

### The Locality Effects of Japanese Sluicing in *Wh*-Island Contexts

Abe (2017) argues for the in-situ approach to sluicing, advocated by Kimura (2017) and Abe (2015), by demonstrating that Japanese sluicing shows a special pattern of sensitivity to locality conditions in *wh*-island contexts. According to this in-situ approach, it is predicted that a *wh*-remnant in sluicing behaves just like an in-situ *wh*-phrase since it stays in situ and deletion applies to the targeted TP in such a way that it deletes all materials except the *wh*-remnant. Thus, under this approach, the sluice of (1a) is analyzed as in (1b):

- (1) a. He is writing something, but you can't imagine what.  
 b. you can't imagine [<sub>CP</sub> C<sub>Q</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> ~~he is writing~~ what]]

In (1b), *what* stays in situ and the whole TP except this *wh*-phrase gets deleted. This analysis immediately explains the island insensitivity of sluicing, since no *wh*-movement takes place, hence challenging the standard claim that the island insensitivity of this construction is attributed to repair by ellipsis. There is a good test case for examining whether this in-situ approach is on the right track. It has been well known since Nishigauchi (1990) that in-situ *wh*-phrases are sensitive to *wh*-islands in Japanese:

- (2) John-wa [Mary-ga dare-ni atta ka] tazuneta no?  
 John-TOP Mary-NOM who-DAT saw Q asked Q  
 'Did John ask who Mary saw?'

This sentence is interpreted as a yes-no question with the in-situ *wh*-phrase *dare-ni* taking embedded scope. That this *wh*-phrase cannot take matrix scope thus indicates that it is sensitive to a *wh*-island. Under the in-situ approach to sluicing, it will be expected that the sluicing counterpart is also sensitive to *wh*-islands, but this expectation is not fulfilled:

- (3) A: John-wa [Mary-ga aru hito-ni atta ka] tazuneta. B: Eh! Dare-ni.  
 John-TOP Mary-NOM a person-DAT saw Q asked yeah who-DAT  
 'John asked whether Mary saw a person. Oh yeah, who?'

The matrix sluice (3B) is interpreted as a question asking who it was that John asked whether Mary saw. Abe (2017) argues that this is attributed to the fact that the matrix scope reading of *dare-ni* 'who-DAT' becomes possible when this *wh*-phrase undergoes long-distance scrambling to the top of the sentence. Thus, the sluice (3B) can be analyzed as having the following structure:

- (4) [<sub>CP</sub> dare-ni<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> John-wa [<sub>CP</sub> ~~Mary-ga *t<sub>i</sub>* atta ka~~] tazuneta]]

In this structure, *dare-ni* undergoes scrambling to the matrix Spec-CP and the following TP gets deleted (Note that scrambling shows very weak effects regarding *wh*-islands). In this paper, I argue for this line of analysis by investigating the sluicing counterparts of those cases discovered by Yoshida (2019) where in-situ *wh*-phrases can escape from *wh*-islands in Japanese. A case in point is illustrated below:

- (5) John-wa [Mary-ga dare-ni atta **ka to**] tazuneta no?  
 John-TOP Mary-NOM who-DAT saw Q COMP asked Q  
 'Did John ask who Mary saw?'

Here the in-situ *wh*-phrase *dare-ni* is embedded in what Yoshida (2019) calls a complex complementizer (C-Comp) like *-ka-to*, which consists of the Q-marker *ka* and the complementizer *to*. In this case, the in-situ *wh*-phrase can take matrix scope. It is then predicted that in the sluicing counterpart of this construction, as illustrated in (6) below, the *wh*-remnant can stay in situ under the in-situ approach since it can take matrix scope without undergoing movement, so that the sluice of (6B) is analyzed as in (7):

(6) A: John-wa [Mary-ga aru hito-ni atta **ka to**] tazuneta. B: Eh! Dare-ni.  
 John-TOP Mary-NOM a person-DAT saw Q COMP asked yeah who-DAT  
 ‘John asked whether Mary saw a person. Oh yeah, who?’

(7) [<sub>TP</sub> John-wa [<sub>CP</sub> Mary-ga dare-ni atta **ka to**] tazuneta]]

I argue for this in-situ analysis by comparing it with that proposed by Abe (2017) for such a sluicing case as in (3) that involves long-distance scrambling (cf. (4)). Here is one illustration: Given the impossibility of scrambling of possessor DPs, Abe (2017) demonstrates that the matrix scope reading of a remnant *wh*-phrase in such a case as (3B) is impossible when the remnant *wh*-phrase is a possessor DP:

(8) A: Dono sensei-mo<sub>i</sub> [zibun<sub>i</sub>-no seito-ga dareka-no syasin-o nusunda ka]  
 every teacher self-GEN student-NOM someone-GEN picture-ACC stole Q  
 tazuneta.  
 asked ‘Every teacher<sub>i</sub> asked if self<sub>i</sub>’s student stole someone’s picture.’  
 B: Eh! ?\*Dare-no? / <sup>OK</sup>Dare-no syasin-o?  
 yeah who-GEN who-GEN picture-ACC

The unacceptability of *dare-no* ‘who-GEN’ in (8B) is attributed to the fact that this remnant *wh*-phrase needs to be scrambled long-distance to take matrix scope but this is impossible. It is then predicted that such a possessor remnant *wh*-phrase becomes possible when it is embedded in an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp. This is borne out:

(9) A: Dono sensei-mo<sub>i</sub> [zibun<sub>i</sub>-no seito-ga dareka-no syasin-o nusunda  
 every teacher self-GEN student-NOM someone-GEN picture-ACC stole  
**ka to**] tazuneta.  
 Q COMP asked ‘Every teacher<sub>i</sub> asked if self<sub>i</sub>’s student stole someone’s picture.’  
 B: Eh! <sup>OK</sup>Dare-no?  
 yeah who-GEN

I further discuss a new type of what I call partially truncated sluicing, which involves an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp:

(10) A: Taroo-wa [Hanako-ga aru mono-o katta **ka to**] tazuneta.  
 Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM a thing-ACC bought Q COMP asked  
 ‘Taroo asked whether Hanako had bought something.’  
 B: [Nani-o **ka to**] tazuneta no?  
 what-ACC Q COMP asked Q  
 ‘What is *x* such that Taroo asked whether Hanako had bought *x*?’

(10B’) illustrates a case in point, whose most peculiar property is that even though the remnant *wh*-phrase is embedded in an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp, it can take matrix scope. It is demonstrated that this construction shows island sensitivity, unlike standard cases of matrix sluicing. I argue that this is attributed to the PF anti-adjacency filter, proposed by Abe (2015), which prohibits a *wh*-phrase from being adjacent to a Q-marker like *ka*, and that this filter forces a remnant *wh*-phrase like *nani-o* in (10B) to undergo movement. This proposal is supported by the fact that possessor *wh*-remnants are disallowed in this construction, just like in (8), so that as a reply to (9A), the following sluice is unacceptable:

(11) B: ?\*[Dare-no **ka to**] tazuneta no? B’: <sup>OK</sup>[Dare-no syasin-o **ka to**] tazuneta no?  
 who-GEN Q COMP asked Q who-GEN picture-ACC Q COMP asked Q

**Selected References** Abe, J. 2017. Against the approach of island repair by ellipsis: The case of *wh*-islands in Japanese. *SICOGG* 19. / Yoshida, T. 2019. Complement selection and *wh*-scope in Japanese. *JEAL* 28.