

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

Jun Abe

1 Introduction

In Abe (2017), I argue for the in-situ approach to sluicing advocated by Kimura (2007, 2010) 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 roughly analyzed as in (1b):

- (1) a. He is writing something, but you can't imagine what.
b. you can't imagine [_{CP} C_Q [_{TP} ~~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, as shown below in (2), since no *wh*-movement takes place, hence challenging the standard claim that the island insensitivity of this construction is attributed to repair by ellipsis (cf. Merchant 2001):

- (2) a. Sandy was trying to work out which students would be able to solve a certain problem, but she wouldn't tell us which one.
=*she wouldn't tell us which one Sandy was trying to work out which students would be able to solve *t*.
b. That certain countries would vote against the resolution has been widely reported, but I'm not sure which ones.
= *I'm not sure which ones that *t* would vote against the resolution has been widely reported. (Chung, Ladusaw and McCloskey:272)

In Abe (2017), I demonstrate that Japanese counterparts of sluicing show sensitivity to *wh*-islands, despite the fact that they do show insensitivity to other islands. This is attributed to the fact that in-situ *wh*-arguments in Japanese are sensitive to *wh*-islands but not to other 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:

- (3) 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, hence showing insensitivity to this kind of *wh*-islands. I demonstrate that the sluicing counterpart of this

construction also shows island insensitivity, hence giving further support to the in-situ approach to sluicing. I further discuss a new type of what I call partially truncated sluicing, which involves an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp, and demonstrate that this construction shows island sensitivity, unlike standard cases of 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 such a remnant *wh*-phrase to undergo overt movement.

2 *Wh*-Island Sensitivity of Japanese Sluicing

In Abe (2017), I point out that there is a good test case for examining which approach is correct, the in-situ approach or the “repair by ellipsis” approach. This is concerned with *wh*-islands in Japanese, which in-situ *wh*-arguments are claimed to be sensitive to, as observed by Nishigauchi (1990):

- (4) John-wa [Mary-ga dare-ni atta ka] sitteiru no?
 John-TOP Mary-NOM who-DAT saw Q know Q
 ‘Does John know 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 *wh*-islands. Under the in-situ approach to sluicing, it will be expected that the sluicing counterpart is also sensitive to *wh*-islands, but this expectation does not seem to be fulfilled.¹

- (5) A: John-wa [Mary-ga aru hito-ni atta ka] tazuneta.
 John-TOP Mary-NOM some person-DAT saw Q asked
 ‘John asked if Mary saw a certain person.’
 B: Eh! Dare-ni?
 yeah who-DAT
 ‘Oh yeah, who?’ (= Who did John ask if Mary saw?)

The matrix sluice (5B) is interpreted as a question asking who it was that John asked if Mary saw. This clearly shows that Japanese matrix sluicing is insensitive to *wh*-islands on top of other islands, thus apparently giving support to the “repair by ellipsis” approach. In Abe (2017), I argue that such a case as (5) is accommodated under the in-situ approach by adopting a weaker version of this approach, namely the one in which the remnant *wh*-phrase can stay in situ but need not. It is well known that the matrix scope reading of *dare-ni* in (4) becomes possible when this *wh*-phrase undergoes long-distance scrambling to the top of the sentence, as shown below:²

¹ I follow Hasegawa (2006) in assuming that matrix sluicing in Japanese shows typical properties of sluicing, including island insensitivity, unlike embedded sluicing, which behaves like clefting.

² It is well known that scrambling shows very weak effects regarding *wh*-islands, unlike other islands such as complex NP and adjunct clause islands, to which it shows rather strong sensitivity, as we see directly.

- (6) Dare-ni₁ John-wa [Mary-ga t₁ atta ka] sitteiru no?
 who-DAT John-TOP Mary-NOM saw Q know Q
 ‘Who does John know whether Mary saw?’

According to Takahashi (1993), the *wh*-phrase *dare-ni* in this case takes only matrix scope. Based on this observation, I propose in Abe (2017) that the sluice (5B) can have the following structure:

- (7) [_{CP} dare-ni [_{TP} John-wa [_{CP} Mary-ga <dare-ni> atta ka] tazuneta]]

Here the *wh*-phrase *dare-ni* undergoes long-distance scrambling to the top of the sentence. The output form of the matrix sluice (5B) is derived by simply deleting TP.

This analysis makes a prediction: the possibility of the matrix scope reading of a *wh*-remnant in such a case as (5B) is sensitive to whatever locality conditions on scrambling. In Abe (2017), I demonstrate that this prediction is in fact borne out regarding the following three properties of scrambling: (i) the island sensitivity of scrambling, (ii) the impossibility of scrambling of possessor NPs with their modified nouns stranded in situ, and (iii) the impossibility of long-distance scrambling of adjuncts. Recall that we have noted Yoshida’s (2019) case of *wh*-islands that involves a C-Comp, repeated below:

- (8) 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*-argument *dare-ni* can take matrix scope, unlike the standard case (4). Thus it is no wonder under the in-situ approach that the sluicing counterpart of this construction shows no island effects:

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

Under the in-situ approach, the sluice (9B) can have the following structure:

- (10) [_{CP} [_{TP} John-wa [_{CP} Mary-ga dare-ni atta **ka to**] tazuneta]]

Here deletion applies to TP in such a way that all the materials except the focused phrase *dare-ni* are deleted. Note that in this case, this *wh*-phrase does not have to undergo scrambling since it can take matrix scope while it stays in situ. It is then predicted that those types of sluicing that involve interrogative clauses headed by C-Comps are not sensitive to the locality conditions on scrambling, unlike those involving standard cases of interrogative clauses. In the following three subsections, I demonstrate that this prediction is in fact borne out.

2.1 Island Sensitivity of Scrambling

It has been well known since Saito (1985) that scrambling is subject to islands except *wh*-islands (cf. (6)), as shown below:

- (11)?*[Zibun₁-no syasin-o]₂ daremo₁-ga [John-ga *t*₂ okutta] aite-o
 self-GEN picture-ACC everyone-NOM John-NOM sent person-ACC
 sagasiteiru rasii yo.
 is-looking-for seem
 ‘Lit. [His₁ picture]₂, everyone₁ seems to be looking for the person John gave *t*₂ to.’
- (12)?*[Zibun₁-no okasi-o]₂ daremo₁-ga [John-ga *t*₂ zenbu tabetyatta kara]
 self-GEN sweets-ACC everyone-NOM John-NOM all ate because
 okotta rasii yo.
 got-angry seem
 ‘Lit. [The whole of some of his₁ sweets]₂, everyone₁ seems to have got angry
 because John ate *t*₂.’

Given this property of scrambling, it is predicted under the in-situ approach that remnant *wh*-phrases in Japanese matrix sluicing should show island effects caused by scrambling in *wh*-island contexts. In Abe (2017), I demonstrate that this prediction is in fact borne out:

- (13) A: Daremo₁-ga [[zibun₁-no tomodati-ni yubiwa-o ageta] hito-o
 everyone-NOM self-GEN friend-DAT ring-ACC gave person-ACC
 Mary-ga sikatta ka] tazuneta.
 Mary-NOM scolded Q asked
 ‘Everyone₁ asked if Mary had scolded the person who gave a ring to self₁’s friend.’
- B: *Eh! Zibun-no dono tomodati-ni?
 yeah self-GEN which friend-DAT
 ‘Oh yeah, [which friend of his₁]₂ [~~did everyone₁ ask if Mary had scolded the person who gave a ring to *t*₂]~~?’
- (14) A: Daremo₁-ga [[zibun₁-no tomodati-ni John-ga yubiwa-o ageta node]
 everyone-NOM self-GEN friend-DAT John-NOM ring-ACC gave because
 Mary-ga okotteiru ka] tazuneta.
 Mary-NOM is-angry Q asked
 ‘Everyone₁ asked if Mary was angry because John gave a ring to self₁’s friend.’
- B: *Eh! Zibun-no dono tomodati-ni?
 yeah self-GEN which friend-DAT
 ‘Oh yeah, [which friend of his₁]₂ [~~did everyone₁ ask if Mary was angry because John gave a ring to *t*₂]~~?’

The unacceptability of the matrix sluices (13B) and (14B) is attributed to the fact that the remnant *wh*-phrases need to undergo long-distance scrambling to take matrix scope and this movement crosses complex NP and adjunct clause islands.

Under the present assumptions, it is predicted that if (13A) and (14A) are changed into those that involve interrogative clauses headed by C-Comps, then (13B) and (14B) become grammatical. The fact that the relevant data show significant improvement confirms the correctness of the prediction:

- (15) A: Daremo₁-ga [[zibun₁-no tomodati-ni yubiwa-o ageta] hito-o
 everyone-NOM self-GEN friend-DAT ring-ACC gave person-ACC
 Mary-ga sikatta **ka to**] tazuneta.
 Mary-NOM scolded Q COMP asked
 ‘Everyone₁ asked if Mary had scolded the person who gave a ring to self₁’s friend.’
 B: ?Eh! Zibun-no dono tomodati-ni?
 yeah self-GEN which friend-DAT
 ‘Oh yeah, [which friend of his₁]₂ [~~did everyone₁ ask if Mary had scolded the person who gave a ring to t₂]~~?’
- (16) A: Daremo₁-ga [[zibun₁-no tomodati-ni John-ga yubiwa-o ageta node]
 everyone-NOM self-GEN friend-DAT John-NOM ring-ACC gave because
 Mary-ga okotteiru **ka to**] tazuneta.
 Mary-NOM is-angry Q COMP asked
 ‘Everyone₁ asked if Mary was angry because John gave a ring to self₁’s friend.’
 B: ?Eh! Zibun-no dono tomodati-ni?
 yeah self-GEN which friend-DAT
 ‘Oh yeah, [which friend of his₁]₂ [~~did everyone₁ ask if Mary was angry because John gave a ring to t₂]~~?’

Due to the complexity of the data, these dialogues are far from perfect, but there is a significant contrast in acceptability between (13)/(14) and (15)/(16). This is predicted under the in-situ approach since in (15B) and (16B), the remnant *wh*-phrases can stay in situ, just like in (10), due to the fact that they can take matrix scope without undergoing movement. Thus, it is expected that the acceptability of (15B) and (16B) is the same as that of their full-fledged counterparts, given below:

- (17) a. ?Daremo₁-ga [[zibun₁-no dono tomodati-ni yubiwa-o ageta] hito-o
 everyone-NOM self-GEN which friend-DAT ring-ACC gave person-ACC
 Mary-ga sikatta **ka to**] tazuneta no?
 Mary-NOM scolded Q COMP asked Q
 ‘Lit. Everyone₁ asked if Mary had scolded the person who gave a ring to which self₁’s friend?’
 b. ?Daremo₁-ga [[zibun₁-no dono tomodati-ni John-ga yubiwa-o ageta node]
 everyone-NOM self-GEN which friend-DAT John-NOM ring-ACC gave because
 Mary-ga okotteiru **ka to**] tazuneta no?
 Mary-NOM is-angry Q COMP asked Q
 ‘Lit. Everyone₁ asked if Mary was angry because John gave a ring to which self₁’s friend?’

The expectation seems to be fulfilled, as far as I can determine.

2.2 Impossibility of Scrambling of Possessor NPs

A possessor NP cannot be scrambled out of a dominating NP, a case of Left Branch Condition (LBC), as shown below:

- (18)?*Kono seito-no₁ Mary-ga [_{t₁} syasin]-o nusunda (koto)
 this student-GEN Mary-NOM picture-ACC stole fact
 ‘Lit. This student’s₁ Mary stole [_{t₁} picture].’

Under the present assumptions, it is predicted that the same LBC effect should be observed in Japanese sluicing cases such as (5B) that involve standard *wh*-island contexts, since in order for the remnant *wh*-phrase to take matrix scope, long-distance scrambling must be applied to this *wh*-phrase. In Abe (2017), I demonstrate that this is in fact borne out. The following data show that a possessor NP can be a *wh*-remnant in matrix sluicing if no island is involved:

- (19) A: Dono sensei-mo₁ [zibun₁-no seito-ga dareka-no syasin-o
 every teacher self-GEN student-NOM someone-GEN picture-ACC
 nusunda to] itta.
 stole COMP said
 ‘Every teacher₁ said that self₁’s student had stolen someone’s picture.’
 B: Eh! Dare-no?
 yeah who-GEN
 ‘Lit. Oh yeah, whose₁ [~~did every teacher₂ say that self₂’s student had stolen [_{t₁}-picture]?~~?’

Here the sluice *dare-no* ‘who-GEN’ can be answered differently relative to the students involved in stealing; for instance, Teacher A said that his/her student had stolen John’s picture, Teacher B said that his/her student had stolen Bill’s picture, etc. The acceptability of the sluice (19B) is attributed to the fact that the *wh*-remnant *dare-no* can stay in situ. Now compare (19) with the following example, which involves a standard *wh*-island:

- (20) A: Dono sensei-mo₁ [zibun₁-no seito-ga dareka-no syasin-o
 every teacher self-GEN student-NOM someone-GEN picture-ACC
 nusunda ka] tazuneta.
 stole Q asked
 ‘Every teacher₁ asked if self₁’s student had stolen someone’s picture.’
 B: Eh! ?*Dare-no?
 yeah who-GEN
 ‘Lit. Oh yeah, whose₁ [~~does every teacher₂ asked if self₂’s student had stolen [_{t₁} picture]?~~?’
 B’: Eh! Dare-no syasin-o?
 yeah who-GEN picture-ACC
 ‘Lit. Oh yeah, whose picture₁ [~~does every teacher₂ asked if self₂’s student had~~

~~stolen- t_1]~~?’

When (20B) is compared with (19B), such a distributive answer as is available to the latter sluice is much harder to get with the former sluice. This is attributed to the fact that the remnant *wh*-possessor in this sluice needs to be scrambled long-distance to take matrix scope but this is impossible, as shown in (18). (20B) contrasts sharply with (20B’) in the availability of the distributive answer in question; the latter can be answered as, for instance, ‘Teacher A asked if his/her student had stolen John’s picture, Teacher B asked if his/her student had stolen Bill’s picture, etc.

The present analysis is further supported by the fact that the degraded status of a remnant *wh*-possessor in sluicing obtains only in standard *wh*-island contexts. As predicted under the present assumptions, the sluice (20B) becomes acceptable when (20A) is changed into one that involves an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp:

- (21) A: Dono sensei-mo₁ [zibun₁-no seito-ga dareka-no syasin-o
 every teacher self-GEN student-NOM someone-GEN picture-ACC
 nusunda **ka to**] tazuneta.
 stole Q COMP asked
 ‘Every teacher₁ asked if self₁’s student had stolen someone’s picture.’
 B: Eh! Dare-no?
 yeah who-GEN
 ‘Lit. Oh yeah, whose₁ [~~does every teacher₂ asked if self₂’s student had stolen [t_1
 picture]~~]?’

The sluice (21B) is almost perfect with the intended distributive reading. This is because the remnant *wh*-possessor can stay in situ in this case due to the fact that it can take matrix scope without undergoing movement.

2.3 Impossibility of Long-Distance Scrambling of Adjuncts

It has been standardly claimed (see Saito (1985) and Takano (2002), among others) that adjuncts cannot undergo long-distance scrambling, as shown below:

- (22)??[Aru riyuu-de]₁ daremo₂-ga [zibun₂-no t_1 musume-ga
 some reason-for everyone-NOM self-GEN daughter-NOM
 kubi-ni natta to] itta (koto)
 was-fired COMP said fact
 ‘For some reason₁, everyone₂ said [that self₂’s daughter was fired t_1].’

Given this property of scrambling, it is predicted under the present assumptions that when a *wh*-adjunct serves as the remnant of sluicing, the sluice will get degraded in a standard *wh*-island context. Again, I demonstrate in Abe (2017) that this is borne out. The following data show that a *wh*-adjunct may serve as a remnant of sluicing:

- (23) A: Daremo₁-ga [zibun₁-no musume-ga aru riyuu-de
 everyone-NOM self-GEN daughter-NOM some reason-for

- kubi-ni natta to] itta.
 was-fired COMP said
 ‘Everyone₁ said that self₁’s daughter was fired for some reason.’
- B: Eh! Nan-no riyuu-de?
 yeah what-GEN reason-for
 ‘Oh yeah, for what reason₁ [~~did everyone₂ say that self₂’s daughter was fired t_1]~~?’

In this case, the sluice (23B) may be interpreted as a question asking about each person for the reason x such that he/she said that his/her daughter was fired for x . This is because under the in-situ approach, the remnant *wh*-adjunct can stay in situ. Let us compare (23) with a sluicing case of a remnant *wh*-adjunct that is embedded in a standard *wh*-island:

- (24) A: Daremo₁-ga [zibun₁-no musume-ga aru riyuu-de
 everyone-NOM self-GEN daughter-NOM some reason-for
 kubi-ni natta ka] tazuneta.
 was-fired Q asked
 ‘Everyone₁ asked if self₁’s daughter was fired for some reason.’
- B: Eh! ??Nan-no riyuu-de?
 yeah what-GEN reason-for
 ‘Oh yeah, for what reason₁ [~~did everyone₂ ask if self₂’s daughter was fired t_1]~~?’

There is a clear contrast between the sluices (23B) and (24B) with respect to the availability of the intended distributive readings. The degraded status of (24B) is attributed to the fact that in this case, the remnant *wh*-adjunct *nan-no riyuu-de* ‘for what reason’ needs to undergo long-distance scrambling to take matrix scope, which gives rise to degradedness, just like in (22).

Under the present assumptions, it is predicted that the degraded status of (24B) should be cleared if (24A) is changed into one that involves an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp. This is in fact borne out:

- (25) A: Daremo₁-ga [zibun₁-no musume-ga aru riyuu-de
 everyone-NOM self-GEN daughter-NOM some reason-for
 kubi-ni natta **ka to**] tazuneta.
 was-fired Q COMP asked
 ‘Everyone₁ asked if self₁’s daughter was fired for some reason.’
- B: Eh! Nan-no riyuu-de?
 yeah what-GEN reason-for
 ‘Oh yeah, for what reason₁ [~~did everyone₂ ask if self₂’s daughter was fired t_1]~~?’

There is a significant improvement in the sluice (25B) with respect to the availability of the intended distributive reading. This is because in this case the remnant *wh*-adjunct does not have to undergo movement to take matrix scope, hence immune from the locality effects on movement.

3 Partially Truncated Sluicing in *Wh*-Island Contexts

In this section, I examine a different sluicing construction that involves an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp. Let us consider the following examples:

- (26) A: John-wa [Mary-ga aru mono-o katta **ka to**] tazuneta.
John-TOP Mary-NOM some thing-ACC bought Q COMP asked
'John asked whether Mary had bought something.'
B: [Nani-o **ka to**] tazuneta no?
what-ACC Q COMP asked Q
'What was *x* such that John asked whether Mary had bought *x*?'

The sluice (26B) illustrates a new case of sluicing, as far as I know, which I call partially truncated sluicing, following Kuwabara's (1997) terminology. The most peculiar property of this construction is that even though the remnant *wh*-phrase is embedded in an interrogative clause headed by a C-Comp, it takes matrix scope, so that the sluice is interpreted in the same way as that of a matrix sluicing case like *Nani-o?* 'what-ACC'.

Even though the sluice (26B) looks like a case of embedded sluicing, it cannot be analyzed as a case of clefting. It has been argued that the embedded sluicing case of the kind Takahashi (1994) discusses, as illustrated below, is in fact a species of clefting:

- (27) Mary-ga nanika-o katta rasii ga, boku-wa [nani-o ka]
Mary-NOM something-ACC bought likely but I-TOP what-ACC Q
wakara-nai.
know-not
'It is likely that Mary bought something, but I don't know what.'
(Takahashi 1994:266)

Nishiyama et al. (1996) argue that the fact that copula *da* can be optionally inserted right after the remnant *wh*-phrase in (27) is a good piece of supporting evidence for the cleft analysis of this sluicing-like sentence. Thus, according to this analysis, the underlying structure of the elliptic part of (27) corresponds to the following sentence:

- (28) Boku-wa [(sore-ga) nani-o (da)] ka wakara-nai.
I-TOP it-NOM what-ACC be Q know-not
'I don't know what it was'

Further support for the cleft analysis is given regarding island sensitivity. Takahashi's (1994) cases of sluicing-like construction show island sensitivity, unlike genuine instances of sluicing, as Takahashi himself observes (the data are slightly modified):

- (29) a.?*Mary-wa [John-ni nanika-o ageta] onna-ni atta sooda ga,
Mary-TOP John-DAT something-ACC gave woman-DAT met I-heard but
boku-wa [nani-o ka] siri-tai.
I-TOP what-ACC Q want-to-know
'I heard that Mary met a woman who had given something to John, and I want

- to know who₁ (Mary met a woman who had given t_1 to John).’
- b.?*Mary-wa [John-ga dareka-o kubi-ni sita kara] okotteru
 Mary-TOP John-NOM someone-ACC fired because is-angry
 sooda ga, boku-wa [dare-o ka] siri-tai.
 I-heard but I-TOP who-ACC Q want-to-know
 ‘I heard that Mary was angry because John fired someone, and I want to know
 who₁ (Mary was angry because John fired t_1).’

These data show that Takahashi’s sluicing-like construction is sensitive to complex NP islands (cf. (29a)) and adjunct clause islands (cf. (29b)). If we take this Japanese construction to belong to the standard type of sluicing, such island sensitivity of this construction is unexpected. On the other hand, this property is compatible with the cleft analysis, since Hoji (1987) independently observes that Japanese clefts show island sensitivity, as illustrated below:³

- (30) a.?*Mary-ga [John-ni t ageta] onna-ni atta no-wa kono hon-o da.
 Mary-NOM John-DAT gave woman-DAT met NL-TOP this book-ACC be
 ‘It was this book that Mary met a woman who had given t to John.’
- b.?*Mary-ga [John-ga t kubi-ni sita kara] okotteru no-wa kono otoko-o da.
 Mary-NOM John-NOM fired because is-angry NL-TOP this man-ACC be
 ‘It is this man that Mary is angry because John fired t .’

(30a, b) correspond in relevant respects to (29a, b), respectively, and the correspondence also seems to hold in their acceptability. This fact is straightforwardly explained under the cleft analysis.

Unlike Takahashi’s (1994) sluicing-like construction, the type of partially truncated sluicing illustrated in (26B) does not show any property of clefting:

- (31) A: John-wa [Mary-ga aru mono-o katta ka to] tazuneta.
 John-TOP Mary-NOM some thing-ACC bought Q COMP asked
 ‘John asked whether Mary had bought something.’
- B: *[Nani-o **da** ka to] tazuneta no?
 what-ACC COP Q COMP asked Q
- B’: *[**Sore-ga** nani-o (da) ka to] tazuneta no?
 it-NOM what-ACC COP Q COMP asked Q

(31B) shows that this construction does not tolerate copula insertion and (31B’) that it resists insertion of *sore-ga* ‘it-NOM’, which would be possible if it were susceptible to the cleft analysis, as in (28). From these facts, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the case of partially truncated sluicing under consideration is a real species of sluicing in the same sense that matrix sluicing is.

Now one might expect that this construction is island insensitive, just like matrix sluicing. This expectation is not borne out, however:

³ NL in the glosses stands for nominalizer.

- (32) A: Daremo-ga [[zibun-no kutu-o nusunda] hito-o Mary-ga
 everyone-NOM self-GEN shoes-ACC stole person-ACC Mary-NOM
 sitteiru **ka to**] tazuneta rasii yo.
 know Q COMP asked seem
 ‘It seems that everyone₁ asked [whether Mary knows the person who stole
 their₁ shoes].’
- B: Honto? Zibun-no dono kutu-o?
 really self-GEN which shoes-ACC
 ‘Really? [Which shoes of theirs₁]₂ does it seem that everyone₁ asked [whether
 Hanako knows the person who stole *t*₂]?’
- B’: *Honto? [Zibun-no dono kutu-o **ka to**] tazuneta no?
 really self-GEN which shoes-ACC Q COMP asked Q
- (33) A: Daremo-ga [[zibun-no kutu-o Mary-ga nusunda node]
 everyone-NOM self-GEN shoes-ACC Mary-NOM stole because
 sensei-ga okotteiru **ka to**] tazuneta rasii yo.
 teacher-NOM is-angry Q COMP asked seem
- B: Honto? Zibun-no dono kutu-o?
 really self-GEN which shoes-ACC
 ‘Really? [Which shoes of theirs₁]₂ does it seem that everyone₁ asked [whether
 the teacher was angry because Hanako stole *t*₂]?’
- B’: *Honto? [Zibun-no dono kutu-o **ka to**] tazuneta no?
 really self-GEN which shoes-ACC Q COMP asked Q

(32B) and (33B) are cases of matrix sluicing, and though the sluices are located inside islands (a complex NP island in (32B) and an adjunct clause island in (33B)), they are fine. On the other hand, their partially truncated counterparts (32B’) and (33B’) are simply bad. We need to answer why they are bad under the in-situ approach.

Abe (2015) addresses the question of what prevents Takahashi’s (1994) type of embedded sluicing-like construction, as illustrated in (27), from being analyzed as a real instance of sluicing. Note that if it were, we could not account for the island sensitivity of this construction, as illustrated in (29). In Abe (2015), I propose what I call *PF Anti-Adjacency Filter*:

- (34) *PF Anti-Adjacency Filter*
 *[_{CP} ... *wh*-phrase Q-morpheme ...]

This filter simply prohibits a *wh*-phrase from being adjacent to a Q-morpheme like *ka*. This PF filter takes care of the fact that Takahashi’s (1994) embedded sluicing-like construction cannot be a genuine instance of sluicing while matrix sluicing is free from this filter, hence nothing preventing this latter construction from being analyzed as a genuine instance of sluicing. Further, Abe (2015) claims that the elliptic part of (27) is susceptible to the cleft analysis, since the existence of a copula saves such an ellipsis from violating the PF filter (34), and that deletion of a copula is just an extra-grammatical process, hence not affecting the way this PF filter operates. Note that this filter also excludes the elliptic part of the partially truncated sluicing construction under consideration from being analyzed simply as a case of sluicing, just like in Takahashi’s (1994) case. Let us consider what the structure of

(26B) looks like. If *nani-o* ‘what-ACC’ simply stays in situ, then its structure will be something like the following:⁴

(35) [CP [TP *pro*_{Taroo} [CP [TP ~~Hanako-NOM~~ what-ACC ~~bought~~]-Q-COMP]] asked] Q]

The surface form of (26B) will be derived from this structure by deleting the embedded TP except *what-ACC*. Note that this violates the PF filter (34). Now I propose that in order to circumvent this violation, the remnant *wh*-phrase must undergo overt movement. Suppose that *what-ACC* is overtly adjoined to the embedded interrogative CP.⁵ Then, the structure of (26B) will be the following:

(36) [CP [TP *pro*_{John} [CP [_{Focus} what-ACC] [CP [TP ~~Hanako-NOM~~ <what-ACC> ~~bought~~]-Q-COMP]] asked] Q]

The surface form of (26B) is derived from this structure by deleting the embedded TP except the bottom copy of *what-ACC*. Let us suppose that a “trace” is visible for the PF filter (34).⁶ Then, it will make sense to assume that in this structure, the pronounced copy of *what-ACC* is not adjacent to the Q-morpheme *ka* due to the intervention of the bottom copy of this *wh*-phrase, hence not violating this PF filter. It then follows that in the case of partially truncated sluicing under consideration, the *wh*-remnant must undergo overt movement in order to avoid violating the PF filter (34). It in turn follows that if this overt movement violates a locality condition like an island condition, then it gives rise to ungrammaticality.

It is predicted that the partially truncated sluicing under consideration will not allow an immobile *wh*-phrase to serve as a remnant since in that case, the *wh*-phrase could not avoid violating the PF filter (34). This prediction is borne out by the fact that possessor *wh*-remnants are disallowed in this construction. We have seen above that possessor *wh*-remnants are allowed in matrix sluicing; the relevant example (21) is reproduced below:

- (37) A: *Dono sensei-mo*₁ [*zibun*₁-no *seito-ga* *dareka-no* *syasin-o*
 every teacher self-GEN student-NOM someone-GEN picture-ACC
nusunda ka to] *tazuneta*.
 stole Q COMP asked
 ‘Every teacher₁ asked if self₁’s student had stolen someone’s picture.’
 B: Eh! *Dare-no?*
 yeah who-GEN
 ‘Lit. Oh yeah, whose₁ [~~does every teacher₂ asked if self₂’s student had stolen [_t—~~

⁴ In this structure, the matrix subject *pro* refers to *John*.

⁵ See Abe (2020) for the reason why the overt movement in question must be adjunction to the embedded CP.

⁶ The most well-known evidence that a trace is visible for a PF operation comes from *wanna*-contraction:

- (i) a. Who do you want to go out?
 b. *Who do you wanna go out?

It is most natural to attribute the ungrammaticality of (ib) to the fact the trace of *who* intervenes between *want* and *to*, which blocks the contraction in question.

picture]?’

Now as a reply to (37A), the following sluice is unacceptable:

- (38) B:?*Eh! [Dare-no **ka to**] tazqueta no?
yeah who-GEN Q COMP asked Q
cf. Eh! [Dare-no syasin-o **ka to**] tazqueta no?
yeah who-GEN picture-ACC Q COMP asked Q

The unacceptability of (38B) gives strong support to the present proposal that the partially truncated sluicing in question involves overt movement of the remnant *wh*-phrase.

To recapitulate, I have argued for the in-situ approach to sluicing by examining the locality effects of the Japanese sluicing constructions that involve two kinds of *wh*-islands, one that blocks an in-situ *wh*-phrase inside it from taking a higher scope (the standard one) and the other that allows such an in-situ *wh*-phrase to take a higher scope (Yoshida’s (2019) case that involves a C-Comp). In Abe (2017), I deal with the sluicing constructions that involve the former type of *wh*-islands and argue that they involve long-distance scrambling of *wh*-remnants, which is necessary for them to matrix scope. In this paper, I have dealt with those that involve the latter type of *wh*-islands and argue that *wh*-remnants in these constructions can stay in situ since they take matrix scope without undergoing movement, and hence that they are not subject to the locality effects induced by long-distance scrambling, unlike those sluicing constructions that involve the standard type of *wh*-islands. I have further discussed what I have called partially truncated cases of Japanese sluicing that involve Yoshida’s (2019) type of *wh*-islands, and demonstrated that they are island sensitive, unlike matrix sluicing. I have argued that this is attributed to a PF filter that prohibits a *wh*-remnant from being adjacent to a Q-morpheme, which thus forces the *wh*-remnant to undergo overt movement. The way these sluicing constructions are subject to a variety of locality effects in *wh*-island contexts will not be expected under the “repair by ellipsis” approach. On the other hand, it is given rather natural explanations under the in-situ approach, hence giving strong support to this approach.

References

- Abe, Jun. 2015. *The in-situ approach to sluicing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Abe, Jun. 2017. Against the approach of island repair by ellipsis: The case of *wh*-islands in Japanese. In 2017 *The syntax-morphology interface in generative grammar, Proceedings of the 19th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar*, ed. by Changguk Yim, 3-17. Seoul: The Korean Generative Grammar Circle.
Abe, Jun. 2020. An escape from *wh*-islands in Japanese. Ms.
Chung, Sandra, William A. Ladusaw and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:239-282.
Hasegawa, Nobuko. 2006. Sluicing and truncated *wh*-questions. In *In search of the essence of language science: Festschrift for Professor Heizo Nakajima on the occasion of his*

- sixtieth birthday*, ed. by Yubun Suzuki, Keizo Mizuno and Kenichi Takami, 453-470. Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.
- Hoji, Hajime. 1987. Japanese clefts and reconstruction/chain binding effects. Talk given at WCCFL 6.
- Kimura, Hiroko. 2007. *Interface conditions and triggers of pied-piping: A case study of sluicing*. MA Thesis, Tohoku Gakuin University, Sendai.
- Kimura, Hiroko. 2010. A wh-in-situ strategy for sluicing. *English Linguistics* 27:43-59.
- Kuwabara, Kazuki. 1997. On the properties of truncated clauses in Japanese. In *Researching and verifying an advanced theory of human language*, Report (1) for the Grant-in-Aid for COE Research, 61-83. Chiba, Japan: Kanda University of International Studies.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the theory of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Nishiyama, Kunio, John Whitman and Eun-Young Yi. 1996. Syntactic movement of overt wh-phrases in Japanese and Korean. In *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 5*, ed. by Noriko Akatsuka, Shoichi Iwasaki and Susan Strauss, 337-351. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1985. Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1993. Movement of wh-phrases in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11:655-678.
- Takahashi, Daiko, 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3:265-300.
- Takano, Yuji. 2002. Surprising constituents. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 11:243-301.
- Yoshida, Tomoyuki. 2019. Complement selection and wh-scope in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 28:1-27.