose two hypotheses for the interpretation of Korean and Japanese MNCs.

- (22) a. For the interpretation of Korean and Japanese MNCs, the syntactic position of an NPI is the most significant factor. There exist two different interpretations if an NPI occurs in argument position, whereas there is only one interpretation if it occurs in adjunct position (Argument-adjunct asymmetry).
- b. An NPI in adjunct position in an MNC is a real NPI, whereas one in argument position is a Non-NPI.

I now present arguments in support of the hypotheses. (3) and (4) are repeated as (23a, b) below for ease of reference.

- (23) a.(J) Kono biru-wa chika 10 kai-made aru-ga chika 5
 this building-Top basement 10th floor-up to exist-but basement 5th

- kai-made-shika dare-mo itta-koto-ga nai.
 floor-up to *shika* anyone go-experience-Nom Neg-Pres
 'This building has 10 floors underground but everyone has been down only down to 5th floor underground.'
- (K) I bilding-eun jiha 10 cheung-kkaji iss-neunde jiha
 this building-Top basement 10th floor-up to exist-but basement
 5 cheung-kkaji bakk-e amu-do gabon jeog-i eobs-da.
 5th floor up to bakk-e *anyone* go experience-Nom Neg-Pres-Decl
- b.(J) Watashitachi-wa uta-de -shika nani-mo kaese-nai-kara
 we -Top song-with -*shika* anything pay back-Neg-because
 saiko-no-mono-o mise-yo-ze.
 best-Gen-thing-Acc show-let us-Modal
 'Let's show our best because we can't pay [them] back with anything but a song.'
- (K) Ulideul-eun nolae-lo bakk-e amugeos-do gap-eul su eobs-eunikka
 we -Top song-with *bakk-e* anything pay back Neg-because
 choego-ui geos-eul bo-yeojudolog ha-ja.
 best-Gen thing-Acc show-let us-Modal
- c.(J) Watasi-wa nonda-toki-ni-shika hitokoto-mo monku-o ie-nai
 I -Top drunk-time-in-*shika* even a word a complaint-Acc say-can-Neg
 danna-ga iya-desu.
 husband-Nom hate-Pres
 'I don't like my husband who can't [express] even one word of complaint except when he was drunk.'
- (K) Jeo-neun sulmasyeoss-eul ttae bakk-e han madi-do bulpyeong-eul
 I -Top drunk time *bakk-e* even a word a complaint-Acc
 tolohal su eobs-neun nampyeon-i silh-eo-yo.
 say-can Neg husband-Nom hate-Pres
- d.(J) Sinnkokuni yobu mono-no mae-ni-shika kessite araware-nai kami.
 sincerely call for person-Gen before-Loc *shika* never appear-Neg god
 'A god who never appears except for a person who seriously calls for.'
- (K) Jinjihage buleuneun salam ap-e bakk-e gyeolko nata-ji anhneun sin.
 sincerely call for person before-Loc *bakk-e* never appear-Comp Neg god

In (23a) and (23b), *shika* (*bakk-e*) occurs with *Indeterminate-mo* (*do*). In (23c), *shika* (*bakk-e*) appears with *1-Classifier-mo* (*do*). In (23d), *shika* (*bakk-e*) occurs with *kessite* (*gyeolko*) 'never'. They are all acceptable and have only one interpretation.

The NPIs in (23b) - (23d) behave as real NPIs except for *dare-mo* (*amu-do*) ‘anyone’ in (23a).

Now, let us focus on the syntactic position of the NPIs in (23). Firstly, *shika* (*bakk-e*) appears in adjunct position, namely, *shika* (*bakk-e*) precedes in *made* (*kkaji*) ‘up to’ in (23a), *de* (*lo*) ‘with’ in (23b), *ni* (*e*) ‘in’ in (23c) and *mae-ni* (*ap-e*) ‘before’ in (23d).

Secondly, Kawashima & Kitahara (1992:144), Aoyagi & Ishii (1994:297-298), Nishioka (2000:182) and Kataoka (2006:204), among others argue that *Indeterminate-mo* in Japanese is an adjunct. See the examples below.

- (24) a. *Dare-mo* kuruma-o kawa-na-katta.
 anyone car-Acc buy-Neg-Past
 ‘Nobody bought a car.’
 b. John-ga nani-mo kawa-na-katta.
 -Nom *anything* buy-Neg-Past
 ‘John didn’t buy anything.’

Kawashima & Kitahara (1992:144) argues that both *dare-mo* ‘anyone’ and *nani-mo* ‘anything’ in (24) are not in argument position. Given that Japanese is a pro-drop language, they argue that (24a) contains a null subject, whereas (24b) contains a null object, as shown in (25).

- (25) a. Gakusei-ga dare-mo kuruma-o kawa-na-katta.
 student-Nom *anyone* car-ACC buy-Neg-Past
 b. John-ga nama mono-o nan-imo kawa-na-katta.
 -Nom raw food -Acc *anything* buy-Neg-Past

Choi (1998:325) follows Kawashima & Kitahara’s analysis and argues that the Korean *Indeterminate-do* functions as an adjunct.

Thirdly, the syntactic position of *1-Classifier-mo* (*do*) appears in adjunct position because *hitokoto-mo* (*han madi-do*) ‘even a word’ in (23c) functions like a modifier of the host NP *monku-wo* (*bulpyeong-eul*) ‘a complaint’.

Lastly, we can see that the syntactic position of *kessite* (*gyeolko*) ‘never’ in (23d) is in adjunct position because it is an adverb.

Here, we can generalize that there is only one interpretation when NPIs such as *shika* (*bakk-e*), *Indeterminate-mo* (*do*), *1-Classifier-mo* (*do*) and *kessite* (*gyeolko*)

'never' in adjunct position co-occur with other NPIs in adjunct position within one single Neg. That is why the following co-occurrences of *Indeterminate-mo (do)*, *1-Classifier-mo (do)* and *kessite (gyeolko)* 'never' have only one interpretation unlike *bakk-e (shika)* in the argument position in (18) and (19).

- (26) a. (J) Dare-mo nani-mo tabe-na-katta.
anyone anything eat-Neg-Past
 'No one ate anything.'
- (K) Amu-do amugeos-do meog-ji anh-ass-da.
anyone anything eat-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
- b. (J) Dare-mo hon-o issatsu-mo kawa-na-katta.
anyone book-Acc even a book buy-Neg-Past
 'No one bought even a book.'
- (K) Amu-do chaeg-eul han gwon-do sa-ji anh-ass-da.
anyone book Acc even a book buy-Comp Neg-Past-Decl
- c. (J) Dare-mo kessite shabera-na-katta.
anyone never speak-Neg-Past
 'No one ever spoke.'
- (K) Amu-do gyeolko malha-ji anh-ass-da
anyone never speak-Comp Neg-Past-Decl

In sum, contrary to Sells' analyses that there is only one real NPI in Japanese and Korean MNCs, I have argued that NPIs in adjunct position such as *shika (bakk-e)*, *Indeterminate-mo (do)*, *1-Classifier-mo (do)* and *kessite (gyeolko)* 'never' are all real NPIs when they co-occur within one single Neg, whereas *bakk-e*¹¹ in argument position behaves as a Non-NPI.

However, two questions remain; (i) why does *dare-mo (amu-do)* 'anyone' of [Type A] in (18) behave as a Non-NPI even though it is in adjunct position? This may be related to the fact observed by Kuno and Whitman (2004) that *amu-do* 'anyone' in Korean has the meaning of 'everyone' when it comes in subject position unlike *amugeos-do* 'anything' in Korean. (ii) why does *bakk-e* of [Type A, C] in (18, 19) behave as an NPI even though it appears in argument position? My viewpoint is that it seems to be in argument position; however, it actually appears in adjunct position. This is because it functions in the similar manner as exceptive marker like

¹¹ Recall that unlike *bakk-e*, *shika* in argument position cannot occur with other NPIs within a single Neg.

Japanese *igai* or *hoka* 'except' (See Park (to appear c)). But further researches are required on this point.

3. Concluding remarks

In this paper, I have shown that there are problems with past attempts to account for the interpretation of Japanese and Korean Multiple NPI constructions. I have presented two arguments: (i) there appears to be an argument-adjunct asymmetry for NPIs in the interpretation of MNCs, in other words, there are two different interpretations if an NPI is in argument position, whereas there is only one interpretation if an NPI is in adjunct position; (ii) real NPIs in Japanese and Korean MNCs appear in adjunct position, whereas Non-NPIs appear in argument position.

【References】

- Aoyagi, Hiroshi and Toru Ishii (1994) On NPI licensing in Japanese. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 4. Noriko Akatsuka(ed.). pp.295-311. CSLI.
- Choi, KiYong (1998) Hangugeo-ui bujeong geugeo amu-e daehayeo [On Korean NPI Amu] *The Korean Generative Grammar Circle* 8-2. pp.313-341.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia (2001) The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24. pp.659-735.
- Kataoka, Kiyoko (2006) *Nihongo hiteibun-no kozo: Kakimazebun-to hitei koo hyogen* [The structure of Japanese negative sentences: Scrambled sentences and negative sensitive item]. Kurosio Publishers.
- Kato, Yasuhiko (1985) *Negative sentences in Japanese*. Sophia Linguistica 19. Monograph. Sophia University.
- Kawashima, Ruriko and Hisatugu Kitahara (1992) Licensing of negative polarity items and checking theory: A comparative study of English and Japanese. *Proceedings of the Formal Linguistics Society of Midamerica* 3. pp.139-154.
- Kim, Alan Hyun-Oak (1997) The NPI *pakkey* and universal quantifier negation in Korean. In S. Kuno et al.(ed.). *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 6. pp.323-337. Dept. of Linguistics, Harvard University.
- Kuno, Susumu, and Young-joo Kim (1999) The syntax and semantics of the *man* and *pakkey* constructions. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 8. pp.436-456. Dept.of Linguistics, Harvard University.
- Kuno, Susumu and John Whitman (2004) Licensing of multiple negative polarity items. *Studies in Korean Syntax and Semantics by Susumu Kuno*. In Young-Key Kim-

- Renaud and John Whitman(eds.). pp.207-228. Seoul: International Circle of Korean Linguistics.
- Lee, ChungMin (2002) Negative polarity in Korean and Japanese *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 10. Noriko Akatsuka(ed.). pp.481-494. CSLI.
- Nishioka, Nobuaki (2000) Japanese negative polarity items wh-MO and XP-shika phrases: Another overt movement analysis in terms of feature-checking. *Syntactic and Functional Explorations: In Honor of Susumu Kuno*. K. Takami, A. Kamio and J. Whitman(eds.). pp.159-184. Kurosio Publishers.
- Park, KangHun (2007a) Nikkan ryo gengo-niokeru hitei icchi gensho-ni tsuite [On negative concord phenomena in Japanese and Korean]. *Nihongo-to Nihon Bungaku* 44 [Japanese Language and Literature 44]. pp.40-57. Tsukuba Daigaku Kokugo Kokubun Gakkai [The Society of Japanese Language and Literature] University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan.
- Park, KangHun (2007b) Shika-Nai no taju NPI gensho-ni tsuite [On multiple NPI phenomena of *Shika-Nai* in modern Japanese]. *Nihongo Bunpo* 7-2 [The Society of Japanese Grammar 7-2] pp. 154-170. Kurosio Publishers.
- Park, KangHun (to appear a) Gedai nihongo-ni okeru taju hitei kyokuse komoku kobun-nitsuite [On multiple NPI constructions in modern Japanese]. *Nihon Gengo Gakkai 135 kai Yokoshu* [Proceedings of the 135th Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan].
- Park, KangHun (to appear b) Constraints on multiple negative polarity item constructions in Japanese and Korean. *Tsukuba Working Papers in Linguistics* 26. Linguistic Circle, University of Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan.
- Park, KangHun (to appear c) Nikkan ryogengo-niokeru hitei to koosuru gentei hyogen-Bunpoka gensho-ni chakumoku shite- [On Exceptive phrases in concord with a sentential negation in Japanese and Korean: In case of a grammaticalization perspective] *Gengo Gijutsu-to Gengo Kyoiku-no Sogo Kasseika-no Tameno Nihongo, Chugokugo, Kankokugo Taishokenkyu* [A Contrastive Study of Japanese, Chinese and Korean] Yoshiko Numata(ed.). Heisei 16 Nendo-19 Nendo Mombukagakusho Kagaku Kenkyuhi Josei Kenkyu Hokokusho [Reports to the Ministry of Education (no.16320047)] Univerisity of Tsukuba.
- Sells, Peter (2001) Negative polarity licensing and interpretation. *Harvard Studies in Korean Linguistics* 9. In S. Kuno et al.(ed.). pp.3-22. Dept. of Linguistics, Harvard University.
- Watanabe, Akira (2004) The genesis of negative concord. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35. pp.559-612.