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A. MIYAGAWA 2001, IN PRESS


Negation and "All"

(1) Taroo-ga  
zen’in-o  
home-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
Taro-Nom  
all-Acc  
praise-Neg-Past (Expl/Comp think)
'(I think that) Taro didn't praise all (!).'
not >> all, (*all >> not

(2) Zen’in-ga  
sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
all-Nom  
that test-Acc take-Neg-Past
'All did not take that test.'
*not >> all, all >> not

(3) For negation to take scope over "all" (not >> all), negation c-commands "all" (cf. Klima 1964).

(4)=(1)

(5)=(2)
(6) Crucial minimal pair

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S & O & V \\
\text{a. } \text{Zen'in-ga} & \text{sono tesuto-o} & \text{uke-nakat-ta} \ (\text{yo/ to omou}) \\
\text{all-Nom} & \text{that} & \text{take-Neg-Past} \\
\end{array}
\]

'All did not take that test.'

*not >> all, all >> not

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
O & S & V \\
b. \text{Sono tesuto-}\text{o}_{1} & \text{zen'in-ga} & \text{t}_{1} \text{ uke-nakat-ta} \ (\text{yo/ to omou}) \\
\text{that test-}\text{Acc}_{1} & \text{all-Nom} & \text{t}_{1} \text{ take-Neg-Past} \\
\end{array}
\]

'All didn't take that test.'

not >> all, (all >> not)

For some people, this distinction is clearer with non-perfect tense

(7) a. \text{Zen'in-ga} \text{sono tesuto-o} \text{ uke-na-i} \ (\text{yo/ to omou})

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
all-Nom & \text{that test-}\text{Acc} & \text{take-Neg-Nonpast} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Students all will not take that test.'

*not >> all, all >> not

b. \text{Sono tesuto-}\text{o}_{1} \text{ zen'in-ga} \text{ t}_{1} \text{ uke-naka-i} \ (\text{yo/ to omou})

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{that test-}\text{Acc}_{1} & \text{all-Nom} & \text{t}_{1} \text{ take-Neg-Nonpast} \\
\end{array}
\]

'That test, students all won't take.'

not >> all, (all >> not)

(8)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{TP} \\
\text{OBJ} & \text{T'} \\
\text{vP} & \text{T} \\
\text{SUB} & \text{v'} \\
\text{VP} & \text{V-v'-Neg-T} \\
\text{t_{obj}} & \text{t_{v}} \\
\end{array}
\]

(9) EPP and Scrambling

\text{A-scrambling is triggered by the EPP feature on T.}
"the other" derivation for (6)b (all >> not); subject undergoes EPP movement, object then undergoes A'scrambling.

1.1. Disambiguating (6)b

"TP" and "VP" Adverbs: "high" (TP) adverb can force a "Spec, TP" reading of subject

TP adverb "fortunately" to the right of subject

(11) Sono tesuto-ozen'in-ga saiwaini t_i uke-nakat-ta (yo/ toomou) that test-Acc all-Nom fortunately t_i take-Neg-Past

'That test, all didn't take fortunately.'

*not >> all, all >> not

VP manner adverb "quickly"

(12) Sono tesuto-ozen'in-ga isoide t_i uke-nakat-ta (yo/ to omou) that test-Acc all-Nom quickly t_i take-Neg-Past

'That test, all didn't take quickly.'

not >> all, all >> not

Idiom Chunk

(13) Idiom chunk forces A-scrambling (Miyagawa 1997)

idiom: kosi-o orosu

hip-Acc lower

'sit down'

Kosi-ozen'in-ga t_i orosa-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)

hip-Acc all-Nom t_i lower-Neg-Past

Lit: 'Hip, everyone didn't lower = Everyone didn't sit down.'

not >> all, (*) all >> not

1.2. An adjunct cannot meet the EPP requirement
(14) Hanako-tozen'in-ga tₜ odora-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
   Hanako-with all-Nom tₜ dance-Neg-Past
   'With Hanako, all didn't dance.'


(15) "A"-ozen'in-ga [CP sensei-ga tₜ dasu to]
    "A"-Acc all-Nom [CP teacher-ga tₜ give Comp]
    omowa-nakat-ta (yo)
    think-Neg-Past
    "'A', all did not think that the teacher will give.'
    *not >> all, all >> not

Finnish (Holmberg and Nikanne, to appear)
(16)a. S V O
    Graham Greene on kirjoittanut tämän kirjan.
    Graham Greene has written this book

    b. O V S
    Tämän kirjan on kirjoittanut Graham Greene.
    this book has written Graham Greene

2. EVIDENCE FOR VERB RAISING (Miyagawa 2001, in press)

In the emphatic construction, the verb stem is separated from the tense marker by a particle such as sae 'even', mo 'even' or wa 'EMPHTIC' (cf. Kuroda 1965). There is also "do" support.

(17) Taroo-ga sensei-o seme-mo sita.
    Taro-Nom teacher-Acc blame-even did
    'Taro even blamed the teacher.'

(18)a. Emphatic construction
    Sensei-ozen'in-ga tₜ seme-mo si-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
    teacher-Acc all-Nom tₜ blame-even do-Neg-Past
    'The teacher, all did not even blame.'
    *not >> all, all >> not

    b. "Normal" construction
    Sensei-ozen'in-ga tₜ seme-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
    teacher-Acc all-Nom tₜ blame-Neg-Past
    'The teacher, all didn't blame.'
    not >> all, all >> not
3. V RAISING AND EPP SCRAMBLING IN KOREAN (Lee 2000)

Rigidity in scope interaction among quantifiers in Korean
(19) Nwukwunka-ka manhun saram-ul pipanhayssta.
someone-Nom many people-Acc criticized
‘Someone criticized many people.’
some > many, *many > some

Ambiguity in short-form negation construction (cf. Sohn (1995))
(20)a. Nwukwunka-ka manhun paywu-lul ani cohahayassta.
someone-Nom many actors-Acc NEGlike-PST-DC
‘Someone did not like many actors.’

b. Manhun paywu-lul ı nwukwunka-ka tı ani cohahayassta.
many actors-Acc someone-Nom tı NEG like-PST-DC
some > many, many > some

No ambiguity in long-form negation construction (cf. Sohn (1995))
someone-Nom many actors-Acc like NEG do-PST-DC
‘Someone did not like many actors.’
some > many. Plus specific non-quantificational interpretation of ‘many actors’

b. Manhun paywu-lul ı nwukwunka-ka cohahayci tı ani hayassta.
many actors-Acc someone-Nom like tı NEG do-PST-DC
some > many, *many > some

(22) Long-distance scrambled quantifier obligatorily reconstructs (Tada 1993).

PROBLEMS WITH MIYAGAWA 2001

A. Assumes that A-movement does not reconstruct

(23) Zen’in-ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta (yo/ to omou)
all-Nom that test-Acc take-Neg-Past
‘All did not take that test.’
*not >> all, all >> not

B. Finite versus subjunctive

(24) Zen’in-ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta (yo/ to omou) (finite)
all-Nom that test-Acc take-Neg-Past
‘All did not take that test.’
*not >> all, all >> not

(25) Zen’in-ga sono tesuto-o uke-nakat-ta koto (subjunctive)
all-Nom that test-Acc take-Neg-Past fact
‘the fact that all did not take that test.’
not >> all, all >> not
(Same for relative clause)

B. Argument versus subjunctive

(26) Hanako-to i zen’in-ga t i odora-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
    Hanako-with all-Nom t dance-Neg-Past (this judgment has been challenged)
    'With Hanako, all didn't dance.'
    *not > all, all > not

(27) Kinoo zen’in-ga Hanako-to odora-nakat-ta (yo/to omou)
    yesterday all-Nom Hanako-with dance-Neg-Past
    'Yesterday, all didn't dance with Hanako.'
    Jun Abe, p.c., Yamashita 2001: (?!)not > all possible
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