

35mm

33 line, 10 point, times

350 – 410 words

anything going on around you. You are to not be hearing anything going on around you.<sup>7)</sup>

Next, let us consider the claim in (5) that Mori (1999, 2000) makes, namely that the <to not do> word order implies *emphasis* or *blame*. Basically, we also consider this claim to be appropriate (see also Fitzmaurice (2000) and Yasui (2004)). This is because there should be an adequate reason or intent for the achievement of a resulting state of affairs. If the marked word order is used, we may imply such intent. However, we do not consider that the <to not do> word order itself has the meaning of emphasis or blame, but that the linguistic form of *to [not do]* (=to maintain a state of not doing) implies the *referent's persistence*, *non-cooperation*, or *strong involvement* and consequently this word order is very often used in *emphatic* or *blameworthy* situations.

A question might be raised here: one might wonder why the <to not do> word order should express *State* (not *Action*) if it implies *emphasis* or *blame* for the achievement of that state. Indeed, we see a comment that could support this idea in Radford (2004). Consider his examples in (16) and his statement in (17):<sup>8)</sup>

(16) a. He decided [not to co-operate with the police].

b. He decided [to not co-operate with the police]. (Radford 2004: 169)

(17) There is a subtle meaning difference between the two examples: (45b)=(16b)) implies a much more deliberate act of defiance than (45a)=(16a)). (ibid.)

Note in particular that Radford (2004) suggests that (16b) describes a *deliberate act of defiance*. We agree that (16b) is a strong position, and, nevertheless, claim that the basic meanings of (16a, b) are *Action* and *State* respectively, as shown in (18a, b), and the emphatic meaning in (16b) is caused by the implicative meanings of the *referent's persistence*, *non-cooperation*, or *strong involvement*, which come from the *State* interpretation, and consequently (16b) should be interpreted as (19):

(18) a. [Decide [not to do]] implies a denial or refusal to do an act.

b. [Decide [to not do]] implies a decision to maintain a state of not doing.

(19) He decided to maintain the position of non-cooperation as opposed to simply not act in a cooperative manner.

In order to show that the assumptions in (18a, b) are appropriate, let us consider examples when *want* or *try*, rather than *decide*, in the matrix sentences in (16a, b) are used.

First, consider examples with *want*. Note here that *want to* implies that some kind of activity will follow, i.e., *be* in (20a) implies not the stative *be* but *become* (action), and *know* in (20b) implies not *being in the*

35mm

5

footer 17.5mm

copyrights  
2013  
Hituzi Syobo