

### Japanese Sluicing as a specificational pseudo-cleft

Since Ross (1969), a standard analysis of English Sluicing (ES) is to apply IP-ellipsis following overt wh-movement as in (1) (Merchant (2001); cf. Chung, Ladusaw and McCloskey (1997)). As Inoue (1978) originally observed, similar fragmental wh-phrases also exist in Japanese ((2); Japanese Sluicing (JS)). Despite its superficial similarity to ES, it is controversial whether JS should be analyzed similarly (Takahashi (1994); Kuwabara (1997), among many others). Kuwabara (1997) and others argue that a cleft construction underlies JS (the cleft analysis). The cleft analysis argues that the fragment ‘who’ in (2) corresponds to the pivot in its cleft counterpart (3). This work proposes a more refined version of the cleft analysis of JS. In particular, (i) we report new arguments that the specificational pseudo-cleft construction (SPC) underlies JS. (ii) We propose that the optional pronoun *sore* ‘it’ in (2) is a result of deletion: (a) the ‘subject’ of SPC has the form  $[_{DP} [_{CPno-clause} [_{IP...}] no_{NOMINALIZER}]]$ ; (b) in JS, the *no*-clause is deleted under identity; and (c) the definite article after deletion of its complement surfaces as the pronoun *sore*. We argue for a process given in (4), which is essentially the same as Elbourne’s (2000) analysis of e-type pronouns in (5).

There is some evidence that suggests JS is best analyzed as an elliptical cleft. For example, it accommodates the optional existence of the copula (Merchant (1998)) and the pronoun *sore* (Kuwabara (1997)), which are absent in ES. Under the cleft analysis, the copula originally exists in the underlying structure in (3). The pronoun, according to Kuwabara, “replaces” the presupposition clause of the cleft. We point out that the source of the pronoun cannot be the indefinite expression that it apparently refers to (ex. ‘someone’ in (2)), because they lack the animacy agreement. Normally *sore* cannot refer to a referent having the feature [+animate], as in (6). While it seems plausible that a cleft is a possible source for JS, we haven’t had a good understanding of the nature of the “replacement.” It is not clear where the pronoun comes from.

Our first main claim is that the source of JS is SPC rather than a (simple) cleft construction. (Cleft and pseudo-cleft in (7) are superficially indistinguishable in Japanese.) Diagnoses for SPC (Den Dikken (2001)) are applicable to JS. First, SPC shows connectivity effects, as in (8). The anaphor in the fragment *whether*-phrase in (9a), whose structure under our analysis is (9b), also shows connectivity effects. Second, both English SPC and JS are incompatible with negation, as in (10) and (11). Third, the copula in SPC shows agreement with the pre-copular element and not the focused element, as in (12). In the JS example (13a), the subject honorificational copula takes *sore* as the subject. Our analysis correctly predicts this, because it is parallel with (13b), where the denotation of the nominalized presupposition clause is honorified with the object honorificational verb and agrees with the honorificational copula. (For honorification agreement, see Boeckx and Niinuma (2003).) Another piece of evidence for SPC being a possible source for JS comes from the availability of inversion. Japanese SPC does not allow the inversion of the pre- and post-copula constituents as in (14). In JS, exactly the same thing happens, as in (15); *sore* must precede the fragment wh-phrase. This automatically follows if *sore* resumes the *no*-clause that appears in the antecedent clause.

Our second main claim is that JS involves the ellipsis of the nominalized clause. In (5), definite article D takes some clausal complement headed by the nominalizer *no*. We propose that a deletion operation applies under identity in the way illustrated as in (16). The indefinite expression in the first conjunct of JS undergoes QR, thus the first conjunct has the identical construction to that of the presupposition clause in the second conjunct (Nakao (2003); we abstract away from the exact status of the nominalizer here). We claim that the pronoun *sore* is a morphological realization of the definite determiner that attaches to the presupposition clause subject of cleft. Note that the demonstrative *sono* can attach to the nominalized presupposition clause as in (17). We speculate that, after the complement CP is deleted, the demonstrative in [Spec, DP] and the definite D head are transformed into the pronoun *sore* by a morphophonological requirement: the demonstrative *sono* cannot be stranded. The present analysis of *sore* in JS is reminiscent of Elbourne’s analysis of so-called e-type pronouns in (5). *Sore* in JS does have many properties in common with such pronouns. For example, its denotation covaries with a non-c-commanding antecedent, as in (18). If Elbourne’s analysis is on the right track, the similarity between them supports the determiner analysis of *sore*.

To summarize, we propose that JS contains SPC whose presupposition clause undergoes deletion. This analysis accounts for the new data we presented, and hence widens the empirical coverage of the previous cleft approach. Our analysis also has a theoretical consequence. It has been controversial whether languages such as Japanese, which do not have overt agreement on nominals, have DP-structure (Fukui (1986), among others). As far as our claim that *sore* in JS is a morphological realization of D is viable, it follows that Japanese nominals have DP-structure.

- (1) John met someone, but I don't know [<sub>CP</sub> who<sub>1</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John met t<sub>1</sub>]].
- (2) John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa (**sore-ga**) dare (**da**) ka sira-nai. (cf. (1))  
*John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top (it-Nom) who (be) Q know-not*
- (3) watasi-wa [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John-ga t<sub>1</sub> at-ta] **no**]-ga dare<sub>1</sub> (**da**) ka sira-nai. (the cleft analysis)  
*I-Top John-Nom meet-past C-Nom who (be) Q know-not*  
 "I don't know who it was that John met."
- (4) watasi-wa [<sub>DP</sub> **sore** [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John-ga t<sub>1</sub> at-ta] **no**]-D]-ga dare<sub>1</sub> (**da**) ka sira-nai.  
*I-Top it John-Nom meet-past C-Nom who (be) Q know-not*
- (5) Every man who owns a donkey beats [<sub>DP</sub> it [<sub>NP</sub> donkey]]
- (6) John-ga dareka-ni at-te, \*sore-ni/sono hito-ni hanasikake-ta.  
*John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past \*it-Dat/the person-Dat talk-to-past*  
 "John met someone, and talked to \*it/the person."
- (7) It is a book that John bought. (cleft)/ What John bought is a book. (pseudo-cleft)
- (8) What John<sub>1</sub> treasures most is a book about himself<sub>1</sub>/\*him. (Den Dikken (2001))
- (9) a. John<sub>1</sub>-ga dareka-o seme-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga **zibun-zisin<sub>1</sub>** kadooka sira-nai.  
*John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top it-Nom self-self whether know-not*  
 "John<sub>1</sub> blamed someone, but I don't know whether it was himself<sub>1</sub>."  
 b. watasi-wa [<sub>DP</sub> **sore** [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John<sub>1</sub>-ga t<sub>1</sub> seme-ta] **no**]]-ga **zibun-zisin<sub>1</sub>** kadooka sira-nai  
*I-Top it John-Nom blame-past C-Nom self-self whether know-not*
- (10) \*What John<sub>1</sub> is isn't important to himself<sub>1</sub>. (Den Dikken (2001))
- (11) \*John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga dare de-nai ka sira-nai.  
*John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom who be-not Q know-not*  
 "John met someone, but I don't know who it is not."
- (12) What you have bought **is/#are** fake jewels. (#: impossible as SPC) (Den Dikken (2001))
- (13) a. John-ga aru kata-o omikakesi-ta ga,  
*John-Nom certain person-Acc see(Obj.Hon)-past but,*  
 watasi-wa sore-ga dare<sub>1</sub> deirassyat-ta ka sira-nai.  
*I-Top it-Nom who be(Subj.Hon)-past Q know-not*  
 "John saw(Obj.Hon) a certain person, but I don't know who it(Subj.Hon) was."  
 b. Watasi-wa [<sub>DP</sub> [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John-ga t<sub>1</sub> omikakesi-ta] **no**]]-ga dare<sub>1</sub> deirassyat-ta ka sira-nai.  
*I-Top John-Nom see(Obj.Hon)-past C-Nom who be(Subj.Hon)-past Q know-not*  
 "I don't know who it was(Subj.Hon) that John met(Obj.Hon)."
- (14) [[John-ga kat-ta] no]-ga hon da./ \*Hon-ga [[John-ga kat-ta] no] da  
*John-Nom buy-past C-Nom book be/ Book-Nom John-Nom buy-past C be*  
 "What John bought is a book." "A book is what John bought."
- (15) \*John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa **dare-ga sore** (**da**) ka sira-nai. (cf. (2))  
*John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top who-Nom it (be) Q know-not*
- (16) [<sub>IP</sub> Dareka<sub>2</sub>-ni [<sub>IP</sub> John-ga t<sub>2</sub> at-ta]] ga,  
*Someone-Dat John-Nom meet-past but*  
 watasi-wa [<sub>DP</sub> **sore** [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John-ga t<sub>1</sub> at-ta] **no**]-D]-ga dare<sub>1</sub> (**da**) ka sira-nai. ((2), after QR)  
*I-Top it John-Nom meet-past C -Nom who (be) Q know-not*
- (17) [<sub>DP</sub> sono [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> John-ga t at-ta] **no**]] "lit. the thing that John met"  
*the John-Nom meet-past C "meaning. the person that John met"*
- (18) John-ga itumo tigau hito-ni au ga, watasi-wa itumo sore-ga dare ka sira-nai.  
*John-Nom always different person-Dat meet but I-Top always it-Nom who Q know-not*  
 "John always meets a different person, but I always don't know who it is."

**References:** Boeckx and Niinuma (2003) Conditions on Agreement in Japanese, *NLLT* 26. Chung, Ladusaw and McCloskey (1995) Sluicing and Logical Form, *NLS* 3. Den Dikken (2001) Specificational Copular Sentences and Pseudoclefts: A Case Study, in *Syntax Companion*. Elbourne (2000) E-type Pronouns as Definite Articles, *WCCFL* 19. Fukui (1986) *A Theory of Category Projections and Its Applications*, Ph.D Diss, MIT. Inoue (1978) *Nihongo-no Bunpoo Kisoku*, Taishukan. Kuwabara (1997) On the Properties of Truncated Clauses in Japanese, *Report (1) Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language*, Kanda Univ. of International Studies. Merchant (1998) 'Pseudosluicing': Elliptical Clefts in Japanese and English, *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 10. – (2001) *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands and the Theory of Ellipsis*, Oxford University Press. Nakao (2003) Japanese Pseudo-sluicing and Quantifier Raising, *Linguistic Research* 20, Univ. of Tokyo. Ross (1969) Guess Who?, Paper read at Chicago Linguistic Society. Takahashi (1994) Sluicing in Japanese, *JEAL* 3.