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1. Introduction

(1) Goal of this study
To consider the nature of Pronominal Sluicing in Japanese.

(2) English Sluicing
IP-ellipsis follows overt wh-movement (Merchant, 2001, among others)

(3) John met someone, but I don’t know [CP who1 [IP John met t1]].

(4) Japanese Sluicing
   a. Japanese Standard Sluicing
      John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa dare-ni
      John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top who-Dat
      (da)ka sira-nai.
      (be)Q know-not
      “John met someone, but I don’t know who.”
   b. Japanese Pronominal Sluicing
      John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga
      John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
      dare-ni (da) ka sira-nai.
      who-Dat (be) Q know-not
      “John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

(5) Previous studies treated two types of Japanese Sluicing uniformly.
(Section 3)

* We are grateful to the following people for the valuable comments and encouragement: Ivano Caponigro, Tomo Fujii, Takuya Goro, Norbert Hornstein, Koji Hoshi, Howard Lasnik, Jason Merchant, Phil Monahan, Miki Obata, Hajime Ono, Hiromu Sakai, Tetsuya Sano, Eri Takahashi, Asako Uchibori, and Akira Watanabe. This research is supported by grants to Colin Phillips from NSF grant #BCS-0196004 and Human Frontiers grant #RGY01342001.
(6) This study
   b. Pronominal Sluicing is an elliptical specificational pseudo-cleft.
   c. *Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing is a residue of D whose complement CP is deleted.

2. Properties of Pronominal Sluicing

(7) Differences
   a. Pronominal Sluicing shows a reconstruction effect but Japanese Standard Sluicing does not. ((8))
   b. Scrambling out of Pronominal Sluicing is not allowed but scrambling out of Japanese Standard Sluicing is possible. (Takahashi, 2004; (9))

(8) Reconstruction effect
   John₁-ga dareka-o seme-ta ga, watasi-wa *(sore-ga)
   John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top (it-Nom)
   zibun-zisin₁-o kadooka sira-nai.
   self-self-Acc whether know-not
   “John₁ blamed someone, but I don’t know whether it is himself₁.”

(9) Scrambling (Takahashi, 2004)
   John-wa [dono gakusei-ga [Smith sensei-ni] at-ta ka]
   John-Top which student-Nom Smith prof.-Dat meet-past Q
   sitteiru ga, [Brown sensei-ni-wa] (*sore-ga) dono
   know but Brown prof.-Dat-Top (it-Nom) which
   gakusei-ga ka] sira-nai.
   student-Nom Q know-not
   “John knows which student met Prof. Smith, but (he) doesn’t know Prof. Brown, which student (it is).”

(10) A problem
   Previous analyses cannot distinguish Pronominal Sluicing from Japanese Standard Sluicing.
3. Previous Studies

3.1. Two analyses of Japanese Sluicing

(11) Two analyses of Japanese Sluicing

(12) The wh-movement + IP-ellipsis analysis

\[
\text{watasi-wa} \left[ \text{cp} \, \text{dare},-\text{ni} \left( \text{John}-\text{ga \_at-ta} \right) \right] \, \text{ka} \, \text{sira-nai}
\]

I-Top who-Dat John-Nom meet-past Q know-not

“I don’t know who John met.”

(13) The cleft analysis

a. \[
\text{John-ga} \, \text{dareka-ni} \, \text{at-ta} \, \text{ga}, \, \text{watasi-wa} \, \text{sore-ga}
\]

John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom

\[
\text{dare-ni} \, (\text{da}) \, \text{ka} \, \text{sira-nai}.
\]

who-Dat (be) Q know-not

“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

b. \[
\text{watasi-wa} \left[ \text{cp} \left( \text{John}-\text{ga \_at-ta} \right) \right. \, \text{no}-\text{ga}
\]

I-Top John-Nom meet-past C\text{nominalizer-Nom}

\[
\left. \text{[dare},-\text{ni} \, (\text{da})] \, \text{ka} \right] \, \text{sira-nai}.
\]

who-Dat (be) Q know-not

“I don’t know who it was that John met.”

(14) The fragment \textit{who} in (13a) corresponds to the pivot in its cleft counterpart (13b).
3.2. Argument for the cleft analysis

(15) Argument for Cleft Analysis
   a. The position for the copula (16a)
   b. The position for sore (16b)
   c. Lack of animacy agreement (19)

(16) a. The configuration in (12) is incompatible with the optional existence of the copula.
    Under the cleft analysis, the copula originally exists in the underlying structure in (13b). (Merchant, 1998, 2001)
   b. The configuration in (12) cannot accommodate the pronoun sore ‘it’ in Pronominal Sluicing.
    Under the cleft analysis, the pronoun “replaces” the presupposition clause of the cleft (Kuwabara, 1997).

(17) A potential problem with Cleft Analysis
   The specific mechanism of “replacement” is not clear in previous studies.

(18) a. The source of the pronoun in Pronominal Sluicing cannot be the indefinite expression that it apparently refers to (ex. ‘someone’ in (19a)). It is different from normal coreferential pronouns.
   b. It is compatible with the assumption that sore has clausal status.

(19) Lack of animacy agreement
      John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom who-Dat (be) Q know-not
      “John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”
   b. John-ga dareka-ni at-te, John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past
      *sore-ni/sono hito-ni hanasikake-ta.
      it-Dat/ the person-Dat talk-to-past
      “John met someone, and talked to *it/the person.”
4. Proposals
4.1. Pronominal Sluicing as a specificational pseudo-cleft

(20) Pronominal Sluicing is a specificational pseudo-cleft rather than a (simple) cleft construction.

(21) Two types of focus constructions
   a. Cleft
      It is a book that John bought.
   b. Pseudo-cleft
      What John bought is a book.

(22) Specificational and predicational pseudo-cleft
    What John left was the dog’s food.
    a. Specificational: John was supposed to eat the dog’s food, but he left it.
    b. Predicational: Whatever John left was for the dog to eat.
       (Akmajian, 1970; den Dikken, 2001; Higgins, 1979)

(23) a. Specificational: Identify “what John left”
    b. Predicational: Describe “what John left”
4.2. **Diagnosing specificational pseudo-cleft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(24)</th>
<th>Diagnoses for specificational pseudo-cleft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Reconstruction effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Agreement with the pre-copular element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Incompatibility with negation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) Reconstruction effects

a. What John\(_1\) treasures most is a book about himself\(_i\)/*him\(_1\).
   (Specificational)

b. What John\(_1\) treasures most is a book about *himself\(_i\)/him\(_1\).
   (Predicational)

(26) Agreement with the pre-copular element

a. What you have bought is/*are fake jewels.
   (Specificational)

b. What you have bought *is/are fake jewels.
   (Predicational)

(27) Incompatibility with negation

a. *What John\(_1\) is isn’t important to himself\(_i\).
   (Specificational)

b. What John\(_1\) is isn’t important to him\(_1\).
   (Predicational)

(28) Simple cleft shares the properties (24a) and (24b) with specificational, but not (24c).

a. *Reconstruction effects

   It is himself\(_i\) that John\(_1\) blamed.

b. *Agreement with the pre-copular element

   It is/*they are fake jewels that John bought.

c. *Possibility of negation

   It is not himself\(_i\) that John\(_1\) blamed.
4.3. Pronominal Sluicing as a specificational pseudo-cleft

4.3.1. Japanese (pseudo-)cleft

(29) Japanese cleft and pseudo-cleft are superficially indistinguishable.

\[\text{John-ga kat-ta no]-wa hon-o \ da.}\]
\(\text{John-Nom buy-past C-top book-acc be}\)
“It is a book that John bought./ What John bought is a book.”

(30) Specificational/ Predicational distinction
a. (pseudo-) cleft without a Case marker

\[\text{John-ga nokosi-ta no-wa inu-no esa \ da.}\]
\(\text{John-Nom leave-past C-top dog-gen food be}\)
“It is dog’s food that John left./ What John left is dog’s food.”

b. (pseudo-) cleft with a Case marker

\[\text{John-ga nokosi-ta no-wa inu-no esa-o \ da.}\]
\(\text{John-Nom leave-past C-top dog-gen food-acc be}\)

(31) Specific meaning
a. John-ga \textit{dareka-ni} at-ta ga, watasi-wa \textit{sore-ga}

\[\text{John-Nom someone-dat meet-past but I-top it-nom}\]
\(\text{who-dat (be) Q know-not}\)
“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

b. Pronominal Sluicing identifies who the “someone” in the first conjunct is, rather than describes the property that whoever John met would have.

(32) Case marking
a. John-ga \textit{dareka-ni} at-ta ga, watasi-wa \textit{sore-ga}

\[\text{John-Nom someone-dat meet-past but I-top it-nom}\]
\(\text{who-dat (be) Q know-not}\)
“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

b. The fragment wh-phrase in Pronominal Sluicing can be Case-marked. (cf. (30))
Reconstruction effect: The fragmental anaphor is reconstructed to the trace position in Pronominal Sluicing.

a. \textit{John\text{-}ga dareka\text{-}o seme\text{-}ta ga, watasi\text{-}wa John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top sore\text{-}ga zibun\text{-}zisin\text{-}o kadooka sira\text{-}nai.} (= (8))

\textit{it}\text{-}Nom \textit{self\text{-}self\text{-}Acc whether know\text{-}not}

\textit{“John blamed someone, but I don’t know whether it is himself\textsubscript{1}.”}

b. \textit{watasi\text{-}wa [\text{DP sore [{\textit{John\text{-}ga t\text{-}seme\text{-}ta}}\text{-}no}]\text{-}ga I-Top it John-Nom blame-past C-Nom zibun\text{-}zisin\text{-}o kadooka sira\text{-}nai self\text{-}self\text{-}Acc whether know\text{-}not}

Agreement with the pre-copular element

a. \textit{?John\text{-}ga aru kata\text{-}ni oaisi\text{-}ta ga, John-Nom certain person-Dat meet(Obj.Hon)-past but, watasi\text{-}wa sore\text{-}ga dare\text{\textsubscript{i}}\text{-}ni deirassyat\text{-}ta ka I-Top it\text{-}Nom who\text{-}Dat be(Subj.Hon)-past Q sira\text{-}nai. know\text{-}not}

\textit{“John met(Obj.Hon) a certain person, but I don’t know who it is(Subj.Hon).”}

b. \textit{Watasi\text{-}wa [\text{CP [{\textit{John\text{-}ga t\text{-}oaisi\text{-}ta}}\text{-}no}]\text{-}ga dare\text{\textsubscript{i}}\text{-}ni I-Top John-Nom meet(Obj.Hon) C-Nom who\text{-}Dat deirassyat\text{-}ta ka sira\text{-}nai. be(Subj.Hon)-past Q know\text{-}not}

\textit{“I don’t know who it is(Subj.Hon) that John met(Obj.Hon).”}

The focused element \textit{dare} is not an honorificational expression.

b. The subject clause is honorified by the existence of the object honorificational verb and agrees with the honorificational copula.

(See Boeckx & Niinuma, 2003, for discussion of honorification as an agreement phenomenon.)

Incompatibility with negation

*\textit{John\text{-}ga dareka\text{-}ni at\text{-}ta ga, watasi\text{-}wa sore\text{-}ga John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it\text{-}Nom zibun\text{\textsubscript{i}}\text{-}no hahaoya\text{\textsubscript{n}-ni de-na\textit{i} kadoooka sira\text{-}nai. self\text{-}Gen mother\text{-}Dat be\text{-}not whether know\text{-}not}

\textit{“John\textsubscript{1} met someone, but I don’t know whether it is \textbf{not} self\textsubscript{1}’s mother.”}
Another similarity between Japanese (pseudo-)cleft and Pronominal Sluicing: Unavailability of inversion

(Pseudo-)cleft
   John-Nom buy-past C-Top/Nom book-Acc be
   “What John bought is a book.”
   Book-Top/Nom John-Nom buy-past C be
   “A book is what John bought.”

Pronominal Sluicing
a. John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga
   John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top it-Nom
   [dare-ni] (da) ka sira-nai.
   who-Dat (be) Q know-not
   “John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”
b. *John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa dare-ga
   John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top who-Nom
   sore (da) ka sira-nai.
   it (be) Q know-not
### 4.3.3. Analysis

(40) *Sore* as a residue of D

*Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing is a residue of D whose complement CP is deleted.

(41) A puzzle: the dual nature of *sore*

a. *Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing holds the status of DP:
   The form of pronoun, Nominative Case-marking

b. *Sore* in Pronominal Sluicing also has a clausal status:
   Correspondence to the clausal subject of specificational pseudo-cleft

(42) The structure

\[
\text{watasi-wa [dp } \text{sore [t\_John\_ga\_t\_at\_ta] no]} \text{ D]-ga}
\]

\[
\text{I-Top} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{John-Nom} \quad \text{meet-past C} \quad \text{-Nom}
\]

\[
\text{dare\_ni (da) ka sira-nai.}
\]

\[
\text{who-Dat (be) Q know-not}
\]

(43) a. The definite article D takes some clausal complement headed by the nominalizer *no*.

b. *Sore* is a morphological realization of the definite determiner.
   (cf. Kuroda's (1999) analysis of adverbial clauses followed by *sore*)

(44) Deletion under identity

a. *John-ga* dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa sore-ga

\[
\text{John-Nom} \quad \text{someone-Dat} \quad \text{meet-past but} \quad \text{I-Top} \quad \text{it-Nom}
\]

\[
\text{dare\_ni (da) ka sira-nai.}
\]

\[
\text{who-Dat (be) Q know-not}
\]

“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”

b. [*\_IP Dareka\_2-ni [*\_IP John-ga t\_2 at\_ta]] ga, (after QR)

\[
\text{someone-Dat} \quad \text{John-Nom} \quad \text{meet-past but}
\]

\[
\text{watasi-wa [dp } \text{sore [t\_John\_ga\_t\_at\_ta] no]} \text{ D]-ga}
\]

\[
\text{I-Top} \quad \text{it} \quad \text{John-Nom} \quad \text{meet-past C} \quad \text{-Nom}
\]

\[
\text{dare\_ni (da) ka sira-nai.}
\]

\[
\text{who-Dat (be) Q know-not}
\]

(45) After the QR of the indefinite, the first conjunct of Pronominal Sluicing has the identical construction to that of the presupposition clause in the second conjunct (Nakao, 2003).
(46) The speculation of the mechanism
Sore is derived from the demonstrative sono in (47).

(47) The structure
\[ \text{DP sono [John-ga t at-ta no]} \]
\[ \text{the John-Nom meet-past \text{C}_{\text{nominalizer}}/\text{thing}} \]
“lit. the thing that John met” “meaning. the person that John met”

(48) The demonstrative in [Spec, DP] and the definite D head are transformed into the pronoun sore by some morphophonological requirement.

(49) Elbourne's (2001) analysis of e-type pronouns
E-type pronoun is a residue of D whose complement NP is deleted.

(50) a. Every man who owns a donkey beats [DP it [NP donkey]]
b. Every man who owns a donkey beats [DP the [NP donkey]]

(51) The pronoun it as D whose complement NP undergoes deletion.

(52) Similarity between sore in Pronominal Sluicing and e-type pronouns

(53) a. The denotation of the pronoun covaries with a non-c-commanding antecedent.
b. John-ga itumo tigau hito-ni au ga,
John-Nom always different person-Dat meet but
watasi-wa itumo sore-ga dare-ni ka sira-nai.
I-Top always it-Nom who-Dat Q know-not
“John always meets a different person, but I always don’t know who it is.”
4.3.4. Properties explained

(54) Differences between Pronominal Sluicing and Standard Sluicing (Section 2)
   a. Reconstruction effect (55)
   b. Scrambling (56)

(55) Reconstruction effect
   John-ga dareka-o seme-ta ga, watasi-wa *(sore-ga)
   John-Nom someone-Acc blame-past but I-Top (it-Nom)
   zibun-zisin₁-o kadooka sira-nai.
   self-self-Acc whether know-not
   “John₁ blamed someone, but I don’t know whether it is himself₁.”

(56) Scrambling
   John-wa [dono gakusei-ga [Smith sensei-ni] at-ta ka]
   John-Top which student-Nom Smith prof.-Dat meet-past Q
   sitteiru ga [Brown sensei-ni-wa (*sore-ga) dono
   know but Brown prof.-Dat-Top (it-Nom) which
   gakusei-ga ka] sira-nai.
   student-Nom Q know-not
   “John knows which student met Prof. Smith, but (he) doesn’t know Prof.
   Brown, which student (it is).”

(57) a. Reconstruction effect is derived if Pronominal Sluicing is
   specificalional pseudo-cleft.
   b. Impossibility of scrambling is derived from the ban against scrambling
   out of definite DPs (below).

(58) Ban against scrambling out of definite DPs
   a. *[dp [sono] [cp Mary-ga John-ni t₁ syookaisi-ta] hito₁]
      John-Dat the Mary-Nom John-Dat introduce-past person
      “The person who Mary introduced John”
   b. *[dp John₁-ni [dp [sono] [cp Mary-ga t₂ t₁ syookaisi-ta]
      John-Dat the Mary-Nom introduce-past
      hito₁]]
   c. *[dp John₁-ni [dp [cp Mary-ga t₂ t₁ syookaisi-ta] hito₁]]
   d. *[dp John₁-ni [cp Mary-ga t₂ t₁ syookaisi-ta] hito₁]]
5. Remaining Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(59)</th>
<th>Remaining problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Structure of Japanese Standard Sluicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Structure of Japanese Standard Sluicing/Pronominal Sluicing without Case markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Generality of CP-deletion approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(60)</th>
<th>What is the structure of Japanese Standard Sluicing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>No reconstruction effect: no reconstruction site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Possibility of scrambling: no definite D head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (61) | What is the structure of Standard Sluicing/Pronominal Sluicing without Case markers? (Fukaya & Hoji, 1999; Hiraiwa & Ishihara, 2002; Hoji, 1990) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(62)</th>
<th>Non-Case-marked Standard Sluicing/Pronominal Sluicing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John-ga dareka-ni at-ta ga, watasi-wa (sore-ga) dare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John-Nom someone-Dat meet-past but I-Top (it-Nom) who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(da) ka sira-nai.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(be) Q know-not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“John met someone, but I don’t know who (it is).”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (63) | Non-Case-marked cleft does not show the properties of movement. “Aboutness” licensing is possible. (Hoji, 1990) |

| (64) | How general is the “pronouns as deletion” approach applicable to other constructions/languages? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(65)</th>
<th>Similar approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Kuroda's (1999) analysis of adverbial clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Elbourne's (2001) analysis of e-type pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Conclusion

- Japanese Pronominal Sluicing is a different construction from Japanese Standard Sluicing.
- Japanese Pronominal Sluicing has an underlying structure of specificational pseudo-cleft.
- Sore in Japanese Pronominal Sluicing is a residue of D whose complement CP undergoes deletion.
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