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Abstract

Negation has fascinated thinkers and scholars for some 2,500 years. However, within linguistics, it is only in the recent years that negation has been given the attention it deserves. Within language typology, the main subject of investigation has been the notion of standard negation. This is well covered and data from several languages has been presented.

When it comes to Japanese, it has proved hard to come across a detailed description of negation. There is a rich general literature covering many aspects of Japanese grammar, but there seems to be a lack of a work that investigates and collects all negation phenomena in one place. Furthermore, the general grammars do not take the typological perspective of negation into consideration.

The aim of this thesis is to describe various negation strategies and related phenomena in the Japanese language and to put them in a typological perspective. To carry this out, a questionnaire for describing negation is used. Information and examples are extracted from grammars, articles, and a corpus. This is a descriptive text, and the analyses and conclusions presented can clearly contribute to the already existing literature on negation in Japanese, with the addition of a typological perspective.

Sammanfattning

Negation har fascinerat tänkare och forskare i runt 2500 år. Inom lingvistik är det dock under de senaste åren som negation har fått den uppmärksamhet den förtjänar. Inom språktypologi har det huvudsakliga ämnet varit begreppet standardnegation. Detta är väl undersökt och data från flera språk har presenterats.

När det kommer till japanska har det visat sig svårt att hitta en detaljerad beskrivning av negation. Det finns en rik allmän litteratur som täcker flera aspekter av japansk grammatik, men det verkar inte finnas något verk som undersöker och sammanställer alla fenomen kring negation på ett ställe. Vidare tar inte de allmänna grammatikorna de typlogiska aspekterna i åtanke.
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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb(ial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>concessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUR</td>
<td>durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORT</td>
<td>hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP2</td>
<td>2nd-person imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefiniteness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFL</td>
<td>inflectional morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation, negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominalizer/nominalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPST</td>
<td>non-past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>(unanalyzed) particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERM</td>
<td>permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRN</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle/marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBOR</td>
<td>subordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIKA</td>
<td>Japanese quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFF</td>
<td>(unanalyzed) suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>temporal marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Negation has long fascinated people in the field of logics, philosophy, mathematics and linguistics. What is it that is so fascinating and captivating about it? Is it the power to turn a thought, a figure or a sentence into their logical counterparts, often with small means like one symbol, one word, or even one gesture? Or is it the fact that negation can be found in every known language, which basically means that all the people of the earth use negation in some way, for the same purpose, regardless of origin? The reasons for the fascination for negation are many, and it is a functional domain that has attracted thinkers and scholars since ancient times.

Within linguistics, negation is considered a language universal, and it has, especially in the recent years, been given a lot of attention within language typology. However, there is a slight unbalance in what has been described. The focus has mainly been on the notion of standard negation. This is well-covered and investigated, and data has been presented for numerous languages from all over the world. However, there are many other aspects of negation yet to be looked into.

In this bachelor’s dissertation, negation in the Japanese language will be described. The reason to choose Japanese is that I for some time studied the language and that I have a genuine fascination for the language, the people and culture of Japan. Interestingly, along the way, another reason revealed itself; a detailed description of negation in the Japanese language proved to be hard to find. With all probability there are works on the matter written in Japanese but there seems to be a lack of an English counterpart. That is something I wish to change with this thesis.

2. Background

2.1. Japanese

As mentioned, it has been hard to find a grammatical description covering the Japanese negation strategies. In the literature, Martin (1975) provides the most thorough description of Japanese grammar. Being one of the most comprehensive works on Japanese grammar, his chapter about negation covers a great amount of subjects. The advantages with Martin’s work are its extent and that many of the examples are of “real” written or spoken Japanese. The problem on the other hand is basically that it can be very hard to read. It contains almost 1,200 pages and the type setting is small with language examples in running text. The problem lies not in the contents, but in the presentation. It is a bit unstructured and it can be hard to navigate in the massive amount of text. Furthermore, written in 1975, Martin’s work is not fully up-to-date.

Basically, the problem is not a lack of grammars on Japanese. There are many great general works on it, as well as articles describing more specific phenomena. The problem is to come across a work where the negation strategies and the typology of these are collected and described in detail.
2.2. Negation

When talking about negation, there are three types important to distinguish; sentential negation, clausal negation and standard negation. To make an extreme simplification, sentential negation is about negation on a more semantic level with negative words and tags, showing semantic contents. Examples could be the presence of such elements as *either, never, scarcely, hardly*, et cetera. Clausal negation functions more on a syntactic level. Here it is more focus on the constructions used to negate a clause. Standard negation is about the most basic way a language has to negate a clause. Section 6.1. will introduce standard negation in detail.

The study of negation has a long history. It has fascinated thinkers and scholars for some 2,500 years. However, it is in relatively recent times that some of the most influential general works have appeared. Here, a few of them will be given a brief presentation. In 1989, Laurence R. Horn wrote his influential work *A Natural History of Negation*. Horn presents the history of negation stretching from Aristotle up until present day. In that work he also describes negation within logic, the psychology of negation, and several other pragmatic and semantic phenomena.

More than 70 years before Horn’s influential work, Jespersen wrote one of the first important works on negation gaining wide influence. This work, titled *Negation in English and other languages* appeared in 1917. It is with reference to this work that Dahl (1979) introduced the term *Jespersen’s cycle*. Miestamo (2007, p.566) describes Jespersen's cycle as the process "…whereby elements that serve to reinforce negation are reanalysed as negative markers." This is used to diachronically trace the origin of negative markers in language. After 95 years, Jespersen’s work is still influential and remains a true classic.

In 1964, Klima wrote the important work *Negation in English*. This paper contains what is sometimes referred to as the *Klima’s tests (for sentential negation)*. These tests are used to identify sentential negation and to distinguish it from constituent negation. This is done by the addition of tags such as “neither” and “not even” to negative sentences. These tags are only applicable to sentential negation and are thus seen as indicators of sentential negation. For example, “*she isn’t happy, and neither is he*” is a fully grammatical sentence while *”she is unhappy, and neither is he”* is not. Thus, the first sentence contains sentential negation while second shows constituent negation.

There is much more important general literature on negation that could be mentioned here. However, it is not only general descriptions that have been presented. Negation has also been investigated within typology. There are many influential works and some of them will be mentioned later in in relevant places in this text.

2.3 Aim of the study

The aim of this thesis is to cover the negation strategies and phenomena in the Japanese language and to put them into a typological perspective. This is an aim toward which one has to adopt a critical point of view. Is it possible to completely cover such a wide functional domain as negation? Can all the various grammatical and pragmatic aspects associated with negation be covered? Most likely not. What this thesis aims to do is to describe the most common negation strategies, and also other interesting phenomena, with a humble insight that a lot will insufficiently described and some even missed out.
There are several aspects of Japanese negation that are well covered in the literature, but apart from Martin (1975), there seems to be no work collecting all these aspects in one place. That is what I am hoping to be able to achieve here: to provide a more clear-cut and collected description of Japanese negation strategies, as an addition to the already existing literature on the matter. As an addition, this work will also add the typological perspective of negation in Japanese.

3. Language conventions

The grammatical descriptions in this work are based on the Japanese usually known as Standard Japanese, e.g. the Japanese spoken in Tokyo. This “standard” Japanese is called hyoozjungo “standard Japanese” or kyootuugo “common/standard language” and it is formally decided by the Japanese Language Council, within the Ministry of Education (Hinds, 1986). This is the type of Japanese found in textbooks, newspapers, et cetera. There are great dialectal variations throughout the country, but these variations will not be taken into consideration because of the great body of work it would require.

In romanizing Japanese, two systems are mainly used: the Kunreisiki and the Hepburn system. The Hepburn system more clearly expresses the pronunciation of the phonetic variations in Japanese. It is based on English spelling pronunciation (Shibatani, 1990b, p.128). In romanization, consonants are changed where there is a different pronunciation. The result is that inflection looks more irregular.

The Kunreisiki does not give any clue to pronunciation, but neither does it give rise to any irregularities to the stem in inflection; phonetic variations are consistently expressed by one basic letter in the orthography. The Kunreisiki is formalized by the Japanese government and is based on the chart organizing the Japanese orthographic units (Shibatani, 1990b, p.128).

A few examples of this are the romanization of the characters し and つ, romanized as shi and tsu with the Hepburn system and si and tu with the Kunreisiki. Hinds (1986) gives examples of the differences between the two systems, showing that the Hepburn system looks more irregular in inflection. Basically, the Kunreisiki has an advantage when describing grammar, especially when segmenting verbs to show inflection, or like Hinds (1986) puts it: “The major advantage of kunreisiki is that inflectional endings are seen to be more regular”. In the linguistic literature, both romanization systems appear, but the Kunreisiki is the far most common. Therefore, the Kunreisiki will be used here. As a standard, names are written with the Hepburn system, and so it will be here too.

For a comparative table of the Kunreisiki and Hepburn system, see Harada (1966, p.72).
4. Method and data

4.1. The questionnaire

To carry out the aim described above, the main tool for this thesis is a typological questionnaire for describing the negation strategies of a language. It is developed by Miestamo, Tamm and Wagner-Nagy (eds., forthcoming) and has the title *Questionnaire for describing the negation system of a (Uralic) language*. It can be seen as a guide to typological description of negation, and it also helps to limit and focus the great amounts of aspects of negation. In the questionnaire, there are four main topics:

1. The language
2. Clausal negation
3. Non-clausal negation
4. Other aspects of negation

Each of these topics has subsections and the questionnaire covers a wide range of negation phenomena. Some aren’t applicable to Japanese while some aspects in Japanese need labels not found in the questionnaire. However, the questionnaire is followed as strictly as possible.

Because of the clash between the internal numbering of the questionnaire and the numbering of this thesis, the contents of the questionnaire will start from section 5 here, even though it is labeled 1 in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire can be seen in its original form as an appendix in the end.

4.2. The literature

For descriptions of grammatical phenomena, several different books and articles on Japanese grammar are used. The most important source is Martin’s (1975) *A reference grammar of Japanese*, described above. Another important general grammar, among many others, is Hinds’ (1986) *Japanese*. As an addition to these works, several other books and articles will be used for describing specific phenomena. Furthermore, text books provide simplified descriptions of grammar as well as a rich amount of examples.

The general literature on negation was described in section 2.2., and the typological literature, with focus on standard negation, will be described in detail in section 6.1. below.

4.3. The language examples

Some examples in the text are taken directly from other authors. Because of the risk of merely repeating other scholars’ findings, I chose to either construct examples myself or to find examples in a corpus.

The constructed examples are based on my own knowledge of the Japanese language. My attempt is to make them as simple and clear as possible in order to describe the grammatical phenomena...
discussed. When not indicated, the examples are constructed. To reinforce the constructed examples, they are all reviewed by a native speaker of Japanese. The informant is a woman, 33, from Tokyo.

The translations are done partly with personal knowledge of the Japanese language, and partly by using Jim Breen’s WWWJDIC online dictionary (see reference list for URL). The translations made by me are also reviewed by the same informant reviewing the constructed examples.

4.4. The corpus

The corpus used is the Kotonoha corpus, a balanced corpus containing (as of March 2011) 104,800,000 words of written Japanese. It is an online tool and is freely available (see reference list for URL).

The Kotonoha corpus is entirely in Japanese and has no support for the Roman alphabet. Thus, the tokens have to be written with Japanese characters. The search function is very basic and it is overall very user friendly.

There are eleven main categories in the corpus:

1. books (1971–2005)
2. journals; magazines (2001–2005)
4. white papers (authorative reports) (1976–2005)
6. PR; public relations; publicity; information (2008)
9. verse; poetry (1980–2005)

Each category has subsections with various subjects and topics. Books is the most represented category (62,700,000 words) followed by the two Yahoo! categories (Bag of wisdom 10,300,000 words and Blog 10,200,000 words).

The corpus contains, as mentioned, only written Japanese. That raises the question whether the examples extracted from the corpus can be seen as representative for the Japanese language. There are often quite distinct differences between written and spoken language in Japanese. However, blogs can be seen as a relaxed way of writing and thus the written language there moves a bit closer to the spoken. Furthermore, Shibatani (1990b, p.360) states that "...when the reader is not specific, polite language is not generally used." Since blogs do not have specific readers, Shibatani’s statement further reinforces the theory that the blog and forum texts show a style more close to spoken language than to written. The presence of these two categories, which can be regarded as having a more colloquial style, should be enough to express the Japanese language in a fair manner.

Finally, all the examples from the corpus are glossed and translated by me.
The questionnaire:

5. The language

5.1. Introduction

Japanese is the official language of Japan and is spoken by virtually the entire population, some 128 million as of the 2010 Population Census\(^1\). Palau is the only country outside Japan where Japanese has official status, although it is only spoken regionally on the island of Angaur by approximately 1.5% of the country’s total population (2000 Population Census)\(^2\). In July 2012, the population is estimated to reach 21,032, which would give only 315 speakers of Japanese in Palau\(^2\). However, there are roughly 1.1 million Japanese nationals officially living abroad, mainly in U.S.A., China, Australia, Brazil and Great Britain\(^3\). Thus, the language can, although without any formal status, be heard practically all over the world.

Japanese is technically a language isolate in that its genetic affiliation to other languages has not yet been proven (Shibatani, 1990b). However, there are numerous theories on the matter. A small selection of them will be presented here in order to give a picture of the varying theories (for a more detailed overview of the subject, see, for example, Shibatani, 1990b).

Whaley (1997) assigns Japanese to the language phylum Altaic, and language family Japanese-Ryukyuan. However, at the same time, Whaley states that the whole phylum Altaic is “highly controversial” (Whaley 1997, p.xx). Comrie (1989, p.251) states that Japanese is “clearly related genetically to the Ryukyuan languages, but wider generic affiliation, e.g. to Korean or (Uralo-) Altaic, remain controversial”. The connection between Japanese and Ryukyuan has been the most accepted theory. If this theory holds true, then it would be possible to connect Japanese (through Ryukyuan) to mainland Asia, and to find relations with, among others, Korean (see Miller, 1971, and below). In doing so, Japanese would simply not be an isolate. Miller (1971) regards Ryukyuan as a sister to Japanese and Korean, but competing theories from Japanese dialectologists suggest that Ryukyuan and Japanese form “Common Japanese”, to distance them from Korean (Shibatani, 1990b, p.191).

Shibatani (ibid., p.191) states that “the relationship between Ryukyuan and Japanese is far more transparent than that between Korean and Japanese, suggesting the plausibility of Japanese dialectologists’ view on the matter.” To sum up, Shibatani (1990b, p.94) states that there is a consensus that Ryukyuan is a dialect of Japanese.

Other theories on the genetic affiliation of Japanese are Miller (1971), suggesting that Japanese is directly related to Korean (another controversial theory on which the author himself puts a remark on in later work [Miller, 1980]). Miller (1971) even stretches as far as presenting both phonological and

\(^1\) Source: Japan Statistical Yearbook 2012, available online, see reference list for URL.

\(^2\) Source: The World Factbook by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), available online, see reference list for URL.

\(^3\) Source: Japan Statistical Yearbook 2012, available online, see reference list for URL.
lexical evidence for kinship between Japanese and other Altaic languages such as Turkish and Mongol. Benedict (1990) argues the Japanese is part of the Austro-Tai family (Tai-Kadai and Austronesian). Harada (1966) presents further theories, including genealogic kinship to, such as the Tibeto-Burman languages. Shibatani (1990a, p.128) makes the striking remark that “Hypotheses have been presented assigning Japanese to virtually all major language families: Altaic, Austronesian, Sino-Tibetan, Indo-European and Dravidian.”

Despite numerous theories in varying degree of probability, it is clear that the genetic affiliation of Japanese to other languages remains unknown.

5.2. Basic typological information

The basic word order in Japanese is SOV, but the word order is relatively free with the only constraint that verbs (or more precisely, predicates) must appear in sentence-final position (Kuno, 1973). Japanese is a postpositional language and grammatical relations are marked with postpositional particles (Kuno, 1973). Inflection is agglutinating (Shibatani, 1990b). Verbs can be classified as finite and non-finite. These forms are expressed by finite and non-finite affixes (Alpatov, 2001, p.106). In verb conjugation, inflectional morphemes are suffixes directly attached to a verb root, marking such as tense, polarity, and level of politeness. Adjectives inflect for tense and polarity and can take prefixes (Martin, 1975). Auxiliary verbs and the copula also inflect while nouns do not. However, nouns can take negative prefixes (Martin, 1975). Japanese has no marking for person, number or gender, and case is marked with particles (Harada, 1966). There are also different levels of politeness taking various shapes (see Martin, 1975).

According to Shibatani (1990b) and Tsujimura (1996), the Japanese phonology is built upon moras (or morae; sing. mora). These units basically consist of sequences of consonant + vowel (CV) or vowel only (V), orthographically represented by one orthographic unit. Consonant clusters do not occur except for two instances; where the consonant $n$ can close a syllable and cases of prolonged consonant articulations.

5.2.1. Parts of speech

There is a slight disagreement on how many parts of speech there are in Japanese. They are often labeled differently, sometimes two classes are compounded into one and some scholars suggest classes that others do not, et cetera. For example, Tsujimura (1996, pp.126-141) lists eight parts of speech, Berger (in Fujio Düring 1998, pp.7-9) nine, while Harada (1966, pp.87-88) lists ten. With the analyses of the three authors above in mind, a compounded and simplified list can be done:

- verbs
- adjectives (proper)
- adjectives (nominal)
- nouns
- pronouns
- adverbs

4 Despite the rigid verb-final rule, pragmatic elements such as sentence-final particles, and dislocation can appear after the verb (see Kuno, 1973). Other phenomena might also affect the final position (see Hinds, 1986, pp.161-170).

5 Imperative is the only exception where there is a distinction for person (see Alpatov, 2001, and section 6.2.1. below).
Shibatani (1990b, p.221) argues that there are three parts of speech in Japanese that inflect: “verbs, adjectives and (largely suffixal) auxiliary verbs (including the copula)”. However, Shibatani is using the word auxiliary verbs in a wide sense and includes such as passive and negation, which I would assign to adjective and verb respectively. The other parts of speech do not inflect, and only a brief introduction will be given. The presentation of adjectives will be a bit more in detail, while the verbs will be given their own section (5.2.3).

- **Conjunctions**
- **Particles**
- **Numerals**

Pronouns: Japanese has personal, possessive, demonstrative, and interrogative pronouns. There are 1st, 2nd and 3rd personal, singular and plural, pronouns. Possessive pronouns are realized by adding a genitive particle to a personal pronoun. The demonstrative pronouns come in three sets depending on distance from speaker and/or listener. Finally, Japanese has roughly twenty interrogative pronouns.

- **Adverbs:** adverbs are often derived from adjectives. They precede the verb they modify and are not negated.

- **Conjunctions:** conjunctions can be coordinating or subordinating. The gerund forms also function as conjunctions.

- **Particles:** the Japanese particles comprise a large category. It is possible to fit in case particles, interrogative particles, emphasis particles, interjections, and so on.

- **Numerals:** Japanese cardinal numerals come in two sets: one set with Japanese pronunciation and the other with a loaned Chinese pronunciation. Japanese has a large set of numeral classifiers. The numerals are predicative.

- **Nouns:** nouns are, just like nominal adjectives, not inflecting. Nouns can take demonstratives and be modified by other nouns, adjectives and subordinate clauses. Together with a copula, they can be used as predicates whereas the copula assigns such as tense, polarity and tentative form (Tsujimura, 1996). Nouns lack internal marking of person, number, gender and case. Case is realized with particles while number is optionally realized with suffixes (Harada, 1966).

- **Adjectives:**

There are two types of adjectives in Japanese who behave somewhat differently. Both types of adjectives have both attributive uses (preceding the noun they modify) and predicative uses (succeeding the nouns they modify). They can be predicative with or without copula (Harada, 1966). The first type is commonly called *proper adjectives* or just *adjectives*. In text books and other learning tools they are also known as *i-adjectives*, simply because they all end on the syllable -i. *i*-adjectives have various conjugational endings showing, among other things, tense and polarity (Tsujimura, 1996). Examples (1) a.-c. show the use of the i-adjective *aka-i* “red”, in plain form (1) a., in attributive use (1) b., and predicative form (1) c.

(1) a. *aka-i* b. *aka-i hon* c. *hon ga aka-i*

red-NPST red-NPST book book NOM red-NPST

“ […] is/are red” “(a) red book(s)” “(The) book(s) is/are red.”
Example (2) shows the same adjective in the same uses but in negative.

(2) a. aka-ku-na-i
    red-ADV-NEG-NPST
    “[...] is/are not red”
    (lit.) “A not-red book”

    b. aka-ku-na-i hon
       red-ADV-NEG-NPST book
       “(The) book(s) is/are not red.”

    c. hon ga aka-ku-na-i
       book NOM red-ADV-NEG-NPST
       “(The) book(s) is/are not pretty.”

The other type of adjective is commonly called nominal adjectives. They are also called na-adjectives or adjectival nouns because of the copular na which appears between the adjective and the noun it precedes, and their similarity to nouns. Examples (3) a.-c. show the use of the na-adjective kirei “pretty”.

(3) a. kirei (da)
    pretty (COP.NPST)
    “[...] is/are pretty”
    “(a) pretty book(s)”

    b. kirei na hon
       pretty COP book
       “(The) book(s) is/are pretty.”

    c. hon ga kirei (da)
       book NOM pretty (COP.NPST)
       “(The) book(s) is/are not pretty.”

na-adjectives are negated by negating the accompanying copula (Harada, 1966). For that reason one cannot say that adjectival nouns inflect themselves; it is on the accompanying copula that inflection occurs.

(4) a. kirei zya na-i
    pretty COP.TOP NEG-NPST
    “[...] is/are not pretty.”
    (lit.) “A not-pretty book.”

    b. kirei zya na-i hon
       pretty COP.TOP NEG-NPST book
       “(The) book(s) is/are not pretty.”

    c. hon ga kirei zya na-i
       book NOM pretty COP.TOP NEG-NPST
       “(The) book(s) is/are not pretty.”

5.2.2. Japanese verbs

Japanese verbs are assigned to five groups and verb conjugation shows a wide range of patterns depending on grouping (Shirane, 2005, p.401):

1. kami-itidan verbs
2. simo-itidan verbs
3. godan (yodan) verbs
4. kahen verbs
5. sahen verbs

kami-itidan and simo-itidan verbs are sometimes referred to as i-dan and e-dan verbs respectively (Fujio Düiring, 1998, p.47). These names come from the vowel that precedes the final tense particle -ru in the plain form; -e- for e-dan verbs, and -i- for i-dan verbs. Conjugation of these two groups is done by adding suffixes directly to the verb root (Martin, 1975).

godan verbs show a more irregular conjugation pattern in that the final vowel (inflectional ending) undergoes what Tsujimura (1996, p.40) calls a “morphophonological change” depending on what type of ending that will be added.
The *kahen* and *sahen* categories contain only a single verb each. These verbs are irregular and root changes and other morphophonological changes appear (Fujio Düring, 1998).

*kami-itidan* and *simo-itidan* verbs are sometimes regarded as one category, often called *ru-verbs* or vowel-verbs. *godan* verbs are called *u-verbs* or consonant-verbs. However, these alternative labels are somewhat misleading. It is true that *kami-itidan* and *simo-itidan* verbs in the plain form always end on the syllable -ru, which always succeeds a vowel, but there are also *godan* verbs that show exactly the same pattern. This is a lexically governed pattern that has to be learned together when learning the verb. Despite the slightly misleading labels, the terms *ru-verbs* and *u-verbs* will be adopted here for simplicity. For the *kahen* and *sahen* verbs, the term irregular verbs will be used.

All Japanese verbs in the plain form end on a syllable including the vowel -u. For *ru-verbs*, -ru is a fixed unit which is attached to the verb root, and cannot be split up as r-u. With the *u-verbs*, on the other hand, the final syllable is not one unit. In conjugating, the syllable has to be split up so that the consonant preceding the -u is part of the stem, to which that final -u is then affixed. These phenomena with *ru-verbs* realized as root-ru and *u-verbs* as ROOT-(C)-u are of great significance in the conjugation of verbs, as will be seen below.

Japanese is an agglutinating language and the verb stem plays a crucial part in the rich amount of conjugation patterns found in the language. Several different morphemes can be affixed to show, tense, polarity, politeness-level, gerund, volition, desiderative, et cetera. Regardless of type and amount of morphemes added, the verb root of the *ru-verb* keeps its initial form. Thus, conjugation of *ru-verbs* is fairly regular. However, as we shall see in the succeeding sections, the matter is not as straightforward with the *u-verbs*.

Example (5) shows the Japanese *ru-verb* *tabe-ru* “(to eat)” inflected with four conjugational endings: causative, passive, negative, past (example from the *Kotonoha* corpus):

(5) …*tabe-sase-rare-na-katta*…
  eat-CAUS-PASS-NEG-PST
  “…I/you/[…] was/were not forced to eat…”

Verbs are clause-final elements. As a sub-category, some verbs appear as auxiliary verbs. The copula is also assigned to the verb category (Tsujimura, 1996; Harada, 1966).

Segmentation of Japanese verbs is a somewhat unclear subject. There is no consensus in the literature on how to do the segmentation. Basically, different scholars use different ways. One can say that there is a slight degree of opportunism involved; the morphemes are being separated in a way that suits the grammatical phenomena being explained.

Even though segmenting is a bit unclear, a good description is given by Shibatani (1990b, p.224). Shibatani states that Japanese verb morphology traditionally is composed of the following elements:

\[
\text{Root} + \text{Inflectional ending} + \text{Auxiliary} + \text{Particle} \\
\text{Stem}
\]

*Figure 1. Shibatani’s elements of Japanese verb morphology.*

The root is what Tsujimura (1996) refers to as “a meaningful unit which cannot be given further morphological analysis” (p.128), while the inflectional ending is a unit that has gone through a “morphophonological change”, “triggered by the addition of particular endings” (p. 40). Together they
compose the stem (however, some verbs, i.e. ru-verbs, have no inflectional endings). The optional auxiliary reflects the rich variation of inflectional endings that can be added to the verb stem. The optional particle(s) are sentence-final particles indicating for example interrogative or the speaker’s attitude to the contents of the sentence (Kuno, 1973).

Figure 2 shows the simple Japanese interrogative clause, *ikanaika?* “Is/Are (you/[…] not going?)”, put into Shibatani’s *elements of verb morphology* from figure 1, showing all the elements of it:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ik-} \quad a- \quad na-i \quad ka \\
\text{root} \quad \text{inflectional ending} \quad \text{auxiliary particle}
\end{array}
\]

Stem

“Is/Are you/[…] not going?”

*Figure 2. The Japanese interrogative clause, *ikanaika?* “Is/Are (you/[…] not going?)”, put into Shibatani’s elements of verb morphology from figure 1.*

Shibatani (1990b, pp.221-235) assigns the negative marker *-na* to auxiliary verbs, attached to the irrealis root plus inflectional ending. He suggests various ways of analyzing the inflectional categories and their endings, and subcategorizations of auxiliaries and conjunctive particles in those inflectional categories. Yatabe (1996) and Sells (1995, cited in Yatabe 1996) analyze the stem (Shibatani’s root) plus inflectional suffixes (endings) as one morphosyntactic constituent (term from Yatabe, 1996, p.5). Martin (1975) on the other hand analyzes, for example, negation as an addition of one unit consisting both Shibatani’s inflectional ending and the negator *-na* (Shibatani’s auxiliary). Despite these differences in analysis, there is a consensus about the existence of something like a stem to which affixes attaches, but it sometimes labeled stem and sometimes root. Henceforth, the terms *root, stem, inflection(al) (ending) and particle* from figure 1 will be adopted, but the term *auxiliary* will not be used as a morphological unit.

Japanese auxiliary verbs form a group of verbs with a somewhat unclear definition. There are cases of verbs clearly getting an auxiliary function, but Shibatani (1990b) also makes use of the term auxiliary verb in a somewhat broader sense, and recognizes some suffixes, such as passive -(r)a-re, as auxiliaries. The most common form is verbal gerund plus auxiliary describing such as progressive and to try something:

(6) a. *tabe-te ir-u*  
    *eat-GER AUX-NPST*  
    “I/you/[…] am/is/are eating”  

b. *kai-te mi-ru*  
    *write-GER AUX-NPST*  
    “I/you/[…] try/tries to write”

The copula takes different shapes depending on politeness-level: *da* (plain), *de aru* (plain/written language), *desu* (polite), *de arimasu* (very polite), *de gozaimasu* (super polite) (Fujio Düring, 1998, p.74). The copula is used to form predicates with a noun or an adjective as predicatives, often with the basic meaning “(to be)”. It is also used as a conjunction in the gerund form *de* (Martin, 1975). The copula can be inflected for, for example, tense, and mood. It can also be negated.
6. Clausal negation

6.1. Standard negation, introduction

Negation is considered a language universal, i.e. every language has some way of negating a proposition (Payne, 1985; Dahl, 1979). Standard negation (henceforth SN) is well covered in the literature. It has been described somewhat differently in the literature, although the basic meaning is the same. Dahl’s (1979) work focuses on negation “in simple indicative sentences with a verbal predicate” (p.79). Payne (1985) recognizes SN as the “type of negation that can apply to the most minimal and basic sentences” (p.198), while Miestamo (2005) describes it as “the basic way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses” (p.1).

Negation is a functional domain which, especially in the recent years, has been given a lot of attention within language typology.

Some 15 years after Klima’s work, in 1979, Dahl’s paper Typology of sentence negation appeared. This work is the first general typological survey of negation, and is based on a 240-language sample showing how sentence negation is realized in various languages. Dahl assigns negative constructions into two groups: morphological and syntactic negation. He shows that syntactic negation is expressed with simple and double particles, negative auxiliaries and particle plus dummy auxiliaries, while morphological negation mainly makes use of affixation, and more uncommonly, reduplication and prosodic modification. Moreover, Dahl also recognizes that some languages show a change in word order in negation.

Another important typological work on negation is Payne’s Negation that appeared in 1985. This work covers a wide range of aspects such as four types of (syntactic) negatives: negative verbs, negative particles, morphological negatives and negative nouns. Payne’s and Dahl’s works have a somewhat different focus and they choose to treat subjects with a different degree of detail. One can say that the two works complement each other.

A more recent study on negation is Miestamo’s book Standard Negation: The Negation of Declarative Verbal Main Clauses in a Typological Perspective, from 2005. Miestamo proposes from a 297-language sample a division of the encoding structures of negation into two categories: symmetric or asymmetric. This classification is based upon whether the negative structure differs from the corresponding affirmative in other aspects than the addition of negative marker(s). Asymmetry can be either constructional or paradigmatic and is further divided into subtypes A/Fin (where the finiteness of the lexical verb is affected), A/NonReal (negative marked for non-realized categories), A/Emph (negative marked for more emphasized categories) and A/Cat (marking of grammatical categories such as tense-aspect-mood (TAM) and person-number-gender (PNG) differ from the affirmative). The category A/Fin can be further divided into subcategories containing A/Fin/Neg-LV (negative marking on lexical verb), A/Fin/Neg-FE (negative marking on the finite element, term from Dahl, [1979]) and A/Fin/NegVerb (negative marker itself being the finite element). In the A/Cat category we find A/Cat/TAM and A/Cat/PNG.

6.1.1. Standard negation, Japanese, introduction

Martin (1975, p.366) opens his chapter on negation by stating that "Virtually any Japanese predicate can be made negative to deny the assertion made in a statement.” When describing standard negation
in Japanese, a choice has to be made which parts of speech to include. Verbs and i-adjectives inflect and both show SN patterns. na-adjectives, on the other hand, do not inflect and show a special non-standard negation construction. Negation of nouns shows SN patterns only in specific cases. Here, politeness-level and animacy plays a crucial part.

Basically, it is only verbs and i-adjectives that can be treated as SN. At the same time, the i-adjectives are property predicates that appear in non-verbal clauses. The same holds true for na-adjectives and nouns. Since this text has a functional approach, I find it justified to move the i-adjectives from the SN section and describe their function rather than their form. Thus, they will be described together with nouns and na-adjectives as negatives in non-verbal clauses, in section 6.3. Thus, only verbs will be treated in the next section.

6.1.2. Verb morphology

6.1.2.1. Plain form, non-past tense, ru-verbs

The standard negation of ru-verbs in plain form, non-past tense is realized by affixing the negative suffix -na- to a verb stem. The ending can be further morphologically broken down into na-i, where the -na- is the negator and the following morpheme carries tense.

Example (7) shows the verb tabe-ru, “(to) eat”, whereas tabe- is the root and the suffix -ru signals affirmative non-past tense. As mentioned above, to change an affirmative plain form, non-past ru-verb, (7) a., into negative, the suffixes -na-i is added to the root, as in (7) b. The morpheme -i is the indicator of non-past tense, while na- is a set negative unit that keeps its form regardless of tense.

(7) a. tabe-ru
   eat-NPST
   “I/you[…] eat(s).”

   b. tabe-na-i
   eat-NEG-NPST
   “I/you[…] do(es) not eat.”

6.1.2.2. Plain form, past tense, ru-verbs

When putting a negative, plain form ru-verb in the past tense, the first step is adding the negative morpheme -na- to the root, and then the adjectival past tense marker -katta is inflected. The root stays intact and is identical to that of non-past tense, (see example (7) b.). The difference lies in the ending of negator -na-. Once again, -i signals non-past, and in order to get past tense, the -i is substituted for the past tense suffix -katta added to -na-, as shown in (8) b.

(8) a. tabe-ta
   eat-PST
   “I/you[…] ate.”

   b. tabe-na-katta
   eat-NEG-PST
   “I/you[…] did not eat.”

6.1.2.3. Plain form, non-past tense, u-verbs

The conjugation of ru-verbs is, as shown above quite regular. With u-verbs, however, the situation is somewhat different. The conjugation triggers a morphophonological change due to the addition of various endings, and there are also verbs that show odd conjugation patterns.

First, let’s take a look at an example of the contrast between a u-verb in non-past tense, plain form in both affirmative, (9) a., and negative, (9) b. Notice that the root stays intact. It is the stem that becomes different due to the morphophonological change.
In example (9) b., the ending of the verb kak-u “(to) write”, is changed from -u to -a before the negator is inflected. However, the morpheme -a is not a (non-past) tense marker; it does not de facto replace -u, it is an inflectional morpheme triggered by the negation suffix -na. Important to point out is that the gloss infl, “inflectional morpheme” might be somewhat misleading. There are other inflectional morphemes than -a, and these inflectional morphemes are not epenthetic; they all have different functions. In examples (10) b.-d., three different inflectional endings, representing three different verb forms can be seen:

Some u-verbs show a slightly different pattern compared to kak-u in example (9). The verbs omo-u “(to) think”, and i-u “(to) say”, are two examples from this category. The morphophonological alternation -u to -a is still present before the negative morpheme -na. It is the stem that is slightly different. There is an additional /w/ appearing, omo-u → omow-a-na-i. This is with all probability due to historical sound changes where sounds like /wu/ have been abandoned.

The verb aru “(to) be/exist/have” is considered a u-verb, but shows an irregular paradigm in the plain form negative, which is na-i. Higher politeness inflects like a u-verb: ar-i-mas-en.

6.1.2.4. Plain form, past tense, u-verbs

The negative plain form, past tense of u-verbs has the same construction as the ru-verbs. That is, add the negation morpheme -na- to the verb root and then further add the past ending -katta, as shown in (11).

The negative plain form, past tense for aru is na-katta.

6.1.2.5. Irregular verbs

Apart from these conjugation rules for verbs, there are a few exceptions: the irregular verbs suru “(to) do”, and kuru “(to) go”.

suru is negated with a root change resulting in si- and the gets the negative morpheme -na- resulting in si-na-. For higher politeness, the same root is used and the polite morpheme and negator inflect regularly: si-mas-en

kuru gets a phonological change of root to ko-, resulting in the negative ko-na-. In polite form, there is another sound change: the root changes to ki-, on which the polite ending and negation is inflected: ki-mas-en.
6.1.2.6. *The polite forms*

The polite forms in Japanese are so frequent that they are relevant when examining SN.

The polite form, present tense ru-verbs, affirmative is expressed by affixing the polite marker -mas-, followed by the non-past suffix -u. Negation is done by replacing -u with the negative suffix -en.

(12) a. \( \text{tabe-mas-u} \)  

\( \text{eat-POL-NPST} \)  

“I/you[…] eat(s).”

b. \( \text{tabe-mas-en} \)  

\( \text{eat-POL-NEG} \)  

“I/you[…] do(es) not eat.”

For u-verbs, the inflectional morpheme -i appears before the polite morpheme -mas-. Negative is done the same way as for ru-verbs (the inflectional morpheme remains):

(13) a. \( \text{kak-i-mas-u} \)  

\( \text{write-INFL-POL-NPST} \)  

“I/you[…] write(s).”

b. \( \text{kak-i-mas-en} \)  

\( \text{write-INFL-POL-NEG} \)  

“I/you[…] do(es) not write.”

Important to point out is that -en is not a tense marker. Even though it replaces the tense marker of the affirmative form (-u), the verb can still be understood as being in non-past tense, and therefore it can be said that the negative suffix -en expresses an unmarked non-past construction. Because of the lack of a distinct tense marker, the verb has lost some of its finiteness.

For past tense, the past tense copula desi-ta is added to the non-past negative (Hinds, 1986) (constructed examples):

(14) a. \( \text{tabe-masi-ta} \)  

\( \text{eat-POL-PST} \)  

“I/you[…] ate.”

b. \( \text{tabe-mas-en desi-ta} \)  

\( \text{eat-POL-NEG COP-PST} \)  

“I/you[…] did not eat.”

(15) a. \( \text{kak-i-masi-ta} \)  

\( \text{write-INFL-POL-PST} \)  

“I/you[…] wrote.”

b. \( \text{kak-i-mas-en desi-ta} \)  

\( \text{write-INFL-POL-NEG COP-PST} \)  

“I/you[…] did not write.”

The conjugation patterns described above are summarized in table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Plain form NPST</th>
<th>Plain form PST</th>
<th>Polite form NPST</th>
<th>Polite form PST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ru-verb taberu</td>
<td>“eat”</td>
<td>Affirmative:</td>
<td>tabe-ru</td>
<td>tabe-ta</td>
<td>tabe-mas-u</td>
<td>tabe-masi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative:</td>
<td>tabe-na-i</td>
<td>tabe-na-katta</td>
<td>tabe-mas-en</td>
<td>tabe-mas-en desi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-verb kaku</td>
<td>“write”</td>
<td>Affirmative:</td>
<td>kaku</td>
<td>kai-ta</td>
<td>kaka-mas-u</td>
<td>kaka-masi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular u-verb aru</td>
<td>“be”</td>
<td>Affirmative:</td>
<td>ar-u</td>
<td>at-ta</td>
<td>ar-i-mas-u</td>
<td>ar-i-masi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“exist”</td>
<td>Negative:</td>
<td>na-i</td>
<td>na-katta</td>
<td>ar-i-mas-en</td>
<td>ar-i-mas-en desi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular verb kuru</td>
<td>“come”</td>
<td>Affirmative:</td>
<td>kuru</td>
<td>ki-ta</td>
<td>ki-mas-u</td>
<td>ki-masi-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative:</td>
<td>ko-na-i</td>
<td>ko-na-katta</td>
<td>ki-mas-en</td>
<td>ki-mas-en desi-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The verb conjugation in affirmative and negative.
6.1.2.7. The super-polite forms

Japanese has, as mentioned above, different politeness levels and verbs inflect differently depending on the level of politeness. In the previous, as well as upcoming sections, the plain and polite forms are treated. However, the super-polite forms show some interesting phenomena and thus deserve a brief description. Due to the complexity and lack of space, the description will be kept relatively brief.

There are two distinct ways to express super-polite forms in Japanese: either lexically; the verb gets a completely different form, or morphologically; the verb gets special inflection (plus other markers).

Tsujimura (1996, pp.362-364) suggests that there are three types of super-polite speech with three different uses. These three types are: honorific, humble and polite. The honorific form is used to honor a person and that person’s actions. There are four ways to express this form, and each form will be described briefly and then it will be shown how negation interacts with the form. Note that the points in the list are not described in order of frequency.

- The first construction makes use of a completely different verb form. These verbs, like the one in (16), conjugate like u-verbs (cf. (9), (11), (13), (15) above). However, some have a different conjugation pattern; a loss of the /i/ (Banno et al. 1999b, p.138). The examples are from the Kotonoha corpus. The word graciously is from Banno et al. (1998b, pp.138-140) and is used to express the honorific.

(16) sensei, wain o miesiagar-i-mas-u?
professor wine ACC drink.HON-INFL-POL-NPST
“Professor, do you (graciously) drink wine?”

cf. sensei, wain o nom-i-mas-u?
professor wine ACC drink-INFL-POL-NPST
“Professor, do you drink wine?”

(17) syayoo-san wa irassya-i-mas-u ka?
company.president-POL TOP come.HON-INFL-POL-NPST Q
“Is the (honored) company manager (gracefully) coming?”

cf. syayoo-san wa ki-mas-u ka?
company.president-POL TOP come-POL-NPST Q
“Is the company manager coming?”

To negate the verbs in (16) and (17), the standard u-verb conjugation pattern is followed; inflectional morpheme -i- followed by polite -mas- and negative -en:

(18) hitotu miesiagar-i-mas-en?
one eat.HON-INFL-POL-NEG
“Will you (gracefully) not eat one?”

(19) o-isya-sama wa irassya-i-mas-en ka?
HON-doctor-HON TOP come.HON-INFL-POL-NEG Q
“Is the (highly honored) doctor (gracefully) not coming?”

- The second construction makes use of a pattern o-V ni naru, with o- being an honorific prefix and the verb naru means “(to) become”. This form is used for verbs lacking a special lexical honorific form (Banno et al. 1998b, p.138). The main verb is a nominalized adverbial form (Shibatani, 1990b). To negate this construction, the verb nar-u is negated with the u-verb SN construction (from the Kotonoha corpus):
(20) sensei wa yuuji tikaku ni o-kaeri ni professor TOP ten.o’clock close.to TEMP HON-return.ADV.HON PART 
  nar-i-masi-ta become-INFL-POL-PST
  “The professor (gracefully) returned at close to ten o’clock.”

(21) kootei wa o-okori ni nar-i-mas-en emperor TOP HON-be.angry.ADV.HON PART become-INFL-POL-NEG
  “The emperor (gracefully) does not become angry.”

- Shibatani (1990b, p.375) and Kuno (1986, p.20) present the construction of V-(r)are-ru. This form is conjugated as a ru-verb and negating it follows SN patterns. Example (22) is from Kuno (1986, p.20, with modified politeness-level), and example (23) is a constructed negation of Kuno’s sentence. Glosses and translations by me.

(22) sensei ga Mary o mat-are-mas-u 
  teacher NOM Mary ACC wait-HON-POL-NPST
  “The teacher (gracefully) waits for Mary”

(23) sensei ga Mary o mat-are-mas-en 
  teacher NOM Mary ACC wait-HON-POL-NEG
  “The teacher (gracefully) does not wait for Mary.”

- AOTS (eds., 2002, p.53) presents the construction of o-V COP. In this construction, negation comes on the copula (example (24) is from the Kotonoha corpus, example (25) is constructed):

(24) senmu ga o-mati des-u 
  managing.director NOM HON-wait.ADV.HON COP-NPST
  “The managing director is (gracefully) waiting.”

(25) o-kyaku-sama, terebi o o-sagasi de-wa ar-i-mas-en ka 
  HON-customer-HON TV ACC HON-search.ADV.HON COP-TOP be-INFL-POL-NEG Q
  “(Highly honored) customer, you don’t happen to (gracefully) look for a TV?”

The humble form is used by the speaker to make his/her own activities humble and thus paying respect to the listener, addressee or the one whom it is spoken about. This form can be expressed in two ways (Banno et al. 1999b, pp.159-160):

- The first way is to use a different verb form (example from the Kotonoha corpus, the word humbly is used to express the humility).

(26) asita no asa, syusyookantei ni 
  tomorrow GEN morning prime.minister’s.official.residence to mair-i-mas-u 
  go.HUM-INFL-POL-NPST
  “Tomorrow morning, I will (humbly) go to the prime minister’s official residence.”

  cf. asita no asa, syusyookantei ni ik-i-mas-u 
  tomorrow GEN morning prime.minister’s.official.residence to go-INFL-POL-NPST
  “Tomorrow morning, I will go to the prime minister’s official residence.”

Negating this form is done in same manner as the above honorific special verbs. Some have a special conjugation pattern (27), while some conjugate like u-verbs (28) (from the Kotonoha corpus):

(27) ...kyoo wa zikan ga goza-i-mas-en... 
  today TOP time NOM exist.HUM-INFL-POL-NEG
  “…today, I (humbly) have no time...”
(28) go-aisatu ni wa mair-i-mas-en
HON-salutation to TOP go.HUM-INFL-POL-NEG
“I will (humbly) not go to the salutation.”

- The other way is to use the construction o-V suru, with -o once again being an honorific suffix and the verb suru means “(to) do”. In the o-V ni suru construction, the verb suru is negated (30), as described in section 6.1.2.5. above (from the Kotonoha corpus):

(29) dansei ni o-kiki si-mas-u
men PART HON-ask.HUM do-POL-NPST
“I will (humbly) ask the men.”

(30) o-tosi wa o-kiki si-mas-en
HON-age TOP HON-ask.HUM do-POL-NEG
“I will (humbly) not ask about age.”

After examining the super-polite forms, it can be seen that they do not show any special negative forms, they follow the patterns of SN.

The polite forms were described in section 6.1.2.6. and will also appear in section 6.1.3. where examples can be seen. This form is used when the situation does not call for honorifics or humble expressions. However, the overall level is polite.

This section has only introduced a small selection of verbs and there are more functions and uses, but further investigation is beyond the scope of this thesis.

6.1.3. Negative verb forms in clauses

To negate a declarative verbal main clause, plain form, such as (31) a. and (32) a., the negative suffix -na- inflects on the verb root. The -i and -katta that succeed the negator, assign tense; non-past and past respectively. The subject calls for nominative (or topic) marker and the direct object for accusative case:

(31) a. kodomo ga ringo o tabe-ru
child NOM apple ACC eat-NPST
“The child eats an apple.”

b. kodomo ga ringo o tabe-na-i
child NOM apple ACC eat-NEG-NPST
“The child does not eat an apple.”

(32) a. kodomo ga ringo o tabe-ta
child NOM apple ACC eat-PST
“The child ate an apple.”

b. kodomo ga ringo o tabe-na-katta
child NOM apple ACC eat-NEG-PST
“The child did not eat an apple.”

In the progressive aspect, the auxiliary verb iru is added after the main verb, which gets the gerund form, and the negation comes on the auxiliary:

(33) kodomo ga ringo o tabe-te i-ru
child NOM apple ACC eat-GER AUX-NPST
“The child is eating an apple.”

(34) kodomo ga ringo o tabe-te i-na-i
child NOM apple ACC eat-GER AUX-NEG-NPST
“The child is not eating an apple.”

(35) kodomo ga ringo o tabe-te i-ta
child NOM apple ACC eat-GER AUX-PST
“The child was eating an apple.”
6.1.4. Morphosyntactic status of the negative

When negated, the verbal, adjectival and nominal sentences become adjectival sentences, and further conjugations follow the pattern of adjective conjugation (Martin, 1975; Hinds, 1986). Martin (p.372) describes the following forms: infinitive, -(a)naku; gerund, -(a)nakute; provisional, -(a)nakereba; perfect, -(a)nakatta; conditional, -(a)nakkattara; representative, -(a)nakkattari. Since the negator -na- has adjectival status, the verb loses some of its finiteness. However, the discussion of the status of the verb and the adjectival status of the negator is a complex subject with a rich amount of literature on the matter. Here, I will briefly introduce some points on the matter.

There are two kinds of -na- in Japanese: the dependent -na- that inflects on verbs and adjectives, and the verbal -na- that has independent status (Ikeya & Kawamori, 1998). Only the dependent -na-
appears in SN constructions, as shown in (45)-(46), while the dependent -na- has a special function, as in (47) (see section 6.3. below), (ibid., p.69).

(45) watasi wa ringo o tabe-na-i
    I NOM apple ACC eat-NEG-NPST
    “I do not eat an apple.”

(46) kono hon wa omosiro-ku-na-i
    this book NOM interesting-ADV-NEG-NPST
    “This book is not interesting.”

(47) kokoni ringo wa na-i
    here apple NOM NEG-NPST
    “Here is no apple.”

Ikeya and Kawamori (1998) state that, traditionally, the independent -na- has been regarded an adjective, while the dependent -na- is regarded an auxiliary when inflected on a verb and an adjective when inflected on an adjective (ibid., p.69).

When recognizing the dependent na-i as an adjective, the question is whether it is inflectional or derivational.

Verbal negation is, once again, expressed by adding the morpheme to a verb root:

(48) tabe-na-i
    eat-NEG-NPST
    "I/you/[…] do(es) not eat"

The question is whether the morpheme -na- is derivational or inflectional. Arguments for derivational morpheme are to be found in a comparison between conjugations of adjectives and verbs. In marking tense, the conjugation between negated adjectives and verbs are identical (constructed examples following Han, Storoshenko & Sakurai [2004]):

(49) tabe-na-i
    eat-NEG-NPST
    "I/you/[…] do(es) not eat"

(50) ooki-ku-na-i
    big-ADV-NEG-NPST
    "[…] is/are not big"

(51) tabe-na-katta
    eat-NEG-PST
    "I/you/[…] did not eat"

(52) ooki-ku-na-katta
    big-ADV-NEG-PST
    "[…] was/were not big"

In affirmative, the tense marking differs:

(53) tabe-ru
    eat-NPST
    "I/you/[…] eat(s)"
As is shown in (49)-(52) above, the tense marking in negative is identical for verbs and i-adjectives, i.e. the addition of the elements -na-, -i (present) and -katta (past). In (53)-(56), on the other hand, the examples show that tense marking in affirmative differs. According to these examples, the ending -na- is adjectival and therefore a derivational morpheme which derives an adjective from the verb.

On the other hand, the negated verb still behaves like a verb in that transitive verbs assign their internal arguments in accusative case as shown in (57):

(57)  
\[
\text{ringo o } \text{tabe-na-i} \\
\text{apple ACC } \text{eat-NEG-NPST} \\
\text{“I/you/[…] do(es) not eat apples.”}
\]

Transitive adjectives never do so; they assign nominative case for their internal argument (constructed example following Han, Storoshenko & Sakurai [2004]):

(58)  
\[
\text{watasi wa ringo ga suki zya } \text{na-i} \\
\text{I TOP apple NOM fond.of COP.TOP NEG-NPST} \\
\text{“I do not like apples.”}
\]

Martin (1975, p.374) describes this by stating that the underlying negated sentence keeps its original adjuncts, with their markings.

It is generally rather unclear how to analyze the verb negator -na- in Japanese, and there is no consensus in the literature. Some scholars (for example Hinds, 1986) analyze it as an adjective, others (for example Shibatani, 1990b) as an auxiliary and others (for example Dahl, 1979) an inflectional suffix, while yet others see it as just an unanalyzed negative ending (for example Fujio Düring, 1998). This is an important discussion in that the adjectival status of the negative has consequences on grammar; some forms, such as hortative and imperatives, are not eligible with adjectives and thus not with negated verbs (see Martin, 1975; Kishimoto, 2008). In my opinion, the negator -na- is clearly an inflectional suffix (as opposed to an auxiliary verb), and the conjugation patterns clearly suggests that

---

6 As mentioned above, Shibatani (1990b) is treating several verb endings as auxiliaries. This is the case with the negator -na-. Most likely, Shibatani is using the term auxiliary in a wider sense than traditionally. It would be a great overgeneralization to assign all verb endings to auxiliary. For example; Steele (1978, cited in Kroeger [2005, p.251]) defines an auxiliary as an element which "is separated from the verb (i.e., it is a clitic or independent word, rather than an affix)". If this is true, assigning -na- to auxiliaries is not an accurate action. Obviously, in Japanese, the verb negator -na- is in fact affixed to the verb, and does not stand as an independent word. Furthermore, it is traditionally only particles that are regarded as possibly being clitics (see Vance, 1993, for a discussion on the matter), thus seemingly ruling out the possibility of assigning -na- to clitics. Furthermore, Hinds (1986, p.187) simply states that, in Japanese "Clitic particles do not exist."
it has adjectival status. The fact that some verb forms are not eligible with negative is not enough to discard the adjectival status from the negator.

6.1.5. Japanese negation in a typological perspective

In the typological literature mentioned in the introduction, standard negation in Japanese is analyzed only by Dahl (1979) and Miestamo (2005). Dryer (2011) also presents some typological information on Japanese. He states that negation is being expressed with negative affixes (Dryer, 2011b), namely suffixes (Dahl, 1979). Dryer (2011c; 2011d) furthermore shows that double negation construction do not occur, although special multiple negative constructions do (see Martin, 1975, and section 8.5.2. below).

As mentioned, Miestamo (2005) assigns the encoding structures of negation into two categories: symmetric or asymmetric. Out of these categories, Miestamo recognizes Japanese negation as asymmetric within the subtypes A/Fin/Neg/LV and A/Cat/TAM. In the A/Fin/Neg/LV, the finiteness of the verb is affected in the negative. This is shown in example (59) b. where the polite past negative is realized with the negated verb followed by a copula carrying tense. The lexical verb is thus less finite (examples from Hinds, 1988, pp.99-100, cited in Miestamo, 2005, p.249).

(59) a. *tabe-masi-ta*  
   eat-POL-PST  
   “I/you/[…] ate.”

b. *tabe-mas-en desita*  
   eat-POL-NEG AUX.POL.PST  
   “I/you/[…] did not eat.”

In type A/Cat/TAM, the tense is affected when the verb is negated. This is shown in example (60) b. where the non-past marker *-u* is replaced by the negative marker *-en*, and thus affecting tense (examples from Hinds, 1988, pp.99-100, cited in Miestamo, 2005, p.249).

(60) a. *tabe-mas-u*  
   eat-POL-NPST  
   “I/you/[…] eat(s).”

b. *tabe-mas-en*  
   eat-POL-NEG  
   “I/you/[…] do(es) not eat.”

Furthermore, Miestamo shows that the negated verbs in plain form are asymmetric in the category A/Fin. This is because of the adjectival status of the negator *-na* (see section 6.1.4. above). Miestamo (2005, p.294) suggests that adjectives are less finite than verbs and thus, the plain form negative falls in the category of A/Fin.

To summarize: the examples given in the above sections all show an agreement with the typological literature mentioned; the examples clearly show that the negative marker *-na* is a suffix, agreeing with Dryer (2011b) and Dahl (1979). In section 6.1.2.6., the finiteness of verbs in polite form is mentioned, and it agrees with Miestamo’s (2005) findings. The adjectival status of the plain form negative is discussed in section 6.1.4. and also agrees with Miestamo.

When it comes to word order typology, Dryer (2011e, f, g) presents some information on Japanese. Firstly, he shows that the basic word order in Japanese is SOV (Dryer, 2011e). Under negation, Dryer (2011f) shows that standard negation is expressed by a negative suffix on the verb, and that that suffix is post-verbal. Furthermore, it is shown (Dryer, 2011g) that Japanese is a language which codes negation solely through verb morphology, and not through negative words, and that it does not employ double negation (Dryer, 2011e, f). The information given by Dryer (2011e, f, g) agrees with the descriptions of Japanese given by me in the above sections.
6.2. Negation in non-declaratives

6.2.1. Negative imperatives

6.2.1.1. Introduction

Negative imperative is a type of clausal negation that often differs from standard negation (Miestamo, 2005, p.217; 2007, p.553).

Xrakovskij (ed., 2001) classifies negative imperative constructions based on person and number paradigms as an addition to verbal constructions. Xrakovskij presents five categories:

1. “Languages with person and number paradigms in the imperative only”
2. “Languages with person and number paradigms both in the imperative and other moods”
3. “Languages with imperative paradigms which include the verb forms of other moods as well”
4. “Languages with imperative paradigms which include verb forms comprising auxiliary verbs”
5. “Languages without imperative paradigms”

Xrakovskij assigns Japanese to class 1, together with Nivkh, Klamath and Mongolian.

In their 495-language sample, van der Auwera and Lejeune (2011), classifies languages after examining the structural difference between the negative imperative (prohibitive) and both the corresponding affirmative imperative, and the negative indicative. After examining how, if all, the prohibitive differs from the other categories, four classes are presented:

1. “The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives”
2. “The prohibitive uses the verbal construction of the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives”
3. “The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives”
4. “The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy not found in (indicative) declaratives”

van der Auwera and Lejeune assign Japanese to type 2, which is the most common imperative construction in their sample (followed by type 4, type 1, and the least common type 3.) However, this is something that I wish to present some critique to in the following section.

6.2.1.2. Japanese imperatives

In his analysis of Japanese imperatives, Alpatov (2001) distinguishes two forms: synthetic imperative forms and analytic imperative forms. Synthetic forms are realized with suffixes while analytic forms are expressed with auxiliaries and converbs. Alpatov also states that Japanese verbs have no markers for person and number, with the one exception of the imperative where there are 1st-person singular/plural forms and a specialized prohibitive 2nd-person form. Alpatov (2001, p.106) list different imperative verb forms in Japanese: “…imperative proper and prohibitive…” and “…permission/non-permission” verb forms.

The second person affirmative imperative in Japanese is expressed by ROOT-ro (61) a., or ROOT-yo (61) b., for ru-verbs. u-verbs gets the form ROOT-e (61) c., or a special form for some irregular verbs (61) d. (Alpatov, 2001, p.107) (a. and c. are constructed, b. is from Alpatov (2001, p.108), and d. is from the Kotonoha corpus).
(61)  a.  *yame-ro!*
    stop-IMP2
    “Stop it!”

   b.  *bankoku no roodoosya, danketu se-yo!*
    all.countries GEN proletarian unite do-IMP2
    “Proletarians of all countries, unite!”

     c.  *hasir-e!*
    run-IMP2
    “Run!”

      d.  *kusuri o nom-i-nasai!*
    medicine ACC drink-INFL-IMP2
    “Take your medicine!”

The standard negator in Japanese indicative is ROOT-na-*(tense)* and ROOT-a-na-*(tense)* for ru-verbs and u-verbs respectively. The negative imperative takes the form of ROOT-na for and ROOT-u-na for ru-verbs and u-verbs respectively (modified from Alpatov, 2001). The negative prohibitive suffix -na is the same as for negative indicative, but there is no tense inflected.

(62)  a.  *tabe-na-i*
    eat-NEG-NPST
    “I/you […] do(es) not eat.”

      b.  *tabe-na!*
    eat-IMP2.NEG
    “Don’t eat!”

(63)  a.  *kak-a-na-i*
    write-INFL-NEG-NPST
    “I/you […] do(es) not write.”

      b.  *kak-u-na!*
    write-NPST-IMP2.NEG
    “Don’t write!”

Simply put, the particle -na, is added to a verb in plain form, non-past tense, as shown in (62) b. and (63) b.

Example (64) shows another example of 2nd-person prohibitive (example from Alpatov, 2001, p.118). Glosses slightly modified.

(64)  *Nom-u nara noru-na. Nor-u nara nomu-na.*
    drink-NPST if steer-IMP2.NEG steer-NPST if drink-IMP2.NEG
    (a road poster) “Having had a drink, don’t get behind the steering wheel. Having got behind the steering wheel, don’t drink!”

With the prohibitive suffix, the politeness level is minimal, and their use is restricted to rude speech, commands and slogans (ibid., p.118). To reinforce the imperative, the sentence-final particle yo can be added for further emphasis (Martin, 1975). Martin (1975, p.966) states that one cannot create imperatives from negatives since they are adjectival. Instead, the imperfect form of the verb is assigned a negative imperative particle. This is also pointed out by Kishimoto (2008, p.412) by showing that negative imperative forms are available only for verbal predicates; adjectives cannot be turned into negative imperatives. In saying that negatives cannot be turned into imperatives, what is meant is that the prohibitive suffixes cannot appear on an already negated verb. That would yield ungrammatical sentences such as *tabe-na-i-ro! or *tabe-na-ro!*. The prohibitive suffix come on a non-negated verb root; *tabe-na!*

Another prohibitive construction is the combination of the conditional converb in -tewa/-dewa and the negative auxiliaries ikenai and naranai (Alpatov, 2001, p.118). Example (65) shows an example of this construction (modified example from ibid., p.118):
(65) amari kibisiku tsume-towa ike-na-i!
too severely blaim-CONV AUX:PERM-NEG-NPST
“One ought not to blame [me] too seriously!”

These prohibitives express non-permission and can attain a higher level of politeness by replacing the negative plain form ending -na-i with the polite negative -mas-en.

Other ways of expressing prohibitives is to use a negative verbal gerund, -nai-de, and optionally the auxiliary kureru or the honorific verb kudasaru, as in example (66) a. from Fujio Düring (1998, p.71) (with (66) b. in affirmative by me), or kuretamae, as in example (67) from Alpatov, (2001, p.119):

(66) a. mado o ake-na-i-de kudasai!
   window ACC open-NEG-INFL-GER AUX:IMP2
   “Please, do not open the window!”

   b. mado o ake-te kudasai!
   window ACC open-GER AUX:IMP2
   “Please, open the window!”

(67) waruku omow-a-nai-de kuretamae!
   badly think-INFL-NEG-GER IMP2
   “Don’t think [anything] bad!”

These imperatives are used as a polite way of requesting a favor, and there are several politeness-levels.

1st-person negative imperatives are expressed by combining a negated verb with the nominalizer koto, which results in an infinitive form (Fujio Düring, 1998) and then adding the hortative form of a verb, as in (68). Modified example from Martin, (1975, p.611) (with (68) b. in affirmative by me). Glosses and translation by me.

(68) a. yoba-na-i koto ni si-yoo!
   call-NEG-NPST INF PART do-HORT
   “Let’s not call!”

   b. yob-u koto ni si-yoo!
   call-NPST INF PART do-HORT
   “Let’s call!”

6.2.1.3. A critique

On the basis of the analysis of the prohibitive forms in Japanese, I would like to present my critique to van der Auwera and Lejeune’s (2011) analysis. According to the authors, Japanese is in the class of languages that use the same verbal construction for prohibitives as for the corresponding affirmative, but uses a negative strategy not found in indicative. However, I would like to say it is the opposite:

- The 2nd person prohibitive form and affirmative imperative are not the same: the affirmative imperative makes use of the suffixes, -ro, -yo, -e and a special verb form (85). The prohibitive makes use of the suffix -na, cf. (86) a., (87) a. If we were to follow van der Auwera and Lejeune’s analysis, the prohibitive form would be the ungrammatical *yame-ro-na.

- The negative strategy for 2nd person prohibitives is same as for indicative: -na is the negator for both, cf. (62) and (63). In the other imperative constructions, the auxiliaries, such as kudasai (66), look same in both affirmative and negative imperative. However, the standard -na- is still the negator.
The points made above show that van der Auwera and Lejeune’s analysis is incorrect. Japanese should be assigned to class 3: “The prohibitive uses a verbal construction other than the second singular imperative and a sentential negative strategy found in (indicative) declaratives”.

**6.3. Negation of non-verbal predicates**

**6.3.1. Introduction**

Negation in non-verbal clauses often shows different patterns relative to those of basic clauses containing a verbal predicate (see for example Veselinova, under revision; Eriksen, 2011).

Non-verbal predicates are, as the name suggests, predicates that are not verbs. This means that elements from other parts of speech take on the predicate role. It can be an adjectival, nominal, or locative predicate (Dryer, 2007). Dryer shows that it is very common to use copular constructions to accompany the non-verbal predicate. In many languages these predicates are used to express such as identity, properties, possession, location, et cetera (Veselinova, under revision).

Existential clauses are other types of clauses often containing non-verbal predicates. Often the full existential verbs are used but the function gets closer to that of a copula (Dryer, 2007), or an auxiliary (Eriksen, 2011).

In Japanese, some nouns and all the adjectives are non-verbal predicates, and thus fall outside of SN. i-adjectives show SN conjugation patterns, but are property predicates appearing in non-verbal clauses. To unify the functions of i-adjectives, na-adjectives, and nouns in clauses, they will all be treated here.

**6.3.2. i-adjectives**

**6.3.2.1. Morphology**

In non-past tense, plain form, the adverbial morpheme -ku- is inflected on the root, resulting in an infinite form. Then follows the negator -na-, and the non-past morpheme -i:

(69)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ao-i} \\
\text{blue-Npst}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ao-ku-na-i} \\
\text{blue-ADV-NEG-Npst}
\end{array}
\]

“[...] is/are blue”

“[...] is/are not blue”

For higher politeness, the polite form of na-i, ar-i-mas-en is added, alternatively -na-i plus copula:

(70)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ao-i} \\
\text{blue-Npst}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{des-u} \\
\text{COP-Npst}
\end{array}
\]

“[...] is/are blue”

(71)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ao-ku} \\
\text{blue-ADV}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ar-i-mas-en} \\
\text{be-INF-POL-NEG}
\end{array}
\]

“[...] is/are not blue”

(72)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ao-ku-na-i} \\
\text{blue-ADV-NEG-Npst}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{l}
\text{des-u} \\
\text{COP-Npst}
\end{array}
\]

“[...] is/are not blue”

In past tense affirmative, the final -i is dropped and replaced by -katta. In past tense negative, the only difference from the non-past tense negative is that the negative ending -katta is inflected and expresses tense:
(73) a. ao-katta
   blue-PST
   “[...] was/were blue”

   b. ao-ku-na-katta
   blue-ADV-NEG-PST
   “[...] was/were not blue”

For higher politeness, the polite form of na-i; ar-i-mas-en is added, plus the past tense copula desi-ta, alternatively -na-katta plus copula:

(74) ao-katta des-u
    blue-PST COP-NPST
    “[...] was/were blue”

(75) ao-ku ar-i-mas-en desi-ta
    blue-ADV be-INFL-POL-NEG COP-PST
    “[...] was/were not blue”

(76) ao-ku-na-katta des-u
    blue-ADV-NEG-PST COP-NPST
    “[...] was/were not blue”

When the copula is used to express higher politeness-level, it loses its tense. In examples (74) and (76) the adjectives are in past tense but the copula in non-past tense. The overall tense of the sentence will be decided by the adjective, not the copula. The copula is used as a politeness marker. However, in sentence (75) it actually is the copula assigning tense. This is because of the construction of negation in polite speech; arimasen desita. This is simply the way to negate verbs in polite speech; negated verb plus copula carrying tense. Coincidently, in (74) and (76) it is the adjective, not the copula, that expresses tense, while in (75) it is the copula, not the adjective that does.

6.3.2.2. Irregular adjective

There is one irregular adjective: ii “good”. This adjective follows the conjugation of other i-adjectives, but the irregularity lies in the stem where a sound change from i- to yo- occurs. This sound change appears in past tense and negative, as shown in (77)-(80):

(77) i-i
    good-NPST
    “[...] is/are good”

(78) yo-katta
    good-PST
    “[...] was/were good”

(79) yo-ku-na-i
    good-ADV-NEG-NPST
    “[...] is/are not good”

(80) yo-ku-na-katta
    good-ADV-NEG-PST
    “[...] was/were not good”

The change of politeness level follows the same pattern as the other adjectives, as described above.
6.3.2.3. **Negative clauses, i-adjectives**

i-adjectives can have a predicative use, with or without copula (Harada, 1966). Thus, in a simple sentence such as “the sky is/was (not) blue”, the Japanese sentence contains no verb. The optional copula is used to express level of politeness.

Example (81) shows affirmative (with the optional copula expressing higher level of politeness). Sentences (82)-(84) show negative in two different levels of politeness. (82) is plain while (83) and (84) polite (different constructions but synonymous). All examples are in non-past tense:

(81) \[ \text{sora ga ao-i (da)} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-NPST (COP.NPST)} \]
\[ \text{“The sky is blue.”} \]

(82) \[ \text{sora ga ao-ku-na-i} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-ADV-NEG-NPST} \]
\[ \text{“The sky is not blue.”} \]

(83) \[ \text{sora ga ao-ku ar-i-mas-en} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-ADV be-INFL-POL-NEG} \]
\[ \text{“The sky is not blue.”} \]

(84) \[ \text{sora ga ao-ku-na-i des-u} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-ADV-NEG-NPST COP-NPST} \]
\[ \text{COP-NPST} \]
\[ \text{“The sky is not blue.”} \]

Examples (85)-(88) show past tense. (85) is affirmative while (86)-(88) show negative in two politeness-levels:

(85) \[ \text{sora ga ao-katta (da)} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-PST (COP.NPST)} \]
\[ \text{“The sky was blue.”} \]

(86) \[ \text{sora ga ao-ku-na-katta} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-ADV-NEG-PST} \]
\[ \text{“The sky was not blue.”} \]

(87) \[ \text{sora ga ao-ku ar-i-mas-en desi-ta} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-ADV be-INFL-POL-NEG COP-PST} \]
\[ \text{“The sky was not blue.”} \]

(88) \[ \text{sora ga ao-ku-na-katta des-u} \]
\[ \text{sky NOM blue-ADV-NEG-PST COP-NPST} \]
\[ \text{“The sky was not blue.”} \]

**6.3.3. na-adjectives**

6.3.3.1. **Morphology**

na-adjectives do not inflect themselves, it is the copula that gets the inflection (Hinds, 1986). In negation, this construction can be seen as a negated copular construction or copular negation, and hence falls outside of SN.

The negative copula construction is done by focusing the copula de with topic marker wa, resulting in the form de-wa (Martin 1975, p.373, calls this “subdued nuclear focus”). Since the copula gets
focus from the topic marker and then gets negated, it is a case of constituent negation (see section 8.1.2. below). In spoken language, de-wa is often contracted to zya (Martin, 1975, p.66).

(89) a. kirei da pretty COP.NPST “[…] is/are pretty”
   b. kirei de-wa/zya na-i pretty COP-TOP/ COP.TOP NEG-NPST “[…] is/are not pretty”

The verb involved in negating na-adjectives is aru. Negation and further conjugation follow the ordinary patterns for this verb, as described in above sections.

(90) a. kirei dat-ta pretty COP-PST “[…] was/were pretty”
   b. kirei de-wa/zya na-katta pretty COP-TOP/COP.TOP NEG-PST “[…] was/were not pretty”

(91) a. kirei des-u pretty COP-NPST “[…] is/are pretty”

b. kirei de-wa/zya ar-i-mas-en pretty COP-TOP/COP.TOP be-INFL-POL-NEG “[…] is/are not pretty”

c. kirei desi-ta pretty COP-PST “[…] was/were pretty”

d. kirei de-wa/zya ar-i-mas-en desi-ta pretty COP-TOP/COP.TOP be-INFL-POL-NEG COP-PST “[…] was/were not pretty”

6.3.3.2. Negative clauses, na-adjectives

Negative clauses with na-adjectives are simply expressed by presenting a topic or a subject marked with wa (92) or ga (93), and then the na-adjective plus the copular negation construction. For conjugation patterns in different tense and politeness-level, see conjugation for i-adjectives above.

(92) kore wa kirei de-wa/zya na-i this TOP pretty COP-TOP/COP.TOP NEG-NPST “This is not pretty.”

(93) kore ga suki de-wa/zya na-katta this NOM like COP-TOP/COP.TOP NEG-PST “I/you[… ] did not like this.”

6.3.4. Nominals

Japanese nominals (nouns) can be negated in two ways; either with the same negative copula construction as for na-adjectives, or with N with nominative or topic marking plus negated verb.

Japanese nominals (nouns) are negated differently depending on whether it is an existential negation or negation of. The negative copula construction is for identity, class inclusion, and property. The other construction is for existentials in the form N+NOM/TOP+NEG. The difference between these two ways can be seen in examples (94) and (95), from Banno et al. (1999a, p.77). Glosses by me.
(94) terebi ga ar-i-mas-en
   TV NOM have-INFL-POL-NEG
   “I do not have a TV.”

(95) terebi zya ar-i-mas-en
   TV COP.TOP be-INFL-POL-NEG
   “It is not a TV.”

Sentence (94) is the negation of (96) (ibid., p.77). Glosses and translation by me.

(96) terebi ga ar-i-mas-u
   TV NOM exist-INFL-POL-NPST
   “I have a TV.”

Sentence (95) is the negation of (97) (ibid., p.77). Glosses and translation by me.

(97) terebi des-u
   TV COP-NPST
   “It is a TV.”

Considering the data above, it can be said that existentials belong to SN. When functioning as property predicates nouns do not belong to SN. But there is another issue: when the verb a-ru “(to) be/exist” is used in the plain form na-i, the negation is not within SN. However, in the polite form arimasen, it is. The important thing here is not to point out whether negation of nouns belongs to SN or not, what is important is to show how the negation patterns look and not why they look the way they do.

Japanese is, as shown above, a language where honorifics and level of politeness plays a crucial part. Nouns can be made more polite with the addition of two prefixes: o- (mainly for words with Japanese origin) or go- (mainly for words with Chinese origin). These prefixes are used to show respect to a person (and to his/her belongings). Another use is to make the words more “beautiful”, and is then mainly used by women (Tsujimura, 1996, p.376). Examples of two honorific nouns are given in the following examples (the examples are constructed, but they are also cross-checked in the Kotonoha corpus):

(98) a. susi → o-susi
    sushi HON-sushi
   b. henzi → go-henzi
    reply HON-reply

6.3.5. A classification of Japanese negatives in non-verbal clauses

6.3.5.1. Introduction

Veselinova (under revision) shows from a 95-language sample that there are several different ways of expressing negation in non-verbal clauses and existentials. Veselinova also classifies languages by comparing how SN and non-verbal negation differ. She finds several different combinations depending on what the non-verbal clause expresses.

In her survey, Veselinova (under revision, p.4) focuses on simple declarative non-verbal and existential sentences, and it is from negation of the following categories she makes her classifications:

1. intransitive predications with a full lexical verb
2. a. predications that express identity
   b. class inclusion
   c. property assignment
3. locative sentences with a definite subject
4. locative-presentative constructions
5. sentences that express predicative possession

Her findings show three basic structural types (ibid., p.9):

1. Languages with a single negation strategy, i.e. all categories are negated with the same negation strategy.
2. Languages with two negation strategies, i.e. one out of the categories given above have a different negation strategy from that of SN.
3. Languages with multiple negation strategies, i.e. two (or more) categories have a different negation strategy from that of SN.

Eriksen (2011) presents another way to treat negation in non-verbal clauses. He makes use of the term DNA “direct negation avoidance”, which means that non-verbal predicates are often negated by special means as to, as the name might suggest, avoid direct negation. Eriksen explains that direct negation is when a predicate “…is the main object of the negation’s semantic scope...” (Eriksen, 2011, p.277).

There are several ways to avoid direct negation and Eriksen shows three main strategies to achieve DNA when negating non-verbal predicates (Eriksen, 2011, p.278):

1. Distantiating strategies, such as: It is not true that this dog is a collie.
2. Phrase-internal strategies, such as: This dog is something which is not a collie.
3. Negationless strategies, such as: This dog is different from a collie.

After examining his sample, Eriksen states that his DNA theory is so strong that “DNA may actually be the effect of a universal rule” (Eriksen, 2011, p.305).

I find Veselinova’s methodology a bit more clear-cut than Eriksen’s, so for the sake of simplicity, I choose here to examine negation in non-verbal clauses in Japanese following Veselinova’s (under revision) methods.

6.3.5.2. Japanese

Japanese nouns and na-adjectives are, with a few exceptions, not negated with SN strategies. As described above, the negation comes on the copula or accompanying verb, not on the nouns or na-adjectives themselves. This stands in contrast to verbs and i-adjectives that get the negation inflected to their stems/roots. Because of these special constructions, negation of nouns and na-adjectives fall outside of SN.

Following Veselinova, I will take a look at what type of negated non-verbal clauses that triggers what type of negation strategy in Japanese.

Table 2 shows the translation from English to Japanese of the five sentence types listed above. The examples are following Veselinova (under revision, p.4), but I choose here to take the sample sentences from the Kotonoha corpus. Translations and modification for different politeness-levels and polarity by me.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>dentists are smoking.</td>
<td>dentists are not smoking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sikaisi wa tabako wo sutte iru.</td>
<td>sikaisi wa tabako wo sutte inai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sikaisi wa tabako wo sutte imasu.</td>
<td>sikaisi wa tabako wo sutte imasen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a. this is Mr. Clennam.</td>
<td>this is not Mr. Clennam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kotira wa kurenamu san da yo...</td>
<td>kotira wa kurenamu san zya nai yo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kotira wa kurenamu san desu yo...</td>
<td>kotira wa kurenamu san zya arimasen yo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>I’m a teacher...</td>
<td>I’m not a teacher...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watasi wa sensei da...</td>
<td>watasi wa sensei zya nai...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watasi wa sensei desu...</td>
<td>watasi wa sensei zya arimasen...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tonight, (my) wife is at home.</td>
<td>Tonight, (my) wife is not home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>konya wa yomesan wa ie ni iru.</td>
<td>konya wa yomesan wa ie ni inai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>konya wa yomesan wa ie ni imasu.</td>
<td>konya wa yomesan wa ie ni imasen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is a bed in the room...</td>
<td>There is not a bed in the room...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heya ni beddo ga aru...</td>
<td>heya ni beddo ga nai...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heya ni beddo ga arimasu...</td>
<td>heya ni beddo ga arimasen...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a. My boyfriend has a car...</td>
<td>My boyfriend doesn’t have a car...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>karesi ga kuruma wo motte iru...</td>
<td>karesi ga kuruma wo motte inai...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>karesi ga kuruma wo motte imasu...</td>
<td>karesi ga kuruma wo motte imasen...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>My boyfriend has a car...</td>
<td>My boyfriend doesn’t have a car...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watasi no kare wa kuruma ga aru...</td>
<td>watasi no kare wa kuruma ga nai...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watasi no kare wa kuruma ga arimasu...</td>
<td>watasi no kare wa kuruma ga arimasen...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Japanese non-verbal and existential sentences in affirmative and negative.

Example 1 shows an SN construction with an auxiliary (see section 6.1.3.).

Examples 2.a., 2.b., and 2.c. express identity, inclusion and class assignment respectively. 2.a. has a noun (proper name), 2.b. a noun, and 2.c. has a na-adjective. They are, as expected, all negated with the negated copula construction zya nai/arimasen.

In example 3, the locative sentence with a definite subject is negated with an SN construction. However, here is an interesting point to be made. The verb iru means "(to) be/exist" but is used exclusively for animate entities. Thus, it can be seen as an existential. So what we have here is an existential expressed by an SN construction.

Example 4 shows an existential negation with the construction ga nai/arimasen (contrastive to the copular negation zya nai in examples 2.a., 2.b., and 2.c.). The verb aru “(to) exist” is used for inanimate entities.

Example 5 shows an interesting phenomenon; there are two ways of expressing possession in Japanese. One way is with a verbal construction (5.a.) and the other with an existential construction (5.b.). 5.a. shows, once again, the same SN verbal construction as in example 1. However, 5.b. shows an existential negation (inanimate). The two ways of expressing possession are synonymous.
At this point, there is an important point to be made. Example 3 shows the verb aru. That verb is somewhat problematic. In this case, the plain form has the special form na-i, while the polite form is conjugated like other u-verbs (with the addition of the inflectional morpheme -i- and the polite negative -mas-en):

\[(99) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{na-i} \\
\text{b.} & \text{ar-i-mas-en}
\end{array}\]

These are:

- \text{be.NEG-NPST}
- \text{be-INF-POL-NEG}

“[...] is/are not...” or “[...] do(es) not exist.”

This raises an important question. Should the verb aru be treated as a u-verb or as a special construction? It shows standard conjugation patterns in its polite form, but non-standard patterns in its plain form. So if the sentence is in polite form it is an SN construction. If it is in plain form, it is not an SN construction. To classify Japanese using Veselinova’s methods, the classification has to be made depending on the politeness-level of the verb. Thus, it is hard to make a generalization. Furthermore, the fact that there are two existential negatives who behave differently makes the case even more problematic. If na-i is analyzed as following SN patterns (as is the fact in polite form) then the classification becomes easier. If not, then there is not an obvious class among the ones presented by Veselinova to assign Japanese to.

With the above points in mind, a brief summary is here presented: every example except 2.a. through 2.c. show SN patterns. The examples differing from SN are the ones presenting identity, class inclusion and property who show a copular negation. Thus, Japanese can be assigned to Veselinova’s “Type 2A: Languages with a special ascriptive negator”, with the special ascriptive negator being the negated copula construction zya nai.

For further information on negation in non-verbal clauses, see Veselinova (under revision) and Eriksen (2011). Unfortunately, Japanese is absent in both Veselinova’s and Eriksen’s language samples.

### 6.4. Negation in dependent/subordinate clauses

Japanese shows no special negation construction dedicated to dependent/subordinate clauses.

Fujio Düring (1998, pp.159-167) gives examples of several different subordinate clauses in Japanese and points out that verbs and adjectives are used in the plain form (SN) in these clauses (p.159). All the following examples are from the Kotonoha corpus.

Example (100) shows a concessive subordinate clause and is (in all the following examples, the subordinate clauses are in bold face):

\[(100) \quad \begin{array}{ll}
o-kane & moti \\
de-wa & na-katta-keredomo, konahikiba toka
\end{array}\]

HON-money possess.ADV COP-TOP NEG-PST-CONC mill such.things.as

kosakuti nado o mot-te i-masi-ta

small.farming.ground and.so.forth ACC possess-GER AUX-POL-PST

“Although I was not rich, I had such things as a mill, a small farming ground and so on.”

Example (101) shows an attributive subordinate clause. In English, this construction is expressed with the relative pronoun “who”:
The use of the plain form in the subordinate clauses is most often the only option to produce a grammatical sentence. However, there are exceptions. For example, AOTS (eds., 2001, p.22) explains that temporal and causal subordinate clauses can make use of the polite forms (SN). However, the examples given there are of super-polite forms. Sentence (102), on the other hand, shows a temporal subordinate clause with a polite form verb:

(102) Temporal subordinate clause:

```
kyoo no gyoji ga owar-i-masi-tara repooto tuduke-mas-u
```

today GEN event NOM end-INFL-POL-TEMP report continue-POL-NPST

“When today’s events are over, I will continue on the report.”

An interesting thing is that, looking in the Kotonoha corpus, it is hard to find examples of polite form negative in subordinate clauses. To express negation in subordinate clauses, the plain form is by far the most frequent. The most common construction for polite form negative is to use it in indirect quotations:

(103) Quotation subordinate clause:

```
sore wa dek-i-mas-en to iw-are-masi-ta
```

that TOP be.able.to-INFL-NEG COMP say-PASS-POL-PST

“I am not able to do that”, I was told.”

However, the use of super-polite forms in subordinate clauses is more common:

(104) Causal subordinate clause:

```
kankokuseifu wa toozen dooi o itas-i-mas-en
```

Korean.government TOP naturally agreement ACC do.HUM-INFL-NEG

```
ode motiron muri na hanasi de ar-i-mas-u.
```

because of.course impossible COP discussions COP exist-INFL-NEG-NPST

“Since the Korean government, as expected, did not agree, (further) discussions are, of course, impossible.”

The above examples only show a small selection of subordinate clauses. There are more types, more functions and the subject is rather complex. Here, the subject has just been lightly touched upon. But it is safe to say that, after examining the grammatical literature and searching the Kotonoha corpus, regardless of choice of plain, polite or super-polite verb forms, there is no special construction for negation in subordinate clauses.

6.5. Other clausal negation constructions: literary negatives

In Japanese there are two literary negatives: -zu and -nu. They are considerably less frequent than the standard negator -na, and therefore do not belong to standard negation (Miestamo, 2005).

In the -zu construction, the negative suffix -zu is affixed to a negative verb stem and results in a negative infinitive (Martin, 1975; Hinds, 1986). It can appear in sentence-final predicative position (105) or as a pre-copular noun (106). Example from Martin (1975, pp.376-377). Glosses by me.
(105) *nusumi wa su-re do, hidoo wa se-zu*
steal TOP do-CONC PART atrocious TOP do-NEG
“Though I may steel, I commit no atrocities!”

(106) *hitokoto mo wakara-zu desu*
one.word PART understand-NEG COP
“I fail to understand a word!”

Commonly, -zu is accompanied by the copula infinitive *ni* for an adverbial use, as in (107) (Hinds, 1986, p.103). Glosses slightly modified.

(107) *koo iu fuu na sukaafu no sikata nanka ii n zya-nai,*
this say way PART scarf PART way-to-do like good NOM NEG
sotogawa ni, naka ni irezu-ni
outside on inside in put-in-NEG
“This way of wearing the scarf is all right, isn’t it, on the outside, without tucking [it] in?”

-zu *ni* is also used as a subordinate conjunctive with the meaning “without doing”. The *zu* (*ni*) form has the same use as the gerund forms. Thus, -zu has the same meaning as *naku-te* (adjectival gerund), and -zu *ni* the same as *nai-de* (verbal gerund), as shown in examples (108) and (109) (example (108) a. from Banno et al., 1999b, p.161, example (108) b. from Martin, 1975, p.377, and (109) a. and (109) b. from AOTS (eds.), 2002, p.88). Glosses by me.

(108) a. *yuube wa, ne-nai-de, benkyoo si-masi-ta*
last.night TOP sleep-NEG-GER study do-POL-PST
“Last night, I studied without getting any sleep.”

b. *tabe-zu ni ne-ta*
eat-NEG COP.INF sleep-PST
“I slept without eating.”

(109) a. *paateii ni ikenakute, zannen da*
party to go.POT.NEG.ADv.GER regret COP.NPST
“I am sorry that I cannot attend the party.”

b. *paateii ni ikezu, zannen da*
party to go.POT.NEG, regret COP.NPST
“I am sorry I cannot attend the party.”

Both Martin (1975) and AOTS (eds., 2002) points out that the -zu form has a rather stiff tone and is mostly used in written language. The common, lexicalized expression *N ni mo kakawarazu* “in spite of, regardless of (its being)” comes from the -zu-construction.

The other literary negative is -nu. It attaches, just like -zu and the standard negator -na-, directly to a verb stem with the morphophonological change *u* to *a* appearing. -nu is even more restricted than -zu and appears almost exclusively in set expressions like (110) (Hinds, 1986, p.103. Glosses slightly modified.

(110) *hi no nai tokoro ni kemuri wa tatanu*
fire PART NEG place in smoke TOP stand-NEG
“Where there’s smoke, there’s fire. (lit) “In a place where there is no fire, smoke will not rise.”]

Martin (1975, p.381) points out that -nu appears in attributive position with the same meaning as -na-i, as in (111) a. and (111) b. Glosses by me.
(111) a. *Soo iw-a-nu*
    that say-INFL-NEG
    “I/you […] do(es) not/will not say that.”

    Same as:

    b. *Soo iw-a-na-i*
    that say-INFL-NEG-NPST
    “I/you […] do(es) not/will not say that.”

These non-standard negation constructions have a restricted formal use mainly found in literature and set expressions. Some forms appear only in written language (Martin, 1975, p.377). However, around the time of Martin’s work, these constructions were still in use in Kansai speech (ibid., p.377).

7. Non-clausal negation

7.1. Negative questions and how to reply to them

In Japanese, it is generally assumed that basically, *hai*, *ün*, *soo*, *ee*, and *sikari* correspond to “yes” while *iie*, *ùùn*, *iya*, and *ina* correspond to “no”. However, a closer look reveals that the matter is not that straightforward.

There are two types of questions in Japanese; neutral, and ones that expect an affirmative answer (Hinds, 1986, p.17 calls these questions “leading questions”). Neutral questions are the ones in which the question particle *ka* (or other interrogative elements such as *no*, *kai* or particle *ne*) is present (Hinds 1986, p.17). In this group, Kuno (1973, p.274) recognizes the presence of “(negative) neutral questions”. These questions presuppose no specific answer. The questions that expect an affirmative answer are stated as negatives (ibid, p.17). The one-word answers to negative questions show a peculiar behavior. Kuno (1973, p.273) states that the standard answer to such questions are direct opposites of the English counterparts; where one expects “yes” in English, it will be *iie* in Japanese, and where one expects “no” in English it will be *hai* in Japanese. This can be seen in example (112) from Kuno (ibid., p.273):

(112) Kumamoto e ikimasen desita ka?  "Didn’t you go to Kumamoto?"
    *hai*, ikimasen desita.  “No, I didn’t.”
    *iie*, ikimasita yo.  “Yes, I did indeed.”

However, there are cases where the one-word reply function the same way as in English, i.e. *hai* for “yes” and *iie* for “no”. What is crucial is what is negated in the sentence. Kuno (1973, p.274) states that it is the presence of a “semantic negative”, not syntactic, that decides whether the speaker expects an affirmative or negative answer from the listener.

7 The accents on *ün* and *ùùn* are to signal intonation; *ün* is pronounced with a falling intonation and *ùùn* with rising-falling intonation.

8 This is not an exhaustive list of one-word replies.
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As mentioned, neutral questions have no presupposition as for the answer, while leading questions do. Typical cases of questions expecting an affirmative answer are the ones in which the sentence includes a tag-question, or sentence-final particle ne. Hinds (1986, p.19) gives examples of the tag-questions zya nai (ka)? and daroo (ka)?. zya nai (ka)? and daroo (ka)? are sentence final elements and can be compared to the English negative tags “isn’t it?” or “don’t you agree?” They are common in conversation, appear in both affirmative and negative sentences, and are often accompanied with the nominalizer n/no. These elements do not change the polarity of the sentence as a whole, thus, when present, the sentence keeps its polarity signaled by the main verb.

Kuno (1973) gives examples of the distinction between the two sentence types. Examples (113) and (114) are directly from Kuno (1973, p.274):

(113) Neutral (negative) question:
A: kinoo gakkoo ni ikimasen desita ka?
yesterday school to go-not did
“Did you not go to school yesterday?”

B: hai, ikimasen desita.
yes go-not did
"No, I did not go.”

iie, ikimasita.
no went
"Yes, I did.”

(114) Leading question (expecting affirmative):
A: kinoo gakkoo ni itta n zya arimasen ka?
yesterday school to went that is-not
“Isn’t it the case that you went to school yesterday?”

B: Hai, ikimasita yo.
"Yes, I did.”

iie, ikimasen desita yo.
"No, I did not.”

In (113), the A-clause is negative, as shown on the negated main verb ikimasen. The person answering the question affirms or denies the form of the question. The A-clause in (114), on the other hand, is semantically an affirmative clause (the verb iku “(to) go” being affirmative), regardless of the negative tag-question arimasen. The speaker affirms or denies the facts of the question. This once again shows that tag-questions do not change the polarity of the sentence, in this case, they merely signal an expectation of the affirmative answer.

The explanation of the peculiar behavior of hai and iie is, according to Martin (1962, pp.364-365, cited in Kuno, 1973, p.273), that the replies are used to “…affirm or deny the FACTS rather than the STATEMENT of the facts.” (emphasis in original). In a later work Marin rephrases that statement: “…When a question is put negatively, the speaker of standard Japanese usually replies to the FORM rather than the CONTENT.” (Martin, 1975, p.368, emphasis in original). In English, it is the statement of (113) that is denied while it is the fact in Japanese. In (115) however, the two languages show the same pattern because of the presupposition of an affirmative answer.
Kuno (1973, pp.275-281) gives more examples of constructions with neutral or leading questions. Negative questions with indefinite pronouns in the form interrogative plus particle mo or ka signal neutral and leading questions respectively. These types correspond to “any(-)” (Q-mo) and “some(-)” (Q-ka) in English (see section 7.2. below and Shimoyama, 2011, for a discussion about indefinite pronouns and NPIs). Examples (115) and (116) are simplified from Kuno (1986, pp.275-266). Glosses by me.

(115) Neutral (negative) question:
A:  nani-mo       ka-wa-na-katta?
    what-INDEF buy-INFL-NEG-PST
"Didn’t you buy anything?"

B:  hai, nani-mo  ka-wa-na-katta
    yes what-INDEF buy-INFL-NEG-PST
    “No, I didn’t buy anything.”

    iie, hon       o   kat-ta
    no book       ACC buy-PST
    “Yes, I bought a book.”

(116) Leading question (expecting affirmative):
A:  nani-ka       ka-wa-na-katta?
    what-INDEF buy-INFL-NEG-PST
    “Didn’t you buy something?”

B:  hai, hon       o   kat-ta
    yes book       ACC buy-PST
    “Yes, I bought a book.”

    iie, nani-mo  ka-wa-na-katta
    yes what-INDEF buy-INFL-NEG-PST
    “No, I didn’t buy anything.”

When a sentence includes the nominalizer plus copula construction no/n desu, the question is neutral if the negative appears before the nominalizer but leading if the copula is negated Example from Kuno (1986, p.278). Glosses by me.

(117) Neutral (negative) question:
A:  ik-a-na-katta   n   da?
    go-INFL-NEG-PST NMLZ COP,NPST
    “Is it the case you didn’t go?”

B:  hai = “no (I did not go)”, iie = “yes (I went)”

(118) Leading question (expecting affirmative):
A:  it-ta no       de   wa na-i?
    go-PST NMLZ COP TOP NEG-NPST
    “Isn’t it the case that you went?”

B:  hai = “yes (I went)”, iie = “no (I did not go)”

Furthermore, negating the verb omou “(to) think”, result in a leading question (example A from the Kotonoha corpus):
Leading question (expecting affirmative):

A: \textit{okasi-i to omow-a-na-i ka}

\begin{itemize}
  \item funny-NPST NMLZ think-INFL-NEG-NPST Q
\end{itemize}

\textquote{“Isn’t it funny?”}

B: \textit{hai = “yes (it is)”, iie = “no (it isn’t)”}

As mentioned above, the sentence-final particle \textit{ne} signals a leading question, if the statement is negative and an \textit{interrogative intonation} is present (term from Kuno, 1973, p.278). Finally, cohortative questions show a bit different pattern that an agreement is expressed with \textit{hai} while a disagreement is not expressed with \textit{iie} but an excuse (Kuno, 1973, p.279). However, if the question is a polite request, then \textit{hai} is used for affirmative and \textit{iie} for negative (Martin, 1962, cited in Kuno, 1973, p.273). Kuno finally touches on the problematic matter of negative questions that can be answered with either \textit{hai} or \textit{iie}, for both positive and negative answers, and addresses the presence of intonation and \textit{“nonlinguistic environments”} (p.280).

The issue of negative questions and how to answer them is clearly summarized by Kuno (1973, p.275):

\textquote{“…the Japanese \textit{hai} is used for introducing a negative-statement answer, and \textit{iie} for introducing a positive-statement answer, to a negative question when it is a neutral question. On the other hand, if a negative question includes the questioner’s expectation of the positive-statement answer, \textit{hai} is used for introducing a positive-statement answer, and \textit{iie} a negative-statement answer, just like ‘yes’ and ‘no’ in English.”}

After this long description of negative questions and how to answer to them, positive questions and their answers should also be mentioned. The basic way to ask a question in Japanese is to add the clause-final question particle \textit{ka}. In doing so, together with affirmative, the question becomes neutral (cf. above). Thus, the speaker does neither expect a positive answer, nor a negative. This means that \textit{hai} will correspond to “yes”, while \textit{iie} will correspond to “no”:

\begin{itemize}
  \item person: \textit{dare} → \textit{dare-ka/-mo/-demo}
  \item thing: \textit{nani} → \textit{nani-ka/-mo/-demo}
  \item place: \textit{doko} → \textit{doko-ka/-mo/-demo}
  \item time: \textit{itu} → \textit{itu-ka/-mo/-demo}
\end{itemize}
As mentioned briefly in the previous section, -ka can be compared with English “some(-)” and -mo with “any(-)”. However, this is a highly simplified approach. These indefinites have various different uses, which as a result makes it misleading to make such overgeneralizations. To show this, Haspelmath provides an implicational map to show what particle is used in what context. Since one indefinite pronoun can have several uses, the implicational maps are made to clearly show what pronoun can be used in what context. In figure 3, Haspelmath’s implicational map over Japanese indefinite pronouns is reproduced (Haspelmath, 1997, p. 312).

Figure 3. Haspelmath’s implicational map over Japanese indefinite pronouns.

As can be seen in figure 3, the particle -ka can be used for “specific known”, “specific unknown”, “irrealis non-specific”, “question” and “conditional”. -mo can be used for “indirect negation”, “comparative” and “direct negation”. -demo is used for only “free-choice”. Haspelmath furthermore gives example sentences of these different categories. Due to lack of space, it is not possible to give examples from every category here. However, one example from the -ka-series (121) and one example from the -demo-series (122) (terms from Haspelmath, 1997, p.312) are presented below (examples from the Kotonoha corpus). Indefinite pronouns are in bold-face.

(121) “Specific unknown”
\[
\text{dare-ka} \text{ tasuke-te kudasai.} \quad \text{who-INDEF help-GER AUX.IMP2}
\]
“Someone please help me.”

(122) “Free choice”
\[
\text{okane wa \underline{itu-demo} \ i-i des-u yo} \quad \text{money TOP when-INDEF good-NPST COP-NPST EMPH}
\]
“As for the money, anytime is ok.”

Since this thesis is focusing on negation, all three categories in the -mo-series will be given. All the examples are from Haspelmath (1997, pp.312-313). Glosses and translations in original.

(123) “Comparative”
\[
\text{kono syoonen-wa kono kurasu-no \underline{dare-yori-mo} \ hayaku hasir-u} \quad \text{this boy-TOP this class-GEN who-from-INDEF fast run-NPST}
\]
“This boy can run faster than anyone in his class.”
"Direct negation"

\[ \text{dare-mo kanojo-o aishite i-na-i} \]

who-INDEF she-ACC love-CONV DUR-NEG-NPST

"Nobody loves her."

"Indirect negation"

\[ \text{kyoo-wa dare-mo ku-ru to omow-ana-i} \]

today-TOP who-INDEF come-PRES SBOR think-NEG-NPST

"I don’t think anybody is coming today."

Noteworthy is that -\text{mo} is almost exclusively used in negative contexts, but in comparative sentences it can function with affirmative as well, as shown in example (123). However, as the map implies, -\text{mo} cannot appear in whichever affirmative context; it is restricted to comparative sentences. Thus sentence (126) a. would be ungrammatical; the question clause calls for particle -\text{ka} (126) b. (constructed example, for convenience, the glosses are following Haspelmath’s):

(126) a. *\text{dare-mo ki-ta ka} \hspace{1cm} \text{b. dare-ka ki-ta ka}

\[ \text{who-INDEF come-PST Q} \]

"Did somebody/anybody come?"

It is also worth pointing out that -\text{ka} also can appear in negative context even if its use is mainly limited to affirmative (as noted by Haspelmath, 1997, p.85) (example from the Kotonoha corpus):

(127) \[ \text{nani-ka nom-a-na-i ka ne} \]

what-INDEF drink-INFL-NEG-NPST Q EMPH

"Aren’t you going to drink something?"

In the same manner as with -\text{mo} above, the contexts where the indefinites can “change” surroundings (polarity) are rather limited. The construction in (127) above is a negated polar question, a context where -\text{ka} can appear with negation.

In his typological survey, Haspelmath (2011) assigns Japanese to the group of languages where “Negative indefinites co-occur with predicate negation” (as opposed to the categories of languages in which “negative indefinites preclude predicate negation”, “show mixed behavior”, and the ones using a “negative existential construction”).

As an addition to Haspelmath’s approach, I would like to present the views of other scholars who treat indefinites in somewhat different ways. However, Haspelmath’s approach provides a clear analysis of the matter, so the approaches of other scholars will only be presented briefly.

Kawamori and Ikeya (2001, p. 90) makes the important statement that “Japanese has no lexical counterparts of negative NPs like ‘nobody’, ‘nothing’, etc.”. In their paper, they treat the Japanese indefinites as negative polarity items (see section 8.2.1. below).

Haspelmath (1997) considers the Japanese indefinite pronouns being a combination of interrogatives plus particle. Shimoyama (2011) on the other hand analyzes Haspelmath’s interrogatives as being the Japanese indefinites themselves. Then the particles -\text{mo} or -\text{ka} are added depending on function and context. Shimoyama (2011, p.414) gives examples of what she considers being indeterminate pronouns in Japanese: \text{dare} (person), \text{nani} (thing), and \text{doko} (place). She describes that, usually, indeterminate pronouns are either existential or universal depending on which particle they are combined with; -\text{ka} signals existential force while -\text{mo} signals universal force:

(128) a. \text{dare-/nani-/doko-ka}: “someone/something/somewhere”

b. \text{dare-/nani-/doko-mo}: “everyone/everything/everywhere”
In addition, Shimoyama (2011) analyzes *mo* plus negative as indeterminate NPIs who can be either existential or universal:

(129)  *dare/-nani/-doko-mo + NEG: “anyone/anything/anywhere”*

Furthermore, Shimoyama (2011, p.414) also notes that accent also makes a distinction between the universal force and NPIs (in Tokyo speech):

(130)  a.  *da’re-mo = universal “everyone”  b.  *do’ko-mo = universal “everywhere”*

Shimoyama’s analysis is in my opinion a bit unclear. She analyses *dare, nani,* and *doko* as the indefinite pronouns. However, these words are question words. It is not clear why they should be considered pronouns themselves. Shimoyama’s theory needs to be more looked into.

In any way, both Shimoyama (2011) and Haspelmath (2011) agree that *-mo* typically calls for negative surroundings. Generally, Japanese indefinites are considered being NPIs. However, since they by nature are indefinite pronouns, I chose to treat them in this section and not in section 8.2.

For a detailed description of indefinite pronouns, see Haspelmath (1997) and Shimoyama (2011).

### 7.3. Lexical negation

#### 7.3.1. Negative prefixes

Japanese has a set of prefixes with an inherently negative meaning. They have similar functions to the English counterparts “un-“, “in-“, “non-“, “-less” et cetera.

The prefixes are of Chinese origin and most typically occur with Chinese words. However, they can also be attached to Japanese and even English words (Martin, 1975, p.388).

Martin (1975, pp.388-390) list six negative prefixes, their meaning and the word they can attach to and the word class they result in. Often, the addition of these prefixes triggers a change of word class.

Martin’s list is long and complex so here, only one example of each prefix will be given, with no further information about word classes and possible changes of these (all examples from Martin, 1975, pp.388-390):

- *hi- : hi-zyoosiki “senseless”*
- *hu- : hu-seikaku “inaccurate”*
- *bu-1: bu-kiyoo “unskillful”*
- *mu- : mu-kyooiku “uneducated”*
- *bu-2: bu-aisoo “unsociable”*
- *mi- : mi-kansei “incomplete”*

Important to note is that these prefixes result in constituent negation, hence, they fall outside of SN. For details, see Martin (1975, pp.388-390).

#### 7.3.2. Negative suffix

The above list shows that nouns (and some other word classes) can get negative prefixes. But nouns can also get a negative suffix. This suffix is *-nasi*, with the meaning “without” or “-less”. Technically,
it is a negated nominalized adjective predicative form (Martin, 1975, p.898, 904), and it comes from the verb *na-i*. *-nasi* typically succeeds an unmarked noun, has a privative function, and yields the meaning “without N” or “N-less”, as shown in example (131).

\[ \text{(131) } \text{*niku-nasi*} \]
\[
\text{meat-without} \\
\text{“Without meat.”}
\]

With the particle *ni*, *nasi-ni* (132) functions the same way as the negated adverbial *naku* (133). The adverbial is often used as a connecting form, and here, it gets the meaning “to do A without doing B”. The two examples compared are from the *Kotonoha* corpus.

\[ \text{(132) } \text{...*enryo-nasi ni i-tte kudasai...} \]
\[
\text{restraint-without PART say-GER AUX:IMP2} \\
\text{“Please say it without restraints.”}
\]

\[ \text{(133) } \text{...*Kooun wa enryo-naku i-tta.} \]
\[
\text{Kooun TOP restraint-without say-PST} \\
\text{“Kooun said it without restraints.”}
\]

With particle *de*, *nasi-de* gets the function of the verbal gerund *nakute* (Martin, 1975, p.898). The verbal gerund often gets a conjunctional function. Here, it gets a cause-effect reading, “had it not been for A... so B”, “A because B”, or the same meaning as in the above examples; “without”. Example (134) is the title of a pop song, example (135) is from Martin 1975, p.833, and example (136) is from the *Kotonoha* corpus. Glosses by me.

\[ \text{(134) } \text{\textit{anata-nashi de-wa iki-te yuk-e-na-i}} \]
\[
\text{you-without COP-TOP live-GER live-INFL.POT-NEG-NPST} \\
\text{“I can’t live without you.”}
\]

\[ \text{(135) } \text{\textit{kore-nasi de wa, konniti no Mitsubishi wa na-katta to}} \]
\[
\text{this-without PART TOP today GEN Mitsubishi TOP NEG-PST COMP} \\
\text{i-e-yoo} \\
\text{say-INFL.POT-HORT} \\
\text{“Let us say that, had it not been for this, we would not have the Mitsubishi of today.”}
\]

\[ \text{(136) } \text{\textit{tomodati ga i-na-ku-te sabisi-i des-u}} \]
\[
\text{friends NOM exist-NEG-ADV-GER sad-NPST COP-NPST} \\
\text{“I feel lonely because I have no friends.”}
\]

*-nasi* appears in several different constructions, with different particles and can be topicalized or predicative with copula (see Martin, 1975 for a detailed description).

### 7.3.3. Negative adjectives

There are several adjectives in Japanese that are seemingly negative in that they end on *-nai*. The adjectives with this form express undesirable qualities (Martin, 1975, p.386). Examples of such words are *kitanai* “dirty”, *abunai* “dangerous”, *tumaranai* “boring”, and *sukunai* “few”. Martin (1975) explains that *-nai* in these adjectives is an *etymological* suffix. The negative marker is present, but it has etymological status, and can thus not be analyzed as a negative anymore. However, an interesting thing is that negation of these adjectives follows the same conjugation patterns as for other *i*-adjectives. Thus, it is not the case of a frozen lexical stem since the etymological suffix still takes part of the morphology. The case here is that the suffix and its morphology are on a semantic level.
In conjugation, one can say that it is the etymological ending -nai that gets negated, in the form -naku, and then the negator -na- is added. The conjugation shows that the etymological negative is following the conjugation patterns of other i-adjectives; the change of ending -i to -ku triggered by the negator -na-. This is the way to negate a negative in Japanese and looks the same for the “proper” negative as well as for the etymological one.

The form -naku-na- might suggest a double negation construction. However, since the etymological ending -nai is not a negative marker on these adjectives, the addition of a “proper” negator does not trigger double negation. The meaning would be a plain negative, such as:

(137) suku-na-ku-na-i
    few-SUFF-ADV-NEG-NPST
“not few”

7.3.4. Negative verb

There are some verbs that are etymologically negative. These verbs look negated, but the polarity is affirmative. A good example of this is the verb sumimasen “excuse me”. This verb cannot appear in affirmative *sumimasu with the meaning “I do not excuse myself”. Neither can it be used with the plain form negative as in *sumanai. This suggests that sumimasen has an etymological negation and is a lexicalized unit that cannot undergo any further modification.

8. Other aspects of negation

8.1. The scope of negation

8.1.1. Japanese, overview

The scope of negation in Japanese is a truly problematic subject. In his master’s thesis, Storoshenko (2004) summarizes the situation. In reviewing the literature on negation scope, he recognizes that "...the picture that emerges is definitely not clear." (p.39). He even states that "The data regarding Japanese negation scope is so contradictory and lacking in an empirical base that some researchers have declared it to be useless for syntactic analysis..." (p.iii). With this in mind, a brief overview of some of the viewpoints of the scope of negation in Japanese will be given, but due to lack of space and a confusion in the literature, a detailed survey will not be possible. For details, and an overview of the literature on negation scope, see Storoshenko (2004) and the references therein.

Shimoyama (2011, p.415) presents a basic characteristic for the scope of negation in Japanese by stating that “Sentential negation in Japanese is known to take relatively low scope in general...” Kuno (1980, cited in Takubo, 1985; Storoshenko, 2004) states that the negation morpheme -na- takes scope over the verbal immediately preceding it but does not extend beyond it. However, there are exceptions, and Kuno himself later revises his thesis, recognizing for example that when a quantifier is present, -na- can take scope also over the object.

Kato (1983, cited in Storoshenko, 2004) shows that any element except the subject can be under the scope of negation. However, Shimoyama (2011, p.415) shows that negation can take wide scope over
both subject and object, and Storoshenko (2004, p.32) that *wa*-nominals automatically come under the scope. Furthermore, Kishimoto (2008, p.380) states that *-na-* can take scope over an entire clause.

In analyzing the scope of negation, there are numerous standpoints among numerous scholars, but there always seems to be counter evidence against every theory. The matter is unclear and this is something for future research to clarify.

Finally, one important point should be made here. The scope of negation does not have a direct impact on the negation strategies; if a sentence is negated with an *SN* construction, that construction will stay intact even if the scope somehow alters. In other words, there is not one construction expressing wide scope and another expressing narrow scope, and the placement of the negator (clause-final) also remains.

One case where the scope of negation actually calls for a special negation strategy is in constituent negation, which is the topic of the next section.

8.1.2. Constituent negation

In the overview on scope of negation in the previous section, it was mentioned that constituent negation calls for a special construction. This construction is expressed by focusing a constituent with topic marker *wa* and the addition of a negator. Storoshenko (2004, p.32), mentions that *wa*-nominals (however, not exclusively nominals, as will be seen below) automatically come under the scope of negation. Simply put, in constituent negation, the scope is limited; it is narrow and takes only the focused constituent under its scope.

There are two main ways of negating a constituent. The first way is to topicalize the constituent with an addition of the postpositional topic marker *wa* and then negate the verb with an *SN* construction (Hinds, 1986). This type of constituent negation can be compared to the English counterpart where this is expressed with stress (Kusanagi, 1971, cited in Hinds, 1986, p.103 and p.149). Hinds shows that several different constituents can be negated using this strategy. What can be negated is for example temporal, instrument, comitative, locative and adjunct NPs, and even verbs. Example (138) shows a sentence in which all constituents can be negated (from Hinds, 1986, pp.149-150).

(138) sanji ni jidoosha de tomodati to daigaku e ikanakatta 3:00 at TOP car by friend with university to go-NEG-PST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”

In sentence (138), the constituents are *sanji ni, jidoosha de, tomodati to, daigaku e*, and the verb *iku*. Examples (139)-(143) show negation of those constituents. Examples from Hinds (1986, pp.149-150). Glosses in original.

(139) sanji ni wa jidoosha de tomodati to daigaku e ikanakatta 3:00 at TOP car by friend with university to go-NEG-PST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”

(140) sanji ni jidoosha de wa tomodati to daigaku e ikanakatta 3:00 at car by TOP friend with university to go-NEG-PST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”

(141) sanji ni jidoosha de tomodati to wa daigaku e ikanakatta 3:00 at car by friend with TOP university to go-NEG-PST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”
sanji ni jidoosha de tomodati to daigaku e wa ikanakatta
3:00 at car by friend with university to TOP go-NEG-PST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”

sanji ni jidoosha de tomodati to daigaku e iki wa sinakatta
3:00 at car by friend with university to go TOP do-NEG-PST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”

The constituents written in boldface are the ones that would get primary stress in English. However, in Japanese, there is no additional stress, it is the topic marker wa that shows the contrast (Hinds, 1986). Important to point out is that it is not the constituent itself that gets negated; the negation is still on the verb. Dahl (1979, p.105, footnote) briefly discusses two types of placement of negation: focus-dependent and verb-dependent placement. Japanese constituent negation is verb-dependent; the constituent that gets negated is focused with wa. However, the negator is always on the verb.

Noteworthy is that the construction in (143) is sometimes referred to as a distinct negation construction, called wa-negation (see Han, Storoshenko & Sakurai, 2004 and Storoshenko, 2004). However, I would like to present some critique to this. Sentences (139) through (143) all show constituent negation. My main objection would be that iki in sentence (143) has an adverbialized form, and functions as a noun (as analyzed by Martin, 1975). Thus, it is not a negation of the verb; it is a constituent negation of a nominal extracted from a verb. Furthermore, this way of negating is mainly to create a contrast. It is just about where to put the focus. Sentence (143) implies that the person didn’t go to the university, but something else. The natural expectation would be to hear what the person did instead. If sentence (143) would be put in a SN construction, the result is a simple indicative sentence with no stress on “go” and no expectation as to what comes next:

sanji ni jidoosha de tomodati to daigaku e ik-a-na-katta
3:00 at car by friend with university to go-NEG-INFL-PAST
“I didn’t go to the university with friends at 3 by car.”

To call the construction in (143) a distinct negation construction is to me a bit opportunistic because of the limited use mainly to contrastive sentences, and the basic fact that the focused verb is not negated.

In any way, this construction is not the most basic negation strategy in Japanese and will thus not be treated any further.

The other way of constituent negation involves actual negation of the constituent. Martin (1975, p.366) refers to this as adjunct negation. Examples from English would be such as “Not I but someone else” or “Not to me but to someone else”. To express this in Japanese, the adjunct is nominalized, then negated: watasi → watasi da → watasi de(wa)/zya nai “it isn’t me” or watasi ni → watasi ni da → watasi ni de(wa)/zya naku(te) “it isn’t to me” (Martin, 1975, p.366). After that, the negated nominal is adverbialized and conjoined (optionally with the gerund); watasi de(wa)/zya naku(te)… “not I but…” or watasi ni de(wa)/zya naku(te)… “not to me but…” (Martin, 1975, p.366). Examples (145) and (146) show this construction (constructed examples):

watasi de-wa/zya naku, Taroo ga si-ta
me COP-TOP/COP.TOP NEGADV, Taro NOM do-PST
“It was not I, it was Taro who did it.”

watasi ni de-wa/zya naku, Taroo ni ki-ta
me to COP-TOP/COP.TOP NEGADV, Taro to come-PST
“It was not to me, it was to Taro [she] came.”
Example (147) shows an example with the gerund (from the *Kotonoha* corpus):

(147) gitaa zya na-ku-te beesu des-u…
    guitar COP.TOP is.NEG-ADV-GER bass COP-NPST
    “It’s not a guitar, it’s a bass…”

This construction is often contrastive, but has other uses, as in example (148) (modified from the *Kotonoha* corpus):

(148) mosi zyooodan zya na-ku-te hontou ni
    if joke COP.TOP is.NEG-ADV-GER real PART
    komat-te i-tara tauke-mas-u
    be.troubled-GER AUX-COND help-POL-NPST
    “If it it’s not a joke, and he’s really in trouble, I will help.”

To express “not only…but also…” a similar strategy is used. In the “not only” sentence, the quantifier *dake* “only” is negated and conjoined, often in the set form *dake de naku*. In the “but also” sentence the particle *mo* “also” appears, as in example (149) from AOTS (eds., 2002, p.21). Glosses by me.

(149) syain dake de naku, kazoku mo sukii ryokoo ni
    employee only COP NEG-ADV family also ski tour in
    sanka deki-mas-u
    participate be.able.to.POT-POL-NPST
    “Not only employees, but also their families can participate in the ski tour.”

dake de naku is directly interchangeable with *dake de nasi ni* (see section 7.3.2. above). Example from Martin (1975, p.898). Glosses by me.

(150) sensei dake de nasi ni gakusei mo…
    teacher only COP without PART student also
    “Not only the teacher but also the students…”

These ways of constituent and adjunct negation can not only contain simple nouns, but also adverbs, adjectives and verbs can appear (Martin, 1975).

### 8.2. Negative polarity

#### 8.2.1. Negative polarity items

Negative polarity items (henceforth NPIs) is a wide, complex subject that is well investigated in the literature. I do not attempt to describe it in any detail here, since it falls outside the scope of this work, but a brief summary will be given.

van der Wouden (1997, p.61, cited in Miestamo 2009, p.219) describes NPIs as “…expressions that can only appear felicitously in negative contexts.” Miestamo (2009, p.219) notices that “Most languages have NPIs that denote a minimal amount.” which is just the case with some of the Japanese NPIs.

Kawamori and Ikeya (2001, p.85) give examples of Japanese NPIs: *kessite* “ever”, *nanni-mo* “anything”, *dare-mo* ”anyone”, *doko-mo* “anywhere”, *sika* “only”, and the already mentioned *tittomo* “not at all”. *kessite, sika, and tittomo* all denote minimal amount while *nani-mo, dare-mo and doko-mo* are negative indefinite pronouns (see section 7.2. above). Japanese NPIs typically appear with clausal negation (Shimoyama 2011, Watanabe 2004). However, Kawamori and Ikeya (2001, p.85) point out
that NPIs such as *tittomo, doko-mo, and dare-mo can appear without sentential negation, as in example (151) (from the *Kotonoha* corpus):

(151)
A:  *dare* ga *sonna koto o i-tta n da i?*
   someone NOM like.that thing ACC say-PST NMLZ COP.NPST Q
   “Did someone say a thing like that?”

B:  *uun. dare-mo.*
    no who-INDEF
    “No. No one (said a thing like that).”

Watanabe (2004) argues that these NPIs in fact are not NPIs but negative concord items. He gives tests for separating NPIs from concord items, one of the tests being ability to be used as an elliptical answer. *tittomo, doko-mo, and dare-mo all pass this test, thus explaining Kawamori and Ikeya’s statement above. Haspelmath (1997) also shows indefinite pronouns plus *mo* can express indirect negation, which would be the case here (cf. figure 3 above.).

Watanabe (2004) concludes that the so called *wh + mo expressions* are inherently negative concord items. Important to point out is that they keep their negative polarity even when appearing as elliptical answers, thus they are inherently negatives (Watanabe, 2004, cf. (152) above). At the same time, Kawamori and Ikeya (2001) argue that negative concord never occurs in Japanese, but that the NPIs show similarities to negative concord.

In a sentence, NPIs must co-occur with sentential negation, thus (152) is grammatical while (153) is not (examples from Watanabe, 2004, p.561, glosses modified):

(152)  *John-wa nani-mo tabe-na-katta*
   John-TOP what-INDEF eat-NEG-PST
   “John didn’t eat anything.”

(153)  *John-wa nani-mo tabe-ta*

Watanabe (2004, pp.560-561) points out that Japanese never allows double negation within a single clause, thus the reading “John didn’t eat nothing” is not available for (152).

Japanese NPIs are complex and there is little consensus in the literature. However, in any case, there is a consensus that the NPIs exemplified above all appear in negative sentences and that they are inherently negative.

For a detailed investigation of NPIs and their scope, see Shimoyama (2011).

### 8.2.2. *sika* + NEG

The quantifier *sika* has been given great attention in the literature and it is a very complex subject, both syntactically and semantically. A deep analysis will be abandoned here, for details, see the two great works on the matter: Muraki (1978) and Kato (1985). Here, a general description will be given just to give a hint of the richness and complexity of *sika*.

*sika* is a quantifier with the meaning “only, nothing but, anything but, except for, as few as”.

It seems that Mr Murayama doesn’t read anything but comics."

Removing the negation will yield an ungrammatical sentence (ibid., p.344):

*Murayama san wa manga sika yomai ne.

Furthermore, sika and the negation must be clause mates (Tsujimura, 1996; Shimoyama, 2011). However, there are cases where sika and the negation may appear in different clauses (see Hinds, 1986; Kawamori & Ikeya, 2001; Martin, 1975).

Kawamori & Ikeya (2001, pp.85-87) present some properties of sika:

- “sika is always to be associated with overtly negative particles like -na- or -nu, -zu, -mai, and a negative-like adjective dame.” (p.85) (example from the Kotonoha corpus):

  kookoozidai, sekaisi sika benkyoo si-na-katta...
  high.school.days world.history SIKA study do-NEG-PST
  “In my high school days, I did nothing but study world history.”

- sika cannot function as an elliptical answer, a property of other NPIs such as tittomo, dokomo, and daremo (constructed example):

  A: nanika tabe-ta?
  something eat-PST
  "Have you eaten something?"

  B: *banana sika
  banana SIKA
  “Only a banana.”

- “sika…always implies the logical contrary of its sika-less counterpart.” (see Kawamori & Ikeya, 2001, p.86 for examples).

- “sika can be used with any NP or PP.” (p.86) Example (158) shows sika with a noun phrase (gonin “five people”) and example (159) shows sika with a prepositional phrase (suteeji no ue de “on the stage”). Examples from the Kotonoha corpus.

  kokusai kuukoo ni gonin sika i-na-i
  international airport LOC five.people SIKA be-NEG-NPST
  “There are only five people in the international airport.”

  boku wa suteeji no ue de sika erisu no kao o mi-te i-na-katta...
  me TOP stage GEN on LOC SIKA Elis GEN face ACC see-GER AUX-NEG-PST
  “I was seeing Elis’ face only on the stage.”

- “sika…can ‘absorb’ some case particles, like ga and no.” (p.87). In (160) the particle o marks the accusative. The particle is though absorbed by sika, as can be seen in (161) from the Kotonoha corpus:

  wakamono wa hanbaagaa ya piza o tabe-ru
  young.people TOP hamburgers and.such pizza ACC eat-NPST
  “Young people eat hamburgers and pizza and such.”
(161) wakamono wa hanbaagaa ya pizza sika tabe-na-i
young people TOP hamburgers and.such pizza SIKA eat-NEG-NPST
“Young people eat nothing but hamburgers and pizza and such.”

- “sika and the negative particle can be separated from each other by any number of constituents.” (p.87). The first verb appearing after sika is kaku “(to) write”, but that is not the verb that gets the negation required by sika; that verb appears in the end: na-i. Here, the scope of the negation stretches all the way back to sika, despite the theories on the narrow scope of negators in Japanese (see section 8.1.1.). Example from Martin, (1975, pp.76-77). Glosses by me.

(162) namae sika kak-u hituyoo wa na-i
name SIKA write-NPST necessary TOP NEG-NPST
“It is necessary to write only one’s name.”

- “sika construction can embed another sika construction.” (see Kawamori & Ikeya, 2001, p.87 for an example).

Tsujimura (1996) shows that sika can attach to several constituents in a sentence (examples from ibid., p.344).

(163) a. Taro ga biiru o nom-u
Taro NOM beer ACC drink-NPST
“Taro drinks beer.”

b. Taro sika biiru o nom-a-na-i
Taro SIKA beer ACC drink-INFL-NEG-NPST
“Only Taro drinks beer.”

c. Taro ga biiru sika nom-a-na-i
Taro NOM beer SIKA drink-INFL-NEG-NPST
“Taro drinks only beer.”

d. Taro ga biiru o nom-u sika na-i.
Taro NOM beer ACC drink-NPST SIKA NEG-NPST
“There is no other choice for Taro than to drink beer.”

Another property of sika is that it cannot co-occur with other NPIs such as daremo. This is due to the fact that sika cannot “share” a negation (Kawamori & Ikeya, 2001, p.91).

An interesting point that occurs in the sika NEG is that the contents sometimes become rather contradictory to the meaning. Consider the following sentence (from Martin, 1975, p.76). Glosses by me.

(164) kono hon sika dame da
this book SIKA not.good COP.NPST
“Only this book will do.”

The sentence in (164) contains the inherently negative word dame “not good”. But the sika construction yields a meaning “this, and only this, book is good”.

For a detailed syntactic analysis of sika, see Ikeya & Kawamori (1998), and for a rich amount of example sentences with sika, see Martin (1975, pp. 76-82).

The function of sika follows the findings of Miestamo (2009, p.219), who states that “Most languages have NPIs that denote a minimal amount.” This is just the case with Japanese, albeit there is much more to sika than just that.
8.3. Case marking under negation

In Japanese, there is no change in case marking under negation. It can be said that case marking under negation “follows” the case marking under affirmative. If the verb calls for accusative case for their internal argument in affirmative, it will be accusative in negative too. Notice also that the topic marker *wa* stays intact:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(165)} \quad &\text{a. } \text{watasi } \text{wa} \text{ ringo } \text{o} \text{ tabe-ru} \quad \text{b. } \text{watasi } \text{wa} \text{ ringo } \text{o} \text{ tabe-na-i} \\
&\text{me } \text{TOP} \text{ apple } \text{ACC} \text{ eat-NPST} \quad \text{me } \text{TOP} \text{ apple } \text{ACC} \text{ eat-NEG-NPST} \\
&\text{“I eat an apple.”} \quad \text{“I do not eat an apple.”}
\end{align*}
\]

If the verb calls for nominative, it will be nominative in negation too (from the Kotonoha corpus):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(166)} \quad &\text{a. } o-niku \text{ ga } \text{tabe-rare-ru} \quad \text{b. } o-niku \text{ ga } \text{tabe-rare-na-i} \\
&\text{HON-meat } \text{NOM} \text{ eat-POT-NPST} \quad \text{HON-meat } \text{NOM} \text{ eat-POT-NEG-NPST} \\
&\text{“I can eat meat.”} \quad \text{“I can not eat meat.”}
\end{align*}
\]

Locative expressions with particle *ni* also stay intact under negation (constructed examples, particles and verb forms cross checked in the Kotonoha corpus):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(167)} \quad &\text{a. } \text{byooin } \text{ni} \text{ ik-u} \quad \text{b. } \text{byooin } \text{ni} \text{ ik-a-na-i} \\
&\text{hospital } \text{to } \text{go-NPST} \quad \text{hospital } \text{to } \text{go-INFL-NEG-NPST} \\
&\text{“I go to the hospital”} \quad \text{“I do not go to the hospital.”}
\end{align*}
\]

Particle *de* can express such as instrument, degree, reason, manner, locative, et cetera (Kuno, 1986, pp.259-260). Example (168), from the Kotonoha corpus, shows a sentence with particle *de* marking an instrument:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(168)} \quad &\text{a. } \text{migite } \text{de} \text{ tabe-mas-u} \\
&\text{right-hand } \text{INS} \text{ eat-POL-NPST} \\
&\text{“(I) eat with (my) right hand.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{b. } \text{indozin } \text{mo} \text{ zenin } \text{ga } \text{te} \text{ de } \text{tabe-te i-mas-en} \\
&\text{indian.people } \text{PART} \text{ everybody } \text{NOM} \text{ hand } \text{INS} \text{ eat-GER AUX-POL-NEG} \\
&\text{“Not all Indian people are eating with their hands.”}
\end{align*}
\]

8.4. Reinforcing negation

Reinforcing negation in Japanese is done by lexical means. This is done by the addition of adverbs such as *hontou ni* “really, truly”, *ikkou ni* “not at all, not a bit”, *nekkara* “absolutely not”, *zenzen* “not at all” (this is not an exhaustive list). Out of these, *ikkou ni* is the only one that exclusively appears with negation, while the other can reinforce both negative and affirmative.

The reinforcing elements precede the word they modify, and the modified words can be of virtually any part of speech (a statement reinforced by searches in the Kotonoha corpus).

Example (169) shows the adverb *hontouni* with the adjective *oisii* “tasty”, a. in affirmative and b. in the corresponding negative (from the Kotonoha corpus):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(169)} \quad &\text{a. } \text{hontou ni} \text{ oisi-i } \text{des-u} \\
&\text{truth } \text{PART} \text{ tasty-NPST COP-NPST} \\
&\text{“(It is) truly tasty.”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{b. } \text{hontou ni} \text{ oisi-ku-na-i } \text{des-u} \\
&\text{truth } \text{PART} \text{ tasty-NEG-NPST COP-NPST} \\
&\text{“(It is) really not good.”}
\end{align*}
\]
Example (170) shows the adverb *zenzen* with the negation of the verb *siru* “to know” (from the *Kotonoha* corpus):

(170) *zenzen sir-a-na-katta na*
    not.at.all know-NFL-NEG-PST EMPH
    “I did not know at all. / I had no idea.”

Another construction used is *tondemonai*, which can be used as a strong one word reply with the meaning “absolutely not!, not at all!, impossible!, no way!...”. AOTS (eds., 2002, p.96 mentions the use of *tondemonai* as a reply when being praised, as in example (171) (constructed example following AOTS [eds., 2002, p.96]). It can also modify nouns and then gets the meaning “unthinkable, unexpected, outrageous…”, as in (172) from the *Kotonoha* corpus.

(171) A: *totemo kawaii-ne!*
    very pretty-NPST EMPH
    “You are very pretty!”

    B: *tondemonai!*
    “Not at all!”

(172) *tondemonai kingaku*
    outrageous amount.of.money
    “An outrageous amount of money”

### 8.5. Other aspects of negation

#### 8.5.1. Introduction

It is obvious that there are numerous subjects that can be treated in this final section. It could be anything that yet has not been covered in the above sections. However, it is not possible to dig deep into all various types of subjects that could fit in here, so a choice had to be made what to describe here. The choice fell on two special multiple negation construction: debitive and modal-like construction containing multiple negators. They are interesting because of their forms, multiple negative constructions signaling non-negative meanings, and because of the complexity that they show. Furthermore, these constructions are important parts of every day discourse and it is therefore justifiable to discuss them here.

#### 8.5.2. Special multiple negation construction

##### 8.5.2.1. Debitive

To express obligation in Japanese, two negated items are often used. Hinds (1986, p.315) calls this form *debitive*. There are different ways of expressing obligation, and they will be briefly presented here:

The most common way is to form an “if-then” sentence (Hinds, 1986, p.315). The negative “if” clause is expressed by a negative verb with either the conditional particle *to* to create a natural condition (Kim, 2010, p.84), or the *negative participle* (term from Hinds, 1986) form of the verb (*nakereba*) followed by the “then” clause. In the negative “then” clause, the *negative auxiliaries* (term from Alpatov, 2001) *ikenai, naranai* “must (not)”, and the word *dame* “no good” are most commonly used. An example of this construction is given in (173):
Looking a bit more in detail, the first way to describe obligation is with a negative participial verb plus the particle wa and a prohibitive verb (Hinds, 1986). First, a volitionary verb is negated with the standard negator -na-. What follows is the adjectival gerund -kute. This unit is thereafter topicalized with the topic marker wa, resulting in V-na-kute-wa, which can be translated as “unless, without” (Martin (1975) uses the term highlighted for gerund plus wa). Finally, the negative prohibitive verbs ikenai or naranai is added resulting in V-na-kute-wa ike-na-i, with the literary meaning “cannot do without doing V”, or, “must not not V”. The word dame “no good” can also be used instead of the verb. An interesting point is that the prohibitive verbs are negated by standard negation, but the construction as a whole is special and does therefore not fall inside of SN.

The second way is to use a conditional construction. This construction is similar to the above one. The difference is that, the particle to is used to describe a natural condition (Kim, 2010, p.84). The verb is once again negated with -na-, but gets plain non-past tense -i, and the conditional particle to follows and finally the prohibitive verbs ikenai or naranai, or dame follows: V-na-i to nara-na-i. This construction gets the meaning “if you don’t do X, it will result in something non-profitable”.

The third way also involves a condition but with another construction. Here the negative provisional form (term from Martin, 1975) -nakere-ba inflects on the negative stem of the verb to form an adjectival conditional (Hinds, 1986). Just as with the above constructions, ikenai, naranai or dame can once again follow.

In the -nakutewa ikenai and the -nakereba naranai constructions, nakutewa and nakereba are interchangeable (Fujio Düring, 1998). Hinds (p.315) also points out that the “then” clause is often omitted when it can be understood by implication. Kim (2010, p.84) also points out that the three forms of the “if” clause and the three elements of the “then” clause can be freely interchangeable resulting in nine combinations:

\[(174) \text{ nakutewa ikenai/naranai/dame} \]
\[\text{ nakereba ikenai/naranai/dame} \]
\[\text{ nai to ikenai/naranai/dame} \]

In spoken language, naku-te-wa is often abbreviated to nakutya (Banno et al., 1999a, p.233), and nakere-ba to nakya (Hinds, 1986, p.315).

Important to point out is that these constructions do not imply that it is the listener that has to do something (2\textsuperscript{nd}-person imperative); this is not an imperative construction. Neither does it involve any coercion. To make someone do something, the causative or causative/passive construction is used. The construction showed here simply implies that the speaker notices that something has to be done and is addressed to 1\textsuperscript{st}-person singular or plural.

The above debitive constructions also contain different degrees of obligation. The degree depends on the directness of the “if” clause (Alfonso, 1966, p.822ff, cited in Hinds, 1986, p.317):

\begin{center}
\textbf{LEAST DIRECT}
\begin{itemize}
  \item nai to [ikemasen]
  \item nakereba [ikemasen]
  \item nakute wa [ikemasen]
\end{itemize}
\textbf{MOST DIRECT}
\end{center}
8.5.2.2. Modal-like elements and multiple negators

Another multiple negation construction is one which includes sentences with modal-like elements (term from Hinds, 1986). These elements are the nominal hazu “obligation”, wake “reason”, and koto “fact” (Hinds, 1986, p.104). When double negations appear, the result is affirmative, as Hinds (1986, p.104) shows with the following examples: nai hazu wa nai “There is no expectation that it not exist” with the equivalent affirmative aru hazu da “It ought to exist”.

This is in line with Martin (1975, pp.368-369), who points out that “Multiple negatives cancel each other out.” An odd number leaves the sentence negative while an even number turns it into affirmative. Double negatives are made by negating the nominalization of the negative (Martin, 1975, p.369). Martin also gives an example of a multiple negation construction (ibid., p.370):

(121) Naku wa nai koto wa nai zya nai
   (lit.) “It isn’t that it isn’t that it ISN’T that there isn’t any.” =
   “There really ARE some.”

In connection with this example, Martin points out that these constructions seldom occur. However, sentences with two negators are common (a statement based on searches in the Kotonoha corpus), as shown in example (176) from the Kotonoha corpus:

(122) deki-na-i koto wa na-i
   be.able.to-NEG-NPST thing TOP NEG-NPST
   “There is no such thing as not making it = I/you/[...] can make it.”

Hayashi (1960) (cited in Martin, 1975, p.386) recognizes that in Japanese, it is common to express an affirmative by negating a contrary. This grammatical phenomenon is found in other languages as well and is traditionally called litotes. Examples of this are the very common sukuriku-nai “not few” = “quite a lot”, and mezurasiku-nai “not rare” = “fairly common”. These are examples of a single negative, yielding a negative meaning. When yet another negator appears the contrary is negated and gives the sentence an affirmative meaning. Examples of this is (from the Kotonoha corpus) otokorasiku naku nai “not non-manly” = “not womanly” = “manly”, or mezurasiku naku wa nai “it isn’t that it isn’t rare” = “not very common” (Martin, 1975, p.370). Martin points out that the first word, e.g. sukuriku, is not a negative but an adjective infinitive, and thus the sentence only contains two negatives which yield an affirmative reading. This can be explained by the etymological status of -nai attached to these adjectives (see section 3.3.3. above).

Important to point out is that, as noted above, these multiple negators negate the nominalization of the negative and are thus cases of constituent negation.

Regardless of probability of sentences such as (175) to appear in natural discourse in Japanese, some constructions are common. This simply shows that multiple negations in Japanese are, to some extent, in use.

9. Concluding remarks

This thesis has investigated various negation strategies and phenomena in the Japanese language. It was shown that standard negation in plain form is expressed with a suffix, -na-, directly attached to a verb stem. Expressing negation with a suffix is typologically one of the most common constructions.
Tense is also expressed by suffixes: -i for non-past and -katta for past tense. However, conjugation patterns depend on what type of verb is being negated; ru-verbs show regular patterns while u-verbs involve a morphophonological change to the stem.

Level of politeness plays a crucial part in the Japanese language, and these verb forms show patterns different from the plain form verbs. Negation is expressed by suffix -en succeeding the polite marker -mas- inflected on the verb stem. Past tense is expressed with a copula.

The two types of adjectives were thoroughly described. i-adjectives conjugate similarly to plain form verbs in negative. The negator -na- is the same, and inflects on the stem of the adjective. There is a stem change; the adverbial -ku- appears between the root and the negator. Tense marking shows the same pattern as for plain form verbs.

na-adjectives are negated with a negative copula construction zyu na-, showing a behavior similar to constituent negation.

Nouns are negated the same way as na-adjectives. However, there is another way to negated nouns; with an existential negation with verbs aru for animate entities and iru for animate.

Other aspects such as negation of non-verbal predicates and indefinite pronouns were investigated to some extent. Furthermore, new light was shed on Japanese negative imperatives. A re-analysis on an already existing description of negative imperatives was presented, and another conclusion was put forth. The negative imperative in Japanese is expressed by a negative imperative form that differs from the corresponding affirmative. The negator is the same for imperatives and indicative declaratives. This pattern is uncommon in the language sample in the authors’ survey.

Many other aspects were treated, and after examining the Japanese negation phenomena and their typology, this thesis cover enough subjects to contribute to the already existing literature on the matter.
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Appendix
QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR DESCRIBING THE NEGATION SYSTEM OF A (URALIC) LANGUAGE

General remarks and instructions
- This questionnaire explicates the different aspects of negation that should be covered in the chapters. There is a separate set of instructions for formatting the manuscripts (style sheet).
- The questionnaire starts from function and asks what the formal constructions expressing these functions are in each language.
- We wish to leave you some freedom as to choosing which topics in the questionnaire you would like to treat at more length than others. In any case, please try to treat all the topics in the questionnaire at sufficient length so as to give your readers a good understanding of the topic in your language. Remember also the maximum length of papers given in the style sheet. Section 4.5 contains some additional topics that you can more freely choose to include or leave out.
- Please number the sections in your chapter according to the numbering in the questionnaire.
- Note that some topics can be described under several subsections. Please do not repeat example sentences, but insert them where they serve best as illustrations. Pay attention to cross-referencing, and check the cross-references to other sections and examples carefully before final submission.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. The language

Give some basic information on the language: Where is it spoken? How many speakers? Current status in terms of politics/culture/ethnic identity? Endangered? What is its position within the Uralic language family, i.e. how is it related to other Uralic languages? Main dialectal divisions? Main typological characteristics (especially those that differ from other Uralic languages)?

This section should be very brief, maximally 500 words.

Constructions expressing negation (Sections 2–3)

Describe all the different constructions used to express negation in the language, paying attention to:
- Negative marker(s) (see Dahl 1979, Payne 1985, Dryer 2005, 2011a,b):
  - type: particle, clitic, affix, verb, noun, ...
  - position: pre-verbal, postverbal, clause-initial, clause-final...
Structural differences between positives vs. negatives (see Miestamo 2005a: 51ff, 2005bc, 2007)

- Are negative markers simply added to a corresponding positive, or does the structure of the clause differ from the affirmative in other ways, too? (constructional asymmetry) Describe the structural differences.
- Are the same grammatical categories available in the negative as well, or are some distinctions made in the affirmative lost in the negative? (paradigmatic asymmetry) Describe the differences in the paradigms available in the negative vs. affirmative.

What are the more specific functions of these negative constructions – which environments are they used in, i.e. what do they negate?
- Note specifically which categories/environments use the same negative construction.

Languages often have different negative constructions for negation in different environments (clausal negation, different clause types, constituent negation, negative indefinites etc.). In Sections 2 and 3 the different negative constructions should be described, clausal negation in Section 2 and non-clausal negation in section 3. The subsections deal with different clause types and environments, in which negation may show dedicated constructions, different from the negation of other clause types / environments.

In the description of each negative construction, please take into account the points discussed above (negative markers, structural (a)symmetry, functions). Please also give illustrative examples (both the negative and its non-negative counterpart whenever possible).

2. Clausal negation

2.1. Standard negation

Standard negation refers to the (basic) way(s) a language has for negating declarative verbal main clauses (see especially Payne 1985, Miestamo 2005a). E.g., in Finnish, standard negation is expressed by a construction in which the negative auxiliary *e*- appears as the finite element of the sentence, carrying the verbal person-number markers, and the lexical verb is in a non-finite form (uninflected present connegative in the present and past participle in the past tense) (example 1).

(1) Finnish (constructed examples)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Koira  haukku-u</th>
<th>b. Koira ei  hauku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dog  bark-3SG</td>
<td>dog  NEG.3SG bark.CNG.PRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The dog is barking.'</td>
<td>'The dog is not barking.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Koira  haukku-i</td>
<td>d. Koira ei  haukku-nut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog  bark-PST.3SG</td>
<td>dog  NEG.3SG bark-PST.PTCP.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The dog barked.'</td>
<td>'The dog did not bark.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can all grammatical categories be expressed in the negative or are some categories lost in negation? (paradigmatic asymmetry)

In case of negative verb constructions, pay special attention to which categories are marked on the auxiliary and which ones on the lexical verb (cf. Miestamo 2005a: 87).

Languages may have different standard negation constructions, e.g., in different TAM categories, in different person/number/gender categories etc. For example in Komi, the present and the past use negative verb constructions with a different stem of the negative verb (2a-d), and the perfect and the pluperfect use a completely different construction with a negative particle (2e-h).

(2) Komi-Zyrian (Rédei 1978: 105–109)

a. šet-ə b. o-z šet
give-3SG.PRES NEG-3 give
'(s)he gives.' '(s)he does not give.'

c. šet-i-s d. e-z šet
give-PRET-3SG NEG.PRET-3 give
'(s)he gave.' '(s)he did not give.'

e. šet-əm-a f. abu šet-əm-a
give-PERF-3SG NEG give-PERF-3SG
'(s)he has given.' '(s)he has not given.'

f. abu šet-əm-a
viši

h. abu šet-əm-a viši
give-PERF-3SG be.PRET.3SG NEG give-PERF-3SG be.PRET.3SG
'(s)he had given.' '(s)he had not given.'

Describe all the different constructions used in different standard negation environments (declarative verbal main clauses).

Languages may have clausal negation constructions differing from standard negation in different clause types. There may be a dedicated negative construction for imperatives, non-verbal clauses, etc. Sections 2.2-2.5 should describe negation in each of these clause types. In case a clause type does not have a dedicated negative construction, it should be briefly noted which negative construction, already described, is used to negate it (perhaps giving an illustrative example if needed and if space permits). If there are several negative constructions used for different clause types, you may show in the form of a table which negative constructions go with which clause types.

2.2. Negation in non-declaratives

Do imperatives have a dedicated negative construction different from standard negation (or show special behaviour with respect to standard negation in some way at least)? Describe the dedicated construction (special behaviour) according to the instruction given above (neg-markers, (a)symmetry, functions)
and give examples. You may also characterize negative imperatives in terms of the typological classification proposed by van der Auwera and Lejeune (2005).

What about other non-declaratives (questions, (other) non-declarative mood categories)? If there are any special constructions, describe them here, too.

2.3. Negation in non-verbal clauses

Non-verbal clauses can be divided into different types as follows (Payne 1997: 111ff):

- equation, e.g., *She is my mother.*
- proper inclusion, e.g., *Kurumaku is a hunter.*
- attribution, e.g., *She is intelligent.*
- locative predication, e.g., *The cat is on the mat.*
- existential predication, e.g., *There are wild cats. There are wild cats in Africa.*
- possessive predication, e.g., *Tom has a car.*

How are these clause types negated? Do any of these clause types have a dedicated negative construction different from standard negation or from the other non-verbal clause types (or show special behaviour with respect to standard negation or the other non-verbal clause types in some way at least)? Describe the dedicated construction (special behaviour) according to the instruction given above (neg-markers, (a)symmetry, functions) and give examples.

2.4. Negation in dependent/subordinate clauses

How is negation in dependent/subordinate clauses expressed – standard negation or dedicated constructions? Describe the constructions according to the above instructions. Pay attention to both finite and non-finite dependent clauses. Can non-finite clauses be negated?

In Finnish, for example, finite subordinate clauses are negated by standard negation but non-finite dependent clauses cannot be negated at all (3).

(3) Finnish (constructed examples)

a. *Näin että hän tule-e*  
   see.PST.1SG that 3SG come-3SG  
   ‘I saw that (s)he’s coming.’

b. *Näin että hän ei tule*  
   see.PST.1SG that 3SG NEG.3SG come.CNG.PRES  
   ‘I saw that (s)he’s not coming.’

c. *Näin hän-e n tule-va-n*  
   see.PST.1SG 3SG-GEN come-PTCP.PRES-GEN  
   ‘I saw her/him come.’
2.5. Other clausal negation constructions

If there are other clausal negation constructions, not covered in sections 2.1-2.4, section 2.5. can be added to discuss them.

3. Non-clausal negation

This section deals with constructions/elements expressing negation other than clausal negation.

3.1. Negative replies

How are negative replies to polar questions expressed? Are there one-word negative replies like English no? Relate them to the corresponding affirmative replies.

What is the semantics of negative replies – does it disagree with the content or the polarity of the question?

Is the dog barking? – No!
Isn’t the dog barking – No!

Do both of these replies mean that the dog is not barking or does the latter mean that the dog is barking? You may also comment on (the semantics of) affirmative replies to negative questions here or in Section 4.5.

3.2. Negative indefinites and quantifiers

Describe the negation of indefinite pronouns and adverbs in the language, e.g. nobody, no-one, nowhere, never, none, no; anybody, anyone, anywhere, ever, one, any.

- How are these related to indefinites in non-negatives? What is the range of use of these indefinites in non-negative contexts (e.g., English nobody is negative only but anybody has non-negative uses as well); these functions
can be described in terms of the semantic map proposed by Haspelmath (1997).

- How are they used in clauses: Are they used together with clausal negation or not (English *I saw nobody* vs. *I didn’t see anybody*)? (cf. Haspelmath 2005). In order to find sample sentences and typologically interesting patterns of combining negators, the literature on negative concord can be consulted as well (e.g., Giannakidou 2002; Zeijlstra 2004).
- In case the language does not have indefinites or cannot use them in negatives, how are the equivalent meanings expressed, e.g., ‘I didn’t see anybody’, ‘Nobody came’, ‘The dog never barked’, ‘You didn’t go anywhere.’?
- Note that this subsection is related to negative polarity which is also a topic in Section 4 below. Try to find a balance between what is treated here and what in Section 4.

3.3. Abessive/caritive/privative negation

How are the meanings ‘without’, ‘-less’, or ‘un-’ expressed, e.g., *without a book, bookless, unread, unreadable.*

- Do verbs and nouns behave similarly or do they have different markers?
- Are the markers adpositions, inflectional case markers, or derivation; if it is a primarily nominal marker, how does it combine with verbs?
- If the language has several of these, what is their division of labour, i.e. which functions does each marker express and what is its distribution?
- NB! If these markers are used in clausal negation constructions, these functions should be described in section 2.
- There is a more detailed questionnaire on abessive/caritive negation by Anne Tamm on the website for those who wish to focus a bit more closely on these issues, see http://negationworkshop.pbworks.com/w/file/39844169/Abessive.pdf>.

3.4. Other negative constructions/expressions

Describe and illustrate any other negative constructions/expressions that are not covered above.

4. Other aspects of negation

This section pays attention to various morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic phenomena that are not negative constructions/expressions themselves, but arise in connection with negation.

Please address the topics in sections 4.1-4.4 at least briefly. Section 4.5 is titled other phenomena and these are things that each author can choose to include or leave out depending on their existence in the language, availability of data etc.
Note that some of the topics overlap with each other or with points raised in Sections 2-3. Please give careful thought to how to relate the topics in different sections to each other so that the same thing is not repeated but that the readers can easily see the connections.

4.1. The scope of negation

How is the scope of negation narrowed to a specific constituent (e.g., Foc Neg-Verb vs. Neg-Foc Verb)? What is the role of intonation and stress in coding the scope of negation? Prosodic prominence may be indicated by underlining as in (5).

(5) Estonian (constructed examples)
   a. Keegi p-ole kohal.  
      someone NEG-be.CNG present
      ‘There is someone who is not present (one person is missing).’
   b. Keegi p-ole kohal.  
      someone NEG-be.CNG present
      ‘Nobody is present.’
   c. Mitte keegi p-ole kohal.  
      NEG someone NEG-be.CNG present
      ‘Nobody is present.’

Scope-related questions more generally? Note that examples discussed under different topics of the questionnaire may be discussed here in terms of their scope properties.

4.2. Negative polarity

List negative polarity items, their form/meaning/use (licencing conditions). Note that this overlaps to some extent with section 3.2.

4.3. Case marking under negation

Is case marking affected under negation (e.g., partitive/genitive objects or subjects)? Any other effects negation might have on the marking of NPs? Note that this question could also be subsumed under negative polarity, but is treated separately here.

4.4. Reinforcing negation

Describe and illustrate the items used for reinforcing negation (e.g., Estonian mitte in 6). To the extent that these are elements forming separate negative constructions/expressions, they can also be treated or at least mentioned in Sections 2 or 3.
4.5. Negation and complex clauses

How is the coordination of positive+negative or two negatives expressed? Are there special negative coordinators, such as *neither, nor*?

What about subordination? Are there negative conjunctions, such as *lest*? Note that this is related to section 2.4.

To the extent that the negative coordinators and conjunctions are elements forming separate negative constructions/expressions, they can also be treated or at least mentioned in Sections 2 or 3.

4.5. Other aspects of negation

The authors are given more freedom as to whether they want to include the points in this section in their chapters.

Negative questions are treated in 2.2, but more can be said about their Function/use here (expecting positive or negative answer or neutral?) How are they replied to?

Negative transport (neg-raising) means that a higher-clause negative is interpreted as negating a lower-clause predicate, e.g. *I don't think they're coming meaning I think they're not coming* (see Horn 1978, 1989). Does neg-transport occur? Which predicates allow it and which ones do not?

Metalinguistic negation: this means that what is negated is not the content of the proposition but rather the way it is expressed – “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.” (Horn 1989: 363)

- Some examples of metalinguistic negation (from Horn 1989):
  - *He doesn't have three children, he has four.*
  - *Around here we don’t like coffee – we love it.*
  - *He didn’t call the [pólis], he called the [polís]*
  - *Phydeaux didn’t shit the rug, he soiled the carpet.*

- Metalinguistic negation may lead to different behaviour of negative polarity items:
  - *John didn’t manage to solve {some/*any} problems – they were quite easy for him to do.* (Horn 1985: 130)
How does the language treat metalinguistic negation. Does it show special behaviour different from ordinary (“descriptive”) negation?

According to the instructions in the beginning of this questionnaire, the description of each negative construction should pay attention to whether some grammatical categories are lost in the negative. Here, you can still come back to the question what is negatable in the language? Can, e.g., quantifiers be negated – which ones can and which ones cannot? What about clauses with indefinite subjects?

Are there any interesting non-negative uses of negative constructions or constructions resembling negative constructions in the language?

Any other phenomena that should be taken into account in describing the system of negation in your language but that has not been covered above?
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