Ellipsis in Disguise

Synopsis In this paper, I examine the paradigm of Argument Ellipsis (AE) in Japanese and argue that movement out of CP followed by CP AE is not allowed. I argue that there is no CP ellipsis. The seemingly CP ellipsis is an illusion created by a null topic, a case of deep anaphora.

Introduction AE refers to cases where an argument may be elliptic (rather than pronominal), as evidenced by the contrast in the availability of quantificational reading in (1b,c). There are two other properties of AE. First, it is limited to arguments and does not include adjuncts, as in (2). This thus differentiates it from canonical VP ellipsis. Second, it applies to elements of different categories, including PP and CP, as long as they are arguments, as shown in (3) and (4).

(1) a. Hanako-ga   taitei-no sensei-o   sonkeisiteiru
    Hanako-nom most-gen teacher-acc respect 'Hanako respects most teachers.'
  b. sosite Taroo-mo [e] sonkeisiteiru
    and   Taroo-also   respect 'lit. And Taroo also respects.'   (^{OK}*quant. reading*)
  c. sosite Taroo-mo karera-o sonkeisiteiru
    and   Taroo-mo them-acc respect 'And Taroo also respects them.'   (^{X}*quant. reading*)

(2) a. Taroo-wa kono riyuu de sinda   b. Hanako-mo   e sinda.
    Taroo-top this reason for died   Hanako-also   died
    'Taroo died for this reason.'   'Hanako also died.'≠ Hanako died for this reason, too.
    (cf. John died for this reason. Mary did [$_{VP}$ e], too. = Mary died for this reason, too.)

(3) a. Taroo to Hanako-ga   otagai-kara   meeru-o   uketotta
    Taroo and Hanako-nom each.other-from e-mail-acc received
  b. Ken to   Yumiko-wa [$_{PP}$ e] tegami-o uketotta   (^{OK}*sloppy reading*)
    Ken and Yumiko-top   letter-acc received
    'lit. Taroo and Hanako received e-mail from each other. Ken and Yumiko received letters.'

(4) a. Taroo-wa zibun-no teian-ga   Hanako-o   odorokasu to omotteiru
    Taroo-top self-gen proposa-nom Hanako-acc surprise   that think
  b. Ken-mo [$_{CP}$ e] omotteiru   (^{OK}*sloppy reading*)
    Ken-also   think 'lit. Taroo thinks his proposal will surprise Hanako. Ken also thinks e .'

Extraction Shinohara (2006) observes one interesting fact about AE that scrambling out of CP followed by CP AE is not allowed, as shown in (5). Shinohara (2006) argues that this is due to the radical/obligatory reconstruction effect of scrambling. After reconstruction of the scrambled element, (5a) will have the representation in (6a) with a full CP. After copying of this full CP, (5b) will have the structure in (6b), with the sentence-initial object left having no case and theta-roles, hence the ungrammaticality. (5c) is ungrammatical for the same reason.

(5) a. Hon-o$_1$ Taroo-wa [$_{CP}$ Hanako-ga t_1 katta   to] itta ga
    book-acc Taroo-top   Hanako-nom   bought that said though
    'Taroo said that Hanako bought a book, but…'
  b. *Zassi-o$_2$ Ziroo-wa [$_{CP}$ e_2] itta   c. *Sono hon-o$_2$ Ziroo-wa [$_{CP}$ e_2] itta
    magazine-acc Ziroo-top   said   that book-acc Ziroo-top   said
    'Ziroo said (that Hanako bought a) magazine' 'Ziroo said (that Hanako bought) that book'

(6) a. Taroo-wa [$_{CP}$ Hanako-ga hon-o katta   to] itta ga
  b. **Zassi-o** Ziroo-wa [$_{CP}$ Hanako-ga **hon-o** katta   to] itta

Problem Under the analysis above, it is thus predicted that if the scrambled element does not reconstruct (for independent reasons), there will be no Case/theta-role violation and CP AE will be possible. This prediction, however, is not borne out, as shown in (7-8). Nishigauchi (2002)

observes that there is no Condition C violation in (7a) and co-reference between *he* and *John* is allowed. He thus argues that the scrambled element does not reconstruct to the base position. (7b) shows that, even in this case, CP AE is still ungrammatical. Moreover, Miyagawa (2006), building on Abe (2005), shows that the obligatory reconstruction effect of scrambling is not always attested when there is another scope element in the embedded clause, as in (8a), and the $\forall > \exists$ reading is possible. (8b) shows CP AE is still bad, even when there is no reconstruction.

(7) a. [John$_1$-ni-tuite-no dono hon]$_2$-o kare$_1$-ga [Hanako-ga t_2 ki-ni-itteiru ka] sitte-iru
　　　 John-about-gen which book-acc he-nom Hanako-nom　　 like　 Q　 knows
　　　 'lit. Which book about John$_1$, he$_1$ knows Hanako likes '
　 b. *[Bill$_1$-ni-tuite-no dono hon]-o　 kare$_1$-mo [$_{CP}$ e] sitte-iru
　　　 Bill-about-gen　 which book-acc　 he-also　　　　 knows
　　　 'He also knows which book about Bill, (Hanako likes).'

(8) a. Daremo$_1$-ni　 dareka-ga　　 [futari-no kodomo-ga t$_1$ kisusita to] omotteiru
　　　 everyone-dat someone-nom 2-gen　　 kids-nom　　　 kissed　 C　 thinks
　　　 'Everyone, someone thinks that two kids kissed.'　　　　　 ($^{OK/??}\forall > \exists$, $\exists > \forall$)
　 b. *dono kangofu-ni-mo aru　 isha-mo　　 [$_{CP}$ e] omotteiru
　　　 every nurse-dat-also　 some doctor-also　　　 thinks
　　　 'Every nurse, some doctor also thinks that (two kids kissed).'

Proposal The paradigm above may be summarized as in (9). I claim that the whole paradigm receives a straightforward account under the proposal that there is no CP ellipsis. Specifically, I propose that the seemingly CP ellipsis in (4b) is just an illusion created by a null topic binding a variable (cf. Huang (1984)), as shown in the structure in (10). There is independent evidence that a null argument can be bound by a discourse/null topic in Japanese (11a) and that CP can be fronted (11b). (4b) will thus have the structure in (11c), with the null CP bound by a null topic. This discourse topic is a case of deep anaphora (cf. Hankamer and Sag (1976)). This explains why movement out of an elided CP is bad, whether the moved element reconstructs or not. Being a deep anaphora, the CP AE behaves like a null pronoun and has no internal structure. Movement out of it is thus banned. In this respect, it patterns alike with Null Complement Anaphora (NCA), another case of deep anaphora that resists extraction, as in (12), selected by verbs like *agree*.

(9)	Movement?	Reconstruct?	Grammatical?	Predicted?
Scrambling	√	√	X	√
Binding Condition	√	X	X	X
Quantifier Scope	√	X	X	X

(10) [$_{CP}$ (null) topic]$_1$　 subject …　 e$_1$ … V

(11) a. [e] kita　　 [upon hearing the footsteps of **the teacher** in the hall, the student said…]
　　　　　 came　　 '(The teacher) is coming.'
　 b. [$_{CP}$ Hanako-ga　 hon-o　　 katta　 to]$_1$ Taroo-wa [$_{CP}$ t_1] itta
　　　　 Hanako-nom book-acc bought　 that Taroo-top　　　 said
　　　　 'Taroo said that Hanako bought a book'
　 c. [$_{null\ topic}$ his proposal will surprise Hanako]$_1$ Ken also thinks [$_{CP}$ e_1]

(12) a. When Mary said she was going to change careers, Anne agreed _____.　 (Depiante 2000)
　 b. *Tim asked which book Anne agreed to donate and Jim asked which car Jane agreed _____.

Selected References **Depiante, A. (2000)**. *The syntax of deep and surface anaphora*. UConn dissertation. **Hankamer, J. and I. Sag (1976).** Deep and surface anaphora. *LI*, 391-428. **Huang, J. (1984).** On the distribution and reference of empty pronoun. *LI*: 531-574. **Miyagawa, S. (2006).** On the undoing nature of scrambling. *LI*: 607-624. **Nishigauchi, T. (2002).** Scrambling and reconstruction at LF. *Gengo Kenkyu* 121: 49-105. **Shinohara, M. (2006).** On some differences between the major deletion phenomena and Japanese argument ellipsis. Ms. Nanzan University.