

Wh-Movement in Japanese: Matrix Sluicing is different from Embedded Sluicing *

*Nobuko Hasegawa
Kanda University of International Studies*

By examining matrix Sluicing, which has characteristics distinct from those of embedded Sluicing, I will argue that even Japanese, which has been considered as a non-*wh*-movement language, exhibits syntactic *wh*-movement, if triggered by the pragmatic or functional requirement on a truncated version of a true information question. This is a case study for a framework where sentential 'Force' in the sense of Chomsky (1995) and Rizzi (1997) or clause typing plays an important role in the application of grammatical operations as well as in the explication of language differences.

1. Introduction

In this paper, I will argue that Japanese, which has been considered as a language where *wh*-movement may not take place in syntax, exhibits syntactic *wh*-movement when that is the only way to make an utterance a *wh*-question; namely, in the context of a truncated *wh*-question (TWQ), which is exemplified by B's responses in (1).

- (1) a. A: Mary bought something. B: Really? *What*?
 b. A: Someone came in. B: Yeah? *Who*?
 c. A: John lost his wallet. B: Really? {*Where/When/How*}?

TWQ is a kind of Sluicing, Matrix-Sluicing (henceforth, M-Sluicing) in Lasnik (2001), looking exactly like ordinary Sluicing or E(mbedded)-Sluicing, typical examples of which are given in (2).

- (2) a. Mary bought something but I don't know *what*.
 b. Someone came in—guess *who*!
 c. John lost his wallet but no one knows {*where/when/how*}.

*Earlier versions of this paper have been presented at the 24th annual meeting of the English Linguistics Society in Japan in November 2006, at WAFL 4 in May 2007, and graduate seminars at Kanda University of International Studies. I am grateful to the participants for comments and suggestions. I have also benefited from discussions with various people, including Noam Chomsky, Jim Huang, Sachiko Kato, Howard Lasnik, and Shoichi Takahashi. It is unfortunate that I could not take into consideration Fukaya (2007), whose existence I noticed only at the final stage of writing up this paper.

In Section 2.1, we briefly review the characteristics of Sluicing in English and see how they have been analyzed. We then take a look at Sluicing (E-Sluicing) in Japanese and go over its analyses, showing that E-Sluicing in Japanese may be best analyzed as the truncated Cleft construction. In Section 3, we will examine M-Sluicing (TWQ) in Japanese, which exhibits the same characteristics as Sluicing in English, differing from E-Sluicing in Japanese. Based on the discussions in Sections 2 and 3, I will present an analysis for M-Sluicing for both English and Japanese and discuss how they differ from E-Sluicing. I will speculate at the end of the paper that certain syntactic operations (such as *wh*-movement) may be triggered by pragmatic or functional requirements that realize the ‘Force’ of a sentence.

2.1 Sluicing in English

(3) a. Mary bought something but I don't know what. (=2a))
 b. [_{TP} Mary bought something] but
 I don't know [_{CP} what_i [_{TP} ~~she bought t_i~~]]
 ↑ *wh*-movement

(4) *Extraction from a relative clause*

- (5) *Extraction from an adjunct island*

- a. Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn't remember **which**.
- b. *Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn't remember **which** (*of the teachers*) Ben will be mad [if Abby talks to].

(6) *Extraction of an AP from a DP*

- a. She bought a big car but I don't know **how big**.
- b. *I don't know **how big** she bought [a __ car].

(7) *Extraction of a PP from a DP*

- a. She's eating a pizza, but I don't know **from which restaurant**.
- b. *I don't know **from which restaurant** she is eating [a pizza __].

Under the analysis (3b), the (a) examples are supposed to be derived from non-Sluiced (a) sentences, which are ruled ungrammatical due to Subjacency.

Furthermore, Merchant (2001) notes that there are examples such as (8), which do not seem to have non-Sluiced counterparts.

- (8) a. The report details what_i IBM did t_i and **why**. (*why IBM did t_i / why IBM did it_i)
- b. Abby was reading, but I don't know **what**. (*what Abby was reading)

Incidentally, though the examples in (4)-(8) are all E-Sluicing cases, the same facts hold in M-Sluicing in English. In what follows, we are not particularly concerned with how Sluicing in English is to be analyzed but, for the sake of explicating the differences between Sluicing cases and other movement operations (Cleft/Focus formation in Japanese, in particular), I will simply assume, following the spirit of Merchant (2001), an analysis where Sluicing is derived via *wh*-movement and deletion but, unlike (3b), the non-Sluiced counterpart does not necessarily correspond to what is preceding. That is, the antecedent of the deleted part of Sluicing is a sentence that is semantically/pragmatically (as well as syntactically) compatible with the context. Thus, the non-Sluiced version of (5a), for example, is not (5b) but something like "Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn't remember ~~which (of the teachers) Abby talks to.~~," which does not involve a Subjacency violation. I will leave it open exactly how deletion is conditioned.

2.2 E-Sluicing in Japanese: a *Wh*-movement analysis vs. a Cleft analysis

It was Takahashi (1994) who first examined Sluicing in Japanese rather extensively. Since then, various people have taken it up. The construction discussed under the name of Sluicing is of the E-Sluicing type, such as (9).

- (9) a. Hanako-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, **nani-o ka** wakar-ana-i.
H. -nom something-acc bought but what-acc Q know-not-pres
'Hanako bought something but (I) don't know what.'
- b. Kyoo, dareka-ga ki-ta yo. **Dare-ga ka** wakar-u?
today someone-mom come-past. who-nom Q do-you know-pres?
'Today, someone came. Can you guess who?'
- c. Taro-ga saihu-o nakusi-ta kedo, {**doko-de / itu**}ka wakar-ana-i.
T. -nom wallet-acc lose-past but {where/when} Q know-not-pres.
'I heard Taro lost his wallet, but I do not know {where/when}.'

For these examples, two types of analyses have been presented. One is a *wh*-movement analysis that is basically the same as (3b) for English, and the other is

a Cleft-based analysis, where a *wh*-word moves via Focus movement (or perhaps Scrambling) to the sentence initial Focus position, which gives rise to a Cleft construction, and what is deleted is a part that constitutes old or presupposed information. These analyses are schematized in (10) and (11), taking (9a) as an example.¹

(10) Wh-Movement analysis

[_{CP} [_{TP} Hanako-ga nanika-o kat-ta] ga]
 [(watasi-wa) [_{CP} nani-o [_{TP} ~~Hanako-ga t kat-ta~~] ka]wakar-ana-i]
 ↑
 Wh-movement

(11) Cleft Analysis

[_{CP} [_{TP} Hanako-ga nanika-o kat-ta] ga]
 [(watasi-wa) [_{CP} [_{XP} nani-o [_{TP} ~~Hanako-ga t kat-ta~~] ~~no~~] (da) ka]wakar-ana-i]
 ↑
 Focus-movement (or Scrambling)

Between these two analyses, as has been discussed in Fukaya and Hoji (1999), Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002), Kuwagara (1996), etc., a Cleft analysis seems to fare with better, since Sluicing in (9) (i.e., E-Sluicing) behaves just like the ordinary Cleft construction, except that Sluicing involves the deletion of the presupposed or old information (i.e., the TP part in (11)). First, as shown in (11), Sluicing optionally has the copula *da*, which is a characteristic of the Cleft construction. Second, the case marker on the Focus phrase of the Cleft can be deleted; so as that on the Sluiced phrase. See (12) and (13).

(12) Two types of Clefts: with a Case marker or without

- a. Hanako-ga kat-ta no wa hon-o 3-satu da.
 H. -nom buy-past that-top book-acc 3-Num Copula
 'It was three books that Hanako bought.'
- b. Hanako-ga kat-ta no wa hon 3-satu da.
 H. -nom buy-past that-top book-acc Copula
 'It was three books that Hanako bought.'

(13) Two types of Sluicing: with a Case marker or without

- a. Hanako-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, {nani-o / nan}(-da) ka wakar-anai.
 H. -nom something-acc buy-past but {what-acc/what}-(Cop) Q know-not
 'Hanako bought something but I do not know what.'

¹ Takahashi (1994) presents a *Wh*-movement analysis, while Fukaya and Hoji 1999, Hiraiwa and Ishihara 2002, and Kuwabara 1996 among others advocate a Cleft analysis, though they differ in details, such as what causes the movement of a *wh*-word and where it moves to, either via Scrambling to a TP-adjoined position or via a focus movement to a focus position. We will not be concerned with exact details of these analyses. What matters here is that the movement is a syntactic one and, as will be shown immediately, it observes Subjacency, unlike Sluicing in English. See Hasegawa 1991 and Koizumi 1995 for some discussion on the Cleft construction in Japanese.

- b. Dareka-ga ki-ta kedo, {dare-ga / dare} (**-da**) ka wakar-u?
 Someone-nom come-past but {who-nom/who} (Cop) Q know-pres?
 ‘Someone came but do you know who?’

What is of particular interest is the fact that the two types of Cleft behaves differently with respect to Subjacency, and so do the two types of Sluicing. That is, the case-marked version of both Cleft and Sluicing observes Subjacency, whereas the non-case-marked one does not. Observe (14)-(16).

- (14) Hanako-ga [Taro-ga **bara-no hanataba-o** okut-ta zyosei]-o
 H. -nom T. -nom rose bouquet-acc give-past woman-acc
 sagasitei-ru
 look=for-pres
 ‘Hanako looks for the woman who Toro gave a rose bouquet.’
- (15) a. *Hanako-ga [Taro-ga __ okut-ta zyosei]-o sagasitei-ru no wa **bara-no hanataba-o** da.
 ‘(lit.) It was **a rose bouquet** that Hanako looks for the woman who Taro gave to.’
 b. Hanako-ga [Taro-ga __ okut-ta zyosei]-o sagasitei-ru no wa **bara-no hanataba** da.
 ‘(lit.) It was **a rose bouquet** that Hanako looks for the woman who Taro gave to.’
- (16) a. *Hanako-ga [Taro-ga nanika-o okut-ta zyosei]-o sagasitei-ru ga, **nani-o (da) ka** sir-anai.
 ‘Hanako looks for the woman who Toro gave something to, but I do not know **what**.’
 b. Hanako-ga [Taro-ga nanika-o okut-ta zyosei]-o sagasitei-ru ga,
 {**nani/ (nan-da)**} **ka** sir-anai.
 ‘Hanako looks for the woman who Toro gave something to, but I do not know **what**.’

Based on example (14), Cleft sentences (15) and Sluicing (16) are constructed taking the object of the relative clause, *bara-no hanataba-(o)* ‘rose bouquet-acc’ or *nani-(o)* ‘what-acc’ as a focus phrase or a Sluiced phrase, respectively. The difference between the (a)’s and (b)’s in (15) and (16) is that the former involves the case marker *-o* and the latter does not, which obviously is the cause for the grammaticality difference. That is, the case marked version observes Subjacency but the non-case marked one does not.

Here, we are not concerned with how these two versions of Clefts and Sluicing are analyzed.² What interests us is the fact that Clefts and Sluicing behave similarly, which can be captured in the Cleft analysis (11), and that, as long as the case marked version is concerned, syntactic movement is involved both in Cleft and Sluicing. The following examples further explicate this point. The case-marked version of Cleft and Sluicing does not allow the extraction out

² See Fukaya and Hoji (1999) and Hasegawa (1996) for analyses of these two types of clefts. See Koizumi (1995) as well.

of an adjunct, as seen in (17), of a pronominal modifier as exemplified in (18) and (19).

(17) *Extraction from an adjunct island*

- a. Taro-ga **keeki-o** tabe-ta kara Hanako-ga okot-ta.
T. –nom cake-acc eat-past because H. –nom angry-past
'Hanako got angry because Taro ate the cake.'
- b. *Taro-ga __ tabe-ta kara Hanako-ga okot-ta no wa **sono keeki-o** da..
'(lit.) It was that cake that Hanako got angry because Taro ate.'
- c. *Taro-ga nanika-o tabe-ta kara Hanako-ga okot-ta rasii ga **nani-o ka** wakar-ani..
'It seems that Hanako got angry because Taro ate something, but I don't know what.'

(18) *Extraction of an AP from a DP³*

- a. Hanako-ga **ookina** kuruma-o kat-ta.
H. –nom big car-acc buy-past
'Hanako bought a big car.'
- b. *Hanako-ga __ kuruma-o kat-ta no wa **ookina** da.
'(lit.) It was big that Hanako bought a car.'
- c. *Hanako-ga kuruma-o kat-ta rasii ga, **donna (da) ka** sir-ana-i.
seem but how Cop Q know-not-pres
'It seems that Hanako bought a car but (I) don't know what kind.'

(19) *Extraction of a nominal modifier from a DP*

- a. **Gengogaku-no** sensei-ga tyakunin-suru rasi-i.
linguistics-gen teacher-nom appointed-pres seem
'It seems that a professor of linguistics will be appointed.'
- b. *__ sensei-ga tyakunin-suru no wa **gengogaku-no** da.
'It is of linguistics that a professor will be appointed.'
- c. *__ sensei-ga tyakunin-suru rasii ga **nan-no ka** sir-ana-i.
'It seems that a professor will be appointed but I don't know of what.'

In what follows, in order to make clear the contrast between E-Sluicing and M-Sluicing in Japanese, I will take only the case-marked version as the legitimate Sluicing (E-Sluicing) case.

³ (18c) has a grammatical counterpart (i), which differs from (18c) in that the *wh*-phrase has the genitive *no* marker. With the presence of *no*, the Sluiced part is not considered as just a *wh*-phrase (the interrogative AP) but a DP with a deleted NP (or N-bar) or with a pronominal *no*, depending on how *no* is analyzed, either as a Genitive case or a pronominal that corresponds to 'one' in English, respectively.

(i) Hanako-ga kuruma-o kat-ta rasii ga, **donna-no (da) ka** sir-ana-i.
H. –nom car-acc buy-past seem but how-Gen Cop Q know-not-pres
'It seems that Hanako bought a car but (I) don't know what kind one.'

3. M-Sluicing in Japanese

We have seen in (1) the case of M-Sluicing in English. Japanese M-Sluicing examples are given in B's responses in (20).

- (20) a. A: Hanako-ga nanika-o kat-ta. B: Hontoo? **Nani-o?**
 H. -nom something-acc buy-Past really what-acc
 'Hanako bought something.' 'Really? What?'
 b. A: Dareka-ga ki-masi-ta yo. B: E? **Dare-ga?**
 someone-nom come-polite-past SP Yeah who-nom
 'Someone Came.' 'Yeah? Who?'
 c. A: Taro-ga sai-hu-o nakusi-ta yo. B: Hontoo? {**Doko-de?** / **Itu?**}
 T. -nom wallet-acc lose-past SP really where / when
 'Taro lost his wallet.' 'Really? {Where / When}?'

As mentioned in Section 2.1, E-Sluicing and M-Sluicing behave similarly in English with respect to Subjacency; however, in Japanese, M-Sluicing differs from E-Sluicing in the sense that the former do not observe Subjacency just like English Sluicing. Compare the following (B) responses with the E-Sluicing case observed in (16)-(19).

- (21) a. A: Hanako-wa [Taro-ga nanika-o okut-ta zyosei]-o sagasitei-ru.
 H.-top T.-nom something-acc give-past woman-acc look=for-pr.
 'Hanako seems to be looking for a woman who Toro gave something to.'
 B: Hontoo? **Nani-o**? 'Really? What?' (cf. 16a)
 b. A: Taro-ga nanika-o tabe-ta kara Hanako-ga okot-ta rasii.
 T. -nom something-acc eat-past because H. -nom angry-past seem
 'Hanako seems to have gotten angry because Taro ate something.'
 B: Hontoo? **Nani-o**? 'Really? What?' (cf. 17c)
 c. A: Hanako-ga kuruma-o kat-ta rasii.
 H. -nom car-acc buy-past seem
 'Hanako seems to have bought a car.'
 B: Hontoo? **Donna**? 'Really? What kind?' (cf. 18c)
 d. A: Raigetū atarasii sensei-ga tyakunin-suru rasii.
 next-month new teacher-nom appointed-pres seem
 'It seems that a new professor will be appointed next month.'
 B: E? **Nan-no**? (cf. 19c)
 'Yeah? Of what?'

The responses given in (B) are examples of M-Sluicing and they are all grammatical, as opposed to the E-Sluicing counterparts (i.e. the cf. examples), which are all unacceptable.

There is another notable difference between E-Sluicing and M-Sluicing in Japanese; the Q-morpheme *ka*. In Japanese, the question status is ordinarily marked by the presence of the Q-morpheme, as shown in (22).

- (22) a. Hanako-wa nani-o kai-masi-ta *ka*?
H. -top what-acc buy-polite-past Q
'What did Hako buy?'
- b. Taro-ga [Hanako-ga nani-o kat-ta *ka*] sirabete-i-ru.
T. -nom H. -nom what-acc buy-past Q investigate-prog-pres.
'Taro is investigating what Hanako bought.'

In E-Sluicing as well, as has been observed in Section 2.2, the presence of Q-morpheme at the C-head position is mandatory. In contrast, as seen in (21), M-Sluicing does not make use of the Q-morpheme *ka* and its presence is prohibited, which is shown in (23).

- (23) Compare the following with [B] in (20)
- a. B: Hontoo? **Nani-o** (*ka)? ↗ ↘ (cf. **Nani-o** kai-masi-ta *(ka)) ↗ *↘
 really what-Acc Q what-Acc buy-polite-past Q
 ‘Really? What?’
- b. B: E? **Dare-ga** (*ka)? ↗ ↘ (cf. **Dare-ga** ki-masi-ta *(ka)) ↗ *↘
 Yeah who-Nom Q who-Nom come-polite-past Q
 ‘Yeah? Who?’
- c. B: Hontoo? {**Doko-de** / **Itu**} (*ka)? ↗ ↘
 ‘Really? {Where / When}?’

Furthermore, as indicated by the arrows in (23), the intonation pattern of M-Sluicing is different from that of the non-truncated version of a *wh*-question (i.e., the cf. examples in (23)). M-Sluicing allows the falling pattern, which is not allowed in *wh*-questions.

Note that a similar fact is observed in M-Sluicing in English: the presence of the auxiliary at the C head is not allowed, either, as noted by Lasnik (2001).⁴

- (24) a. A: Mary bought something. B: Really? What (*did)?
b. A: John lost his wallet. B: Really? {Where/When} (*did)?

The fact that an auxiliary in the C head cannot take place in (24) is somewhat a mystery, since the Sluiced item is supposed to be at the CP-Spec position and what is deleted is the complement of C (i.e., TP), leaving not only the CP-Spec but C-head intact. Then, why the auxiliary is not allowed in (24)? To the extent that the C item, which is required in a full-fledged question, cannot take place in a M-Sluicing counterpart, the facts in (24) for English and in (23) for Japanese must be explained on the same grounds. We will attempt to provide an explanation for this fact in the next section.

⁴ See Lasnik (2001) for relevant discussion.

4. Sluicing and Clause Types

4.1 M-Sluicing and CP-Spec in Syntax

We have seen in the above that, as far as Japanese is concerned, Sluicing must be subdivided into two types; E-Sluicing and M-Sluicing. Between these two, M-Sluicing behaves similarly to Sluicing in English, with respect to the non-observance of Subjacency and the prohibition of the item in the C-head.⁵ Given this, let us suppose that M-Sluicing in Japanese can be analyzed just like Sluicing in English. That is, M-Sluicing has a structure where a *wh*-item resides at the CP-Spec position and the TP is deleted. In other words, M-Sluicing in Japanese DOES involve *wh*-movement to a CP-Spec position, just like English Sluicing. And, in fact, there is a piece of evidence that supports this.

It has been argued in Hasegawa (1986) and Nishigauchi (1990), among others, that a *wh*-question in Japanese pied-pipes an entire island when a *wh*-item is inside a syntactic island. The relevant examples are given in (25).

- (25) a. Syatyoo-wa [**dare-ga** suisen si-ta gakusei]-o saiyou sitagatte-imasu **ka**?
president-top who-mom recommend-past student-acc hire-want-polite Q
'Who does the president want to hire [the student that __ recommended]?'
b. [Yamada-kyoozyu-ga suisen si-ta gakusei] desu.
Y. -prof. -nom recommend student Cop.
'The student that Prof. Yamada recommended.'
c. *?Yamada-kyoozyu desu. 'Prof. Yamada.'

For the question (25), the acceptable answer involves the entire island (25b) and the short answer (25c) is not allowed. Supposing that the value that the answer gives corresponds with the operator that resides at the CP-Spec in the question at the level of LF, it is reasonable to assume, following Nishigauchi, that a *wh*-word inside an island pied-pipes the entire island to the CP-Spec position at LF. The ungrammaticality of (25c) is due to Subjacency; i.e. the *wh*-word alone cannot move out of the island to the CP-Spec position of the matrix clause and it is not possible to provide only the value that corresponds to the *wh*-word inside the island. In other words, the availability of the long answer (25b), the answer with an entire island, and the prohibition of the short answer (25c) indicate that there is no syntactic *wh*-movement to the CP-Spec position in (25a), since the pied-piping of the island to CP-Spec by the *wh*-word can be done only at LF.

Given this much in mind, let us observe Sluicing that involves a *wh*-word inside a syntactic island. What is of relevance is (27) for E-Sluicing and (28) for M-Sluicing, given the context in (26).

⁵ Another similarity between M-Sluicing in both languages is that it allows the falling intonation, though M-Sluicing in English does not allow the rising intonation, whose option Japanese counterparts has. This fact deserves a careful examination; however, I speculate that the presence or absence of a *wh*-phrase in CP-Spec has to do with the intonation pattern; the 'falling' intonation is observed when a *wh*-item resides at the CP-Spec of a question and the 'rising' intonation is required when the question status is marked only by the C head, like yes-no questions in general and ordinary *wh*-questions in Japanese, in particular.

- (26) Syatyoo-wa [**dareka-ga** suisen si-ta gakusei]-o saiyo sitagatte-imasu.
 ‘The president wants to hire [the student that someone recommended].’
- (27) a. Demo, [**dare-ga suisen si-ta gakusei]-o (da) ka** wakar-anai.
 ‘(Lit.) But I don’t know [the student that who recommended].’
 b. Demo, ***dare-ga (da) ka** wakar-anai.
 ‘But I don’t know who.’
- (28) a. Hontoo? ***[Dare-ga suisen si-ta gakusei]-o ?**
 ‘Really? A student that who recommended?’
 b. Hontoo? **Dare-ga?**
 ‘Really? Who?’

There is a clear contrast between E-Sluicing, which allows only the long version, and M-Sluicing, which requires the short one. This means that though E-Sluicing involves LF movement of the island, which pied-pies the entire island to the relevant position (may be at the CP-Spec position or at the Cleft/Focus position) in LF, M-Sluicing, which is a TWQ, does not make use of LF-movement of an island but seems to allow a *wh*-movement directly to a CP-Spec position in syntax.⁶

This difference between E-Sluicing and M-Sluicing becomes rather apparent once we take into account the functions of Sluicing. M-Sluicing is a TWQ, a true information question, while E-Sluicing is not necessarily so. For example, in the context where (2b) ‘*Someone came in—guess who?*’ is uttered, the speaker is not necessarily asking the value of *who*. But rather, she herself may very well know ‘who came in’ but puts a particular focus on the identity of the person. That is, E-Sluicing is pragmatically not an information question but a statement with some focus on the identity that is represented by the *wh*-word. In fact, E-Sluicing of Japanese directly shows this function by making use of the truncated Cleft form, which is a kind of focus construction.

On the other hand, M-Sluicing is a true information question but with a most truncated or ‘economical’ form of question. Since it is a question, it must involve a question CP and, being an information question, it must be represented by a *wh*-word. Thus, as long as these two requirements are met, nothing else would be needed in a truncated form. Naturally, M-Sluicing requires a *wh*-word at CP-Spec and nothing more. This holds even in Japanese, overriding its ordinary option of marking a question status by the Q-morpheme.

4.2 The Condition on ‘Force’ Realization

Now, we are in the position of explaining the fact observed in (23) in Japanese and (24) in English: Why can’t the C head be overtly marked in M-Sluicing. To account for this fact, Rizzi’s statement is suggestive regarding how pragmatic Force (or clause typing) is to be realized in syntax.

⁶ As mentioned in Section 1, this does not mean that the *wh*-movement involved here violates Subjacency. The full-fledged version of (28b) is something like (i), where no island is involved.

(i) Dare-ga (sono gakusei-o) suisen-si-ta no? ‘Who recommended (him/her/that student)?’

- (29) ... the clausal Type (Cheng 1991), or the specification of Force (Chomsky 1995) ... is expressed sometimes by overt morphological encoding on the head (special C morphology for declaratives, questions, relatives, etc.), sometimes by simply providing the structure to host an operator of the required kind, sometimes by both means (this is the rare case, presumably due to an economy of representation type principle favoring overt expression of a certain substantive specification on the head or on the specifier, but not simultaneously on both ...) (Rizzi 1997: 283)

To the extent that (29) holds, something like (30) is at work in grammar.

- (30) Condition on the Realization of Clause Type or Force⁷

The semantic/pragmatic function of Clause Type or sentential Force must be overtly realized either at Head or at Spec of CP; but not at both.

That is, M-Sluicing is an information question in the most truncated or economical form, which requires the marking of CP as a question with the mandatory presence of a *wh*-word—the simplest possible way to guarantee this is to mark the relevant CP-Spec with a *wh*-word. No other item is needed—hence the ungrammaticality of the head marking of C by an auxiliary or the Q-morpheme *ka*, and a surprising application of *wh*-movement in Japanese, which does not take place in ordinary (non-truncated) *wh*-questions.

If the analysis presented here for M-Sluicing is on the right track, we may come up with a framework where a pragmatic requirement or ‘Force’ plays a more important role than previously thought in accounting for differences in languages and in applications of operations. Sluicing seems to provide a case study for such a view. That is, Sluicing serves two different ‘functions’, one as a true question (M-Sluicing) and the other as a focus construction (E-Sluicing). For the former, the syntactic form and ‘Force’ coincide and, most probably, it takes the form of question universally. Thus, even in Japanese, which has been considered as a non-*wh*-movement language, the *wh*-movement of a *wh*-item to a CP-Spec position takes place in syntax, overriding its ordinary choice of marking the question status at the head C by the Q-morpheme. For the latter (E-Sluicing), languages may differ how such ‘Force’ is expressed in syntax; in English the *wh*-question formation is utilized but in Japanese a Cleft/Focus construction is adopted.

References

- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen. 1991. *On the typology of wh-questions*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chung, Sandra. 2005. Sluicing, form-identity effects, and the lexicon. Paper presented at MIT linguistics colloquium.
- Fukaya, Teruhiko, and Hajime Hoji. 1999. Stripping and sluicing in Japanese and some implications. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 18: 145-158.

⁷ I propose (30) in Hasegawa (2005) on the bases of *wh*-questions as well as of the positions of the *ga*-marked subject and the *mo* ‘also’-marked phrases.

- Fukaya, Teruhiko. 2007. *Sluicing and Stripping in Japanese and some Implications*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 1986. More arguments for the pied-piping analysis of *wh*-questions in Japanese. In *Oriental Linguistics*, ed. by Nobuko Hasegawa and Yoshihisa Kitagawa, *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 11, 79-107, GSLI University of Massachusetts.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 1997. A copula-based analysis of Japanese clefts: *Wa*-cleft and *ga*-cleft. *Researching and verifying an advanced theory of human language: Report (1)* 15-38. Kanda University of International Studies.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 2005. EPP materialized first, AGREE later: *Wh*-questions, subjects, and *mo* 'also'. *Scientific Approaches to Language* 4, 33-80. Kanda University of International Studies.
- Hasegawa, Nobuko. 2006. Sluicing and truncated *wh*-questions. In *Gengokagaku-no shinzui-o motomete (In search for the quintessence of language sciences)*, ed. by Yubun Suzuki, Keizo Mizuno, and Ken-ichi Takami. 453-470. Hituzi Publishers.
- Hiraiwa, Ken, and Shinichiro Ishihara. 2002. Missing links: Cleft, sluicing, and "no *da*" construction in Japanese. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 43: 35-54.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1995. *Phrase structure in minimalist syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Kuwabara, Kazuki. 1996. Multiple *wh*-phrases in elliptical clauses and some aspects of clefts with multiple foci. *Formal approaches to Japanese linguistics 2. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 29: 97-116.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? *North East Linguistic Society* 31, 301-320.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2006. Sluicing. In *The syntax companion*, ed. by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 269-289. London: Blackwell.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the theory of grammar*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-331. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ross, John R. 1969. Guess who? *Chicago Linguistic Society* 5: 252-286.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3: 265-300.

Graduate School of Language Sciences
Kanda University of International Studies
2-4-1 Wakaba, Mihama-ku
Chiba, 261-0014
JAPAN

hasegawa@kanda.kuis.ac.jp
<http://www.kandagaigo.ac.jp/kuis/labo/cls/>