

平成 28 年度 学術振興基金助成による成果報告書

平成 29 年 1 月 31 日

学 長 殿

所属部局・職名 経済経営学類・教授

申 請 者 名 福富 靖之

<p>助成事業の区分 (該当するものに○印)</p>	<p>研究協力に関する事業 (学術出版・叢書・学会等運営 <u>学会参加</u>) 学術振興に関する事業 (学生・事務職員・その他の特別事業)</p>
<p>事 業 名</p>	<p>The West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 34 (第 34 回西海岸形式言語学会)</p>
<p>事業実施期間</p>	<p>平成 28 年 4 月 28 日 ~ 平成 28 年 5 月 4 日</p>
<p>成 果 の 概 要</p>	<p>The West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 34 (第 34 回西海岸形式言語学会) において、論文 “Coordinated Multiple <i>Wh</i>-Question and its Reverse” (等位多重 <i>Wh</i> 疑問文とその逆) を口頭発表した。 本発表では、「メアリーに何をあげたの、そして誰が」を例とする、ここで「逆等位多重 <i>WH</i> 疑問文」と呼ぶ構文が、これまでの日本語生成統語論研究において指摘されたことのない現象であり、「等位多重 <i>WH</i> 疑問文」とは異なり、「隠れ分裂文 (<i>concealed clefts</i>)」から派生されることを示した。 発表の要旨は以下の通りである。</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Coordinated Multiple <i>Wh</i>-Question and its Reverse</p> <p>This paper deals with a less-examined multiple <i>wh</i>-question in Japanese, which I refer as a “Reversed Coordinated Multiple <i>Wh</i>-Question” and argues that it is derived from a “concealed cleft” construction. It certainly constitutes a kind of multiple <i>wh</i>-questions, since it requires a <i>wh</i>-question as the first conjunct as in (1):</p> <p>(1) a. <i>nani-o</i> Mary-<i>ni</i> ageta no <i>sosite dare-ga</i>? what-ACC Mary-DAT gave Q and who-NOM Lit. “What gave to Mary and who?” b. *<i>ringo-o</i> Mary-<i>ni</i> ageta <i>yo</i> <i>sosite dare-ga</i>? apple-ACC Mary-DAT gave PRT and who-NOM Lit. “gave an apple to Mary and who?” c. *<i>ringo-o</i> Mary-<i>ni</i> ageta no <i>sosite dare-ga</i>? apple-ACC Mary-DAT gave Q and who-NOM Lit. “Did give an apple to Mary and who?”</p> <p>While (1a) includes a <i>wh</i>-question as the first conjunct, (1b) and (1c) include a declarative sentence and a yes/no question respectively, resulting in unacceptable sentences.</p> <p>Ishii (2014) argues convincingly that Japanese has a coordinated multiple <i>wh</i>-question (CWH) with two <i>wh</i>-arguments, although it is a non-multiple-<i>wh</i>-language like English. He attributes the difference between Japanese and English to the existence of a scrambling operation in Japanese, which allows backward sluicing to obey the parallelism condition on deletion (Fox and Lasnik 2003):</p>

(2) a. dare-ga sosite nani-o Mary-ni ageta no?
 who-NOM and what-ACC Mary-DAT gave Q
 Lit. “Who and what gave to Mary?”

b. *Who and what gave to Mary?

(3) [CP [CP dare-ga₁ [TP(Elided Clause) nani-o₂ [TP t'₁ [vP Mary-ni t₂ ageta]]] C_{1+Q₁]] [&P sosite [CP}

[TP nani-o₃ [TP(Antecedent Clause) t₁ [vP Mary-ni t₃ ageta]]] no]]

The required formal parallelism on deletion also accounts for the obligatory application of scrambling to the second conjunct of CWHs, although we may not be able to refer the example (4) as CWHs because two *wh*-arguments are not apparently conjoined:

(4) *dare-ga sosite Mary-ni nani-o ageta no?
 who-NOM and Mary-DAT what-ACC gave Q
 Lit. “Who and gave what to Mary?”

Interestingly, when the order of the first and second conjuncts in (4) is reversed, the sentence becomes acceptable:

(5) Mary-ni nani-o ageta no sosite dare-ga?
 Mary-DAT what-ACC gave Q and who-NOM

Lit. “What gave to Mary and who?”

The difference in acceptability between (4) and (5) indicates that the sentence with forward deletion has a different derivation from that with backward sluicing; as is well-known, the example in (5) could be derived from a “concealed cleft” construction (Saito 2003 and Takahashi 1994, among others):

(6) Mary-ni nani-o ageta no sosite [CP Op_i [TP t_i Mary-ni pro
 Mary-DAT

ageta] no]-wa dare-ga
 gave that-TOP who-NOM

In fact, a pronominal and a copular can appear in reversed CWHs (7), but not in “ordinary” CWHs as in (8):

(7) Mary-ni nani-o ageta no soiste (sore-wa) dare-ga da?
 Mary-DAT what-ACC gave Q and it-TOP who-NOM is

Lit. “What gave to Mary and is it who?”

(8) *(sore-wa) dare-ga da sosite nani-o Mary-ni ageta no?
 it-TOP who-NOM is and what-ACC Mary-DAT gave Q

Lit. “Is it who and what gave to Mary?”

In addition, the example in (9) is ungrammatical because the corresponding cleft sentence is ruled out by Subjacency (10):

(9) *kinoo [NP nani-ga nusumareta to yuu nyuusu]-o kiita no
 yesterday what-NOM stolen-was that news -ACC heard Q
 sosite doko-kara?

and where-from

Lit. “Yesterday what did you hear the news that was stolen and from where?”

(10) *[CP Op_i [TP kinoo [NP t_i genkin-ga nusumareta to yuu
 yesterday cash-NOM stolen-was that

nyuusu]-o kiita] no]-wa Tokyo Ginkoo kara; desyoo.
 news -ACC heard -TOP from must-be

“It must be from the Bank of Tokyo that you heard the news yesterday that cash was stolen.”

In contrast to the reversed counterparts, CWHs do not exhibit CNPC effects, because, as is well known, sluicing remedies Subjacency violations and makes the sentence grammatical. The contrast between (9) and (11) corroborates the proposal that CWHs and their reversed counterparts have different derivations.

(11) doko-kara sosite nani-ga kinoo nusumareta to
 where-from and what-NOM yesterday stolen-was that
 yuu nyuusu-o kiita no?

news-ACC heard Q

Lit. “From where and what did you hear the news that was stolen?”

The fact that CWHs involves a full *wh*-movement (cf. Takahashi 1993) and backward sluicing is confirmed by their sensitivity to the superiority effect, as pointed out in Ishii (2014):

- (12) ?*nani-o sosite dare-ga Mary-ni ageta no?
 what-ACC and who-NOM Mary-DAT gave Q
 Lit. “What and who gave to Mary?”
- (13) dare-ga sosite nani-o Mary-ni ageta no?
 who-NOM and what-ACC Mary-DAT gave Q
 Lit. “Who and what gave to Mary?”

Compare (12) with (2a), repeated here as (13), in which *dare-ga* (who-NOM) sideward moves to the SPEC of CP in the first conjunct, and it blocks the movement of *nani-o* (what-ACC), resulting in the superiority effect. Here again, reversing the first and second conjuncts ameliorates the acceptability of (12), since the corresponding reversed CWHs involve concealed clefts as shown in (15):

- (14) a. dare-ga Mary-ni ageta no sosite nani-o
 who-NOM Mary-DAT gave Q and what-ACC
 Lit. “Who gave to Mary and what?”
- b. nani-o Mary-ni ageta no sosite dare-ga
 what-ACC Mary-DAT gave Q and who-NOM
 Lit. “What gave to Mary and who?”
- (15) a. ...sosite [CP Op_i [TP pro Mary-ni t_i ageta] no]-wa
 nani_i-o
- b. ...sosite [CP Op_i [TP t_i Mary-ni pro ageta]no]-wa
 dare_i-ga

Furthermore, the proposed analysis through concealed clefts accounts straightforwardly for the lack of pair-list interpretation of reversed CWHs.

In summary, our proposal offers an additional evidence for “concealed clefts” analysis of forward sluicing in Japanese and in tandem with Ishii’s (2014) analysis of Japanese CWHs through backward sluicing, we argue that there are at least two kinds of deletion process in Japanese syntax.