

## On the Stativity of Negation in Japanese

The adjectival nature of negative morpheme *na* has often been noted in the literature (Martin 1975, Kato 1985, McGloin 1986), which implies that negative sentences are stative. However, the interpretation of *made* ‘until’ in negative sentences poses a problem to this generalization (1)-(2). As observed in Giannakidou (2002) for English and Greek, in (1), the event actualization is an entailment since it cannot be canceled whereas it is in (2). The contrast poses a problem for the analysis of negation as a stativizer because we expect the event actualization inference is cancelable, contrary to fact.

Assuming that *made* ‘until’ is ambiguous between durative and Negative Polarity Item (NPI) as defended in Karttunen (1974) and Giannakidou (2002) for English *until*, I argue that the fact that the event actualization inference is not cancelable in (1) does not jeopardize the stativity of negation; rather that it is a consequence of the fact that NPI-*made* phrase triggers PERFECTIVE-operator on top of negation. Following Gerö and von Stechow (2002), I propose the Tense-Aspect Architecture as in (3a). In (3b), the NPI-*made* triggers PERFECTIVE in the specifier of AspP. Since NEG is a stativizer, PERFECTIVE cannot take NegP as its input directly. It has to be mediated by some functional projection FP headed by the inflectional morpheme *-kat*. This FP accommodates an eventivizer BECOME (Dowty 1979), whose function is to map states to events. With the semantics for NPI-*until* in (4) due to Giannakidou, the structure in (3b) makes the sentence eventive, resulting in the event actualization as entailment.

There are at least two pieces of evidence in favor of the analysis presented above. First, the aspectual shift described above is empirically supported by the analogy between negative and adjectival imperatives as in (5). These types of imperatives are often found in literary texts. It is well known that stative predicates are incompatible with imperatives. What happens in (5) then is the shift from states to events mediated by BECOME. It is argued that what is responsible for the aspectual shift from states to events is the presence of the inflectional morpheme *-kar*, which is translated as ‘be’ in English. The allomorph is also present in the form of *-kat* in (1). It is this morpheme, I argue, that heads the FP. Secondly, *hiru made* ‘until noon’ in (1) becomes unambiguously durative when *kara* ‘from’ phrase is added to it as in (6), and the event actualization is no longer an entailment as the continuation does not lead to a contradiction. In the present analysis, this means that NEG stativizes the VP, which licenses IMPERFECTIVE-operator at the specifier of AspP as default. Then, the durative *made*-phrase adjoins to AspP, which provides a correct input for the *made*-phrase.

The fact that the durative reading of (1) is hard to obtain is argued to be attributed to the structural disambiguation required for *made* ‘until’ together with the indefinite nature of the expression. First, indefinite NPs are upward-entailing (Ladusaw 1980) and so is *made* phrase as the left to right inference goes through in (7). Secondly, indefinites cannot take scope over negation without a contextual clue, but additional information given by a relative clause makes the existence salient as in (8), which parallels the contrast between (1) and (6). Third, if the structure disambiguates the choice of durative-*made* over NPI-*made*, we obtain unambiguous durative readings as in (6) with additional *kara*-phrase and (9a), where the *made*-phrase is base-generated structurally higher than NEG.

- (1) A: Sono kozutumi -wa hiru made todok -ana -kat -ta.  
 the parcel TOP noon until arrive NEG -be PAST  
 B: #Soo-da-kedo, jissai-wa, sono hi -ni todok -ana-kat -ta  
 that's true-but actually the day on arrive NEG-be PAST  
 ‘The parcel didn’t arrive until noon. #In fact, it didn’t arrive that day.’
- (2) A: Ohime-sama -wa mayonaka made ne -ta.  
 princess TOP midnight until sleep PAST  
 B: Soo-da-kedo jissai, me -o samasi -ta no-wa yonakano ni-ji sugi dat -ta.  
 that's true-but actually eye-ACC wake PAST NM midnight two past COP PAST  
 ‘The princess slept until midnight. In fact, she woke up at a little bit past two pm.’
- (3) a. [TP TENSE<sub>T</sub> [AspP ASPECT<sub>Asp</sub> [NegP [NEG [Neg [VP . . . . .]]]]]]  
 b. [TP sono kozutumi-wa [AspP PERFECTIVE [FP BECOME [NegP [NEG [VP hiru  
 made [VP [V todok] na<sub>Neg</sub> -kat<sub>F</sub>] ∅<sub>Asp</sub>] -ta<sub>T</sub>]]]]
- (4) Scalar semantics for NPI-*until*  
 $[[ \text{not } P \text{ until } Q ]] = \lambda e \exists t [Q(t) \wedge \neg P(e,t) \wedge \neg \exists t' \exists e' [t' C \wedge t' < t \wedge P(e',t')]]$   
 (Giannakidou 2002)
- (5) a. iku na -kar -e ‘Don’t go.’ b. utukusi -kar -e ‘Be beautiful.’  
 go NEG be-IMP beautiful-be-IMP
- (6) Sono kozutumi -wa asa kara hiru made todok -ana-kat -ta -si  
 the parcel TOP morning-from noon until arrive NEG PAST and  
 jissai sono hi-ni-wa todok -ana-kat -ta yo.  
 actually that day-on arrive NEG PAST  
 ‘The parcel didn’t arrive from morning until noon, and in fact it didn’t arrive that day.’
- (7) a. A young man came → A man came.  
 b. Sally slept from morning until midnight → Sally slept until midnight.
- (8) a. Peter didn’t read a book. (NEG > A BOOK; #A BOOK > NEG)  
 b. Peter didn’t read a book that Sally gave him. (NEG > A BOOK; A BOOK > NEG)
- (9) a. Sono kozutumi-ga todok -anakat -ta koto-wa yuugata made sin de-at -ta.  
 the parcel-NOM arrive NEG PAST NM-TOP evening until true be PAST  
 ‘Until evening, it was true that the parcel didn’t arrive.’  
 b. #Sono kozutumi-ga todoi -ta koto-wa yuugata made sin de-at -ta.  
 the parcel-NOM arrive PAST NM-TOP evening until true be PAST  
 ‘#Until evening, it was true that the parcel arrived.’

## References

- Dowty, D. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*, Reidel, Dordrecht.  
 Gerö, E-C. and A. von Stechow. 2002. *Tense in Time: Greek Perfect*. Draft.  
 Karttunen, L. 1974. “Until”, *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10: 283-297.  
 Kato, Y. 1985. *Negative Sentences in Japanese*. Ph.D thesis, Sophia University.  
 Ladusaw, W. A. 1980. *Polarity Sensitivity as Inherent Scope Relations*. Garland.  
 Martin, S. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. Yale University Press.  
 McGloin, N.H. 1986. *Negation in Japanese*. Boreal Scholarly Publishers and Distributors.  
 Giannakidou, A. 2002. “UNTIL, Aspect, and Negation: A Novel Argument for Two  
*Untils*”, in B. Jackson (ed.), *SALT XII*.