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1. Introduction

(1) Investigations into the nature and the acquisition of ellipsis constructions provide us with a privileged window onto biologically-determined UG.

(2) The Best Investigated Instances of Ellipsis:
   a. VP-ellipsis: John can play the guitar, and Mary can, too.¹
   b. Sluicing: John can play something, but I don’t know what.

(3) In languages like Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, and Turkish, null arguments allow both strict-identity and sloppy-identity interpretations, and the latter interpretation is argued to follow from ellipsis of argument DPs (which is called argument ellipsis) (see e.g. Kim 1999, Oku 1998, Saito 2007, Takahashi 2008, Saito & An 2010, Şener & Takahashi 2010, and Sakamoto 2012, among many others).

(4) Japanese (Saito & An 2010):
   a. John-ga zibun-no konpyuutaa-o kowasita.
       John-NOM self-GEN computer-ACC destroyed
   b. Mary-mo kowasita.
       Mary-also destroyed
       ‘John₁ destroyed his₁ computer. Mary₂ also destroyed his₁/her₂ computer.’

(5) Korean (Saito & An 2010)
       John-NOM self-GEN computer-ACC destroyed
   b. Mary-to pwuswuessta.
       Mary-also destroyed
       ‘John₁ destroyed his₁ computer. Mary₂ also destroyed his₁/her₂ computer.’

¹. See Thornton & Wexler (1999) for a detailed discussion on the acquisition of VP-ellipsis.
Mongolian (Sakamoto 2012):

a. Bat-Ø uuri-n bagsh-ig hundel-deg.
   Bat-NOM self-GEN teacher-ACC respect-HBT
   ‘Bat respects self’s teacher.’

b. Oyuna-Ø ch __________ hundel-deg.
   Oyuna-NOM also respect-HBT
   ‘Oyuna also respects his/her teacher.’

Turkish (Şener & Takahashi 2010):

a. Can [ pro anne-si ]-ni eleştir-di.
   John his mother-3SG-ACC criticize-PAST
   ‘John1 criticized his1 mother.
   Mete, however, praised his1/2 mother.

b. Mete-yse __________ öz-dü.
   Mete-however praise-PAST
   ‘John1 criticized his1 mother. Mete2, however, praised his1/2 mother.

This study conducts an experiment to determine whether Japanese-speaking preschool children permit such sloppy-identity interpretation for null objects.

Building on and criticizing my own previous study (Sugisaki 2007), I will present a new piece of evidence that children rely not on VP-ellipsis (of the Hebrew-type), but on argument ellipsis, to obtain the relevant interpretation.

2. Argument Ellipsis and its Parametric Variation

2.1. Sloppy Null Objects in Japanese: VP-ellipsis?

a. John-ga zibun-no konpyuutaa-o kowasita.
   John-NOM self-GEN computer-ACC destroyed
   ‘John1 destroyed his1 computer.’

b. Mary-mo sore-o kowasita.
   Mary-also it-ACC destroyed
   ‘Mary2 also destroyed his1 computer.’ / *‘Mary2 also destroyed her2 computer.’


In Overt Syntax:

a. \[ \text{TP} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{John-ga} \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{zibun-no} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{konpyuutaa-o} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]
\[ \text{TP} \quad \text{tV} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{kowasiv-ta} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{destroyed} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]

b. \[ \text{TP} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{Mary-mo} \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{zibun-no} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{konpyuutaa-o} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]
\[ \text{TP} \quad \text{tV} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{kowasiv-ta} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{destroyed} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]

In the LF Component: The antecedent VP is copied.

a. \[ \text{TP} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{John-ga} \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{zibun-no} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{konpyuutaa-o} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]
\[ \text{TP} \quad \text{tV} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{kowasiv-ta} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{destroyed} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]

b. \[ \text{TP} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{Mary-mo} \\
\text{VP} \quad \text{zibun-no} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{konpyuutaa-o} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]
\[ \text{TP} \quad \text{tV} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \quad \text{kowasiv-ta} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{destroyed} \\
\text{IV} \end{array} \]

This VP-ellipsis analysis of the sloppy interpretation for null objects gains plausibility from Goldberg’s (2005) proposal that a corresponding derivation is also available in languages like Hebrew, Irish, and Swahili (see also Doron 1999 and McCloskey 1991).

V-stranding VP-Ellipsis in Hebrew (Goldberg 2005):

Q: Šalaxt etmol et ha-yeladim le-beit-ha-sefer?
‘Did (you) send yesterday the children to school?’

A: Šalaxti.
‘(I) sent yesterday the children to school.’

(Doron 1999, cited in Goldberg 2005:44)

Evidence for Overt V-raising:
In Hebrew, VP-edge elements must follow the main verb.

Evidence for VP-ellipsis: In Hebrew, VP-internal constituents other than direct objects cannot elide independently.
*Locative Argument Gap without DO Also Null:

Karmela natna et ha-sefer le-Xagit,

Karmela give[Past3Fsg] ACC the-book to Chagit

ve-Yosef zarak et ha-kadur.

and-Yosef throw[Past3Msg] ACC the-ball

‘Karmela gave the book to Chagit, and Yosef threw the ball.’

* ‘Karmela gave the book to Chagit, and Yosef threw the ball to her.’

(Goldberg 2005:45)

2.2. Sloppy Null Objects in Japanese: Not VP-ellipsis

Problem #1: Even null subjects allow the sloppy-identity interpretation (Oku 1998).

(20) a. Hanako-wa [ zibun-no teian-ga saiyou-sareru to ]
Hanako-TOP self-GEN proposal-NOM accepted-be that
omotteiru.

think

‘Hanako1 thinks that her1 proposal will be accepted.’

b. Taroo-mo [ _________ saiyou-sareru to ] omotteiru.
Taroo-also accepted-be that think

‘Taroo2 also thinks that her1/his2 proposal will be accepted.’

Verbal Identity Requirement on VP Ellipsis (Goldberg 2005:171):
The antecedent- and target-clause main Vs of VP Ellipsis must be identical, minimally, in their root and derivational morphology.

(23) *Non-Matching Root, Matching Derivational Morphology:

Q: Rivka hisi’a otax le-beit ha-sefer?

‘(Did) Rivka drive you to school?’

A: * Ken, hi hevi’a.

yes she bring[Past3Fsg]

‘Yes, she brought [me to school].’

(Goldberg 2005:163)

(24) *Non-Matching Derivational Morphology, Matching Root:

Q: Hisa’ta etmol et Li’ora le-Tel Aviv?
drive[Past2Msg] yesterday ACC Liora to-Tel Aviv

‘(Did) you drive yesterday Liora to Tel Aviv?’
A: * Ken, hi nas’a.
   yes, she travel[Past3Fsg]
   ‘Yes, she traveled to Tel Aviv yesterday.’ (Goldberg 2005:165)

(25) **Future 2Fsg Antecedent V, Past 1sg Target V:**

Q: Tazmini et Dvora la-mesiba?
   invite[Fut2Fsg] ACC Dvora to.the-party
   ‘(Will) (you) invite Dvora to the party?’

A: Kvar hizmanti.
   already invite[Past1sg]  
   ‘(I) already invited [Dvora to the party].’ (Goldberg 2005:163)

(26) a. Q: Dina soreget et ha-svederim še-hi lovešet?
   Dina knit.PRTCPL.F.S. ACC the-sweaters that-she wears
   ‘Does Dina knit the sweaters that she wears?’

   no, but mother hers knit.PRTCPL.F.S.
   ‘No, but her mother does.’

   ** strict-identity reading, sloppy-identity reading **

c. A2: Lo, ima šera kona (la).
   no mother hers buys.PRTCPL.F.S. (to-her)
   ‘No, her mother buys them (for her).’

   ** strict-identity reading, sloppy-identity reading ** (Doron 1999)

(27) In Hebrew, null objects are licit only when they are inanimate. Cases in which null direct objects are animate, however, are strongly ungrammatical.

(28) * Šmu’el hošiv et ha-yeladot al ha-mita,
   Shmuel sit[Past3Msg] ACC the-girls on the-bed
   ve-Dina hilbiša be-simlot.
   and-Dina dress[Past3Fsg] in-dresses
   ‘Shmuel sat the girls on the bed, and Dina dressed (them) in dresses.’
   (Goldberg 2005:48)

(29) **Problem #2:**

Verbal Identity Requirement does not hold for Japanese null objects with the sloppy interpretation.
(30) Taroo-wa zibun-no gakusei-o semeta-ga
Taroo-TOP self-GEN student-ACC blamed-while
Hanako-wa  __________________________ kabatta.
Hanako-TOP  defended
‘While Taroo1 blamed his1 student, Hanako2 defended his1 / her2 student.’

2.3. **Parametric Variation in Argument Ellipsis**

(31) An alternative approach proposed in a number of theoretical studies is the postulation of *argument ellipsis*, in which only the argument DPs are elided (e.g. Kim 1999; Oku 1998; Otaki 2011; Saito 2003, 2007; Takahashi 2008, in press, among many others).

(32) **In Overt Syntax:**

a. John-wa [cP [DP zibun-no teian-ga ] ] [T saiyoosareru
   John-TOP self-GEN proposal-NOM be.adopted
to ]] omotteiru.
   C think
b. Mary-mo [cP [DP __________________________ ] ] [T saiyoosareru
   Mary-also to ]] omotteiru.
   C think

(33) **In the LF Component:**

a. John-wa [cP [DP zibun-no teian-ga ] ] [T saiyoosareru
   John-TOP self-GEN proposal-NOM be.adopted
to ]] omotteiru.
   C think
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b. Juan también cree [que ______ será aceptada].
   ‘Juan also believes that her proposal will be accepted.’
   
* ‘Juan also believes that his proposal will be accepted.’

(35) English (Oku 1998:311): Bill1 ate his1 shoe, and John ate, too.

(36) To account for the cross-linguistic difference between Japanese (and Korean) on one hand and English and Spanish on the other, Saito (2007) builds on Kuroda’s (1988) proposal and claims that argument ellipsis in Japanese stems from the absence of overt agreement in this language.2,3

(37) a. Watashi-wa mai-asa ringo-o taberu.
   I-TOP every-morning apple-ACC eat
   ‘I eat an apple every morning.’
   b. Taroo-wa mai-asa ringo-o taberu.
   Taroo-TOP every-morning apple-ACC eat
   ‘Taroo eats an apple every morning.’

(38) Saito’s (2007) “anti-agreement approach” to the parameter of argument ellipsis adopts Chomsky’s (2000) system of agreement, in which agreement is a probe-goal relation induced by a set of uninterpretable φ-features on the functional heads of T and v.

(39) a. … [vP φ[|]] [VP V DP[|uCase]] ]
   b. … [vP φ[|]] [VP V DP[|uCase]] ]

(40) a. John brought [DP his friend].
   b. * But Bill did not bring _____.

2. See Oku (1998), Saito (2003), and Takahashi (2008) for a different parametric proposal, in which the relevant parameter relates the availability of argument ellipsis to the existence of (Japanese-type) scrambling. See Takahashi (in press) for problems for this “scrambling approach” to the parameter of argument ellipsis.

3. See Sato (in press) for evidence from the interpretation of null arguments in Colloquial Singapore English for the anti-agreement approach. See Kitahara (2011) for discussion of the theoretical problems in the anti-agreement approach and an alternative analysis.
(41) Derivation: Agree

a. In Overt Syntax: John \([vP \underline{\text{DP his friend}_{ip,uCase}}]\). brought \([DP his friend_{ip,uCase}]\).

b. At LF: John \([vP \underline{\text{DP his friend}_{ip,uCase}}]\). brought \([DP his friend_{ip,uCase}]\).

c. In Overt Syntax: Bill did not \([vP \underline{\text{DP his friend}_{ip,uCase}}]\). brought \([DP his friend_{ip,uCase}]\).

(42) a. John-wa \([DP zibun-no tomodati-o \underline{\text{turetekita}}.}\) brought

‘John\(_1\) brought his\(_1\) friend.’

b. Demo Mary-wa \(\underline{\text{tureteko-nakatta}}.\) brought–not

‘But Mary\(_2\) did not bring her\(_2\) friend.’

(43) Derivation:

a. In Overt Syntax:

Agree

John-wa \([vP [DP zibun-no tomodati-o] \underline{\text{turetekita}}.\) brought \(Q\).

b. At LF:

John-wa \([vP [DP zibun-no tomodati-o] \underline{\text{turetekita}}.\) brought \(Q\).

c. In Overt Syntax:

Mary-wa \([vP [DP zibun-no tomodati-o] \underline{\text{tureteko-nakatta}}.]\) brought–not

(44) One piece of evidence for this anti-agreement approach to the parameter of argument ellipsis comes from the interpretation of null arguments in Kaqchikel (Otaki et al. 2012).

(45) Like other Mayan languages, Kaqchikel exhibits obligatory ergative-absolutive agreement with both subject and object noun phrases.

(46) Transitive:\(^4\)

a. rat x-Ø-aw-axa-j ri achin

you (SG) PEFV-3SG.ABS-2SG.ERG-hear-ACT the man

‘You (SG) heard the man.’

4. “Ø” indicates a phonologically empty exponent.
b. ri achin x-a-r-axa-j rat
   the man PEFV-2SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-hear-ACT you (SG)
   ‘The man heard you (SG).’

(47) Intransitive
a. ri achin x-∅-uk’lun
   the man PEFV-3SG.ABS-arrive
   ‘The man arrived.’

b. rat x-at-uk’lun
   you (SG) PEFV-2SG.ABS-arrive
   ‘You (SG) arrived.’
   (Preminger 2011:26)

(48) Kaqchikel allows productive use of null subjects and null objects, just like Japanese.

a. X-e-ru-tij nimamixku’ a Xwan, iwir.
   PERV-3PL.ABS-3SG.ERG-eat apple CLF Juan yesterday
   ‘Juan ate apples yesterday.’

b. Po _____ man x-∅-u-tij ta
   but NEG PEFV-2SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-eat NEG
   _____ wakami.
   now
   Lit. ‘but _____ didn’t eat _______ today.’

(49) Since Kaqchikel exhibits fairly robust morphological agreement with both subjects and objects, the anti-agreement approach predicts that argument ellipsis is available neither for the subject position nor for the object position.

(50) a. A Xwan n-∅-u-na’oj-ij [ chi
   CLF Juan IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-know-ACT COMP
   xta Mari’y tikir-el n-∅-u-chäp
   CLF Maria can IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-catch
   ri ru-syan ]
   the 3SG.ERG-cat
   ‘Juan thinks that Maria can catch his cat.’

b. Chuqa’a a Kalux n-∅-u-na’oj-ij
   also CLF Carlos IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-know-ACT
   [ chi ri xta Mari’y tikir-el
   COMP the CLF Maria can
   n-∅-u-chäp ]
   IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-catch
Lit. ‘Carlos also thinks that Maria can catch ______.’

\[strict-identity reading, *sloppy-identity reading\]

c. Chuqa’ a Kalux n-∅-u-na’oj-ij
also CLF Carlos IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-know-ACT

[ chi ri xta Mari’y tikir-el
COMP the CLF Maria can
n-∅-u-chäp ri ru-syan ]
IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-catch the 3SG.ERG-cat

Lit. ‘Carlos also thinks that Maria can catch his/her cat.’

\[strict-identity reading, \sloppy-identity reading\]

(51) a. A Xwan n-∅-u-na’oj-ij
CLF Juan IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-know-ACT

[ chi ri ru-syan tikir-el
COMP the 3SG.eERG-cat can
y-e-ru-chäp taq ch’oy ]
IMPF-3PL.ABS-3SG.ERG-catch PL mouse

‘Juan thinks that his cat can catch mice.’

b. Chuqa’ ri a Kalux
also the CLF Carlos

n-∅-u-na’oj-ij [ chi ______ ]
IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-know-ACT COMP
tikir-el y-e-ru-chäp taq ch’oy ]
can IMPF-3PL.ABS-3SG.ERG-catch PL mouse

Lit. ‘Carlos also thinks that [e] can catch mice.’

\[strict-identity reading, *sloppy-identity reading\]

c. Chuqa’ ri a Kalux
also the CLF Carlos

n-∅-u-na’oj-ij [ chi ]
IMPF-3SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-know-ACT COMP
ri ru-syan tikir-el y-e-ru-chäp
the 3SG.ERG-cat can IMPF-3PL.ABS-3SG.ERG-catch
taq ch’oy ]
PL mouse

‘Carlos also thinks that his cat can catch mice.’

\[strict-identity reading, \sloppy-identity reading\]

Previous acquisition literature reports that children appear to be sensitive to the agreement patterns of their target language from very early, at least by the age of three (e.g. Hyams 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% error</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simone</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>1;07-2;08</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clahsen and Penke 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1;08-2;07</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Guasti 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1;10-2;06</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Guasti 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guglielmo</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2;02-2;07</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Guasti 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1;04-2;04</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pizzuto and Caselli 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1;05-2;10</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pizzuto and Caselli 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1;05-3;00</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pizzuto and Caselli 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marti</td>
<td>Catalan/Spanish</td>
<td>1;09-2;05</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Torrens 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josep</td>
<td>Catalan/Spanish</td>
<td>1;09-2;06</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Torrens 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisela</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>1;10-2;06</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Torrens 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillem</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>1;09-2;06</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Torrens 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Percentage of Subject-Verb Agreement Errors in Child Language
(Hyams 2002:231)

Given the finding that agreement errors are extremely rare in the acquisition of “rich” agreement languages, we can reasonably speculate that children acquiring agreementless languages like Japanese would also be sensitive to the absence of overt agreement from the early stages of acquisition.

Prediction for Child Japanese:
Japanese-speaking preschool children have knowledge of argument ellipsis.


Subjects:
10 Japanese-speaking children, ranging in age from 3(years);01(month) to 5;07 (mean age 4;05).

Task: Modified version of the Truth-Value Judgment Task (Crain & Thornton 1998)
a. Each child was told a story, which was accompanied by a series of pictures presented on a laptop computer.
b. At the end of each story, a puppet described verbally what he thought had happened in the story.

c. The task for the child was to judge whether the puppet’s description was true or false, by feeding him either a nice strawberry or a horrible green pepper.

(57) The experiment consisted of:

a. 2 sentences with null objects
b. 2 sentences with overt object pronouns
c. 1 practice item

(58) Sample Story:
Today, Panda and Pig enjoyed riding on their favorite tricycles. Now they decided to wash them. Panda said, “Oh! My tricycle is very dirty.” Pig said, “Shall I help you wash your tricycle?” Panda replied, “No, thanks. I will try to do it by myself, so you can work on your own.” They started washing their favorite tricycles.

(59) Sample Test Sentences:

panda-NOM self-GEN tricycle-ACC washing PRT
‘Panda1 is washing his1 tricycle.’
b. Butasan-mo ______ / sore-o aratteru yo.
pig-also it-ACC washing PRT
‘Pig is also washing _____ / it.’

| Acceptance Rate for Sentences with Null Objects | 90% (18/20) |
| Acceptance Rate for Sentences with Overt Pronouns | 15% (3/20) |

Table 2: Summary of the Results of Sugisaki’s (2007) Experiment

(60) The results are in conformity with the prediction in (53), and hence Sugisaki (2007) interpreted these results as indicating that the knowledge of argument ellipsis is already in the grammar of Japanese-speaking preschool children.5

---

5. See Matsuo (2007) for a related study which also investigated children’s interpretation of null-object sentences. Otaki & Yusa (2012) confirmed that Japanese-speaking children permit ellipsis of object DPs, by demonstrating that children have access to quantificational interpretation of null objects. However, the study by Otaki & Yusa (2012) appears to share the same problem as Sugisaki (2007) in their design of the test sentences.
A significant problem arises, however, if we take account of Goldberg’s (2005) discussion of V-stranding VP-ellipsis in Hebrew.

In Sugisaki’s (2007) experiment discussed above, the antecedent clause and the target clause of the test sentences contained exactly the same verb. According to Goldberg (2005), this is exactly the situation in which V-stranding VP-ellipsis is possible in Hebrew.

Then, in light of the various proposals that children may undergo an intermediate stage in which they entertain target-inconsistent parametric values (e.g. Hyams 1986, Thornton 2007), there remains a possibility that Japanese-speaking children’s sloppy interpretation for null objects stems not from argument ellipsis, but from Hebrew-type V-stranding VP-ellipsis.

5. **Revisiting Argument Ellipsis in Child Japanese: New Experiment**

Subjects:
10 Japanese-speaking children, ranging in age from 3;10 to 4;07 (mean age, 4;04).

Task: Modified version of the Truth-Value Judgment Task (Crain & Thornton 1998)
   a. Each child was told a story, which was accompanied by a series of pictures presented on a laptop computer.
   b. At the end of each story, a puppet described verbally what he thought had happened in the story.
   c. The task for the child was to judge whether the puppet’s description was true or false, by pointing out one of the two cards the puppet has in his hands, a circle ○ (which means correct) or a cross × (which means wrong).

The experiment consisted of:
   a. 2 sentences with null objects
   b. 2 sentences with overt referential DP objects
   c. 2 filler items.

As for the test sentences in (66a) and (66b), the antecedent clause and the target clause contained different verbs, in order to make sure that children have to rely not on Hebrew-type VP-ellipsis but on Japanese-type argument ellipsis.
Sample Story:
Today, Anpanman is doing his workout with his dog, Cheese. Then, Miffy and her dog Snuffy appeared, and asked Anpanman: “What kind of workout are you doing today?” Anpanman replied, “I am jumping over my dog. Look at this!” Anpanman successfully jumped over his dog. Looking at Anpanman’s marvelous jump, Miffy now wants to give a try. “Now let me do it. Look at this!” Miffy also successfully jumped over Anpanman’s dog. Miffy then said, “Let me do it again!” She is now going to jump over her own dog. But unfortunately, she failed to jump high this time, and she stepped on her dog.

Sample Test Sentences:
a. Sentence with a null object: TRUE
Anpanman-wa zyoozuni zibun-no wantyan-o
Anpanman-TOP successfully self-GEN puppy.dog-ACC
tobikoeta kedo, Miffy-wa _______ hunzuketyatta yo.
jumped over while Miffy-TOP stepped on PRT
‘While Anpanman successfully jumped over his dog, Miffy stepped on ______.’

b. Sentence with an overt DP object: FALSE
Anpanman-wa zyoozuni zibun-no wantyan-o
Anpanman-TOP successfully self-GEN puppy.dog-ACC
tobikoeta kedo, Miffy-wa Anpanman-no
jumped over while Miffy-TOP Anpanman-GEN
wantyan-o hunzuketyatta yo.
puppy.dog-ACC stepped on PRT
‘While Anpanman successfully jumped over his dog, Miffy stepped on Anpanman’s dog.’

Note that the test sentences in the target trials as in (69) involved animate direct objects, in light of the observation that Hebrew permits null objects only when they are inanimate (see (26)). This would avoid the possibility that Japanese-speaking children assign null-object structure even though they have knowledge of Hebrew-type V-stranding VP Ellipsis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance Rate for Sentences with Null Objects as in (40a)</th>
<th>85% (17/20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate for Sentences with Overt DP Objects as in (40b)</td>
<td>10% (2/20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Summary of the Results of the New Experiment
6. Conclusion

(71) Saito’s (2007) parametric proposal argue that the availability of argument ellipsis is tightly connected to another prominent properties of Japanese, the absence of overt agreement. This parametric proposal predicts that the knowledge of argument ellipsis is already in the grammar of Japanese-speaking preschool children.

(72) A previous experimental study by Sugisaki (2007) was not successful in excluding the possibility that children entertain target-inconsistent parametric values and rely not on argument ellipsis but on Hebrew-type V-stranding VP-ellipsis.

(73) The present study conducted a new experiment to overcome this problem, and provided a new piece of evidence that Japanese-speaking preschool children indeed have knowledge of argument ellipsis.

(74) This finding confirms that children’s acquisition of argument ellipsis is consistent with the parametric proposal that its availability is closely tied to other prominent properties of Japanese.

(75) A broader implication of this study is that the acquisition of argument ellipsis is potentially a very fruitful area to deepen our understanding about the nature of the innate constraints on language variation.
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