Made and Metalinguistic Negation in Japanese[*]
Takashi Yoshida

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.'

   b. John-wa   yuugata made mat-anakat-ta.
      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

---

[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.

'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   ronbun-o   teisyutu-si-ta.[2]
John-TOP   Friday   until   paper-ACC   submit-PAST
'*John submitted the paper until Friday.'

b. John-wa   kinyoobi made   ronbun-o   teisyutu-si-nakat-ta.
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):

(4) a. *John-wa   yoru-osoku made   syuppatu-si-ta.
John-TOP   night-late   until   start-PAST
'*John started until late at night.'

b. John-wa   yoru-osoku made   syuppatu-si-nakat-ta.
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 *syuppatu-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.

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

    b. Yuube-no   dansu-de   siroi   suutu-o
       last night-GEN dance-at   white suit-ACC
       kitei-ta-no-wa   John-da.
       wear-PAST-GEN-TOP John-be

(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).

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

    b. John beat his wife not because he loved her but because of some other reason.

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:[4]

(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   nakus-ita   koto-ni   kidu-ita   no-wa
        it-ACC   lose-PAST   fact-DAT   realize-PAST GEN-TOP

Wouden (1997), Yoshimura (1999), Horn and Kato (2000), Israel (2001), and references therein.
    [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	nakus-ita
afterward-DAT	become	it-ACC	lose-PAST

koto-ni	kidu-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	gutaika-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	gutaika-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-tuduke-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. *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. (=15)
         university-DAT go   until be-TOP-NEG-PAST

   b. zibun to-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   nakus-ita   koto-ni   kidu-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
      nakus-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   <u>gutaika-si</u>-ta

      this   direction   at-GEN   movement-NOM   shape-become-PAST

      no-wa   1980   nen-ni   naru   made   <u>de-wa-nakat-ta</u>. (=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   <u>gutaika-si-nakat</u>-ta.

      at-GEN   movement-TOP   shape-become-NEG-PAST

      'No definite move in this direction was made until 1980.'

(24) a. *John-ga   <u>nemuri-ni-tu</u>-ita   no-wa

      John-NOM   sleep-DAT-fall-PAST   GEN-TOP

      9-zi   made   <u>de-wa-nakat</u>-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

      <u>nemuri-ni-tuk-anakat</u>-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 [polís].

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.'[8] 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-nakat-ta.
      Taro only   appear-NEG-PAST
      'Only Taro appeared.'

b. *Taro sika   araware-ta.
      Taro only   appear-PAST

(29) a. Hanako-wa   nanimo   tabe-nakat-ta.
      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   kidu-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   <u>nemuri-ni-tu</u>-ita no-wa
          9-zi made <u>de-wa-nakat</u>-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 corresponding 'objected' utterances are unnatural:

(32) a. *zibun   toyuu   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 *made*s, 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.

References

Declerck, Renaat (1995) "The Problem of *Not... Until*," *Linguistics* 33, 51-98.

Declerck, Renaat (1996) "The Semantics of Actualization of *Not ... Until*," *English Linguistics* 13, 299-308.

Horn, Laurence (1989) *A Natural History of Negation*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.

Horn, Laurence and Yasuhiko Kato (2000) *Negation and Polarity: Syntactic and Semantic Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Israel, Michael (2001) "Minimizers, Maximizers and the Rhetoric of Scalar Reasoning," *Journal of Semantics* 18, 297-331.

Kato, Yasuhiko (1985) *Negative Sentences in Japanese, Sophia Linguistica Monograph* 19, Sophia University, Tokyo.

Klima, Edward (1964) "Negation in English," *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. by Fodor Jerry and Jerrold Katz, 246-324, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Ladusaw, William (1979) *Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Linebarger, Marcia (1980) *The Grammar of Negative Polarity*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

McGloin, Naomi H. (1986) *Negation in Japanese*, Boreal Scholarly Publishers and Distributors, Edmonton, Alberta.

Noh, Eun-Ju (2000) *Metarepresentation: A Relevance-Theory Approach*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Progovac, Ljiljana (1994) *Negative and Positive Polarity: A Binding Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tanaka, Hiroaki (1995) "Implicature of *Not ... Until*," *English Linguistics* 12, 272-278.

Tanaka, Hiroaki (1998) *Gohoo to Goyooron no Setten* (An Interface Between Usage and Pragmatics), Kaitakusya, Tokyo.

van der Wouden, Ton (1997) *Negative Contexts: Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*, Routledge, London.

Yoshimura, Akiko (1999) *Hitei Kyokusei Gensyoo* (Negative Polarity Phenomenon), Eihosha, Tokyo.

Faculty of Languages and Cultures
Meikai University
mxf03436@nifty.com