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1. Introduction
(1) Our claims
a. The Japanese NPI –sika is licensed by head-movement at LF.
b. Previous analyses of crosslinguistic differences in NPI licensing based on A/A’-distinction (Lee 1993; Kim 1995, among others) cannot be extended to the analysis of –sika.
c. Not all head movement is PF-movement (cf. Chomsky 2000; Boeckx and Stjepanovic 2001).

(2) Two differences between English NPIs versus Korean/Japanese NPIs
a. [Difference 1: Long-distance Licensing]
   - Long-distance licensing of NPIs is possible in English ((3)).
   - Korean/Japanese NPIs require a clause-mate Neg (Choe 1988; (4), (5)).

b. [Difference 2: Subject NPIs]
   - English does not allow subject NPIs. ((6)a)
   - Korean/Japanese do allow subject NPIs. ((6)b/c)

(3) a. Mary did not meet anyone.
   b. Mary did not believe that John bought anything.

(4) a. Mary-ka amuto ani manna-essta ‘Mary did not meet anybody.’ [Korean]  

(5) a. Mary-wa nanimo tabe nakat-ta. ‘Mary did not eat anything.’ [Japanese]
   b. *Mary-wa [John-ga nanimo tabe-ta to] iwa-nakat-ta. ‘Mary did not say that John ate anything.’

(6) a. *Anyone did not meet Mary.
   b. Amuto Mary-lul ani mennessta. ‘Anybody did not meet Mary.’ [Korean]  
   c. Daremo Mary-o mi-nakat-ta. ‘Anybody did not see Mary.’ [Japanese]

(7) Differences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English NPIs</th>
<th>Korean/Japanese NPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Long-distance licensing</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subject</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Previous Analyses
(8) Two analyses based on A/A’ distinction
(9) Lee’s (1993) analysis (See Aoyagi and Ishii 1994; Nishioka 1994, for a similar analysis.)
   a. NPIs covertly move to [Spec, NegP].
   b. [Spec, NegP] is an A’-position in English, an A-position in Korean.

(10) NPI movement in Korean
   a. NPI movement within a clause generates an A-A chain. → legitimate
   b. NPI movement across a clause generates an A-A’-A chain, because it moves through an intermediate [Spec, CP]. → illegitimate (improper movement: Chomsky 1973; May 1979)

(11) NPI movement in Korean
   a. NPI movement within a clause generates an A-A chain.
   b. NPI movement across a clause generates an A-A’-A chain, because it moves through an intermediate [Spec, CP].

(12) NPI movement in English
   a. NPI movement within a clause generates an A-A chain.
   b. NPI movement across a clause generates an A-A’-A chain.

(13) Summary of Lee (1993)
   a. NPIs covertly move to [Spec, NegP].
   b. LD NPI licensing in Korean and subject NPIs in English are both excluded as improper chains.
(23) **Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. LD- licensing</th>
<th>2. Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean/Japanese</td>
<td>no (RM violation)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(24) *Kim’s (1995) analysis*

a. Unlike in English, NegP is not projected in Korean: Neg is adjoined to V₀. ((25))

b. English NPIs move to [Spec, NegP]; Korean NPIs to [Spec, AgrP]

c. [Spec, NegP] is an A’-position; the stipulation in (22a) is unnecessary.

(25) \[ CP [\text{AgrP} [TP [\text{AgroP} [VP Subject [V \text{ Object} [V₀ \text{ neg(an) } + \text{Verb} ]]]]]]] \]

(26) **NPI movement to [Spec, AgrP] in Korean**

a. Clause-mate NPI movement generates an A-A chain. \( \rightarrow \) legitimate

b. Long-distance NPI movement generates an A-A chain, but skips a potential landing site ([Spec, VP]). \( \rightarrow \) illegitimate (Relativized Minimality: Rizzi 1990)

c. Clause-mate subject NPI movement also generates an A-A chain. \( \rightarrow \) legitimate

d. English examples are explained in the same way as Lee (1993).

(27)a.  

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{IP Mary-ka} \quad \text{[AgroP amukesto1 [AgroO [VP t_{subj} t_{1} ani+manna_{v}]]]} \quad \text{–essta]}
\end{array} \]

\( = (4a) \)

b.  

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{*Mary-ka} \quad \text{[AgroP amukesto1 [VP t_{subj} t_{1} ani+manna_{v}]]} \quad \text{–essta]}
\end{array} \]

\( = (4a) \)

c.  

\[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{[AgrP Amuto1 [IP [AgroP [VP t_{1} Mary-lul t_{v}]] ani+menn_{v},-essta]]}
\end{array} \]

\( = (6b) \)

(28) **Summary of Kim (1995)**

a. Neg projects NegP in English, but not in Korean.

b. NPIs are licensed in [Spec, NegP] in English, and [Spec, AgrP] in Korean.

c. Long-distance NPI licensing in Korean is excluded by Relativized Minimality. Subject NPIs in English are excluded as improper chains.

(29) **Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. LD- licensing</th>
<th>2. Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean/Japanese</td>
<td>no (RM violation)</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **The head-movement analysis of the Japanese NPI –sika**

(30) **Our analysis**

a. Although the above analyses can be tenable for Korean NPIs and Japanese nanimo ‘anything’ ((5), (6)c), they cannot be extended to the analysis of the Japanese NPI –sika.

b. –Sika is licensed by covert head movement to Neg.

---

1 Watanabe (2004) claims that items such as nanimo ‘anything’ and daremo ‘anyone’ are Negative Concord Item (NCIs) rather than NPIs. However, -sika behaves differently from nanimo in some of his diagnostics for NCIs (e.g. nanimo can be used as an ‘independent answer’ unlike –sika, as in (i)). We keep treating –sika as an NPI here.

(i) A: John-wa nani-o tabe-mashi-ta ka?  
John-Top what-Acc eat-polite-past Q  
‘What did John eat?’  
B: Nanimo./ Anything Apples-sika  
‘Nothing.’ ‘Only apples.’
The NPI -sika

a. -Sika is licensed by negation and interpreted as 'not … except,' ‘only.’

b. -Sika behaves in the same way as other Korean/Japanese NPIs with respect to Differences 1, 2.

1. LD-licensing impossible ((32)b); 2. Subject possible ((32)c)

(32)a. Mary-wa ringo-sika tabe-nakat-ta. [Japanese]
Mary-Top apple-sika eat-not-past
'Mary ate only apples.' (= lit. 'Mary didn’t eat except for apples.')

Mary-Top John-Nom apple-sika eat-past C think-not-past
'Mary did not think that John ate only apples.'

c. Mary-sika ringo-o tabe-nakat-ta. 'Only Mary ate apples.'
Mary-sika apple-Acc eat-not-past

(33) Three observations

a. -Sika can attach to adjuncts. (Matsui 2003) ((34))

b. -Sika can attach to heads, as well as phrases. ((36))

c. -Sika is ambiguously interpreted in double negation. ((39))

Mary-wa yakkuri-sika ringo-o tabe-nakat-ta. 'Mary ate apples only slowly.'
Mary-Top slowly-sika apple-Acc eat-not-past

Problem 1

a. If the adjunct-sika phrase were licensed in an A-position ([Spec, NegP] in Lee 1993; [Spec, AgrP] in Kim 1995), it should form an improper chain consisting of Λ-Λ' (explicable given a ban on "comp" to non-"comp" movement in Chomsky 1973).

b. The acceptability of (34) is unpredicted under these analyses.

(36)a. [context: John hates the vegetable juice. Juice is normally what you drink, but…] John-wa sono juusu-o name-sika si-nakat-ta.
John-Top the juice-Acc lick-sika do-not-past
'John only licked the juice./All John did was to lick the juice.'

b. [context: John has a terrible cold. He should take a proper care of himself, but…] John-wa nodoame-o name-sika si-nakat-ta.
John-Top cough-drop-Acc lick-sika do-not-past
'John only licked cough drops./All John did was to lick cough drops.'

(37)a. In (36)a, the scope of –sika is only the V-head.
It only means ‘John only licked the juice (as opposed to drink the juice).’

b. In (36)b, the scope of –sika is the entire VP.
The implication is ‘John didn’t do any activities other than to lick cough drops (as opposed to see the doctor, etc.).’

c. The contrast shows that –sika is ambiguous between V- or VP-attachment depending on the context.

Problem 2

Under previous analyses, it would be hard to account for how a head can move to a Spec position.

(39) Mary-wa ringo-sika tabe-naku-nakat-ta.
Mary-Top apple-sika eat-not-not-past

a. [[Mary-Top apple-sika eat-not] not-past]
'It is not the case that Mary only ate apples. (=ate something else, too.)'

b. [Mary-Top apple-sika [eat-not] not-past]
'Mary did not eat (= avoided eating) only apples. (=ate everything other than apples.)'
(40)a. In (39)a, -sika is associated with the first Neg.
b. In (39)b, -sika is associated with the second Neg.

(41)**Problem 3** (Problem for Kim 1995)
a. The ambiguity is well-accommodated if NPIs are associated with a Neg-related position (e.g. [Spec, Neg]; Neg head). It reflects which Neg the NPI is associated with.
b. The ambiguity is hard to account for if NPIs uniformly occupy [Spec, Agr]P.

(42)**The covert head-movement analysis** ((43))
a. -Sika is base-generated adjoined to a head/phrase.
b. It undergoes covert head-movement to the Neg head.

(43)\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP Mary-wa} \\
\text{Mary-Top}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{VP ringo-t}\text{tabe}\text{ nakat-sika}_1\text{ ta}
\end{array}
\]

(44)**On Difference 1: Why LD-licensing is impossible**
a. (32)b is excluded because the C head is blocked and the movement violates Phase Impenetrability Condition.\(^2\) ((45)a)
b. English NPI movement (= phrasal movement) can use [Spec, CP] as an escape hatch to the next phase. ((45)b)

(45)a. *\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP Mary-wa} \\
\text{Mary-Top}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{VP ringo-t}\text{tabe-ta}\text{ nakat-sika}_1\text{ ta}
\end{array}
\]
\]
\[\text{John-ga} \text{ ringo-t} \text{wata}s\text{ are} \text{ nakat-sika} \text{ past}\]
\[\text{John-Nom} \text{ apple eat past}\text{ think not-sika past}\]
b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP Mary did} \\
\text{Mary Top}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Neg} \\
\text{VP believe}\text{ t'} \text{ [CP t' That [IP John bought t]]]}\text{ past}\]
\]

(46)**Necessary assumptions**
a. -Sika holds a head (affixal) status even when attached to an XP.
b. Therefore, -sika cannot use [Spec, CP] as an escape hatch.
c. Excorporation of –sika is prohibited.
(It cannot adjoin to another head of XP and then move out.)

(47)**A consequence**
a. Only CP is a phase in Japanese. (cf. Simpson and Wu 2002)
b. vP is not a phase in Japanese; v heads such as passives do not block the sika-movement. ((48))

(48)\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP Ringo-Nom} \\
\text{Apple-Nom}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{VP John-ni-sika}\text{ t} \text{ wata}s\text{ are}\text{ nakat}\text{ past}\text{ not past}\n\end{array}
\]
\[\text{Apple-Nom} \text{ John-to-sika hand passive not past}\]
\[\text{‘Apples were handed only to John.’}\]

(49)**On Difference 2: Why subject NPIs are possible**
a. Given VP-internal subject hypothesis, -sika can be attached to [Spec, VP] and move out of VP to Neg head ((50)). This movement does not violate the PIC.
b. The subject (which –sika attaches to) does not need to be licensed in [Spec, NegP] (hence, no improper movement, unlike English *anyone*).

(50)\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP Mary} \\
\text{Mary Top}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NegP} \\
\text{VP ringo-t}\text{tabe}\text{ nakat-sika}_1\text{ ta}
\end{array}
\]
\[\text{Mary subj-t}\text{ apple-Acc eat not-sika past}\]

\[\text{We follow Roberts (1994) and Takahashi (2002), and assume that the Head Movement Constraint does not always hold.}\]
Summary

a. -sika is licensed by covert head movement rather than phrasal movement.
b. Differences 1, 2 are explained as the parameter of head vs. phrasal movement of NPIs.

Differences

1. LD- licensing  2. Subject
   English yes no (improper chain)³
   Korean/Japanese no (PIC violation) yes

4. Conclusion

a. We proposed an analysis where the NPI –sika is licensed by LF head-movement onto Neg.
b. The impossibility of LD licensing of –sika is explained by the PIC.
c. Not all head-movement is PF-movement.
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3 Aoyagi and Ishii (1994) and Kato (2000) argue that the NPIs nanimo ‘anything’ and daremo ‘anyone’ are actually adjuncts, based on the fact that they can co-occur with a ‘real’ argument, as in (i).

(a) Gakusei-ga daremo kuruma-o kaw-anakat-ta. ‘Any students didn’t buy a car.’
   Students-Nom anyone car-Acc buy-not-past

If an apparent subject NPI in (6)c is not a subject, we do not need to assume that it moves to [Spec, AgrsP], and Lee’s (1993) A/A’-chain analysis might become superfluous (for the analysis of nanimo). However, -sika-phrases in the subject position is a real subject (it is incompatible with another subject as in (ii)), and the choice of the analysis of subject nanimo/daremo does not affect our analysis here.

(b) *John-sika Mary-ga ringo-o tabe-nakat-ta. ‘Only John is such that Mary ate apples (?)’
   John-sika Mary-Nom apple-Acc eat-not-past