C-5 A non-movement approach to Japanese sluicing
Tatsuhiro Matsuda

Abstract

Since Takahashi 1994, Japanese sluicing has been extensively studied, and Takita 2009 proposes that some type of Japanese sluicing corresponds to the English sluicing in that a remnant of sluicing moves to a CP position. The present study proposes that Japanese sluicing, unlike English, does not involve movement of a remnant. To make this proposal, I provide a new type of data in which a remnant is not a wh-phrase and show that a remnant is licensed in-situ, without moving remnants. Furthermore, I show that the proposed analysis can easily extended to the linguistic fact about multiple sluicing and about the incompatibility of the particle *to* 'that' with sluicing. Finally, I touch on theoretical implications of the present study.

1. Introduction

Since Takahashi 1994, Japanese sluicing like (1) has been extensively studied.

(1) Minna-wa [John-ga   dareka-o   aisiteiru to]   itta ga, boku-wa dare-o   (da) ka wakaranai.
   everyone-Top John-Nom someone-Acc love   that said but I-Top   who-Acc Cop Q know-not
   'Everyone said John loves someone, but I don't know who (it is).'

One characteristic of this type of sluicing is compatibility with a copula, as illustrated in (1). Based on the compatibility with a copula, Nishiyama et al. (1996) propose that this type of sluicing has some copular sentence such as a cleft sentence in its underlying structure. However, Takita 2009 proposes that Japanese has another type of sluicing like (2a).

(2) a. Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$ dono   jaanaru-ni zibun-no ronbun-o   das-oo   ka] kimeta ga, Hanako-wa
       Taro-Top   which journal-to self-Gen article-Acc submit-Inf Q decided but Hanako-Top
       [dono zyaanaru-ni (*da) ka] kimekaneteiru.
       which journal-to   Cop Q cannot.decide
       'Though Taro decided [to which journal [to submit his paper]], Hanako cannot decide [to which journal [to submit her paper]].'   (Takita 2009: 581(10))
   b. John bought something, but I don't know what.
   c. [$_{CP}$ wh-phrase$_i$ C [$_{TP}$ ...t_i...]]

In (2a), the embedded clauses are complements to control predicates that do not allow copulas to appear in the embedded clauses. He proposes that this type of sluicing corresponds to English sluicing like (2b) and that the wh-phrase in Japanese sluicing moves to a CP position as in (2c), where TP is deleted.

In the present study, I propose that one type of Japanese sluicing exemplified in Takita 2009 does not involve movement of a remnant unlike English, and this difference is due to the presence or absence of complementizers in the lexicon of the two languages.

In the next section, I present a new data, in which a remnant of a sluicing is not a wh-phrase. Based on this example, I propose that a remnant in Japanese sluicing does not move. In section 3, I show that the proposed analysis automatically explains the multiplicity of Japanese sluicing and the incompatibility of Japanese sluicing with *to* 'that'. Section 4 concludes the present study.

2. Proposal

As mentioned above, Japanese has one type of sluicing that does not allow a copula like (2a) and this incompatibility with a copula implies that this type of sluicing does not have a copular sentence in tis underlying structure. Accordingly, it seems that this corresponds to English sluicing. However, this type of Japanese sluicing behaves differently from that of English: it allows a non-wh-phrase to be a remnant as in (3a), unlike English sluicing (3b).

(3) a. Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$ osake-o nomu-to] kimeta ga, pro$_i$ [PRO$_i$ <u>nihonsyu-o</u> (*da) ka]
   Taro-Top alcohol-Acc drink-that decided but Japanese.sake-Acc Cop Q
   mayotteiru.
   cannot.decide
   'Taro decided to drink alcohol, but cannot decide whether he will drink Japanese sake.'
   b. *John decided to drink alcohol, but he hasn't decided {Japanese sake$_i$ whether/ whether Japanese sake$_i$}
   (he will drink e_i).

This difference casts some doubt on the correspondence between Japanese sluicing (2a) and English sluicing (2b), even though they are similar to each other in that they have nothing to do with a copular sentence. To account for this difference between the Japanese sluicing and the English one, I argue that remnants in Japanese sluicing like (2a) do not move and do stay in-situ, unlike English sluicing.

To make this proposal more explicit, I adopt the following assumptions.

(4)   a.   Japanese lacks complementizers (C) in its lexicon while English has C in its lexicon. (Fukui 1995)
   b.   Generalized Blocking Principle (GBP) (Takeda 1999):
      If a language does not have a functional category, the semantic operations which the functional category is responsible for can apply freely, while if a language has a functional category responsible for an application of a semantic operation, free applications of the semantic operation are blocked in that language.
   c.   C is responsible for focus assignment. (Rizzi 1997)
   d.   From (4a)-(4c), it follows that focus can be assigned in Japanese rather freely while in English focus assignment is syntactically restricted in that a focused element must be in a CP position.
   e.   Remnants in sluicing are assigned focus. (See also Abe 2015: 17)
   f.   Sluicing derives from deleting the clause except a nominal with focus.

As to (4c), one of the semantic operations that C is responsible for is focus assignment. Rizzi 1997: 286, based

on the examples like (5), proposes that a focused nominal moves to a CP position.

(5)   a.   YOUR BOOK$_i$ you should give e_i to Paul (not mine).   (Rizzi 1997: 285(2))

        b.   IL TUO LIBRO ho letto(, non il suo).

             "Your book I read(, not his)."   (Rizzi 1997: 286(4))

Whether or not we adopt a cartographic approach, we might safely conclude that C is related to focus. Based on (4a)-(4c), I propose that focus can be assigned to an element rather freely in Japanese while focus assignment is syntactically restricted in English, as illustrated in (6). Specifically, an element can be a focus without moving to a CP position in Japanese; on the other hand, an element to be assigned focus must be in a CP position if phonetic prominence is not used.[1]

(6)   a.   Japanese: [$_{TP}$ ...XP$_{[Focus]}$...]

        b.   English: [$_{CP}$ XP$_{i[Focus]}$ [C [$_{TP}$ ...e_i...]]]

Based on Abe 2015: 17 that deletion applies to a constituent except non-focus parts, I assume that deletion apply to a clause (TP in Japanese and CP in English) except focus. With these assumptions in mind, this free application of focus assignment allows Japanese sluicing whose remnant is a non-wh-phrase. Focus assignment marks a nominal as [Focus] and TP in Japanese is deleted but the [Focus] nominal as in (7a). On the other hand, though the corresponding English sluicing must move a non-wh-phrase remnant to a CP position, the resultant expression is unacceptable for some reason as in (3b) with parenthetical expression, as reproduced in (7b). Thus, English does not have a non-wh remnant sluicing.

(7)   a.   Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$ osake-o nomu-to] kimeta ga, pro$_i$ [~~PRO$_i$~~ nihonsyu-o$_{[Focus]}$ ~~nomoo~~] ka mayotteiru.

        b.   *John decided to drink alcohol, but he hasn't decided {Japanese sake$_i$ whether/ whether Japanese sake$_i$} he will drink [e_i].

In this way, Japanese and English are different in deriving sluicing: Japanese does not involve movement of a remnant while English does.

3. Empirical Consequences

      The proposed analysis has some empirical consequences. First, it automatically explains the fact about the multiplicity of sluicing. Japanese has multiple sluicing like (8a,b), unlike English (8c).

(8)   a.   Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$ dare-ni nani-o   ageru ka] kimeta   ga, Hanako-wa [<u>dare-ni</u> <u>nani-o</u>   ka]

Taro-Top   who-to what-Acc give Q decided but Hanako-Top who-to what-Acc Q

kimekaneteiru.

cannot.decide

'Though Taro decided to whom to give what, Hanako cannot decide to whom to give what.'

b.   Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$toojiron I-de Chomsky 1957-o   atukau-to] kimeta ga, Hanako-wa

Taro-Top   syntax I-in Chomsky 1957-Acc deal-that   decided but Hanako-Top

[on'inron I-de   Chomsky and Halle 1968-o   ka] kimekaneteiru.

phonology I-in   Chomsky and Halle 1968-Acc Q cannot.decide

'Taro decided to read Chomsky 1957 in the class Syntax I, but Hanako cannot decide whether

she will read Chomsky and Halle 1967 in the class Phonology I.'

c.   John said [someone bought something]. *Mary wonders [$_{CP}$ who$_i$ what$_j$[$_{TP}$ (t_i bought t_j)]].

(Takahashi 1994: 284 (47))

(8a) is a Japanese wh-sluicing. Unlike (2a) and (3a), which have a single remnant, (8a) has two remnants *dare-ni* 'who-Dat' and *nani-o* 'what-Acc'. (8b) is an example of a non-*wh* remnant sluicing and it also has two remnants, *on'inron* I-de 'phonology I-in' and *Chomsky and Halle 1968-o* 'Chomsky and Halle 1968-Acc'. These two examples are acceptable. On the other hand, what should be an English multiple sluicing in (8c) has two remnants *who* and *what*, but it is unacceptable.

This can be easily explained since free application of focus assignment in Japanese allows more than one element to be assigned focus and accordingly the two elements can be remnants. Thus, *dare-ni* 'who-Dat' and *nani-o* 'what-Acc' in (8a) and *on'inron I-de* 'phonology I-in' and *Chomsky and Halle 1968-o* 'Chomsky and Halle 1968-Acc' in (8b) can be assigned focus as in (9a,b).

(9) a.   Hanako$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$dare-ni$_{[Focus]}$ nani-o$_{[Focus]}$ ageru ka] kimekaneteiru

b.   Hanako$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$on'inron I-de$_{[Focus]}$ Chomsky and Halle 1968-o$_{[Focus]}$ atukau ka] kimekaneteiru.

c.   *Mary wonders [$_{CP}$ who$_{i[Focus]}$ what$_{j[Focus]}$ C [$_{TP}$ t_i bought t_j]].

Thus, deleting the non-focused parts in (10a,b) results in the expression (8a,b). On the other hand, English focus assignment requires two (or more) remnants to move to a CP position as in (9c). However, multiple wh-movement in the narrow syntax is not possible in English . Thus, English does not allow multiple sluicing. In this way, the proposed analysis can easily explain the fact about multiple sluicing.

Second, the proposed analysis can pave the way for explaining the fact that a non-wh remnant sluicing is not compatible with the particle *to* 'that'. Consider (10).

(10) *Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$ osake-o   nomu-ka]   mayotteita   ga, tuini pro$_i$ [PRO$_i$ nihonsyu-o

Taro-Top   alcohol-Acc drink.want-Q couldn't.decide but finally   Japanese.sake-Acc

(da) to]   kessinsita.

Cop that   decided

intended: 'Taro couldn't decide whether or not to drink alcohol, but he finally decided to drink Japanese

sake.'

(cf.) Taro$_i$-wa [PRO$_i$ osake-o   nomu-ka]   mayotteita   ga, tuini pro$_i$ [PRO$_i$ nihonsyu-o
       Taro-Top   alcohol-Acc drink.want-Q couldn't.decide but finally   Japanese.sake-Acc

       nomu-to]   kessinsita.
       drink-that   decided

       'Taro couldn't decide whether or not to drink alcohol, but he finally decided to drink Japanese sake.'

(10) is a non-wh sluicing in which the particle *to* 'that' is used with sluicing, which is usually used in a declarative sentence. This example is unacceptable. This is in sharp contrast with a copula-type sluicing in Japanese like (11), in which a sluiced declarative sentence is licensed.

(11) Haha-wa   ［boku-no rusu   tyuu-ni Tanaka-ga tazunete-kita to］   itteita ga, boku-wa ［Tanaka-ga
     mother-Top I-Gen   absence during T-Nom   came-to-see   that said but I-Top   T-Nom

     (da) to］   omotteinai.
     Cop that   think-not.

     'My mother said that Tanaka came to see me while I was away, but I don't think that Tanaka came to see me while I was away.'   (Abe 2015: 105 (98))

     The proposed analysis paves the way for explaining the unacceptability of (10). Since free applications of focus assignment create an element with [Focus] and accordingly make a set of propositions like interrogative sentences as in (12), the proposed analysis predicts, or at least expects, that Japanese sluicing is not allowed if a sluiced sentence is a declarative sentence whose denotation is just a proposition, not a set of proposition. Thus, the unacceptability arises in (10), in which *to* 'that' is used with the sluicing.

(12) $\lambda p.\ \exists x[$ Japanese.sake' (x) & $p=\exists e[$event (e) & drink' (e) & Agent $(e, g_c(1))$ & Theme $(e, x)]$

In this way, the proposed analysis can provide a new perspective to approaching the incompatibility of Japanese sluicing with the particle *to* 'that'.

     Notice that it is unclear how the movement approach to sluicing deals with phenomena such as (3), (8) and (10) uniformly, making the proposed analysis more plausible.

4. Concluding Remarks

     In the present study, I have proposed that Japanese sluicing does not involve movement of remnants to a CP position, based on a new type of data in which remnants are not wh-phrases. I also propose that the differences between English sluicing and Japanese ones lie in the presence or absence of complementizers in their lexicon. The proposed analysis can easily extend to multiple sluicing in Japanese and incompatibility with the particle *to* 'that'.

     At this point, we are in a position to mention a theoretical implication of the proposed analysis. The Generalized Blocking Principle (GBP) plays an important part in the proposed analysis. This principle has not

attracted much attention since Takeda 1999 first proposed it. However, if the proposed analysis is on the right track, it makes the GBP more plausible.

References

Abe, Jun. 2015. *The in-situ approach to sluicing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fukui, Naoki. 1995. *Theory of projection in syntax*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Nishiyama, Kunio, John Whitman, and Eun-Young Yi. 1996. Syntactic Movement of Overt *Wh*-Phrases in Japanese and Korean, *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 5, 337–351.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery, in Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, pp. 281–337.

Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3:265–300.

Takeda, Kazue. 1999. *Multiple headed structures*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine.

Takita, Kensuke. 2009. 'Genuine' Sluicing in Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: Papers from the Main Session,* eds. by Ryan Bochnak, Nassira Nicola, Peet Klecha, Jasmin Urban, Alice Lemieux, and Christina Weaver, 577-592. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago.