

Substitutive *why*-Stripping: A Case of Japanese

Hiroko Kimura and Hiroki Narita

1. Introduction

In this paper, we will investigate a hitherto unnoticed type of *why*-stripping, which we dub *substitutive why-stripping* (SWS). Regular *why*-stripping (RWS), exemplified in (1B₁) from Japanese, involves repetition of the correlate (*Hanako*-(*ni*)) as its non-*wh*-remnant. In contrast, SWS such as (1B₂) and (1B₃) involves a paraphrase of the correlate as its remnant (e.g., *imooto* ‘younger sister’ in (1B₂)).

- (1) A: Tár_i-wa Hánako_j-ni gǐhuto-o katta yo. B₁: náze Hánako_j-(ni)? (RWS)
Taro-TOP Hanako-for gift-ACC bought SFP why Hanako-for
‘Taro_i bought a gift for Hanako_j.’ ‘Why (for) Hanako_j?’
B₂: náze imooto_j-(ni)? (SWS) B₃: náze [zibun_i-no musumé tatta hitó-ri]_j-(ni)? (SWS)
why younger.sister-for why self-GEN daughter only one-CL-for
‘Why (for) (his) younger sister_j?’ lit. ‘Why (for) [self_i’s daughter, only one person]_j?’

SWS has some significant implications for the nature of ellipsis that are not evident from studies of RWS. First, SWS presents novel support for the structural approach over the non-structural approach (section 2). Second, SWS provides evidence for structural identity (section 3). Third, SWS supports the *in-situ* approach, indicating that the non-*wh*-remnant can stay inside the ellipsis site (section 4).

2. Evidence for the Structural Approach: Lexical Integrity

SWS presents a clue for a controversial issue of ellipsis: the presence/absence of unpronounced structure. Kim and Abeillé (2019) take the non-structural approach to RWS, according to which RWS is just direct concatenation of *why* and the non-*wh*-remnant. In contrast, Nakao et al. (2013), Ortega-Santos et al. (2014), Weir (2014), Yoshida et al. (2015), Kimura (2018, 2021), and Ha (2022) argue for the structural approach and claim that RWS involves a clausal structure.

SWS provides a novel piece of evidence for the structural approach based on “lexical integrity,” which prevents syntactic phrases from appearing as part of a word (Di Sciullo and Williams 1987). In (2A₁), *Hanako* is inside the compound word *Hanako-gónomi* ‘(to) Hanako’s taste’, which has the same meaning as its phrasal counterpart *Hanako-no konomi* in (2A₂). We use boxes to indicate compounds.

- (2) A₁: káre_i-wa Hanako_j-gónomi-no gǐhuto-o katta yo.
he-TOP Hanako-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought SFP
lit. ‘He_i bought a Hanako_j-taste gift.’
A₂: káre_i-wa Hánako_j-no kónomi-no gǐhuto-o katta yo.
he-TOP Hanako-GEN taste-GEN gift-ACC bought SFP
lit. ‘He_i bought a Hanako’s_j taste gift.’
B₁: náze [_N imootó]_j? (ok as a response to (2A₁)/(2A₂))
why younger.sister
lit. ‘Why [(his) younger sister]_j?’
B₂: náze [_N syuseki-hisyó-kan]_j? (ok as a response to (2A₁)/(2A₂))
why chief-secretary-staff
lit. ‘Why [chief secretarial assistant]_j?’

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

- B₃: náze [NP Táro_k-no máe-no ókusan]_j? (?? as a response to (2A₁)/
 why Taro-GEN ex-GEN wife ^{ok} as a response to (2A₂)
 lit. ‘Why [Taro_k’s ex-wife]_j?’
- B₄: náze [NP zibun_i-no musumé tatta hitó-ri]_j? (*? as a response to (2A₁)/
 why self-GEN daughter only one-CL ^{ok} as a response to (2A₂)
 lit. ‘Why [self_i’s daughter, only one person]_j?’

Interestingly, (2B₃) and (2B₄) are deviant as responses to (2A₁), but not to (2A₂). Since (2A₁) and (2A₂) are synonymous, the contrast should be ascribed to the structural difference in the antecedents: compound structure (2A₁) vs. phrasal structure (2A₂). If SWS involves a clausal structure parallel to the antecedent, the contrast between (2B₁₋₂) and (2B₃₋₄) can be attributed to lexical integrity, which bans phrasal elements from being inside a word (Di Sciullo and Williams 1987). The remnant in the deviant cases (2B₃₋₄) contains phrases (genitive-marked NPs (2B₃), a floating quantifier (2B₄)), which cannot be part of a compound. Thus, (2B₃) and (2B₄) are degraded due to a violation of lexical integrity. In contrast, the remnant in the acceptable cases (2B₁₋₂) is an element that can appear inside a word (a simplex noun *imootó* ‘younger sister’ (2B₁), a compound noun *syuseki-hisyó-kan* ‘chief secretarial assistant’ (2B₂)).

The same contrast is observed for the non-elided counterparts (3B₁₋₄). In contrast to (3B₁) and (3B₂), which do not contain a phrasal element, (3B₃) and (3B₄) are deviant because they violate lexical integrity.

- (3) B₁: náze káre_i-wa [N imooto]_j-gónomi_i-no gñhuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP younger.sister-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [younger sister_i-taste]_j gift?’
- B₂: náze káre_i-wa [N syuseki-hisyó-kan]_j-gónomi_i-no gñhuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP chief-secretary-staff-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [chief secretarial assistant]_j-taste_i gift?’
- B₃:??náze káre_i-wa [NP Táro_k-no máe-no okusan]_j-gónomi_i-no gñhuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP Taro-GEN ex-GEN wife-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [Taro_k’s ex-wife]_j-taste_i gift?’
- B₄:*?náze káre_i-wa [NP zibun_i-no musumé tatta hito-ri]_j-gónomi_i-no gñhuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP self-GEN daughter only one-CL-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [self_i’s daughter, only one person]_j-taste_i gift?’

We observe interspeaker variation regarding cases like (2B₃) and (3B₃). Of importance here is that those who judge (2B₃) marginally acceptable also judge the corresponding non-elided *why*-question (3B₃) as comparably acceptable. In general, there is a correlation between the acceptability of SWS (like (2B₁₋₄)) and that of its non-elided clausal counterpart (cf. (3B₁₋₄)). This correlation is no surprise under the assumption that SWS has a clausal structure parallel to the antecedent.

In contrast, this correlation is problematic for the non-structural approach, because it does not assume structure for ellipsis parallel to the antecedent. Specifically, this approach cannot account for the fact that one and the same string of words becomes acceptable, marginal, or degraded, depending on the structure of the antecedent (the contrasts in (2)).

For these reasons, we conclude that SWS involves a clausal structure parallel to the antecedent. Lexical integrity effects observed in SWS constitute novel support for the structural approach.

3. Evidence for Structural Identity

SWS also has significant implications for the identity condition on ellipsis, another controversial issue. Some linguists argue that semantic identity is enough (Merchant 2001). In contrast, we argue that SWS provides a novel argument for the view that structural identity is required to license ellipsis.

To our knowledge, Merchant’s (2001) semantic identity condition based on focus-assisted mutual entailment (FAME) in (4) is one of the most influential hypotheses on identity. FAME is empirically supported by cases where the ellipsis site and its antecedent have the same meaning while their structures are different. In (5) cited from Merchant (2001), for example, the antecedent contains a gerund whereas

the elided part involves a *to*-infinitive. Despite the structural difference, ellipsis is licensed under FAME, because the antecedent clause and the elided clause are in a mutual entailment relation.

- (4) An expression E can be deleted only if E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo \exists -type shifting, A entails F-clo(E) and E entails F-clo(A) (FAME(A, E) for short; Merchant 2001, adapted).
- (5) [Decorating for the holidays] is easy if you know how [~~to decorate for the holidays~~].

FAME predicts that two antecedents which have the same meaning should allow the same set of ellipsis cases. However, SWS shows that this prediction is not borne out. The antecedent with compound structure in (2A₁), repeated as (6a), has the same interpretation as its phrasal counterpart in (2A₂), repeated as (6b). Then, FAME wrongly predicts that (6a) and (6b) should allow the same set of SWS.

- (6) a. káre_i-wa Hanako_i-gónomi-no gfhuto-o katta yo. (= (2A₁))
 he-TOP Hanako-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought SFP
 lit. 'He_i bought a Hanako_i-taste gift.'
- b. káre_i-wa Hánako_j-no kónomi-no gfhuto-o katta yo. (= (2A₂))
 he-TOP Hanako-GEN taste-GEN gift-ACC bought SFP
 'He_i bought a gift to Hanako_j's taste.'

As observed in section 2, SWS with a phrasal remnant like *zibun-no musumé tatta hitó-ri* 'his daughter, only one person' in (2B₄) is acceptable as a response to (6a) but not to (6b). This contrast poses a serious problem for Merchant's semantic identity condition/FAME. Since F-clo(6a) is equal to F-clo(6b), FAME cannot explain why (6a) but not (6b) disallows examples of SWS with a phrasal remnant (2B₃₋₄). The contrast under discussion strongly suggests that some sort of structural identity is required.

Fragment answers also exhibit the same pattern (see Kimura and Narita 2021). Japanese allows a *wh*-element to be located within a compound in non-echo questions, as exemplified by (7A₁) (Kageyama 1993). We dub this type of question a 'compound *wh*-question.' A fragment answer containing a phrasal compound (7B₂) is, in contrast with (7B₁), deviant as a response to the compound *wh*-question (7A₁), to the same extent that the same phrasal compound leads to deviance in the non-elided sentential answer (7B₄). This phrasal fragment answer (7B₂) is perfect as responses to the phrasal *wh*-question (7A₂).

- (7) A₁: minná_i-wa intéria_j-o [N dare]-gónomi-no soosyoku-ni sita no?
 everyone-TOP interior-ACC who-taste-GEN decoration-DAT did Q
 lit. 'Who-taste decorations did everyone_i put up in the/their_i interior_j?'
 A₂: minná_i-wa intéria_j-o [_{NP} dáre]-no kónomi-no soosyoku-ni sita no?
 everyone-TOP interior-ACC who-GEN taste-GEN decoration-DAT did Q
 lit. 'Decorations to whose taste did everyone_i put up in the/their_i interior_j?'
 B₁: [_N hito-ri-músume] (da/desu). (^{ok} as a response to (7A₁)/
 one-CL-daughter COP ^{ok} as a response to (7A₂))
 '(The) only daughter.'
 B₂: [_{NP} musumé hitó-ri] (da/desu). (* as a response to (7A₁)/
 daughter one-CL COP ^{ok} as a response to (7A₂))
 'One (of their_i) daughter(s).'
 B₃: Ø_i Ø_j [N hito-ri-músume]-gónomi-no soosyoku-ni sita (no da/desu).
 one-CL-daughter-taste-GEN decoration-DAT did C COP
 lit. 'They_i put up daughter-taste decorations there_j.'
 B₄: *Ø_i Ø_j [_{NP} musumé hitó-ri]-gónomi-no soosyoku-ni sita (no da/desu).
 daughter one-CL-taste-GEN decoration-DAT did C COP
 lit. 'They_i put up one of their_i daughters-taste decorations there_j.' (Kimura and Narita 2021)

This shows that fragment answers to a compound *wh*-question are also subject to lexical integrity.

Lexical integrity for fragment answers and SWS can be summarized as the generalization in (8), which supports the structural identity condition (9) adopted from Kimura and Narita (2021:200 (13)).

(8) Generalization (adapted from Kimura and Narita 2021; to be extended):
When the correlate X is located within a compound C of the form $\boxed{X-Q}$, the remnant R of ellipsis is acceptable to the extent that it can also be located within the same compound structure as C ($\boxed{R-Q}$).

(9) The target XP of deletion must be structurally isomorphic to its antecedent XP.

(9) can capture lexical integrity effects observed in fragment answers and SWS when their correlate is part of a compound. Furthermore, (9) can also explain the interspeaker variation for elliptical instances of phrasal compounds like (2B₃): we predict from (9) that if a speaker finds examples like (2B₃) somewhat acceptable, then s/he would find the non-elided counterpart (3B₃) comparably acceptable.

To summarize, SWS presents further support for structural identity over semantic identity.

4. Evidence for the *In-situ* Approach

Now let us consider an implication of SWS for the structural position of the non-*wh*-remnant. As for RWS, it has been widely assumed that while the *wh*-remnant *naze/why* is base-generated outside the ellipsis site, the non-*wh*-remnant (e.g. *Hanako-(ni)* in (1B₁)) moves out of the ellipsis site via focus movement (the so-called Movement-and-Deletion analysis, henceforth MDA) (Ortega-Santos et al. 2014, Weir 2014, and Yoshida et al. 2015). In contrast, Kimura (2018, 2021) and Ha (2022) propose *in-situ* analyses of RWS, in which the non-*wh*-remnant can stay inside the ellipsis site (see also Kimura and Narita in this volume). SWS in Japanese presents novel support for the *in-situ* approach.

To the best of our knowledge, Nakao et al. (2013) are the first to examine RWS in Japanese. They observe that RWS in Japanese is more similar to Cleft than to a *wh*-question. They point out that RWS patterns with Cleft in several respects, including the optional occurrence of a copular verb *da* ‘be’. To capture the similarity, they argue that RWS shares its derivation with Cleft. Specifically, adopting Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s (2002) analysis of Cleft, Nakao et al. claim that both RWS and Cleft in Japanese are derived from the *no da in-situ* focus construction. Their analysis of RWS (1B₁) is illustrated in (10). In the underlying *no-da* construction (10a), *naze* ‘why’ is base-generated in the clause-initial position whereas the non-*wh*-remnant *HANAKO-(ni)* serves as an *in-situ* focus. The non-*wh*-remnant undergoes focus movement out of the ellipsis site FinP to Spec-FocP, as shown in (10b). Then, FinP undergoes deletion as in (10c). Nakao et al. also argue that when FinP undergoes topicalization instead of deletion at the stage of the derivation (10b), the cleft sentence with *naze* ‘why’ in (11) is derived.

- (10) a. [_{CP} náze [_{FocP} [_{FinP} Táro_i-ga HÁNAKO_j-(ni) gĥuto-o katta no] [_{Foc0} (da)]]] (ka)
 why Taro-NOM Hanako-for gift-ACC bought C COP Q
 b. [_{CP} náze [_{FocP} HÁNAKO_j-(ni) [_{FinP} Táro_i-ga t_j gĥuto-o katta no] [_{Foc0} (da)]]] (ka)
 why Hanako-for Taro-NOM gift-ACC bought C COP Q
 c. [_{CP} náze [_{FocP} HÁNAKO_j-(ni) [_{FinP} Táro_i-ga t_j gĥuto-o katta no] [_{Foc0} (da)]]] (ka)
 why Hanako-for Taro-NOM gift-ACC bought C COP Q

- (11) [_{CP} náze [_{FinP} Táro_i-ga t_j gĥuto-o katta no]-wa [_{FocP} HÁNAKO_j-(ni) [_{Foc0} (da)]]] (ka)
 why Taro-NOM gift-ACC bought C-TOP Hanako-for COP Q

We argue that Nakao et al.’s (2013) MDA cannot be extended to SWS as responses to a compound *wh*-question where the correlate is part of a compound. Under MDA, the remnant *imootó* ‘younger sister’ in (2B₁) must move out of the compound *imooto-gónomi* ‘younger sister-taste’. However, extraction out of a compound is generally prohibited, regardless of the size of the moved element, as shown in (12).

- (12) * [_{CP} náze [_{FocP} { [_N imootó_j] / [_N syuseki-hisyó-kan_j] / [_{NP} Táro_k-no máe-no okusan_j] /
 why yonger.sister chief-secretary-staff Taro-GEN ex-GEN wife
 [_{NP} zibun_i-no musumé tatta hitó-ri_j] } [_{FinP} [_{TP} kare_i-wa $\boxed{t_i\text{-gónomi}}$ -no gĥuto-o katta]
 self-GEN daughter only one-CL he-TOP -taste-GEN gift-ACC bought
 [_{Fin0} no]] [_{Foc0} (da)]]]
 C COP

Given that compounds are prototypical islands for syntactic movement, some advocates of MDA might claim that the acceptable instances of SWS (2B₁₋₂) for a compound *wh*-question can still be derived from the deviant structure (12) via repair by ellipsis (Merchant 2001). The problem for this explanation, however, is that it would wrongly rule in cases like (2B₄) as well, since the deviance caused by a “compound island” violation should also be nullified by repair by ellipsis.

These considerations lead to the conclusion that there should be no way to salvage the deviance of (12). In other words, we should keep to the simple well-established truth that syntactic movement cannot affect elements internal to a compound, regardless of whether or not ellipsis applies afterwards. We therefore claim that SWS can be derived without movement of the non-*wh*-remnant. We claim that SWS (2B₁₋₄) is analyzable as (13). SWS is derived from the *no da in-situ* focus construction, with *naze* ‘why’ base-generated in a clause-initial position (cf. Nakao et al.’s 2013 analysis of RWS). We argue that the non-*wh*-remnant constitutes an *in-situ* focus, and it can survive deletion without being affected by movement. We assume that deletion may elide the target XP even when it contains a focused remnant YP. We dub this deletion operation *Focus-Inclusive Deletion (FID)* (see Kimura and Narita 2016, and Kimura and Narita in this volume for the conceptual and empirical validity of FID).

(13) *Analysis 1 (In-situ analysis):*

náze	karé-wa	{[N imootó] _j / [N syuseki-hisyo-kan] _j / ??[_{NP} Tárok-no máe-no okusan] _j /
why	he-TOP	younger.sister chief-secretarial-staff Taro-GEN ex-GEN wife
*?[_{NP} zibun _i -no musumé tatta hitó-ri] _j -gónomi	no	gihuto o katta (no) (da)?
self-GEN	daughter	only one-CL-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought C COP

This analysis can explain why compound-internal nouns, which are immobile elements, may constitute acceptable non-*wh*-remnants of SWS; no extraction out of a compound takes place. It can also provide a straightforward explanation for the relative (un)acceptability of phrasal remnants (2B₃₋₄), which correlates with that of structurally parallel phrasal compounds in the non-elided structure (3B₃₋₄).

One interesting consequence of the *in-situ* approach is that, since the ellipsis site contains the non-*wh*-remnant, the identity condition (9) now requires parallelism between the correlate and the remnant as well. Recently some advocates of MDA have claimed that identity must hold not only between the ellipsis site and its antecedent but also between the remnant outside the ellipsis site and its correlate. For instance, Barros and Vicente (2016) propose two separate identity conditions: the “E-site condition,” which holds between the ellipsis site and its antecedent, and the “remnant condition,” which requires identity between the remnant and its correlate. The *in-situ* analysis can subsume these two identity requirements under the single identity condition in (9). Under the *in-situ* analysis, the remnant stays inside the ellipsis site, so it must be subject to the identity condition as part of the ellipsis site. Because the *in-situ* analysis need not require two separate identity conditions, it provides a simpler picture of identity.

5. Further Refinement of the *In-situ* Analysis

This section examines *why*-stripping where two non-*wh*-remnants are coordinated.

(14) A: Táro_i-wa [Jíro_j to Hánako_k]-o hóméta. (conjunction)

Taro-TOP Jiro and Hanako-ACC praised
‘Taro_i praised [Jiro_j and Hanako_k].’

B₁: náze [Jíro_j to Hánako_k]-(-o)? (RWS) B₂: náze [ozi_j to imootó_k]-(-o) (SWS)

why Jiro and Hanako-ACC why uncle_j and younger.sister_k-ACC

‘Why [Jiro_j and Hanako_k]?’ ‘Why [his uncle_j and (his) younger sister_k]?’

(15) A: Táro_i-wa [Jíro_j ka Hánako_k]-o hóméta. (disjunction)

Taro-TOP Jiro or Hanako-ACC praised
‘Taro_i praised [Jiro_j or Hanako_k].’

B₁: náze [Jíro_j ka Hánako_k]-(-o)? (RWS) B₂: *náze [ozi_j ka imootó_k]-(-o) (SWS)

why Jiro or Hanako-ACC why uncle_j or younger.sister_k-ACC

‘Why [Jiro_j or Hanako_k]?’ ‘Why [his uncle_j or (his) younger sister_k]?’

When the two non-*wh*-remnants are conjoined with *to* ‘and’, both RWS (14B₁) and SWS (14B₂) are acceptable. In the SWS (14B₂), the conjunctive NP remnant *ozi-to imootó* ‘uncle and younger sister’ is a paraphrase of *Jiro-to Hánako* ‘Jiro and Hanako’. In contrast to the conjunction case (14B₂), SWS (15B₂), where the two remnants are coordinated via disjunction with *ka* ‘or,’ is degraded.

Note that Analysis 1 (13) does not have an account for why (15B₂) is degraded, nor do any previous analyses for that matter. Observe that the non-elided question (16) is acceptable as a response to (15A).

- (16) náze Táro_i-wa [ozi_j ka imootó_k]-(-o) hómeta no? (ok as a response to (15A))
 why Taro-TOP uncle_j or younger.sister_k-ACC praised Q
 ‘Why did Taro_i praise [his uncle_j; or (his) younger sister_k]?’

Nothing precludes this clausal structure (16) from serving as the source for SWS in (15B₂). The unacceptability of (15B₂) suggests that there is an additional condition on disjunctive remnants.

As a possible account of the contrast between (14B₂) and (15B₂), we provide a slight variant of our *in-situ* analysis proposed in section 4. Specifically, we argue that the non-*wh*-remnant of SWS such as (14B₂) and (15B₂) involves *appositive* structure. Notice first that the same contrast observed between (14B₂) and (15B₂) is attested in the non-elliptical *why*-questions with apposition in (17) and (18).

- (17) náze Táro_i-wa [[ozi_j to imootó_k] [Jíro_j to Hánako_k]]-(-o) hómeta no?
 why Taro-TOP uncle and younger.sister Jiro and Hanako-ACC praised Q
 lit. ‘Why did Taro_i praise [Jíro_j and Hanako_k] [his uncle_j and (his) younger sister_k]?’

- (18)*náze Táro_i-wa [[ozi_j ka imootó_k] [Jíro_j ka Hánako_k]]-(-o) hómeta no?
 why Taro-TOP uncle or younger.sister Jiro or Hanako-ACC praised Q
 lit. ‘Why did Taro_i praise [Jíro_j or Hanako_k] [his uncle_j or (his) younger sister_k]?’

(17) and (18) show that conjunction, but not disjunction, can bear an appositive NP. This is presumably because the core function of apposition is to identify the host NP with another NP whose reference is determinate. Since disjunction is by its nature referentially indeterminate, it presumably fails to fulfill the identification function. Thus, we claim that disjunctive SWS in (15B₂) is degraded for the same reason as (18): a failure of identification.

We argue that SWS like (14B₂) and (15B₂) are alternatively analyzed as (19a) and (19b).

(19) *Analysis 2 (In-situ apposition analysis):*

- a. náze {Táro_i-wa}—{[ozi_j to imootó_k]——[Jíro_j-to Hánako_k]} (-o) hómeta no?
 why Taro-TOP uncle and younger.sister Jiro and Hanako-ACC praised Q
 b.* náze {Táro_i-wa}—{[ozi_j ka imootó_k]——[Jíro_j-ka Hánako_k]} (-o) hómeta no?
 why Taro-TOP uncle or younger.sister Jiro or Hanako-ACC praised Q

Notice that the apposition analysis can still provide a succinct account of lexical integrity effects (see sections 2 and 3). The non-elided *why*-questions with appositive structure in (16) show different degrees of acceptability in correlation with the corresponding SWS cases in (2B₁₋₄), as in (20B₁₋₄). This fact suggests that lexical integrity excludes not only phrasal compounds but also compound-internal phrasal apposition.

(20) [As a response to the antecedent (2A₁), where the correlate is part of a compound:]

- B₁: náze káre_i-wa [[N imootó] Hanako]_j-gónomi-no gíhuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP younger.sister Hanako-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [younger sister Hanako]_j-taste gift?’
 B₂: náze káre_i-wa [[N syuseki-hisyó-kan] Hanako]_j-gónomi-no gíhuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP chief-secretary-staff Hanako-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [chief secretarial assistant Hanako]_j-taste gift?’

- B₃: ??náze káre_i-wa [[NP Tárok-no máe-no ókusan] Hanako]_i-gónomi-no gihuto-o katta no?
 why he-TOP Taro-GEN ex-GEN wife Hanako-taste-GEN gift-ACC bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [Taro_k’s ex-wife Hanako]_i-taste gift?’
- B₄: *?náze káre_i-wa [[NP zibun_i-no musumé tatta hitó-ri] Hanako]_i-gónomi-no gihuto-o
 why he-TOP self-GEN daughter only one-CL Hanako-taste-GEN gift-ACC
 katta no?
 bought Q
 lit. ‘Why did he_i buy a [self_i’s daughter, only one person Hanako]_i-taste gift?’

In accordance with the findings discussed in this section, our generalization in (8) can be revised as below.

- (21) Generalization (final version; adapted and extended from Kimura and Narita 2021):
 When the correlate X is located within a compound C of the form [X-α], the remnant R of ellipsis is acceptable to the extent that R can also be located within the same compound structure as C ([R-α]) or can be attached to C via apposition to X ([[R X]-α]).

Under the apposition analysis, then, the examples of SWS in (2B₁₋₄) are derived from the appositive structures given in (20B₁₋₄), respectively, via deletion (FID), with the non-*wh*-remnant stays inside the ellipsis site, as shown below.

- (22) a. náze [káre_i-wa [[N imootó] Hanako]_i-gónomi no gihuto o katta no]?
 b. náze [káre_i-wa [[N syuseki-hisyó-kan] Hanako]_i-gónomi no gihuto o katta no]?
 c. ??náze [káre_i-wa [[NP Tárok-no máe-no ókusan] Hanako]_i-gónomi no gihuto o katta no]?
 d. *?náze [káre_i-wa [[NP zibun_i-no musumé tatta hitó-ri] Hanako]_i-gónomi no gihuto o katta no]?

Armed with the attested generalization in (21), the *in-situ* appositive analysis can account for the different degrees of acceptability in (2B₁₋₄)/(22a-d) whose correlate is part of a compound.

A similar pattern is observed in other languages as well. Witness the data below from English and Mandarin Chinese, parallel to the Japanese data presented above ((14), (15), (17), and (18)).

- (23) A: Taro_i praised [Jiro_j and Hanako_k]. (English: Bridget Samuels, p.c.)
 B₁: Why [Jiro_j and Hanako_k]?
 B₂: Why [his uncle_j and (his) sister_k]??
 B₃: Why did Taro_i praise [[his uncle_j and (his) sister_k] [Jiro_j and Hanako_k]]?
- (24) A: Taro_i praised [Jiro_j or Hanako_k].
 B₁: Why [Jiro_j or Hanako_k]?
 B₂: *Why [his uncle_j or (his) sister_k]??
 B₃: *Why did Taro_i praise [[his uncle_j or (his) sister_k] [Jiro_j or Hanako_k]]?
- (25) A: Taro_i chengzan [Jiro_j han Hanako_k]. (Mandarin Chinese: Chi-Ming Louis Liu, p.c.)
 Taro praise Jiro and Hanako
 ‘Taro_i praised [Jiro_j and Hanako_k].’
 B₁: Weishenme shì [Jiro_j han Hanako_k]?
 why COP Jiro and Hanako
 ‘Why [Jiro_j and Hanako_k]?’
 B₂: Weishenme shì [tade shushu_j han tade jiejie_k]?
 why COP his uncle and his sister
 ‘Why [his uncle_j and his sister_k]?’
 B₃: Weishenme Taro_i chengzan [tade shushu_j han tade jiejie_k] [Jiro_j han Hanako_k]?
 why Taro praise his uncle and his sister Jiro and Hanako
 ‘Why did Taro_i praise [[his uncle_j and (his) sister_k] [Jiro_j and Hanako_k]]?’

- (26) A: Taro_i chengzan [Jiro_j huo(shi) Hanako_k].
 Taro praise Jiro or Hanako
 ‘Taro_i praised [Jiro_j or Hanako_k].’
- B₁: Weishenme shi [Jiro_j huo(shi) Hanako_k]?
 why COP Jiro or Hanako
 ‘Why [Jiro_j or Hanako_k]?’
- B₂: *Weishenme shi [tade shushu_j huo(shi) tade jiejie_k]?
 why COP his uncle or his sister
 ‘Why [his uncle_j or his sister_k]?’
- B₃: *Weishenme Taro_i chengzan [tade shushu_j huo(shi) tade jiejie_k] [Jiro_j huo(shi) Hanako_k]?
 why Taro praise his uncle or his sister Jiro or Hanako
 ‘Why did Taro_i praise [[his uncle_j and (his) sister_k] [Jiro_j or Hanako_k]?’

The acceptability of SWS with coordinated remnants patterns with that of the non-elided counterparts with coordinated appositive structure. These crosslinguistic data provide additional support for the appositive analysis (Analysis 2).

6. Conclusion

This paper examined SWS, a hitherto unnoticed variety of *why*-stripping. SWS has significant implications for three controversial issues concerning ellipsis. First, SWS provides novel pieces of evidence for the structural approach (lexical integrity; section 2). Second, SWS constitutes support for the structural identity condition on ellipsis (the compound vs. phrase asymmetry; section 3). Third, SWS shows that the non-*wh*-remnant can stay inside the ellipsis site, supporting the *in-situ* approach to ellipsis (the ban on extraction out of compounds; section 4). We further showed that SWS may involve appositive structure (section 5).

References

- Barros, Matthew, and Luis Vicente (2016). A remnant condition for ellipsis. *Proceedings of WCCFL33*, ed. Kyeong-min Kim et al., 57-66. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Di Sciullo, A. M., and E. Williams. (1987). *On the definition of word*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.
- Hiraiwa, Ken, and Shinichiro Ishihara (2002) Missing links: Clefts, sluicing, and “no da” construction in Japanese,” in *MITWPL 43: Proceedings of HUMIT 2001*, ed. Tania Ionin, et al., 35-54. Cambridge, MA.: MIT.
- Ha, Seungwan (2022). The in-situ analysis of *why*-stripping, in *Studies in Generative Grammar 32*:529-549.
- Kageyama, Taro (1993). *Bunpo to Gokeisei (Grammar and Word Formation)*, Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Kim, Jong-Bok, and Anne Abeillé (2019). *Why*-stripping in English: A corpus-based perspective. *Linguistic Research* 36, 365-387.
- Kimura, Hiroko (2018). A non-movement analysis of *why*-stripping. *MITWPL 88: Proceedings of WAFL 13*, ed. Céleste Guillemot et al., 363-370. Cambridge, MA.: MIT.
- 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 SICOGG 18*, ed. Tae Sik Kim and Seungwan Ha, 225-245.
- 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 Hiroki Narita (this volume). Immobile remnants of Japanese *why*-stripping.
- Merchant, Jason (2001). The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nakao, Chizuru, Iván Ortega-Santos, and Masaya Yoshida (2013). On the structure of Japanese ‘*why*’-stripping. *Online Proceedings of GLOW in Asia IX*, 199-212.
- 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.
- Weir, Andrew (2014). *Why*-stripping targets Voice Phrase. *Proceedings of NELS 43*, ed. Huang, Hsin-lun, et al., 235-248.
- Yoshida, Masaya, Chizuru Nakao, and Ivan Ortega-Santos (2015). 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. Substitutive *why*-Stripping: A Case of Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 41st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Nikolas Webster et al., 308-315. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3760.