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1. Introduction

(1) VP-deletion, N’-deletion, sluicing (Sag 1976, Jackendoff 1971, Ross 1969)
   a. I left because John did [vp leave]
   b. Lincoln’s portrait didn’t please me as much as Wilson’s [N portrait]
   c. John bought something, but I don’t know what [IP he bought]

(2) Kuno 1978 on the absence of VP-deletion in Japanese
   a. *Taroo-ga [vp kaetta] node, watasi-mo kaetta
      -NOM went-home since I -also went-home
      ‘I went home too because Taroo did’
   b. 

(3) a. N’-deletion (Saito and Murasugi 1990)
   b. VP-deletion (Otani and Whitman 1991)
   c. Sluicing (Takahashi 1994)
   d. Argument Ellipsis (Kim 1999, Oku 1998)

2. N’-Deletion (Saito and Murasugi 1990)

2.1. The Pronominal no

(4) a. This book is John’s [N book]
   b. kono hon -wa Taroo-no [N hon] da
      this book-TOP -GEN book is
(5) akai no -o kudasai
    red one-ACC please-give-me
    ‘Please give me a red one’

(6) [NP NP’s [\textit{N} ---]]
    a. I liked [NP Bill’s [\textit{N} wine]], but I didn’t like [NP John’s [\textit{N} wine]]
    b. *I wanted to read [NP a [\textit{N} book]], so I bought [NP a [\textit{N} book]]
    c. *I read about [NP the [\textit{N} man]], but I haven’t had a chance to see [NP the [\textit{N} man]]
    d. *I have [NP Bill’s [\textit{N} blue [\textit{N} book]]], but I don’t have [NP John’s [\textit{N} green [\textit{N} book]]]

(7) a. [NP akai-no [\textit{N} ---]]
    red -GEN

    b. *akai-no ringo
    red -GEN apple
    ‘a red apple’

(8) [NP [\textit{N} akai [\textit{N} no]] … Here, \textit{no} is a pronoun corresponding to \textit{one} in English.

(9) [NP Taroo-no [\textit{N} no]] \rightarrow [NP Taroo-noe [\textit{N} no]] (Okutsu 1974)
    -GEN one -GEN one

2.2. Evidence for N’-deletion in Japanese

(10) The pronoun \textit{no} can only stand for concrete objects. (Kamio 1983)
    a. katai sinnen -o motta hito
        firm conviction-ACC have person
        ‘a person with a firm conviction’

    b. #katai no -o motta hito
        firm one-ACC have person

(11) a. [Taroo-ga motte kita ringo]-wa [amari oisiku-nai no] data
    -NOM brought apple -TOP very tasty -not one was
    ‘The apple that Taroo brought wasn’t a very tasty one’

    b. *[Taroo-no sinnen] -wa [totemo katai no] datta
    -GEN conviction-TOP very firm one was
    ‘Taroo’s conviction was very firm’
c. *[Taroo-no kenkyuu-ni taisuru taido] -wa [amari kansindeki-nai no] datta
   -GEN research -toward attitude-TOP very admirable -not one was
   ‘Taroo’s attitude toward research wasn’t very good’

d. *[Taroo-no supoo-ni taisuru zyoonetu]-wa [hontoo-ni hagesii no] datta
   -GEN sports -toward passion -TOP really fierce one was
   ‘Taroo’s passion for sports was really fierce’

(12) a. [Hanako-no sinnen] -wa [Taroo no]-yori katai to omou
   -GEN conviction-TOP -than firm that (I) think
   ‘I think that Hanako’s conviction is firmer than Taroo’s’

b. [Hanako-no kenkyuu-ni taisuru taido] -wa ii ga, [Taroo no]-wa
   -GEN research -toward attitude-TOP good though -TOP
   yoku-nai
   good-not
   ‘Hanako’s attitude toward research is good, but Taroo’s isn’t good’

c. [Hanako-no supoo-ni taisuru zyoonetu]-wa [Taroo no]-yori sarani
   -GEN sports -toward passion -TOP -than still-more
   hageshii mono datta
   fierce thing was
   ‘Hanako’s passion for sports was even more fierce than Taroo’s’

(13) a. [NP Taroo-no [N no]]
   -GEN one

b. [NP Taroo-no [N kenkyuu-ni taisuru taido]]
   -GEN research -toward attitude

2.3. A Confirmation of the Analysis

(14) a. N’ can be deleted when a genitive phrase is present.
   b. Anything following a genitive phrase can be deleted.

(15) NP
    NP's
    N
    PP

    NP
    NP-no
    N'
    NP/PP-no
    N'
    NP/PP-no
    N
(16) a. the barbarians’ destruction of the city

b. yuubokumin-no tosi-no hakai nomad -GEN city-GEN destruction
   ‘the nomad’s destruction of the city’

(17) a. John’s trip to Europe

b. Taroo-no yooroppa-e -no ryokoo -GEN Europe -to-GEN trip
   ‘Taroo’s trip to Europe’

(18) a. [\text{NP the barbarians’ [\text{IN} destruction of the city then]}]
   b. [\text{NP the city’\text{'s [\text{IN} destruction \text{then}]} (cf. the destruction of the city then)]
   c. *[\text{NP then’s [\text{IN} destruction of the city \text{then}]}]

(19) a. Taroo-no taido (subject)
   -GEN attitude

b. rooma-no hakai (object)
   Rome -GEN destruction

c. ame-no hi (modefier)
   rain-GEN day
   ‘a rainy day’

d. hutakire -no hamu (modifier)
   two-piece-GEN ham
   ‘two pieces of ham’

(20) a. [Taroo-no taido] -wa [Hanako-no \emptyset]-yorimo yoi -GEN attitude-TOP -GEN -than good
   ‘Taroo’s attitude is better than Hanako’s’

b. [rooma-no hakai] -wa [kyooto-no \emptyset]-yorimo hisan datta Roma -GEN destruction-TOP Kyoto -GEN -than miserable was
   ‘Rome’s destruction was more miserable than Kyoto’s’

c. *(saikin -wa) [hare -no hi] -ga [ame-no \emptyset]-yorimo ooi recently-TOP clear-GEN day-NOM rain-GEN -than plentiful
   ‘Recently, there have been more clear days than rainy days’
d. *[hutakire -no hamu]-wa yuusyoku-ni naru ga, [hitokire -no ∅]-wa
two-piece-GEN ham -TOP supper -to become though one-piece-GEN -TOP
nara -nai
become-not
‘Two slices of ham make a supper, but one slice of ham doesn’t’

(21) a. N’-deletion is deletion of N’.
b. Only argument NPs can occupy the NP Spec position.
c. Japanese NPs have basically the same structure as English, although this is not
obvious from the distribution of the genitive Case marker.

3. VP-deletion and Sluicing

3.1. Sloppy Identity and Ellipsis (Otani and Whitman 1991)

(22) a. kimi-wa sore-o mottekimasita ka
    you -TOP it -ACC brought Q
    ‘Did you bring it’

    b. hai, [e] [e] mottekimasita
        yes brought
        ‘Yes, I brought it’

(23) John-wa zibun-no tegami-o suteta; Mary-mo [e] suteta
    -TOP self -GEN letter -ACC discarded -also discarded
    ‘John threw out his letter, and Mary did, too’
    (ambiguous between strict and sloppy readings)

(24) a. John loves his mother, and Mary does, too
    b. John loves his mother, and Mary loves her too

(25) Otani and Whitman’s 1991 VP-deletion analysis based on Huang 1987

(26) a. John reads Russian
    b. John does not read Russian
(27) a. John is a linguist
   b. John is not a linguist

(28) John-wa zibun-no roba -o tataita; Bill-mo [e] ketta
   -TOP self -GEN donkey-ACC hit -also kicked
   ‘John hit his donkey and Bill also kicked his donkey’

(29) a. Taroo-wa [zibun-ga nyuugakusuru daigaku]ni ittemita
   -TOP self -NOM enter college -to went
   ‘Taroo visited the college he plans to enter’
   b. Hanako-mo (soko-ni) ittemmita
      -also there-to went
      ‘Hanako also went (there)’

(30) a. Taroo-wa zibun-no musume-o yootien -ni nyuuen-saseta
      -TOP self -GEN daughter-ACC kindergarten-to enter -made
      ‘Taroo made her daughter enter a kindergarten’
   b. demo, Hanako-wa (kanozyo-o) taien -saseta
      but -TOP she -ACC withdraw-made
      ‘But, Hanako made (her) withdraw from the kindergarten’

(31) a. Japanese has VP-deletion exactly like English.
   b. In Japanese, the verb is not deleted with VP-deletion because it is outside the VP.

3.2. Sluicing or Concealed Cleft (Takahashi 1994)

(32) John-ga dareka -kara tegami-o uketotta ga, boku-wa [dare-kara ka]
    -NOM someone-from letter -ACC received though I -TOP who-from Q
    wakara-nai
    know -not
    ‘John received a letter from someone, but I don’t know from whom’

(33) a. [c[CP,dare-kara [c [IP ∅ ] [c ka ]]]]
    -NOM letter -ACC received that-NOM who-from is Q
    ‘From whom is it that John received a letter’
c. \[\text{[CP [IP (sore-ga) dare-kara (da)] ka]} \]
   \[\text{it -NOM who-from is Q}\]
   ‘From whom is it’

(34) \[\text{[IP [CP John-ga tegami-o uketotta no] -wa Mary-kara da]} \]
   \[\text{-NOM letter -ACC received that-TOP -from is}\]
   ‘It is from Mary that John received a letter’

(35) John-wa \[\text{[zibun-ga naze sikerareta ka] wakatte-inai ga, Mary-wa}\]
   \[\text{-TOP self -NOM why scolded-was Q know -not though -TOP}\]
   \[\text{[naze ka] wakatteiru}\]
   \[\text{why Q know}\]
   ‘John doesn’t know why he was scolded, but Mary knows why’
   (ambiguous between strict and sloppy readings)

(36) John-wa \[\text{[zibun-ga naze sikerareta ka] wakatte-inai ga, Mary-wa}\]
   \[\text{-TOP self -NOM why scolded-was Q know -not though -TOP}\]
   \[\text{[sore-ga naze da ka] wakatteiru}\]
   \[\text{it -NOM why is Q know}\]
   (strict reading only)

(37) a. Japanese has sluicing exactly as in English.
   d. Japanese has optional Wh-movement although it is not obvious from simple sentences.

(38) But there are a few problematic sentences. For example,

John-wa \[\text{[zibun-ga naze sikerareta ka] wakatte-inai ga, Mary-wa}\]
   \[\text{-TOP self -NOM why scolded-was Q know -not though -TOP}\]
   \[\text{[e naze da ka] wakatteiru}\]
   \[\text{why is Q know}\]
   (ambiguous between strict and sloppy readings)

(39) Sloppy reading is allowed with empty pronouns but not with overt pronouns.

(Nishiyama, Whitman and Yi 1996)

(40) a. Taroo-wa \[\text{[zibun-ga naze sikerareta ka] wakatte-inai yooda}\]
   \[\text{-TOP self -NOM why scolded-was Q know -not seem}\]
   ‘It seems that Taroo doesn’t know why he was scolded’

b. demo, Hanako-wa \[\text{[(sore-ga) taiman dakara da to] yoku wakatteiru yooda}\]
   \[\text{but -TOP it -NOM lazy because is that well know seem}\]
   ‘But it seems that Hanako knows that (it) is because of laziness’
4. Argument Deletion and Alternative Analyses

4.1. The Argument Deletion Hypothesis (Kim 1999, Oku 1998)

(41) a. Mike-nun James-lul tali-lul ketechassta
     -TOP -ACC leg -ACC kicked
     ‘Mike kicked James on the leg’

     b. *Mike-nun tali-lul James-lul ketechassta

(42) a. Jerry-nun caki-uy ai -lul phal-ul ttayliessta
     -TOP self-GEN child-ACC arm -ACC hit
     ‘Jerry hit his child on the arm’

     b. kulena Sally-nun [e] tali-lul ttayliessta
     but -TOP leg -ACC hit
     ‘But Sally hit her/his child on the leg’
     (ambiguous between strict and sloppy readings)

(43)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{NP} \\
\iota_v
\end{array}
\]

(44) a. Mary-wa [zibun-no teian -ga saiyoosareru to] omotteiru
     -TOP self -GEN proposal-NOM accepted-be that think
     ‘Mary thinks that her proposal will be accepted’

     b. John-mo [e] saiyoosareru to] omotteiru
     -also accepted-be that think
     ‘John also thinks that her/his proposal will be accepted’

     b. It is no longer clear that Japanese and Korean have VP-deletion.

Hoji (1998): indefinite pronouns

(46) a. Subete-no nihonzin huuhu -ga betubetu-no gakusei-o suisensita  
all -GEN Japanese couple-NOM different-GEN student-ACC recommended  
‘Every Japanese couple recommended different students’

b. Subete-no amerikazin huuhu -mo [e] suisensita  
all -GEN American couple-also recommended  
‘Every American couple also recommended (them)’

(47) a. Subete-no itinensei, -ga soitu, -no booru-o ketta  
all -GEN first-year student-NOM that guy-GEN ball -ACC kicked  
‘Every first-year student kicked his or her ball’

b. Subete-no ninensei -mo (booru-o) ketta  
all -GEN second-year student-also ball -ACC kicked  
‘Every second-year student also kicked a ball’

(48) a. *John even threw the dishes, and Mary the glasses  
b. *John never ate pizza, and Mary sushi

(49) a. Sensei -wa subete-no itinensei, -ni soitu, -no booru-o  
teacher-TOP all -GEN first-year student-DAT that guy-GEN ball -ACC  
kera -aseta  
kick-made  
‘The teacher let every first-year student kick his or her ball’

b. Demo, ninensei -ni -wa (booru-o) ker -ase -nakatta  
but second-year student-DAT-TOP ball -ACC kick-make-did not  
‘But she/he did not let the second-year students kick (a ball)’

(See Shinohara 2004 for more examples.)

(50) a. Why is it that Japanese and Korean allow argument deletion?  
(See Oku 1998, Saito 2003)  
b. Why is it that null arguments in Japanese can have indefinite interpretation?

Moriyama and Whitman 2004: N’-deletion

(51) Taroo-ga hon -o ni -satu yonda. Hanako-mo [e] san -satu yonda  
-NOM book-ACC two-volume read -also three-volume read  
‘Taroo read two books. Hanako also read three’
(52) a. definite … pro
   b. ellipsis … \([\text{DP}] \text{pro} \ [\text{NP}]\)
   c. indefinite … \([\text{DP}] \text{indefinite} \ [\text{NP}]\)

(53) a. Most movies bore Mary, but she does like some
   b. Many unicorns were in the garden, but Mary noticed only a few
   c. *Two heads are better than no
   d. *Sue only bought one book, but Mary bought every \(\text{Elbourne 2001}\)

(54) John likes colorful picture books and Mary likes them, too. \(\text{See Tomioka 1998.}\)

5. Arguments for Argument Ellipsis (I): The Intervention Effect on Genitive Subjects

(55) Taroo-ga /-no itta tokoro
    -NOM/-GEN went place
    ‘the place where Taroo went’

(56) Taroo-ga /*-no waratta
    -NOM/ -GEN laughed
    ‘Taroo laughed’

(57) Taroo-ga /*-no hon -o katta mise
    -NOM/ -GEN book-ACC bought shop
    ‘the shop where Taroo bought a book’

5.1. A Brief Analysis of the Genitive Subjects \(\text{Hiraiwa 2000}\)

(58) John-wa ame-ga /-no yamu made kenkyuusitu-ni ita.
    -TOP rain-NOM/-GEN stop until office -in was
    ‘John was in his office until the rain stopped’

    -TOP abnormal up to -in nervous -is
    ‘John is extraordinarily nervous’
(60) \[ 
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{T'} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{vP} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{T [NOM/GEN]} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{v'} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{V [ACC]} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow_{/} \\
\text{V} \\
\]

(61) Spell-out of morphological accusative case by v triggers nominative Case checking on T in the next strong phase. (Hiraiwa)

(62) When an adnominal T checks genitive, it absorbs the Case-feature of v.

(63) a. komakaku kizanda daikon (Abe 1992)
thinly sliced radish
‘the thinly sliced radish’

b. komakaku kizanda hito
thinly sliced person
‘the person who thinly sliced (it)’

(64) Daikon-o komakaku kizanda radish -ACC thinly sliced
‘She/he/they thinly sliced the radish.’

5.2. A Closer Look at the Intervention Effect

(65) Taroo-ga /-no kinoo itta tokoro
-NOM/-GEN yesterday went place
‘the place where Taroo went yesterday’

(66) Taroo-ga /-no つ taihosareta tokoro
-NOM/-GEN arrested-was place
‘the place where Taroo was arrested’

(67) hon -o Taroo-ga /*-no つ katta mise book-ACC -NOM/-GEN bought shop
‘the shop where Taroo bought a book’
(68) Taroo-ga /-no ō katta hon (Harada 1971)
-NOM/-GEN bought book
‘the book that Taroo bought’

Hiraiwa 2000 and Miyazawa 2001 on Null Objects

(69) Ziroo-ga hazimete Nagoya-ni kuru -node, minna-ga iroiro-na basyo-ni
-NOM for the first time -to come-since all -NOM various place-to
tureteiku yotei-desu
take plan -is
‘Since Ziroo is coming to Nagoya for the first time, the plan is for everyone to take him
to various places.’

(70) a. Hanako-ga /*-no Ziroo-o tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
-NOM/ -GEN -ACC take place -TOP Nagoya Castle-is
‘The place that Hanako is taking Ziroo is the Nagoya Castle.’

b. Ziroo-o Hanako-ga /*-no t tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
-ACC -NOM/ -GEN take place -TOP Nagoya Castle-is
‘The place that Hanako is taking Ziroo is the Nagoya Castle.’

(71) Hanako-ga /-no ō tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
-NOM/-GEN take place -TOP Nagoya Castle-is
‘The place that Hanako is taking (him) is the Nagoya Castle.’

(72) [ ō kiteiru yoohuku]-ga yogoreteiru sinsi (Kuno 1973)
wearing-is suit -NOM dirty-is gentleman
‘the gentleman who the suit that he is wearing is dirty’

5.3. Object Ellipsis

Lasnik (1995) on Pseudogapping

(73) John will select the CEO of a multinational Corporation and Bill will [v ō] his leading
campaign contributor.
(74) 
```
(75) Taroo-ga /*no hon -o katta mise
-NOM/ -GEN book-ACC bought shop
‘the shop where Taroo bought a book’
```
6. Arguments for Argument Ellipsis (II): Problems with Japanese Sluicing

(78) John-ga dareka -kara tegami-o uketotta ga, boku-wa [dare-kara ka] -NOM someone-from letter -ACC received though I -TOP who-from Q wakaranai
know-not
‘John received a letter from someone, but I don’t know from whom’

6.1. Problems with the Sluicing Analysis (Takahashi 1994)

(79) John-wa [zibun-ga naze sikarareta ka] wakatteinai ga, Mary-wa -TOP self -NOM why scolded-was Q know-not though -TOP [naze da ka] wakatteiru
why is Q know
(ambiguous between strict and sloppy readings)

(80) John-ga dareka -kara tegami-o uketotta ga, boku-wa -NOM someone-from letter -ACC received though I -TOP [Mary-kara kadooka] wakaranai
-know-not from whether
‘John received a letter from someone, but I don’t know whether it was from Mary’
(cf. *John received a letter from someone, but I don’t know whether from Mary)

6.2. Possible Alternatives

(81) Sloppy reading is allowed with empty pronouns but not with overt pronouns.
(Nishiyama, Whitman and Yi 1996)

(82) Japanese sluicing may be an instance of (embedded) stripping.
(Fukaya and Hoji 1999)

(83) Ben talked to Linda about his problem, and to Rosa too (Reinhart 1983)

(84) 

... § ... to Linda ... § ... to Rosa too
(85) a.  John-ga susi-o tabeta (tte)  (Hoji 1989)  
\[-NOM \quad -ACC\text{ ate} \]
   ‘John ate sushi’

   b.  Tenpura-o -mo da (yo)  
\[-ACC\text{-also} \]
   ‘And tempura, too’

(86) John-ga nanika -o tabeta-ga, nani -o ka wakaranai  
\[-NOM \quad something-ACC\text{ ate} \quad -though \quad what-ACC Q\text{ know-not} \]
   ‘John ate something but I don’t know what’

(87) Max will upset every woman after the meeting, except Lucie  (Reinhart 1991)

(88) a.  The police have interrogated some politician, but they didn’t say which one  
b.  *The police have interrogated the education minister, but they didn’t say (that) the defense minister

(89) a.  The fact that some politician has resigned got much publicity, but I forgot which one  
b.  *The fact that some politician has resigned got much publicity, but not the defense minister

(90) Keisatu-ga dareka -o renkoosita to iu nyuusu-o kiita node, ima police  
\[-NOM \quad someone-ACC\text{ took-in} \quad that \quad say \quad news \quad -ACC\text{ heard because now} \]
[dare-o ka]-o sirabeteiru  
who-ACC Q\text{ checking-is}  
‘Because we heard the news that the police took in someone, we are now checking who it is’

(91) [John-o kadooka]-wa siranai -ga, keisatu-ga dareka -o renkoosita  
\[-ACC \quad whether \quad -TOP\text{ know-not-through police} \quad -NOM \quad someone-ACC\text{ took-in} \]
koto-wa tasika -da  
fact -TOP certain-is  
‘We don’t know whether it is John or not, but it is certain that the police took in someone’

(92) *We don’t know whether John, but it is certain that the police took in someone
6.3. Sluicing as Subject Ellipsis

(93) John-wa [zibun-ga naze sikanareta ka] wakatteinai ga, Mary-wa -TOP self -NOM why scolded-was Q know-not though -TOP [naze da ka] wakatteiru why is Q know
‘John doesn’t know why he was scolded, but Mary knows why’
(ambiguous between strict and sloppy readings)

(94) [[Cy ɡ]-ga naze da ka]
-NOM why is Q

(95) a. [Cy zibun-ga naze sikanareta ka]
   self -NOM why scolded-was Q
   ‘Why self was scolded’

      -TOP self -NOM scolded-was that-NOM why is Q know
   ‘Mary knows why it is that self was scolded’

(96) John-ga dareka -kara tegami-o uketotta ga, boku-wa
   -NOM someone-from letter -ACC received though I -TOP
   [Mary-kara kadooka] wakaranai
   -from whether know-not
   ‘John received a letter from someone, but I don’t know whether it was from Mary’

(97) a. [[I, John-ga dareka -kara tegami-o uketotta]
    -NOM someone-from letter -ACC received
    ‘John received a letter from someone’

      I -TOP -NOM letter -ACC received that-NOM -from is
      kadooka] wakaranai
      whether know-not
      ‘I don’t know whether it is from Mary that John received a letter’

(98) Taroo-wa [ kare-ga huzisan-ni nobotta to] itteiru ga, boku-wa
   -TOP he -NOM Mt.Fuji-on climbed that saying-is though I -TOP
   [huzisan-ni kadooka] wakaranai
   Mt.Fuji-on whether know-not
   ‘Taroo says that he climbed Mt. Fuji, but I don’t know whether it is Mt. Fuji that he climbed’
(99) a. \([_{CP} kare-ga \ huzisan-ni \ nobotta \ to]\)
   he -NOM Mt.Fuji-on climbed that

   b. Boku-wa \([_{[CP,Op,] [kare-ga \ \_ nobotta] \ no]} -ga \ huzisan-ni, \ (da) \ kadooka]\)
   I -TOP he -NOM climbed that-NOM Mt.Fuji-on is whether
   know-not
   ‘I don’t know whether it is Mt. Fuji that he climbed’

(100) Mary loves John’s mother, and he does, too

(101) “Vehicle change”: r-expression \(\rightarrow\) pronoun \ (Fiengo and May 1994)

(102) WH, Quantified NP, Focus \(\rightarrow\) Op

(103) a. \([_{CP,] [TP, zibun-ga \ naze \ sikarareta] \ ka]} --- WH \(\rightarrow\) Op

   b. \([_{CP,] [TP, zibun-ga \ Op} sikarareta] \ no]\)

   c. \([_{CP,Op,} [_{TP, zibun-ga \ _i sikarareta] \ no}\]

(104) a. \([_{CP,Op,} [_{[TP, x-ga \ _i sikarareta]} \ no]\)

   b. \([_{CP,Op,} [_{[TP, John-ga \ _i sikarareta]} \ no]\]

(105) a. Mary-wa \([[[CP,Op,] [_{[TP, x-ga \ _i sikarareta] \ no}]-ga \ naze \ da \ ka]} wakatteiru\)
   -TOP -NOM scolded-was -NOM why is Q know

   b. Mary-wa \([[[CP,Op,] [_{[TP, John-ga \ _i sikarareta] \ no}]-ga \ naze \ da \ ka]} wakatteiru\)
   -TOP -NOM scolded-was -NOM why is Q know

7. Conclusion

(106) a. N’-deletion
   b. VP-deletion
   c. Sluicing
   d. Argument deletion

(107) a. Extensions of the argument-ellipsis hypothesis
   b. Suggestive evidence for the argument deletion analysis over the indefinite pronoun hypothesis and the N’-deletion analysis
(108) Boku-wa [dono nihonzin huuhu-ni betebetu-no gakusei-o suisensita ka] I -TOP which Japanese couple-DAT different-GEN student-ACC recommended Q oboeteinai ga, [dono itariasizin huuhu -ni ka]-wa oboeteiru remember-not though which Italian couple-DAT Q -TOP remember ‘I don’t remember which Japanese couples I recommended different students to, but I remember which Italian couples (I recommended different students to)’


b. Does it have the same properties as the other deletion phenomena? (Saito 2004b)
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