

Immobile Remnants of Japanese *why*-Stripping

Hiroko Kimura and Hiroki Narita

1. Introduction

This paper examines *why*-stripping in Japanese (JWS), exemplified in (1B). It has the same meaning as the non-elided question, *naze Taro-ga Hanako-o sasotta no?* ‘Why did Taro ask Hanako out?’

- (1) A: Taro-ga Hanako-o sasotta yo. B: naze HANAKO-(o)? (Japanese)
Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC asked.out SFP why Hanako-ACC
‘Taro asked Hanako out.’ ‘Why HANAKO?’

The goal of this paper is to present novel arguments for the *in-situ* analysis (Kimura 2018, 2021, and Ha 2022), showing that a variety of immobile elements can be the non-*wh*-remnant(s) (*HANAKO-(o)* in (1B)).

2. Nakao et al.’s (2013) Focus Movement Analysis

Nakao et al. (2013) argue that JWS is derivationally related to Cleft and propose a movement and deletion analysis (MDA), providing four pieces of evidence that JWS patterns with Cleft: (i) the optional occurrence of copula *da* ‘be’ (see (2)) (ii) the optional case-maker drop (the accusative case-marker *-o* of the non-*wh*-phrase in (2) is optional), (iii) the word order between *naze* ‘why’ and the focus, (as in (3), the focus cannot precede *naze* ‘why’), (iv) the island (in)sensitivity (as in (4), the case-marked version is island-sensitive whereas the non-case-marked version is island-insensitive).

- (2) a. Mary-ga ringo-o katta ga, boku-wa naze (sore-ga) RINGO-(O) (da) ka wakara-nai. JWS
Mary-NOM apple-ACC bought but, I-TOP why it-NOM apple-ACC COP Q know-not
‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why AN APPLE.’
b. [Mary-ga katta no]-wa RINGO-(O) (da) Cleft
Mary-NOM bought C-TOP apple-ACC COP
‘It is AN APPLE that Mary bought.’ (Nakao et al. 2013)
- (3) a. Mary-ga ringo-o katta ga, boku-wa {naze RINGO-O/*RINGO-O naze} JWS
Mary-NOM apple-ACC bought but I-TOP {why apple-ACC/apple-ACC why}
(da) ka] wakara-nai.
COP Q know-not
‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know {why AN APPLE/*AN APPLE why}.’
b. [Mary-ga katta no]-wa {?naze RINGO-O/*RINGO-O naze} na no? Cleft
Mary-NOM bought C-TOP {why apple-ACC/apple-ACC why} be Q
‘Why is it an apple that Mary bought?’ (Nakao et al. 2013)
- (4) a. Mary-wa [NP [CP suruusing-no ronbun-o kaita] hito] -o hihansita ga, JWS
Mary-TOP Sluicing-GEN paper-ACC wrote person-ACC criticized, but
boku-wa naze SURUUSING-NO RONBUN(*-O) (da) ka wakara-nai.
I-TOP why Sluicing-GEN paper(-ACC) (be) Q know-not
‘I heard Mary criticized a person who wrote a paper on Sluicing, but I don’t know why A PAPER ON SLUICING.’

* Hiroko Kimura, Komazawa University. Hiroki Narita, Tokai University. This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI (JP24K21172, JP24K03948, JP21K00589, JP21H00532/23K20467, JP21K18367, and JP19H01256).

- b. [CP Mary-ga [NP [CP kaita] hito]-o hihansita no]-wa kono ronbun(*-o) da. *Cleft*
 Mary-NOM wrote person-ACC criticized C-TOP this paper(*-ACC) COP
 ‘It was this paper₁ that Mary criticized [the person who wrote t₁].’ (Nakao et al. 2013)

Adopting Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s (2002, 2012) analysis of *Cleft*, Nakao et al. (2013) argue that JWS and *Cleft* are both derived from the *no da in-situ* focus construction via focus movement. (1B) is analyzed as (5): in the underlying *no da in-situ* focus construction (5a), *naze* ‘why’ is base-generated in the clause-initial position (Spec-CP of some higher layer of left periphery) and the non-*wh*-remnant *HANAKO-(o)* serves as an *in-situ* focus. The non-*wh*-remnant moves out of the ellipsis site FinP via focus movement (5b), and then FinP undergoes deletion (5c). Nakao et al. also claim that when FinP undergoes topicalization instead of deletion, the *Cleft* sentence with *naze* ‘why’ is derived, as shown in (6).

- (5) a. [CP *naze* [FocP [FinP Taro_i-ga HANAKO_j-(o) sasotta no] [Foc0 (da)]] (ka)
 why Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC asked.out C COP Q
 ‘Why is it that Taro asked HANAKO out?’
 b. [CP *naze* [FocP HANAKO_j-(O) [FinP Taro_i-ga t_j sasotta no] [Foc0 (da)]] (ka)
 c. [CP *naze* [FocP HANAKO_j-(O) [~~FinP Taro_i-ga t_j sasotta no~~] [Foc0 (da)]] (ka)
- (6) [CP *naze* [TopP [FinP Taro_i-ga t_j sasotta no]-wa [FocP HANAKO_j-(O) t_j [Foc0 (da)]] Top⁰] (ka)
 why Taro-NOM asked.out C-TOP Hanako-ACC COP Q
 ‘Why is it HANAKO_i that Taro asked t_i out?’

Their analysis readily explains why JWS can be accompanied by *da* ‘be’, since the underlying *no da in-situ* construction contains the copular verb. In addition, the optional occurrence of the pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’ can also be explained without difficulty, because the presuppositional clause of *Cleft* (FinP in (6)) can be replaced with *sore* ‘it’. Furthermore, case marker drop (see (2a)), the relative word order between *naze* and the focus (see (3a)), and island (in)sensitivity (see (4a)) can be accounted for by the mechanisms invented to explain the same properties of *Cleft* ((2b), (3b), (4b)).

3. Arguments against Nakao et al.’s Focus Movement Analysis

Despite these advantages above, Nakao et al.’s (2013) MDA cannot be maintained. It faces problems in deriving cases in which the non-*wh*-remnant is an immobile element. We will present four such cases.

3.1. Negative Concord Items

The first case involves a negative concord item (NCI) as the non-*wh*-remnant, exemplified by (7B₁).

- (7) A: Hanako-wa [Taro-ga hito-ri-mo sasowa-nai to] omotta. B₁: *naze* (**sore-wa*) HITO-RI-MO?
 Hanako-TOP Taro-NOM 1-CL-MO ask.out-not C thought why it-TOP 1-CL-MO
 ‘Hanako thought that Taro would not ask out even one person.’ ‘Why EVEN ONE PERSON?’
 B₂:*(*naze*) [Hanako-ga [Taro-ga t_i sasowa-nai to]omotta no]-wa HITO-RI-MO_i (da)?
 why Hanako-NOM Taro-NOM ask out-not C thought C-TOP 1-CL-MO COP
 lit. ‘Why is it EVEN ONE PERSON_i that Hanako thought that Taro would not ask out t_i?’

Under Nakao et al.’s MDA, the NCI remnant should undergo focus movement to the same position as the pivot of *Cleft*. However, NCIs cannot be the pivot of *Cleft* in Japanese, as shown in (7B₂) (Kimura and Takahashi 2011). It should be noted that this type of JWS does not pattern with *Cleft* in that it disallows the occurrence of the pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’, as shown in (7B₁).

3.2. Small Clause Predicates

A small clause predicate can also be the non-*wh*-remnant of JWS (8B₁) but not the pivot of *Cleft*.

- (8) A: kinoo Taro-wa [_{SC} Hanako-o nikurasiku] kanzita.
 yesterday Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC hateful felt
 ‘Taro felt Hanako hateful yesterday.’
 B₁: naze (*sore-wa) NIKURASIKU?
 why it TOP hateful
 ‘Why (is it) HATEFUL?’
 B₂:*naze [(kinoo) Taro-ga [_{SC} Hanako-o t_i] kanzita (no)]-wa NIKURASIKU_i (da)?
 why yesterday Taro-NOM Hanako-ACC felt C-TOP hateful COP
 ‘Why was it HATEFUL that Taro felt Hanako?’

(8B₁) cannot be derived by Nakao et al.’s MDA, because small clause predicates generally resist Cleft/focus movement, as shown in (8B₂) (Kikuchi and Takahashi 1991). Again, this case of JWS does not pattern with Cleft in that it is incompatible with the pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’, as shown in (8B₁).

3.3. Compound-internal Elements

A compound-internal element, another type of immobile elements, can also be the non-*wh*-remnant (see Kimura 2018, 2021). In (9B₁), the non-*wh*-remnant *basu* is interpreted as part of the compound [_{VN} [_N *basu*]-[_{VN} *gayoi*]] ‘bus-commute’. We can observe *rendaku* (sequential voicing) and accent shift, hallmarks of Japanese compounding. Thus, [_N *básu*] + [_{VN} *kayoi*] becomes [_{VN} [_N *basu*] + [_{VN} *gáyoi*]].

- (9)A: Taro-wa [_{VN} [_N *basu*]-[_{VN} *gayoi*]]-o siteiru. B₁: naze (*sore-wa) BASU (da) (ka osiete)?
 Taro-TOP bus-commute-ACC do why it-TOP bus COP Q tell.me
 ‘Taro commutes to school by bus.’ ‘(Tell me) why (it is) BUS?’
 B₂:*(naze) [Taro-ga t_i-gayoi-o siteiru no]-wa BASU_i(da)?
 why Taro-NOM commute-ACC do C-TOP bus COP
 lit. ‘Why is it BUS_i that Taro does t_i-commuting?’

Under Nakao et al.’s MDA, the remnant *basu* ‘bus’ undergoes focus movement, leaving *gayoi* ‘commute’ behind. However, extraction out of a compound is generally prohibited (Di Sciullo and Williams 1987). The deviance of the Cleft counterpart (9B₂) can be attributed to focus movement of *basu* ‘bus’ out of the compound. Again, this type of JWS is incompatible with the pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’ (see (9B₁)).

3.4. Conditional-internal Elements

An element internal to a conditional clause can also be the non-*wh*-remnant of JWS.

- (10) A: Taro-wa [Hanako-ga yurusitekureta-ra]dekake-rare-ru. B₁: naze (*sore-wa) HANAKO-(ga)?
 Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM permitted-if go.out-can-PRES why it-TOP Hanako-NOM
 ‘Taro can go out if Hanako permits.’ ‘Why (is it) HANAKO?’
 B₂:*naze [Taro-ga [t_i yurusitekureta-ra] dekake-rare-ru no]-wa HANAKO-(GA)_i (da)?
 why Taro-TOP permitted-if go.out-can-PRES C-TOP Hanako-NOM COP
 lit. ‘Why is it HANAKO_i that Taro can go out if t_i permits?’

Again, the case of JWS with the pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’ (10B₁) is infelicitous and does not pattern with Cleft. Note that the island effect in (10B₁₋₂) appears to be inconsistent with Nakao et al.’s (2013) analysis. Nakao et al. observe that JWS patterns with Cleft regarding island (in)sensitivity in that case-marked instances are island-sensitive, whereas non-case-marked ones are island-insensitive (see (4)). However, JWS (10B₁) does not show the expected parallelism with its Cleft counterpart (10B₂): in contrast to JWS in (10B₁), the Cleft example in (10B₂) is unacceptable even if the nominative case marker is omitted, contrary Nakao et al.’s observation.

Our data in this section indicate that the non-*wh*-remnant in JWS does not undergo focus movement to the same position as the pivot of Cleft. Notice also that JWS with an immobile remnant disallows the

occurrence of the pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’ (see (7B₁), (8B₁), (9B₁), and (10B₁)). Therefore, these cases of JWS cannot be derived from a copular sentence with a null pronominal subject, either.

4. Against MDA in terms of Some Other Type of Movement

Advocates of MDA might suggest that extraction of the remnant out of the ellipsis site can be achieved by movement other than focus movement (as in Cleft formation). For instance, Maeda and Matsumoto (2011) made such a proposal for instances of Stripping with an NCI remnant (e.g. *Taro-wa dare-ni-mo Jiro-no himitu-o barasite-inai to itta ga, Jiro-wa hontoo-ni dare-ni-mo-ka utagatteita*. ‘lit. Taro said that he didn’t reveal Jiro’s secret to anybody, but Jiro doubted whether really nobody.’). Indeed, the NCI *hitori-mo* ‘even one person’ can also undergo scrambling (see (11)). Based on this, one might claim that the cases of JWS involving an NCI are derived by scrambling out of the ellipsis site.

- (11) ^(?)(naze) hito-ri-mo_i Hanako-wa [Taro-ga t_i sasowa-nai to] omotta (no) (da)?
 why 1-CL-MO Hanako-TOP Taro-NOM ask out-not C thought C COP
 lit. ‘Why even one person_i, did Hanako think that Taro will not ask out t_i?’

However, the scrambling-based MDA cannot be extended to other cases of JWS with an immobile remnant, because small clause predicates, compound-internal elements, and conditional-internal elements cannot be affected by any type of movement including scrambling, as shown in (12).

- (12) a. *naze nikurasiku_i [Taro-wa [_{sc} Hanako-o t_i] kanzita (no)] (da)?
 why hateful Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC felt C COP
 lit. ‘Why hateful_i, did Taro feel t_i Hanako?’
 b. *naze basu_i Taro-wa t_i-gayoi-o siteiru no?
 why bus Taro-TOP commute-ACC do Q
 lit. ‘Why bus_i, does Taro do t_i-commuting?’
 c. *naze Hanako-(ga)_i Taro-wa [t_i yurusitekureta-ra] dekake-rare-ru no?
 why Hanako-NOM Taro-TOP permitted-if go.out-can-PRES Q
 lit. ‘Why Hanako_i, can Taro go out if t_i permits?’

Given the complete immobility of these elements, it is unreasonable to assume that the non-*wh*-remnant of JWS undergoes extraction out of the opaque ellipsis site.

5. Against the Pied-Piping Analysis

Now, let us consider the possibility that the target of extraction is a larger phrase containing an immobile remnant. Ortega-Santos et al. (2014) and Yoshida et al. (2015) take this way in explaining the case of *why*-stripping in English (13B), in which the non-*wh*-remnant is a bare preposition, an immobile element. They analyze (13B) as (14), where after movement of the entire prepositional phrase (PP), deletion applies to the complement of the preposition (*death*) and TP separately.

- (13) A: Veterans are honored after death, but not before. B: Why AFTER? (Yoshida et al. 2015)

- (14) [_{CP1/IntP} why [_{CP2/FocP} [_{PP} AFTER [_{DP} ~~death~~]_i] [_{TP} ~~veterans are honored t_i]]]~~

The pied-piping analysis illustrated in (14) works well for JWS involving a small clause predicate. For example, (8B₁) may have the structure in (15). In this structure, the entire small clause moves out of the ellipsis site before the clausal deletion of FinP and argument ellipsis of *Hanako-o* take place.

- (15) naze (kinoo) [_{sc} Hanako-o nikurasiku]_i (kinoo) [_{FinP} Taro-wa t_i kanzita (no)] (da)?
 why yesterday Hanako-ACC hateful yesterday Taro-TOP felt C COP
 ‘Why is it Hanako hateful that Taro felt yesterday?’

However, the pied-piping analysis cannot be a one-size-fits-all solution to JWS with an immobile remnant. First, it cannot derive the intended reading of JWS with a conditional-internal remnant (10B₁). Under this analysis, (10B₁) should have the structure (16), where the entire conditional clause undergoes movement to evade an island violation.

- (16) naze [Hanako-ga_i yurusitekureta-ra] [_{FinP} Taro-wa t_i dekake-rare-ru no] (da)?
 why Hanako-NOM permit-if Taro-TOP go.out-can-PRES C COP
 lit. ‘Why [if Hanako permits]_i can Taro go out t_i?’

(16) does not have the same meaning as JWS (10B₁). The interpretation of (10B₁) is roughly ‘Why is it Hanako (and not some other person) that Taro can go out if she permits?’, which presupposes that there is a person who has the authority to permit Taro to go out (∃x: x a person. Taro can go out if x permits). This “authorizer” presupposition is absent in (16), which roughly means, ‘Why is it under the condition that Hanako permits (and not other conditions such as ‘(if) his mother comes back’) that Taro can go out?’. So long as ellipsis is a meaning-preserving operation, it is highly implausible to assume that (16) is the underlying structure of (10B₁).

Second, the pied-piping analysis can cause overgeneration of examples of JWS such as (17), where the non-*wh*-remnant *feretto* is interpreted as part of the compound *feretto-zuki* ‘ferret-lover’.

- (17) [Context: This veterinary clinic treats animals except small ones such as ferrets.]
 A: kono doobutu byooin-wa tairyoo-no [_{AN} [_N ferretto]-[_{AN} zuki]]-no isya-o yatotta.
 this veterinary clinic-TOP a.lot.of-GEN ferret-lover-GEN doctor-ACC hired
 lit. ‘This veterinary clinic hired a lot of ferret-loving doctors.’
 B: naze FERETTO?
 why ferret
 ‘Why FERRET(S)?’ (slightly adapted from Kimura 2021:(97))

If (17B) is derived via the pied-piping-based MDA, movement must apply to the entire object argument *tairyoo-no ferretto-zuki-no isya-o* ‘a lot of ferret-loving doctors,’ whose constituency is given in (18) (adoption of further functional layers like DP and *nP* makes no significant difference in our discussion).

- (18)
-

To derive (17B), four independent deletion applications should take place, each affecting *tairyoo-(no)*, *zuki-(no)* and *isya-(o)*, and FinP, as in (19).

- (19) naze [~~tairyoo-no~~ ferretto-zuki-no isya-o]_i [_{FinP} kono doobutu—byooin-wa t_i yatotta (no)] (da)?
 why a.lot.of-GEN ferret-lover-GEN doctor-ACC this veterinary clinic-TOP hired C COP
 ‘Why is it [a lot of ferret-loving doctors]_i that this veterinary clinic hired?’

Given the independence of these deletion operations, the pied-piping analysis cannot reasonably exclude the possibility of optional non-application of each deletion. Many choices of non-application lead to ungrammaticality or semantic anomaly. For instance, if deletion does not apply to *isya-(o)* as in (20a), the resulting expression **naze ferreto isya-(o)* ‘Why a ferret doctor?’ is ungrammatical (21a). If the deletion does not apply to *tairyoo-(no)* ‘a lot of’ as in (20b), we would have the semantically incoherent expression #*naze tairyoo-no ferretto?* ‘Why a lot of ferrets?’ (21b). If *tairyoo-(no)* and *isya-(o)* do not undergo deletion as in (20c), the resulting structure would derive the deviant expression **naze tairyoo-no ferretto isya-o?* ‘Why a lot of ferret doctors?’ (21c).

- (20) a. naze [~~tairyoo-no feretto-zuki-no isya-(o)~~]; [~~kono doobutu-byooiin-wa-ti-yatot-ta (no)~~] (da)?
 b. naze [~~tairyoo-no feretto-zuki-no isya-(o)~~]; [~~kono doobutu-byooiin-wa-ti-yatot-ta (no)~~] (da)?
 c. naze [~~tairyoo-no feretto-zuki-no isya-(o)~~]; [~~kono doobutu-byooiin-wa-ti-yatot-ta (no)~~] (da)?
- (21) a. *naze [feretto isya-(o)] (da)?
 why ferret doctor-ACC COP
 b. #naze [tairyoo-no feretto] (da)? (# as a response to (17A))
 why a.lot.of-GEN ferret COP
 ‘Why a lot of ferrets?’ (The remnant cannot refer to many ferret-loving doctors.)
 c. *naze [tairyoo-no feretto isya-(o)] (da)?
 why a.lot.of-GEN ferret doctor-ACC COP

For these reasons, the pied-piping-based MDA fails to cover all the data of JWS.

6. An *In-situ* Analysis

In the preceding discussion, we showed that JWS with an immobile remnant cannot be derived from the copular sentence because they disallow the appearance of an overt pronominal subject *sore* ‘it’ (section 3); an immobile remnant cannot move out of the ellipsis site alone (sections 3-4); pied-piping of a larger phrase including an immobile remnant causes several problems (section 5). Based on these, we conclude that the non-*wh*-remnant can stay inside the ellipsis site.

6.1. An *In-situ* Analysis of JWS

We propose an *in-situ* analysis of JWS, adopting the theory of deletion which allows a focus element to survive deletion (Kimura and Narita 2016 and Kimura 2021). We call this type of deletion operation *Focus-Inclusive Deletion* (FID) (22) (see section 6.2). We analyze (7B₁), (8B₁), (9B₁), and (10B₁) as in (23), (24), (25), and (26), respectively, where the non-*wh*-remnant constitutes an *in-situ* focus in the *no da* *in-situ* focus construction, surviving FID.

(22) Focus-Inclusive Deletion (FID; cf. Kimura 2021:24)

Applied to a constituent XP, FID phonologically reduces all recoverable elements except the focus-marked element within XP.

- (23) naze Hanako-wa [Taro-ga [_FHITO-RI-MO] sasowa-nai to] omotta (no) (da)?
 why Hanako-TOP Taro-NOM 1-CL-MO ask.out-not C thought C COP
 ‘Why does Hanako know that Taro will not ask out EVEN ONE PERSON?’
 → naze [~~Hanako-wa~~—[~~Taro-ga-_FHITO-RI-MO~~]-~~sasowa-nai-to~~]-~~sitteiru-no~~] (da)?
- (24) naze kinoo Taro-wa [_{sc}Hanako-o [_FNIKURASIKU]] kanzita (no) (da)?
 why yesterday Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC hateful felt C COP
 ‘Why did Taro felt Hanako HATEFUL yesterday?’
 → naze [~~kinoo~~—~~Taro-wa-_{sc}Hanako-o~~—[~~_FNIKURASIKU~~]]—~~kanzita~~] (no) (da)?
- (25) naze Taro-wa [_FBASU]-gayoi-o siteiru (no) (da)?
 why Taro-TOP bus-commute-ACC do C COP
 lit. ‘Why is it that Taro does BUS-commuting?’
 → naze [~~Taro-wa-_FBASU~~]-~~gayoi-o~~-~~siteiru-no~~] (da)?
- (26) naze Taro-wa [[_FHANAKO]-ga yurusitekureta-ra] dekake-rare-ru (no) (da)?
 why Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM permitted-if go.out-can-PRES C COP
 ‘Why can Taro go out if HANAKO permits?’
 → naze [~~Taro-wa~~—[[~~_FHANAKO~~]-~~ga yurusitekureta-ra~~]-~~dekake-rare-ru-no~~] (da)?

Under the *in-situ* analysis presented here, the non-*wh*-remnant need not move. Therefore, it is not surprising that an immobile element can be the remnant of JWS.

6.2. Conceptual and Empirical Validity of FID

Some linguists argue against the *in-situ* approach, claiming that deletion must eliminate all elements inside the target constituent. However, the form of deletion that includes a focus inside the ellipsis site (FID) is as theoretically natural as the form of deletion excluding a focus from the ellipsis site (FED).

First, FID applies to constituents just like FED. What is required to achieve FID is only to determine the target constituent XP and the F-marked constituent YP, as is the case with FED as well. The only difference between FID and FED lies in whether the F-marked constituent YP is internal or external to the target constituent of deletion, XP, as shown schematically in (27). Therefore, FID satisfies the general condition of structure dependence to the same extent as FED.

(27) a. FED: $YP_{[F]} \dots [XP \dots] \rightarrow YP_{[F]} \dots [\cancel{XP \dots}]$ b. FID: $[XP \dots YP_{[F]} \dots] \rightarrow [\cancel{XP \dots} YP_{[F]} \dots]$

Second, given that both focus-inclusive and focus-exclusive deaccenting are applicable, it is natural that their extreme forms, FID and FED, are comparably applicable. For instance, in the deaccented *why*-question (28B₁), the focused constituent *Hanako-o* with prosodic prominence is located inside a larger constituent containing non-focused elements that carry old information and are prosodically weakened by deaccenting (indicated by gray fonts and underscores). FID (28B₂) occurs in the same way as deaccenting in the form of (28B₁) (see Tancredi 1992). It is also possible to apply deaccenting to a phrase not containing focus as in (28B₃), whose extreme form corresponds to FED as in (28B₄).

- (28) A: Taro-wa Hanako-o sasotta yo.
 Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC asked.out SFP
 ‘Taro asked Hanako out.’
- B₁: naze [Taro-wa [_F HANAKO-O] sasotta (no)] (da)? (deaccenting)
 why Taro-TOP Hanako-ACC asked.out C COP
 ‘Why did Taro ask [_F HANAKO] out?’
- B₂: naze [~~Taro-wa~~ [_F HANAKO-(O)] ~~sasotta~~ (no)] (da)? (FID)
- B₃: naze [_F HANAKO-O]_i [Taro-wa t_i sasotta (no)] (da)? (deaccenting)
 why Hanako-ACC Taro-TOP asked.out C COP
 lit. ‘Why [_F HANAKO]_i did Taro ask t_i out?’
- B₄: naze [_F HANAKO-O]_I [~~Taro-wa~~ t_i ~~sasotta~~ (no)] (da)? (FED)

For these reasons, we conclude that FID is as theoretically natural as FED.

One might claim that FID may cause overgeneration because it allows discontinuous elements to be elided. However, this is not the case. The *in-situ* analysis based on FID can evade the overgeneration problem that the pied-piping-based MDA faces. Let’s consider the case of JWS (17B). We claim that the possible forms of the remnant under FID is strictly restricted by focus percolation. A common observation is that focus often projects in a bottom-up fashion (see Selkirk 1995, among others). If so, the *in-situ* analysis based on FID correctly derives only felicitous cases. (NB: [_{+F} ...] represents focus-projection).

- (29) a. naze [_{+F} [_F FERRETTO]-zuki-(no)] (da)?
 why ferret-lover-GEN COP
 ‘Why FERRET-lover?’
- b. naze [_{+F} [_{+F} [_F FERRETTO]-zuki-(no)] isya-(o)] (da)?
 why ferret-lover-GEN doctor-ACC COP
 ‘Why FERRET-lover doctors?’
- c. naze [_{+F} tairyoo-no [_{+F} [_{+F} [_F FERRETTO]-zuki-(no)] isya-(o)]] (da)?
 why a.lot.of-GEN ferret-lover-GEN doctor-ACC COP
 ‘Why a lot of FERRET-lover doctors?’

- d. *naze [FERETTO isya-(o)] (da)? (cf. (20a)/(21a))
 why ferret doctor-ACC COP
 ‘Why ferret doctors?’
- e. #naze [tairyoo-no FERETTO] (da)? (# as a response to (17A)) (cf. (20b)/(21b))
 why a.lot.of-GEN ferret COP
 ‘Why a lot of ferrets?’
- f. *naze [tairyoo-no FERETTO isya-(o)] (da)? (cf. (20c)/(21c))
 why a.lot.of-GEN ferret doctor-acc COP
 ‘Why a lot of ferret doctors?’

In the felicitous cases (29a-c), focus-projection applies upward in the tree diagram in (18): [_F FERETTO] ‘ferret’ (17B) → [_{+F} [_F FERETTO]-zuki-(no)] ‘ferret lover’ (29a) → [_{+F} [_{+F} [_F FERETTO]-zuki-(no)] isya-(o)] ‘ferret lover doctor(s)’ (29b) → [_{+F} tairyoo-no [_{+F} [_{+F} [_F FERETTO]-zuki-(no)] isya-(o)] ‘a lot of ferret lover doctors’ (29c). By contrast, in the deviant cases, focus-projection does not occur in a bottom-up fashion. For instance, in (29d), the focus of [_F FERETTO] must be projected to *isya-o* ‘doctor,’ skipping *zuki-no* ‘lover.’ The other deviant cases (29e-f) are also excluded if focus projection takes place only upwards. In this way, the *in-situ* analysis regulated by focus projection can evade overgeneration.

7. Conclusion

We examined four data sets of JWS with an immobile remnant. We showed that they constitute solid evidence against MDA and favor the *in-situ* approach to *why*-stripping. The entire discussion presents novel arguments for the view that a focused element can stay inside an ellipsis site.

References

- Di Sciullo, Anna Maria, and Edwin Williams (1987) *On the Definition of Word*. MIT Press.
- Ha, Seungwan (2022) “The in-situ Analysis of Why-stripping,” *Studies in Generative Grammar* 32:529-549.
- Hiraiwa Ken, Shinichiro Ishihara (2002) “Missing Links: Clefts, Sluicing, and ‘No da’ Construction in Japanese,” *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 43: Proceedings of HUMIT 2001*, 35–43.
- Hiraiwa Ken and Shinichiro Ishihara (2012) “Syntactic Metamorphosis: Clefts, Sluicing and In-situ Focus in Japanese,” *Syntax* 15 (2):142-180.
- Kikuchi, Akira, and Daiko Takahashi (1991) “Agreement and Small Clauses,” *Topics in Small Clauses*, ed. by Heizo Nakajima and Shigeo Tonoike, 75-105, Tokyo, Kurosio Publishers.
- Kimura, Hiroko (2018) “A Non-Movement Analysis of Why-Stripping,” *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 88)*: 363-370.
- Kimura, Hiroko. (2021). “An In-situ Analysis of Why-stripping,” *English Linguistics* 38:1–32
- Kimura, Hiroko, and Hiroki Narita (2016). “Focus-inclusive Deletion in Fragment Answers: Evidence from Japanese.” *Proceedings of the 18th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (SICOGG18)*, 225-45.
- Kimura, Hiroko, and Hiroki Narita (2021) Compound Wh-questions and Fragment Answers in Japanese: Implications for the Nature of Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 52: 195–209.
- Kimura, Hiroko, and Daiko Takahashi (2011). NPI and Predicative Remnants in Japanese Sluicing. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 19: 141-154.
- Maeda, Masako, and Tomoko Matsumoto (2011). “A Syntactic Analysis of Sluicing Constructions in Japanese,” *Kyudai Eibungaku* 53: 117-138.
- Nakao, Chizuru, Iván Ortega-Santos and Masaya Yoshida. (2013) “On the structure of Japanese ‘Why’-Stripping.” *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia IX 2012*.
- Ortega-Santos Iván, Masaya Yoshida, and Chizuru Nakao (2014) “On Ellipsis Structures involving a *Wh*-remnant and a Non-*wh*-remnant Simultaneously” *Lingua* 138: 55-85.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth (1995) “Sentence Prosody: Intonation, Stress, and Phrasing.” In *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, ed. by John A. Goldsmith, 550-569, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Tancredi, Christopher (1992) “Deletion, Deaccenting, and Presupposition,” PhD thesis, MIT.
- Weir, Andrew. (2014) “‘Why’-stripping targets Voice Phrase.” *NELS* 43: 235–248.
- Yoshida, Masaya, Chizuru Nakao and Iván Ortega-Santos (2014) “The Syntax of *Why*-stripping” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33:323-370.

Proceedings of the 41st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Nikolas Webster, Yağmur Kiper,
Richard Wang, and Sichen Larry Lyu

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2025

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 41st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2025 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-483-6 hardback

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the printed edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Kimura, Hiroko and Hiroki Narita. 2025. Immobile Remnants of Japanese *why*-Stripping. In *Proceedings of the 41st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Nikolas Webster et al., 300-307. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3759.