

## Minimizers and multiple focus constructions in Japanese

**Data:** This study investigates two types of Japanese minimizer expression with the numeral “one” (hereafter mini-one), as shown in (1). In pre-nominal mini-ones, the numeral “one” precedes a noun as in (1a). In post-nominal mini-ones, “one” follows a noun as in (1b).

- (1) a. *Alan-wa kooen-de [ip-piki-no inu ]\*(-mo) mi-nakat-ta.* (Pre-nominal mini-one)  
 Alan-TOP park-LOC one-CLS-GEN dog -MO see-NEG-PST  
 ‘%Alan did not see any dog at the park.’ [restrictive interpretation]  
 ‘Alan did not see any animal at the park.’ [non-restrictive interpretation]
- b. *Alan-wa kooen-de [inu ip-piki ](-mo) mi-nakat-ta.* (Post-nominal mini-one)  
 Alan-TOP park-LOC dog one-CLS -MO see-NEG-PST  
 ‘\*ALan did not see any dog at the park.’ [restrictive interpretation]  
 ‘Alan did not see any animal at the park.’ [non-restrictive interpretation]

There are several differences between these two mini-ones in Japanese. **Difference I: Optionality of *mo*:** Pre-nominal mini-ones require the additive scalar focus particle *mo* ‘also’, as in (1a). On the other hand, *mo* is optional in post-nominal mini-ones, as in (1b). One caveat is in order; Nakanishi (in prep.) reports that post-nominal mini-ones with *mo* are unacceptable. However, our consultants judged (1b) as acceptable. **Difference II: (Un)ambiguity:** Nakanishi (in prep.) reports that (1a) is infelicitous in a situation where Alan saw animals other than dogs at the park. We refer to this type of interpretation of mini-ones as the non-restrictive interpretation. In the non-restrictive interpretation of (1a), the domain of a set of alternatives is not limited to dogs. On the other hand, Ochi (2016) reports that pre-nominal mini-ones can receive another interpretation, which we refer to as the restrictive interpretation. Under the restrictive interpretation, the domain of a set of alternatives in (1a) is restricted to dogs, excluding other kinds of animals. Although the non-restrictive interpretation is more salient than the restrictive interpretation in (1a), we follow Ochi’s observation that pre-nominal mini-ones are ambiguous. In contrast to pre-nominal mini-ones, post-nominal mini-ones receive only the non-restrictive interpretation. (1b) receives only the non-restrictive interpretation.

**Analysis:** We propose that the differences between pre-nominal and post-nominal mini-ones follow from the assumption that post-nominal mini-ones contain a covert counterpart of the scalar focus particle *sae*. The structure of post-nominal mini-ones is given in (2).

- (2) [TP [ ... [XP NP [ [CIP # [ CL  $t_{NP}$  ]] X<sub>scal</sub> ]]-*mo* ... Neg ... ] T ]

Following Ochi (2016), we assume that in post-nominal mini-ones, a noun moves into Spec,XP from the complement of the classifier head (see also Watanabe 2006). Under this analysis, the covert scalar particle X<sub>scal</sub> must be present in a structure to derive post-nominal mini-ones. As for pre-nominal mini-ones, we assume that they have an adjunction structure, following Huang & Ochi (2014). This means that pre-nominal mini-ones do not contain the covert scalar particle.

**Difference I: Optionality of *mo*:** The proposal can capture the optionality of *mo*. As discussed by Lahiri (1998) and Nakanishi (in prep.), scalar presupposition is an indispensable ingredients of the meaning of mini-ones. Under their analysis, the covert scalar particle in (2) suffices to derive the meaning of a mini-one. Therefore, the presence of *mo* is optional in post-nominal mini-ones. On the other hand, pre-nominal mini-ones do not include the covert scalar particle, and hence need the additive scalar focus particle *mo*. **Difference II: (Un)ambiguity:** As for the (un)ambiguity of mini-ones, we propose that post-nominal mini-ones cannot receive a restrictive interpretation because a focus particle do not have access to the numeral “one”, due to the presence of an intervening covert scalar particle. The crucial assumption here is that *to obtain restrictive interpretations, the numeral “one” but not a noun must be associated with a scalar focus particle*. This assumption is motivated by the example (3), in which the noun is separated from the measure phrase, and *mo* attaches to the measure phrase. Importantly, (3) receives only the restrictive interpretation.

