日本語の疑問と否定の範囲：文処理の一つの問題

大江，三郎

https://doi.org/10.15017/2556513

出版情報：文學研究. 78, pp.1-27, 1981-02-28. 九州大学文学部
バージョン：
権利関係：

The Scope of Question and Negation in Japanese: A Problem in Sentence Processing

Saburo OHYE

1. Introduction

There are some apparent mysteries in the scope of question and negation in Japanese. This paper aims at clarifying these mysteries by presenting some hypotheses on processing or comprehending Japanese interrogative and negative sentences rather than by proposing what seem to be constraints in grammar, as was done by Kuno (1980_1, 1980_2), though of course I must emphasize that my investigation owes very much to those pilot studies of Kuno's. I actually borrow many of the examples Kuno uses in his papers though I not infrequently disagree with him as to their acceptability status and introduce crucial modifications into his observations of them.

2. Formation of Question and Negation in Japanese

In Japanese the particle *ka* is said to be added sentence-finally to form questions. But this particle is much less used than is generally believed, because it is so neutral that, if it is used in non-polite speech, it suggests that the speaker or the questioner is higher than the hearer or the questionee in social status and often gives an abrupt and impolite color to the sentence ending in it. On the other hand, the interrogative particle *kai*, which expresses a rather familiar feeling on the part of the speaker, conveys the friendliness between the speaker and the hearer and seems to be much more used than *ka* in informal speech. Compare for example a and b of (1).

(1) a. omae (wa) kono hon o yon-da-ka?
you this book read-Past-Q
Did you read this book?
b. kimi (wa) kono hon o yon-da-kai?
you

Both *omae* and *kimi* are second-person pronominal forms (usually for male persons) but the use of the former clearly shows that the speaker is in a position to regard his hearer as quite inferior or that he regards the speech interaction between him and his hearer as an extremely informal one. But this does not of course mean that *ka* and *kai* are compatible only with *omae* and *kimi*, respectively.

The Japanese negative morpheme is *na-i,* which is also attached to the verb at the end of a sentence. Consider the following sentences :

(2) zyon wa mada ko-na-i.
John yet come-Neg-Pres
John has not yet come.

(3) boku wa yuube paatii ni ik-a-na-katta.
I last night party to go-Affix-Neg-Past
I didn't go to the party last night.

For both question and negation, a distinction can be made between two types, that is, propositional and non-propositional types. The sentences in (1) are examples of non-propositional questions and (2) and (3) are non-propositional negative sentences. (4) is the propositional counterpart of (1b), the nominalizing particle *no* before *ka(i)* being the mark of a propositional question.

(4) kimi (wa) kono hon o yon-da no ka(i)?

In (4) the whole proposition *kimi ga kono hon o yon-da* "You read this book" is nominalized and placed in the scope of the Q-element *kai.* The content of the proposition is, pragmatically speaking, the content of the speaker's expectation and its truth or falsity is being questioned. Within the proposition under the scope of the question, any one of the three elements can of course receive emphatic stress and become its focus. A propositional question very often ends in the nominalizer *no* with the final Q-element *ka (i)* left out. Thus, (4') means the same thing as (4).

(4') kimi (wa) kono hon o yon-da no?

The propositional negative sentences corresponding to (3) are given in (5).

(5) a. boku wa yuube paatii ni it-ta no de wa na-i.
I last night party to go-Past be Neg-Pres
(literally) It is not that I went to the party last night.

b. boku wa yuube paatii ni ik-i wa si-na-katta.
I last night party to go-Affix do-Neg-Past
(literally) I didn't do going to the party last night.

In (5a), *no* nominalizes the proposition which precedes it and a form of the copula *de* needs to be inserted for the nominalized proposition to be negated by *na-i.* In (5b), the *i* of *iki* is the nominalizing affix and *si*, a form of *suru* "do" needs to be inserted to bear the negative element. In both sentences, *boku ga yuube paatii ni it-ta* "I went to the party last night" is (thought by the speaker to be) the content of the hearer's expectation and is being denied by the Neg-element. As in propositional questions, some element, such as *paatii ni,* that is under the scope of the Neg-element can be stressed and become the focus of the negation.

We have seen in the above that the Q- and Neg-elements are attached to sentence-final verbs in non-propositional questions and negative sentences. According to Kuno, however, these elements are attached to not only verbs but also adjectives or *X-da* (*da* being the copula) at sentence-final position. Thus we can use non-propositional negative sentences like (6) and (7).

(6) sono ie wa ooki-ku-na-i.
the house large-Affix-Neg-Pres
The house is not large.

(7) kono atari wa sizuka de-na-i.
this area quietness be-Neg-Pres
This area is not quiet.

But (8) and (9), though meeting the above conditions, sound rather strange unless there is some expectation on the part of the speaker that is due to the preceding discourse.

(8) ?sono ie wa tiisa-ku-na-i.
the house small-Affix-Neg-Pres
The house is not small.

(9) a. ?kare wa genki de-na-i.
he health be-Neg-Pres
He is not well.

b. ?kare wa byooki de-na-i.
he sickness be-Neg-Pres
He is not sick.

We could say, though not unconditionally, that the Neg-element is not attached freely to an adjective of negative polarity such as *tiisa-i* "small". Not only (6) and (7), but also the awkward sentences of (8) and (9) can be changed into acceptable sentences of propositional negation with *wa* inserted before *na-i.* *De wa* is very often reduced to *zya* in colloquial

speech. Thus, a and b of (10) are propositional negative sentences that correspond to (9b).

(10) a. kare wa byooki de wa na-i.
b. kare wa byooki zya na-i.

As for non-propositional questions, no such qualification is necessary for them and all the sentences of (11) are quite acceptable.

(11) a. sono ie wa ooki-i ka(i)?
Is the house large?
b. sono ie wa tiisa-i-ka(i)?
Is the house small?
c. kono atari wa sizuka-ka(i)?
Is this area quiet?
d. kare wa genki-ka(i)?
Is he well?
e. kare wa byooki-ka(i)?
Is he sick?

Propositional questions corresponding to (11) are given in (12). The Q-morpheme *ka(i)* may be left out in them.

(12) a. sono ie wa ooki-i no ka(i)?
b. sono ie wa tiisa-i no ka(i)?
c. kono atari wa sizuka-na no ka(i)?
d. kare wa genki-na no ka(i)?
e. kare wa byooki-na no ka(i)?

Only the nominalizer *no* is inserted between an adjective like *ooki-i* and the Q-morpheme, while in X-*da* cases, *na*, one form of *da*, must appear before *no* as seen in c, d, and e above.

Because of the above-mentioned complications connected with the formation of non-propositional negative sentences, I shall in what follows avoid treating cases in which the Q- or the Neg-element is attached to an adjective or an X-*da* form and concentrate on those questions or negative sentences which contain verbs.

3. The Scope of the Q- and the Neg-Elements

As is seen from the above discussions, the linkage of the Q- or the Neg-element with the verb, which is characteristically sentence-final, is very close and close enough to be called agglutination. This characteristic of the question and negation of Japanese clearly has something to do with apparent irregularities as found in examples like the following.

(13) and (14) are quite acceptable as examples of non-propositional interrogative and negative sentences, respectively, but (15) and (16), though seemingly parallel to (13) and (14), are obviously unacceptable.

(13) kinoo kimi wa Tokyo ni it-ta-kai?
yesterday you to go-Past-Q
Did you go to Tokyo yesterday?

(14) kinoo boku wa Tokyo ni (wa) ik-a-na-katta.
yesterday I to go-Affix-Neg-Past
I didn't go to Tokyo yesterday.

(15) *kimi wa {(a) Tokyo de/(b) 1960nen ni} umare-ta-kai?
you {(a) Tokyo in/(b) 1960year in} be-born-Past-Q
Were you born {(a) in Tokyo/(b) in 1960} ?

(16) *boku wa {(a)Tokyo de wa/(b) 1960nen ni wa} umare-na-katta.
I {(a) Tokyo in/(b)1960year in} be-born-Neg-Past
I was not born {(a) in Tokyo/(b)in 1960} .

(17) and (18) are propositional counterparts of (15) and (16), respectively, and are of course quite acceptable.

(17) kimi wa {(a) Tokyo de/(b) 1960nen ni} umare-ta-no (kai)?

(18) boku wa {(a) Tokyo de/(b) 1960nen ni} umare-ta no de wa na-i.

The *no de wa* of a propositional negative sentence is colloquially often reduced to *n zya*. Thus (18a) often appears as *boku wa Tokyo de umare-ta n zya na-i* in informal speech.

(19) and (20), though superficially very similar to (15) and (16), are quite acceptable sentences.

(19) kimi wa 1960nen ni wa moo umare-te i-ta-kai?
already be-born be-Past-Q
Were you already born in 1960?

(20) boku wa 1960nen ni wa mada umare-te i-na-katta.
yet be-born be-Neg-Past
I was not yet born in 1960.

As Kuno (1980$_1$, pp. 25—26) correctly points out, in (19) and (20) *1960nen ni* (*wa*) is a theme or a known item and carries less important information than *umare-te i-ta,* while on the other hand, in (15) and (16) *1960nen ni* is informationally more important than *umare-ta* because this is quite a known item seeing that the hearer is standing alive just in front of the speaker. It is obviously absurd to question or negate a known item. This in fact applies to English as well as to Japanese, though the limitation in the formation of questions and negative sentences in

Japanese as suggested by (15) and (16) is not shared by English, which lacks the characteristic of Japanese mentioned at the beginning of this section. This is easily seen by comparing possible negative answers to the English questions that correspond to (17b) and (19), which are similar in superficial form. (21) and (22) show these exchanges.

(21) A : Were you born in 1960?
B : (a) No. I was not born in 1960.
(b) *No. I was not born.
(c) No, I wasn't.
(d) No. Not in 1960, but in 1962.

(22) A : Were you already born in 1960?
M : (a) No. I was not born yet in 1960.
(b) (b) No. I was not born yet
(c) No, I wasn't
(d) *No. Not in 1960, but in 1962.

It is obvious that what Kuno (1980_2, §2) calls the Pecking Order of Deletion Principle is in operation here.

We can now set up a Hypothesis concerning the scope of non-propositional questions and negative sentences in Japanese.

Hypothesis A The scope of *ka(i)* and *na-i*, which are the Q-and Neg-elements in Japanese, is so limited that it in principle does not extend beyond the element to which they are attached.

Notice, however, that I have put a qualifying phrase "in principle" in the above hypothesis because I suspect that in (13) and (14), examples of non-propositional question and negtion, for instance, not only the sentence-final verb but also the preceding NP (plus case-particle) *Tokyo ni* is in the scope of question and negataion. If this is true, and I believe it is, Hypothesis A should be modified to rather fulfill a filtering function, as is done by Hypothesis B, which follows.

Hypothesis B Neither *ka(i)* nor *na-i* should be attached to an element that is obviously outside the scope of Q or Neg, or that is not the focus of Q or Neg.

Next we must note the possibility of the rather mysterious *wa* occurring in (14). Of course (14) conveys different things depending upon the use or non-use of *wa*. Without *wa*, it indicates *Tokyo ni ik-u* "to go to Tokyo" as an indivisible unit, and suggests that the speaker's going to Tokyo is considered as an established fact as when it is in his regular

habit. No such thing is to be inferred from the sentence with *wa*. The function of *wa* in negative sentences like (14) is, I think, to mark the focus of the negation *besides* the verb that *na-i* is attached to. Between *wa* of this kind and the usual thematic *wa* , a distinction should of course be made. The *sono hon wa* of (23), said in answer to (1b), is a theme though followed by a negative verb.

(23) iya. sono hon wa yom-a-na-katta.
No. that book read-Affix-Neg-Past
No. I didn't read that book.

Theme-marking *wa* and negation-focus-marking *wa* are, however, lexically one and the same and must have something in common. I wish to argue that the basic function of the particle *wa* is to bound the NP it is attached to or, in some sense, separate it from the other part of the sentence. To mark off a theme is of course to separate a thematic NP from the rest of the sentence. To mark off a negation-focus is to separate a particular NP from the rest of the sentence outside the verb and place it within the scope of negation.

Now consider sentences (24), which have been made by putting another NP term *Hanako to* "with Hanako" before the *Tokyo ni* of (14), and sentences (25), which have been formed by further inserting the NP term *kuruma de* "by car" before the two NP terms of (24).

(24) a. ?kinoo boku wa Hanako to Tokyo ni ik-a-na-katta.
b. kinoo boku wa Hanako to Tokyo ni wa ik-a-na-katta.
I didn't go to Tokyo with Hanako yesterday.

(25) a. ??kinoo boku wa kuruma de Hanako to Tokyo ni ik-a-na-katta.
b. ? kinoo boku wa kuruma de Hanako to Tokyo ni wa ik-a-na-katta.
I didn't go to Tokyo with Hanako by car yesterday.

(24a) may be improved by putting a pause after *Hanako to* and by saying *Tokyo ni ik(-u)* "go to Tokyo" with an intonation that indicates it as forming a tight unit. In (24b), *wa* marks *Tokyo ni* as the focus of the negation and even seems to attract the preceding NP term *Hanako to* and bring it into the scope. (25a) is quite an awkward sentence whereas (25b) may be made an acceptable sentence by introducing a pause after *kuruma de* and thereby bringing not only *Tokyo ni* but *Hanako to* within the scope of the negation as in (24b). If emphatic stress is placed on the negative-scope marker *wa* of (24b), *Hanako to* will be excluded from the

scope of the negation. Notice, incidentally, that the "placement of emphatic stress on the scope-marker *wa* of (24b)" mentioned here means that any of the three parts, *Tokyo, ni,* and *wa*, of the whole NP term, not only *wa,* may be stressed. Hereafter, the expression "emphatic stress on *wa*" should be interpreted this way unless otherwise specified. The same effect will ensue if *Tokyo ni wa,* with emphatic stress on *wa* or *ni* (not on *Tokyo*), is made to precede *Hanako to.* In (26), where negation-focus marking *wa*, which is emphatically stressed, is attached to *Hanako to,* not to *Tokyo ni,* the former NP term alone falls within the scope of negation.

(26) kinoo boku wa Hanako to wa Tokyo ni ik-a-na-katta.

This is taken to roughly mean "I went to Tokyo yesterday, but I didn't go there with Hanako."

(27) is a sentence in which the order between *Hanako to* and *Tokyo ni* of (24) is reversed and in this, *wa* may or may not be emphatically stressed but *Tokyo ni* is always excluded from the scope of the negation.

(27) kinoo boku wa Tokyo ni Hanako to wa ik-a-na-katta.

This difference between the two NP terms seems to be due to the fact that their order is "normal" in (24b), whereas it is not in (27).

Let us now turn to questions of non-propositional type with a multiple NP term that correspond to the negative sentences observed above.

(28) a. kinoo kimi wa Hanako to Tokyo ni it-ta-kai?
b. kinoo kimi wa Tokyo ni Hanako to it-ta-kai?
Did you go to Tokyo with Hanako yesterday?

(29) Kinoo kimi wa kuruma de Hanako to Tokyo ni it-ta-kai?
Did you go to Tokyo with Hanako by car yesterday?

In (28a), where word order is normal, both of the two NP terms are question-foci. The same can be said of (29) in which three NP's are arranged in normal order; they are all within the scope of the question. Emphatic stress on any one of the NP's marks it off as a question-focus in these sentences. In (28b), where word order is less normal, either *Tokyo* or *Hanako* always receives emphatic stress thereby falling under the scope of the question.

From the above observations the following hypothesis concerning negation and question of non-propositional type could be advanced:

Hypothesis C (1) The scope of the Neg-element *na-i* is usually so narrow as not to include anything else than the element it is attached to. A NP term is not within

the scope of Neg unless it is marked by non-thematic *wa* or is perceived as forming a tight unit with the element within its scope. Scope-marking *wa* must receive emphatic stress when the NP it is affixed to is segregated from the element within the Neg-scope or immediately precedes it in non-normal order.

(2) The scope of the Q-element includes not only the element it is attached to but also the NP term(s) preceding it in normal order. A single NP term which, being marked off from other NP terms, falls within Q-scope must receive emphatic stress whether in normal order or non-normal order[1].

It should be obvious that Hypotheses B and C are based on the idea that the scope of (non-propositional) question and negation in Japanese is a matter of processing the surface structures of sentences. The difference between my Hypotheses B and C and Kuno's Principles on the same problem (Kuno 1980_2), which follow, is now quite clear.

The Scope of the Interrogative Particle: The scope of the interrogative particle in Japanese does not extend beyond the verb, adjective, or 'x da/desu' that immediately precedes it except when the sentence has a morphologically marked focus (namely, a wh-word) elsewhere.

The Scope of the Negative Morpheme: Only the verbal that immediately precedes the negative morpheme in Japanese falls under the scope of negation except when there is a quantifier in the sentence.

Since I admit that some NP terms can fall within negation-scope, quantifiers in negative sentences are no longer "exceptions," as he says in the above. I will give a counterargument on the scope of *wh*-questions in §5.[2] Thus I must say that Kuno's principles are different from mine in crucial details, but at the same time I wish to point out that they can be reinterpreted as principles on the processing or comprehension of the surface structures just like mine though it is quite obvious that he intends them to be some kinds of constraints in grammar.

4. Further Observations

It seems that there are some counterexamples to the observations given above. Consider, for example, (30) and (31).

(30) kyoo wa kuruma de ki-ta-kai?
today car by come-Past-Q
Did you come by car today?

(31) kyoo wa kuruma de (wa) ko-na-katta.
today car by come-Neg-Past
I didn't come by car today.

These seem to be examples contradicting Hypothesis B, because the hearer of (30) and the speaker of (31) are each of them in the place of conversation and the fact that "he has come" cannot be questioned or denied. But *kuru* "come", though implying that the moving person is at the goal as the result of his motion, primarily expresses the motion to the goal itself particularly when it is preceded by an expression of the means of the motion such as *kuruma de* "by car". *Kuruma de kuru,* therefore, tends to be perceived as forming a tight unit. The Q- or Neg-element, though superficially attached directly to the verb, has this whole thing within its scope.

The non-propositional questions of (32), just like those of (28), are quite possible.

(32) a. kimi wa Pari de koosui o kat-ta-kai?
you Paris in perfume buy-Past-Q
Did you buy perfume in Paris?

b. kimi wa koosui o Pari de kat-ta-kai?

The non-propositional negative sentences of (33)-(35), on the other hand, seem to exhibit some peculiarities.

(33) a. boku wa pari de koosui wa kaw-a-na-katta.
I didn't buy perfume in Paris.

b. boku wa koosui o Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.

(34) a. boku wa Pari de wa koosui o kaw-a-na-katta.

b. boku wa koosui wa Pari de kaw-a-na-katta.

(35) a. boku wa Pari de wa koosui wa kaw-a-na-katta.

b. boku wa koosui wa Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.

In (33), *wa* is focus-marking and may or may not receive emphatic stress. If the *Pari de wa* of (34a) and the *koosui wa* of (34b) do not have emphatic stress, they are themes and the whole sentences become a little awkward because it is a little difficult to interpret *koosui o* and *Pari de* as falling within Neg-scope in them, but if the NP-*wa*'s receive emphatic stress, they become negation-foci. In each or the sentences of (35), either one of the two NP terms *Pari de wa* and *koosui wa* can be a theme

if *wa* is unstressed, and the other one, with emphatic stress on *wa*, is a negation-focus irrespective of which precedes which. The relative complexity in the use of *wa* in the sentences of (33)-(35) seems to be due to the fact that both of the NP terms *koosui o* and *Pari de*, unlike, say, the NP terms of (24), can be thematized. But this complexity is by no means limited to these sentences. Compare the (36) sentences, each of which has a double theme, with the sentences of (35) and (24).

(36) a. kinoo boku wa Hanako to wa Tokyo ni wa ik-a-na-katta.
b. kinoo boku wa Tokyo ni wa Hanako to wa ik-a-na-katta.

A NP-*to* and a NP-*ni*, like a NP-*o* and a NP-*de*, can be thematized.

Now it is interesting to compare the sentences of (33)-(35) with those of (37). Let us assume for simplicity's sake that in (37) *kono koosui* "this perfume" is a known item and can become a theme and that *Pari de* alone is emphasized as a negation-focus though the reverse can of course occur.

(37) a. boku wa kono koosui wa Pari de kaw-a-na-katta.
b. boku wa kono koosui wa Pari de wá(a) kaw-a-na-katta.
[Emphatic stress on *wa* is optional]
c. boku wa Pári de kono koosui wa kaw-a-na-katta
d. boku wa Pari de wá kono koosui o kaw-a-na-katta.
e. boku wa Pari de wá kono koosui wa kaw-a-na-katta.

The sentences of (37) apparently go against Hypothesis B, since "this perfume" is at the hand of the speaker at the moment of utterance and it is quite plausible to assume that "it was bought." In (33)-(35), on the other hand, the verb *ka* (*-u*) "buy" can unquestionably be a negation-focus; hence the acceptability of these sentences. It seems that what is conveyed by (37) should be conveyed by a pseudo-cleft sentence such as (38a) or the propositional negative sentences (38b) and (38c).

(38) a. boku ga kono koosui o kat-ta no wa Pári de wa na-i.
I this perfume buy-Past that Paris be Neg
The place where I bought this perfume is not Paris.
It was not in Paris that I bought this perfume.
b. boku wa kono koosui o Pári de kat-ta no de wa na-i.
c. boku wa kono koosui o Pári de ka-i wa si-na-katta.

This, however, does not indicate that (37) provides counterexamples to Hypothesis B because the perfume in question, even though it is present at the hand of the speaker, was not necessarily bought, but may only have been given to him as a present.

Now, if *kono koosui* in (37) is replaced by *kono tokei* "this watch", only the sentences corresponding to b and e are acceptable, the others becoming more or less awkward. These acceptable sentences are shown as b and e of (37').

(37') b. boku wa kono tokei wa Pari de wá(a) kaw-a-na-katta.
e. boku wa Pari de wá kono tokei wa kaw-a-na-katta.
I didn't buy this watch in Paris.

This slight difference, which may be subject to idiolectal differences, might be explained as follows. Perfume is one of the typical articles to be bought in Paris and it is quite natural to say of perfume that it was or was not among the articles bought in Paris. Nothing like this can be said of a watch. The (37') sentences are only for rejecting Paris as the place where the watch was bought. In other words, the link between *Pari de* and *ka* (*-u*) in (37) is, for pragmatic reasons, tighter than that in (37') and is tight enough to make it easier to bring *Pari de* (*wa*) into the Neg-scope than in (37'). But a dramatic change comes in if *kono koosui o ka* (*-u*) "buy this perfume" in (37) is replaced by *kono syasin o tor-u* "take this picture." The five sentences of (39) correspond to those of (37).

(39) a. *boku wa kono syasin wa Pari de tor-a-na-katta.
b. ?boku wa kono syasin wa Pari de wá(a) tor-a-na-katta.
c. *boku wa Pári de kono syasin wa tor-a-na-katta.
d. ?boku wa Pari de wá kono syasin o tor-a-na-katta.
e. ?boku wa Pari de wá kono syasin wa tor-a-na-katta.
I didn't take this picture in Paris.

These sentences are quite unacceptable or at best marginal because, according to Hypothesis B, the Neg-element cannot be attached to the sentence-final verb in them. In other words, as was not the case with (37) or (37'), it is impossible to include their verb *tor*(*-u*) "take (a picture)" within the scope of negation because there is no real picture that nobody has ever taken.

Now let us turn to non-propositional questions that correspond to the non-propositional negative sentences observed above.

(40) a. kimi wa Pari de koosui o kat-ta-kai?
Did you buy perfume in Paris?
b. kimi wa Pari de tokei o kat-ta-kai?
Did you buy a watch in Paris?
c. kimi wa Pari de syasin o tot-ta-kai?

Did you take pictures in Paris?

(41) *kimi wa Pári de kono koosui o kat-ta-kai?

(42) *kimi wa Pári de kono tokei o kat-ta-kai?

(43) *kimi wa Pári de kono syasin o tot-ta-kai?

Of course, (41)-(43) can be reformed into acceptable sentences by inserting *no* before *kai*. It is important to note that (41) and (42), as well as (43), are unacceptable, though (37) and (37'), negative sentences corresponding to these, are acceptable. In both the questions (41) and (42), and the negative sentences (37) and (37'), the NP term *Pari de* is informationally more important than the verb *ka* (*-u*), though the verb is by no means unimportant, and this difference in importance seems to be more significant in the questions than in the negative sentences. This may be explained at least partly by the fact that the NP negation-focus is, by means of *wa*, more clearly marked than the NP question-focus and is, therefore, better suited to be perceived as carrying information of greater value than the verb. This will become clear from comparison of (1) and (2) of Hypothesis C. (For an explanation of the need of *wa* marking a NP negation-focus, see Note 1.)

Question-and-answer exchanges throw valuable light on the scope problems we are now faced with. Consider first the dialogue (44), in which answers are all in the negative.

(44) A : kimi wa Hanako to Tokyo ni it-ta-kai?
Did you go to Tokyo with Hanako?

B : (i) iya. Hanako to Tokyo ni wa ik-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't go to Tokyo with Hanako.

(ii) iya. Hanako to wa ik-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't go there with Hánako.

(iii) iya. Tokyo ni wa ik-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't go to Tókyo with her.

(iv) iya. ik-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't.

As an answer to A's question, B(i) may have the whole VP "go to Tokyo with Hanako" within the scope of negation, but it is rather awkward compared with the shortest answer B(iv). B(ii) and B(iii) have only *Hanako to* and *Tokyo ni* as the foci, respectively, and if they had been meant to include both of the NP terms within negation-scope, they would have been very awkward because then the two NP terms would have been equally important as information items. Kuno's Pecking Order of

Deletion Principle is in operation again.

(45) exemplifies an impossible dialogue, as will be clear from the discussions given in §3.

(45) A : kimi wa Tokyo de umare-ta no kai? [Non-propositional type is impossible.]
Were you born in Tokyo?
B : (i) *iya. Tokyo de wa umare-na-katta.
No. I was not born in Tokyo.
(ii) *iya. umare-na-katta.
*No. I was not born.

As I already said, *umare-ta* "(I) was born" is quite unimportant as an information item, hence the impossibility of forming questions or negative sentences of non-propositional type.

Now what of the exchanges given in (46)-(49)?

(46) A : kimi wa Pari de koosui o kat-ta-kai?
Did you buy perfume in Paris?
B : (i) iya. Pari de koosui wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't buy any perfume in Paris.
(ii) iya. Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. Not in Paris.
(iii) iya. koosui wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't buy any perfume (there).
(iv) iya. kaw-a-na-katta.
No, I didn't

(47) A : kimi wa kono koosui o Pári de kat-ta no kai? [Non-propositional type is impossible.]
Did you buy this perfume in Paris?
B : (i) iya. kono koosui (wa) Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't buy this perfume in Paris.
(ii) iya. Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. Not in Paris.
(iii) iya. kaw-a-na-katta.
No, I didn't.

(48) A : kimi wa kono tokei o Pári de kat-ta no kai?
[Non-propositional type is impossible.]
Did you buy this watch in Paris?
B : (i) iya. kono tokei (wa) Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't buy this watch in Paris.

(ii) iya. Pari de wa kaw-a-na-katta.
No. Not in Paris.
(iii) *iya. kaw-a-na-katta.
No, I didn't.

(49) A : kimi wa kono syasin o Pári de tot-ta no kai?
[Non-propositional type is impossible.]
Did you take this picture in Paris?
B : (i)? iya. kono syasin (wa) pari de wa tor-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't take this picture in Paris.
(ii)? iya. Pari de wa tor-a-na-katta.
No. Not in Paris.
(iii) *iya. tor-a-na-katta.
No, I didn't.

There is no problem in the dialogue of (46). The degree of acceptability of the B answers in (47)-(49) are easily to be expected from the degree of acceptability of the sentences in (37), (37'), and (39). It is particularly interesting to note the difference between (47) and (48), on the one hand, and the difference between (48) and (49), on the other. In the B answers of (47)-(49), the most important NP terms is *Pari de.* However, "making a purchase in Paris" (*Pari de ka*(*-u*)) forms a tight unit in connection with perfume, while it is not concerning a watch. It is, therefore, quite enough just to say "kaw-a-na-katta" to recover the NP term *Pari de* in (47) B (iii), but the mere utterance of "kaw-a-na-katta" in (48) B (iii) is not sufficient as the condition for recovering the deleted NP term that indicate the place where the purchase of the watch took place. While there is no necessary linkage between *tokei* "a watch" and *ka* (*-u*) "buy", *syasin* (NP) *o tor* (*-u*) (verb) "take a picture" forms such a tight unit that it can almost be called an idiomatic phrase. Thus in (49), where the negative form of *tor-u* appears though the presence of the photograph in question is quite known, not only is B (iii) quite unacceptable but also B(ii) and B(i) are, at best, marginal.

The B answers in (50) correspond to (31).

(50) A : (i) kyoo wa kuruma de ki-ta-kai?
(ii) kyoo wa kuruma de ki-ta no kai?
Did you come by car today?
B : (i) : iya. kuruma de wa ko-na-katta.
No. I didn't come by car.
(ii) *iya. ko-na-katta.

No, I didn't.

It is rather strange that in this case the short negative answer of non-propositional type B(ii) is impossible, whereas the non-propositional question A(i) is quite normal. This is, I suppose, due to the fact that *ko-na-katta,* without an expression of the means of motion such as *kuruma de* "by car", *zitensya de* "by bicycle", and *aruite* "on foot", in B (ii) tends to deny the presence of the speaker at the place of conversation that results from his motion. This is of course self-contradictory. See also what I have said about (30) and (31) at the beginning of this section. Incidentally, the same can be said of negative sentences containing *ik* (*-u*) "go". Compare (51) with (50).

(51) A : kyoo wa {kuruma de/zitensya de/ aruite} it-ta (no) kai?
Did you go {by car/ by bicycle/ on foot} ?

B : (i) iya. {kuruma de/ zitensya de/ aruite} wa ik-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't go by car, etc. today.

(ii) *iya. ik-a-na-katta.
No. I didn't.

The simple *ik-a-na-katta* in B(ii) suggests denial of the speaker's leaving home, which is of course a presupposed thing. In B(i), however, some manner of "motion from the source" is negated. In other words, the *ko-na-katta* and *ik-a-na-katta,* used in B(ii) of (50) and (51), respectively, are so "independent" that it is practically impossible for us to think of a deleted expression of the means of motion to be recovered.

What has been observed in this section suggests that our Hypotheses B and C operate well when combined with Kuno's Pecking Order of Deletion Principle and pragmatic factors such as men's shared belief. I suspect, however, that Kuno's Pecking-Order Principle, which tells us to "delete less important information first and more important information last," though apparently intended as a constraint in discourse grammar, can be reduced to a principle on sentence or discourse processing plus some pragmatic principles on the degree of importance of information from contexts, linguistic and non-linguistic, and on its processing.

5. Some Residual Problems

The addition of polite expressions to verbs seems to make acceptable nonpropositional questions that would otherwise have been unacceptable. (52), and (53), in which the polite expression *mas-i-*ta is preceded by the

honorific *o-umare-ni-nar-i*, sound quite normal, though their non-polite congener (15), repeated here as (54), is unacceptable. The Q-element that must be used after a polite expression is of course the neutral *ka*, not the friendly *kai*.

(52) kimi wa Tokyo de umare-mas-i-ta-ka?

(53) sensei wa Tokyo de o-umare-ni-nar-i-mas-i-ta-ka?
Professor X, were you born in Tokyo?

(54) *kimi wa Tokyo de umare-ta-kai?

Compare also (55) and (56) with (57) (= (41)).

(55) kimi wa kono koosui o Pari de ka-i-mas-i-ta-ka?

(56) sensei wa kono koosui o Pari de o-ka-i-ni-nar-i-mas-i-ta-ka?
Professor X, did you buy this perfume in Paris?

(57) *kimi wa kono koosui o Pari de kat-ta-kai?

The use of a polite expression clearly marks the point of view of the speaker or his "regard for the hearer" and brings the whole proposition it is attached to within its scope. As I already said in §2, a propositional question asks about a proposition expected by the speaker. Thus in each of (52), (53), (55), and (56), the Q-element *ka* is attached to the whole proposition thus marked, just as it is after the nominalizer *no*, and makes the whole question a propositional one.[3] Honorifics are, however, not exclusively used about the hearer and do not share this function with polite expressions.

Things are quite different in negation. Consider (58) and (59).

(58) *Yamada sensei wa Tokyo de (wa) o-umare-ni-nar-a-na-katta.
Yamada Professor Tokyo in [be-born [Honorific] Neg Past]
Professor Yamada was not born in Tokyo.

(59) *Yamada sensei wa Tokyo de (wa) o-umare-ni-nar-i-mase-n-des-i-ta
[be-born [Honorific] Polite-Neg- Polite-Past]

(58) does not contain any polite expression, while in (59) Neg comes in between two polite expressions and fails to make the negation one of propositional type. Thus neither (58) nor (59) is any more acceptable than (60), which is their non-honorific counterpart.

(60) *Yamada wa Tokyo de (wa) umare-na-katta. (Cf. 16)
Yamada was not born in Tokyo.

Besides, a propositional negation negates a proposition expected by the *hearer*. (61) and (62) are acceptable negative sentences of propositional

type that correspond to (58) and (59), respectively.

(61) a. Yamada sensei wa Tokyo de o-umare-ni-nat-ta no de wa na-i
(be-born, Honorific) Past that be Neg

b. Yamada sensei wa Tokyo de o-umare-ni wa nar-a-na-katta.

(62) a. Yamada sensei wa Tokyo de o-umare-ni-nat-ta no de wa ar-i-mase-n
(be-born, Honorific) Past that be-affix-Polite-Neg

b. Yamada sensei wa Tokyo de o-umare-ni wa nar-i-mase-n des-i-ta

a and b of (61) and (62) correspond to the two propositional types of negation exemplified by a and b of (5), respectively.[4]

Our observation of questions has been limited to yes-or-no questions, but it is worth our while to consider *wh*-questions in (63)-(65).

(63) omae wa dare to Tokyo ni it-ta no ka?
you who with to go-Past that Q
Who did you go to Tokyo with?

(64) Kimi wa nan-nen ni umare-ta no?
you what year in be-born-Past that
In what year were you born?

(65) kimi wa kono koosui o doko de kat-ta no?
you this perfume where in buy-Past that
Where did you buy this perfume?

Kuno is obviously mistaken when he says that *wh*-questions in Japanese are of non-propositional type and that in them the final Q-element *ka* has the *wh*-words within its scope.[5]

The reason why *wh*-questions of Japanese are to be considered as propositional ones is that in each of them the speaker presupposes the proposition where the *wh*-word is replaced by an indefinite pronoun. (63), for instance, presupposes that "you went to Tokyo with somebody." The same can be said of yes-or-no questions of propositional type in Japanese. Compare (63), (64), and (65) with (66), (67), and (68), respectively.

(66) omae wa Hánako to Tokyo ni it-ta no ka?
Was it the case that you went to Tokyo with Hánako?

(67) kimi wa 1960nen ni umare-ta no kai?
Was it the case that you were born in 1960?

(68) kimi wa kono koosui o Pári de kat-ta no kai?

Was it the case that you bought this perfume in Páris?

Each pair of correlating *wh-* and yes-or-no questions has the same presupposition. Let us take up (63) and (66) to see the difference between the correlating two types of questions. (63) asks who that somebody in the presupposed proposition was, while (66) asks whether that somebody was Hanako or not. In a propositonal yes-or-no question, the whole proposition marked by *no* is within the scope of the question, but there may be one or more question-foci within the proposition. This is also true of propositional negation, as is clear from examples like b and c of (38). In the *wh*-questions (63)-(65), the *wh*-elements that are the question-foci are stressed just as in the corresponding yes-or-no questions. Thus we can say the following things about (propositional) *wh*-questions and propositional yes-or-no questions in Japanese. For each *wh*-question, there is a presupposed proposition with a *wh*-element or *wh*-elements as the special question-focus or foci. The multiple question-focus in the presupposed proposition of a question is exemplified in (69).

(69) a. omae wa dáre to dóko ni it-ta no ka?
Where did you go with whom?

b. omae wa Hánako to Tókyo ni it-ta no ka?
Did you go to Tókyo with Hánako?

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that the linkage between the Q- or Neg-morpheme and the element it is attached to is so tight that it is impossible to exclude that element from the scope of the question or negation. But that does not necessarily mean, I have also argued, that it does not extend beyond the element. And in this lies the principal difference between Kuno's argument and mine.

Although this paper does not aim at a typological study like Kuno's papers, particularly Kuno (1980_2), which seeks to clarify whether the characteristics seen in Japanese questions and negative sentences are a common feature of some other verb-final languages, I think it is necessary to explain why Japanese has the characteristics mentioned above concerning questions and negative sentences. We might call attention to the fact that *Ka(i)* and *na-i*, the Q-and Neg-morphemes of Japanese, are "bound" forms affixed to "sentence-final" verbs. But whereas the German negative element *nicht* not infrequently occurs sentence-finally

and the English negative *not* is often reduced to the bound form *n't*, their scope is by no means limited. (There are no elements to be superficially realized in segmental phonemes that mark questions of English or German.) What is characteristic of Japanese Q- and Neg-morphemes is that they are not merely bound forms themselves but also are agglutinative enough to determine the forms of the verbals that precede them. (70) and (71) respecively show how the Japanese Neg- and Q- morphemes "choose" particular forms of verbs to form-indivisible wholes.

(70) Negative Forms.

a. Vocalic-stem verbs.	(i) *umare*-na-i	"not to be born"
	(ii) *oki*-na-i	"not to get up"
b. Consonantal-stem verbs.	(i) *ik-a*-na-i	"not to go"
	(ii) *kaw-a*-na-i	"not to buy"

(71) Interrogative Forms.

a. Vocalic-stem.	(i) *umare-ru*-ka(i)
	(ii) *oki-ru*-ka(i)
b. Consonantal-stem.	(i) *ik-u*-ka(i)
	(ii) *Kaϕ -u*-ka(i)

Each of such "negative forms of verbs" and "interrogative forms of verbs" always constitutes what traditional Japanese grammarians call *bunsetu*, that is, a "subsentential segment." In (72) are given a negative and an interrogative sentence with their *bunsetu* boundaries shown by slant lines.

(72) a. boku wa / Hanako to / Tokyo ni wa / ik-a-nai.
I won't go to Tokyo with Hanako.
b. kimi wa / Hanako to / Tokyo ni / ik-u-kai?
Will you be going to Tokyo with Hanako?

Neither Neg nor Q can "skip over" the *bunsetu* it properly belongs to and attach to an element outside it. This, though informally expressed, could easily be formulated as a perceptual strategy.

The English negative element *not*, which is usually put after an auxiliary verb and is often reduced to the form *n't* bound to it, is never "localized" as to its focus. But in rather exceptional cases where it occurs in a NP, thereby rendering a particular perceptual strategy applicable, its scope comes to be limited. Observe examples (73)-(76), quoted from Langendoen and Bever (1973).

(73) The not $\left\{\begin{matrix}\text{very}\\\text{clearly}\end{matrix}\right\}$ happy boy entered the room.

(74) Harry's not overdeveloped muscles were not up to the task.

(75) We worship a not all-powerful deity.

(76) A not unhappy person entered the room.

A determiner marks the beginning of a NP. Thus we have a perceptual strategy like (77).

(77) $X\ Det\ Y \longrightarrow X\ [_{NP}\ Det\ Y$

And, as Langendoen and Bever say, a perceptual strategy (78) applies to assign relations within a NP.

(78) $Det\frown Adv_1\frown Adv_2\frown Adj\frown N \longrightarrow$
$Det\frown Adv_{\text{modifier of Adv}_2}\frown Adv_{\text{modifier of Adj}}\frown Adj_{\text{modifier of N}}\frown N$

This perceptual strategy operates correctly on sentences like (73) to assign the scope of the initial negative adverb *not* as the following adverb. In each of (74) and (75), the adjective after *not* has a very adverb-like prefix and the perceptual strategy (78) applies to the NP in it "by analogy." In (76), the negative prefix *un-* in *unhappy* is treated as if it were a negative intensifying adverb (Adv_2) that modified the adjective *happy* and *not*, as Adv_1, is treated as its modifier. According to Langendoen and Bever, who mean to save standard theory and recognize cases of interaction between competence and performance, sentences like (74)-(76) are ungrammatical but acceptable. Anyway, in cases where a NP is perceptually analyzed as in (78), even the English negative *not*, though not agglutinative, has only the following adverb or adverb-like element under its scope.

In sum, the conjecture upon which the arguments of this paper have been based is that the scope of question and negation in Japanese should not be dealt with by semantic interpretation rules or grammatical constraints but be accounted for as a set of phenomena in sentence processing in which perceptual segmenting of sentences, the marking-off function of *wa*, perceptual effects of stress, pause, and word order, and some pragmatic factors play a large part.

Notes

1. As is clear from comparison of (1) and (2) of Hypothesis C, it is "easier" to include NP term(s) in the scope of non-propositional questions than in that of non-propositional negative sentences. This is, I think,

explainable by the fact that the Q-element is attached to a kind of a "free form" of a verb that can end a sentence, while the Neg-element requires a "bound form" of a verb to precede it.

2. When he delivered a lecture on the same topic in Fukuoka, Japan, on September 3, 1980, he proposed a somewhat revised principle on the scope problem. It runs as follows.

The scope of the Question and Negation.

(i) The scope of the negative morpheme *nai* and the interrogative particle *ka* is very limited, and generally limited to the immediately preceding verb, adjective and "x da". Exceptions to the above constraint are (a) multiple-choice foci and (b) wh-interrogative expressions.

(ii) Themes are outside the scope of *nai* and *ka*.

Mustiple-choice foci constitute a new exception to his constraint on negation scope. His illustrative examples are the following.

(A) Boku wa {aruite "on foot" / zitensya de "by bicycle" / basu de "by bus" / kuruma de "by car"} kita. (Multiple-choice Focus)

(B) Boku wa {1920nen / 1930nen / shuusen no tosi / "the year the war ended" / 1950nen} ni umareta. (Artificial Multiple-Choice Focus)

(C) Shakespeare wa {1504nen / 1564nen / 1724nen} ni umareta. (Entrance-Exam Mode)

(D) Shakespeare wa _____ nen ni umareta. (Fill-in-the-Blank Focus)

In (A)-(C), the items to be chosen are put between braces. According to him, an item that is a multiple-choice focus can fall within negation-scope like *kuruma de wa* in *boku wa kuruma de wa ko-na-katta.* However, this specification, besides being quite unclear in its theoretical status, is empirically unhappy, because the following examples, in each of which an item that has become a multiple-choice focus because of the linguistic context is within negation-scope, are still quite unacceptable.

(E) (Said in 1980) *boku wa 50sai da keredo 1930nen ni wa

I 50 years old be though
umare-na-katta.
be-born-Neg-Past
Though I am 50 years old, I was not born in 1930.

(F) *Shakespeare wa 1560nen dai ni umare-ta no da keredo,
the 1560's in
1562 nen ni wa umare-na-katta.
Though it is true that Shakespeare was born in the 1560's, he was not born in 1562.

3. Though in this paper I limit myself to cases where Q or Neg is attached to a verb, not to an adjective or "X da," I must comment on Kuno's acceptability judgment on (A) and (B) (Kuno 1980_1, p.71).

(A) Tokyo wa, sekai-iti no daitokai desu ka?
world-first big city is Q
Is Tokyo the largest city in the world?

(B)*Tókyo ga, sekai-iti no daitokai desu ka?
Is Tókyo the largest city in the world?

The comma may mean a pause, but whether a pause is put there or not, (B), as well as (A), is quite acceptable to me, the polite expression *-desu* having the same function as the nominalizer *no* as in (C).

(C) Tókyo ga sekai-iti no daitokai na no kai?
Is it (the case) that Tókyo is the largest city in the world?

The *wa-ga* contrast (plus accompanying difference in stress) gives rise to the difference in acceptability between the non-propositional questions (D) and (E).

(D) Tokyo wa sekai-iti no daitosi-kai?

(E) ??Tókyo ga sekai-iti no daitosi-kai?

In (E) the use of *ga* and emphatic stress show that *Tokyo ga* is the only question-focus, but it is entirely outside the element to which *kai* is attached. Hence, the unacceptability of this sentence. (F) is, on the other hand, quite acceptable.

(F) sekai-iti no daitosi wa Tokyo-kai?

4. Kuno's treatment of Polite questions like (53) and (56) is quite different from mine in that it is based on the nominalizing function of the forms (such as *o-umare* and *o-ka-i*) in honorifics (Kuno 1980_2, §3) and he does not seem to regard sentences like (52) and (55) as acceptable.

In his above-mentioned lecture, he told us that it is a "gray area" in the Neg-scope proplem why negative sentences of polite style like (58) and (59) still remain unimproved in acceptability status.

5. Kuno's examples such as (A), (B), and (C) are all unacceptable to me. To make them acceptable, *no* must be inserted before *ka,* and it is much better to omit *ka*, making them end just in *no*.

(A) Dare ga kita ka?
who came Q
Who came?

(B) Kimi wa doko de umareta ka?
you where at born-were Q
Where were you born?

(C) Doko de kono tokei o katta ka?
where at this watch bought Q
Where did you buy this watch?

Kai is never used in *wh*-questions, its use being limited to yes-or-no questions propositional or nonpropositional. It is "non-neutral," also, in that it can be used only in those questions which ask about truth or falsity.

The polite expression *mas*(-*u*) marks off a proposition in *wh*-questions, too, and makes them good propositional questions as in (C'), which corresponds to (C).

(C') Doko de kono tokei o ka-i-mas-i-ta-ka?
buy-Affix-Polite-Affix-Past-Q

References

Kuno, Susumu. (1980_1), "Discourse Deletion," in Kuno, S (ed.), *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics,* Vol. 3, Department of Linguistics, Harvard University, pp. 1—144.

———. (1980_2), "The Scope of the Question and Negation in Some Verb-Final Languages," to appear in *Papers from the Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* University of Chicago.

Langendoen, D. Terence, and Bever, Thomas G. (1973), "Can a Not Unhappy Person Be Called a Not Sad One?" in Anderson, S.R., and Kiparsky, P. (eds.), *A Festschrift for Morris Halle,* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 392—409.

〔論文要旨〕

日本語の疑問と否定の範囲

——文処理の一つの問題——

大　江　三　郎

日本語の疑問文には次の例から分るように一見不可解な不規則性が認められる。

1．a　*きみは｛東京で/1960年に｝生まれたかい？

　　b　きみは｛東京で/1960年に｝生まれたのかい？

2．きみは1960年にはもう生まれていた（の）かい？

1では疑問の助詞「か（い）」を動詞に直接つけるのでなく，「の」を挿入して「きみが……生まれた」の命題全体を疑問の範囲（スコープ）にする必要があるが，2ではそのような必要はない。否定文にもパラレルな現象がみられる。

3．a　*ぼくは｛東京で（は)/1960年に（は）｝生まれなかった。

　　b　ぼくは1960年にはまだ生まれていなかった。

3 a は「ぼくが……生まれた」の命題全体を否定の範囲にして4のような命題否定文にする必要がある。

4．ぼくは｛東京で/1960年に｝生まれたのではない。

さらに5 a は問題ないが，「この」が入った5 b は悪く，「の」の入る命題疑問文5 c にせねばならない。

5．a　きみはパリで写真をとったかい？

　　b　*きみはこの写真をパリでとったかい？

　　c　きみはこの写真をパリでとったの（かい）？

以上から，疑問の要素「か（い）」否定の要素「ない」はすぐ前に来る動詞（など）に直接付着するためその範囲が英語の not などと違って非常に限られる，あるいは逆に，これらの要素が直接付着する動詞は明らかに疑問や否定の範囲からはずれるものであってはならないと推測される。1 a の「きみ」3 a の「ぼく」は存在する以上「生まれた」ことは自明で疑問や否定の焦点にはなり得ない。5 b の「この写真」は話し手のそばに存在する以上，「とられた」（撮影された）にきまっている。従ってこれが問われるのはおかしい。

次に 6 の文は 5 a に対応する否定文である。

6．a　ぼくはパリで写真をとらなかった。
　　b　ぼくはパリで写真はとらなかった。
　　c　ぼくはパリでは写真をとらなかった。
　　d　ぼくはパリでは写真はとらなかった。

6 の否定文の種類は，「パリで」と「写真を」の項を逆にすること，またアクセントをどちらに置くかによって倍加する。助詞「は」は主としてアクセントがないかあるかによって「主題」の「は」か非主題の，つまり否定の範囲に入ることを示すための「は」になる。ただし主題の「は」と否定の範囲を示す非主題の「は」とはそれが付着する名詞句を文の他の部分から分離するという，基本的には同じ働きをもつと考える。

以上のものを含む非常に豊富な例に基づいて日本語の(非命題的な)疑問と否定の範囲について次の仮設が立てられる。

仮設1　疑問の「か（い）」も否定の「ない」も，明らかにその範囲の外にある要素に付着することはできない。

仮設2　(i)否定の「ない」の範囲はふつう非常に狭く，それが付着する要素のみを含む。名詞句の項は，それが非主題的「は」でマークされる場合あるいは「ない」が付着する要素と十分

固いまとまりを構成すると知覚される場合を除き，否定の範囲の外に出る。否定の範囲をマークする非主題の「は」はそれが付く名詞句が否定の範囲内にある動詞などから隔てられる時，あるいはそのすぐ前に位置しても日本語の語順としてノーマルでない語順の時は強調アクセントを置かれる。

(ii)疑問の「か（い）」の範囲はそれが付着する動詞などのみならず日本語のノーマルな語順でその直前に位置する名詞句の項を含む。特定の名詞句の項のみを他の項から分けて疑問の範囲に入れる場合，語順がノーマルであると否とにかかわらず強調アクセントが与えられる。

久野氏（1980$_1$，1980$_2$）は，日本語の疑問と否定の範囲について制約を立てている。これは細部において私のものと異なるが，最大の相違点はわずかな例外を別として疑問と否定の範囲を「か」と「ない」が付着する動詞などの要素に狭く限定し，名詞句の項目にそれが及ばないとしたことである。同じ例の認容可能性についての相違を含め，広いデータに基づいてこの考えを私は批判する。また久野氏が（理論的な性格は必ずしも明瞭でないが）その制約を「文法における制約」とみなしているようにみえるのに対し，私は上記の仮設を，究極的には知覚のストラテジーに定式化されるであろうような知覚的諸要因や，語用論的諸要因が大きな役割を果たす文処理にかかわるものと考える点でも異なる。