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1. Introduction

This paper examines a Japanese elliptical construction which we call Japanese Why-Stripping (JWS). We will discuss properties of JWS in comparison with those of other constructions such as Japanese Sluicing. Sluicing is an elliptical construction that involves a fragmental wh-phrase as shown in (1a) (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001, a.o.). Japanese Sluicing (JS) (Inoue 1976), exemplified in (1b), also involves a wh-remnant and thus is traditionally considered to be the Japanese version of Sluicing, although as discussed below, we will analyse JS in a different way from English Sluicing.

(1) a. Mary bought something, but I don’t know what.
      ‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what.’

JWS, on the other hand, is an elliptical construction with a wh-phrase naze ‘why’ followed by a non-wh remnant (e.g. ringo-o ‘apple-Acc’ in (2b); (2a) is an example of English Why-Stripping).¹

(2) a. Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why an apple.
   b. Mary-ga ringo-o kara-ta ga,
      boku-wa [naze ringo-o ka] wakara-nai.
      I-Top why apple-Acc Q know-not
      ‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why an apple.’

In this paper, we will focus on the similarities between JWS, JS, and the cleft construction (Cleft). Adopting Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s (2002) analysis of JS where JS and Cleft are both derived from the so-called ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction, we claim that JWS is also derived from this same underlying construction. We will also show that JWS is distinct from Multiple Sluicing such as (3) (Nishigauchi 1998, Merchant 1998, a.o.), where more than one wh-phrase survives ellipsis, despite the fact that both constructions involve

¹ The term “Stripping” refers to an elliptical construction with a non-wh remnant (e.g. (i)).
(i) John ate an apple, but not an orange. (= but John didn’t eat an orange.)
Hoji (1990) treats examples like (iiB) as Japanese Stripping, which we will not discuss here.
(ii) A: John-ni-wa huransugo-ga totemo zyoozuni hanas-eru.
    John-Dat-Top French-Nom very well speak-can
    ‘John can speak French very well.’
B: Watasi-no musuko-ni mo da.
    I-Gen son-Dat also be-nonpast
    ‘My son, too.’
multiple remnants.

(3) Dareka-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, Someone-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but boku-wa [dare-ga nani-o ka] wakara-na.i. I-Top who-Nom what-Acc Q know-not ‘Someone bought something, but I don’t know who what.’

Instead, we will claim that the behavior of JWS is captured under the analysis where naze ‘why’ is base-generated in the left periphery (Ko 2005).

2. JS/JWS and Cleft

2.1. Two Lines of Analyses of JS

Before considering properties of JWS, let us review previous analyses of JS, which is a more well-studied construction in the literature. There are two major lines of analyses of JS. Takahashi (1993) claims that JS is derived via wh-movement and clausal deletion as shown in (4a). We will call his approach ‘the wh-movement analysis’ of JS. This analysis assumes that JS is basically the same construction as English Sluicing, which also involves wh-movement and clausal deletion according to authors such as Ross (1969) and Merchant (2001), among others (e.g. (4b)).

(4) a. Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but [CP nani-o [Mary-ga kat-ta-ka]] wakara-na.i. what-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past Q know-not
b. Mary bought something, but I don’t know [CP what, [Mary bought t1]].

Contra the wh-movement analysis, authors including Nishiyama et al. (1996) and Merchant (1998) claim that JS is derived from Cleft. (See also Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s (2002) related analysis, which will be discussed in Section 4). According to this ‘Cleft analysis’, the JS sentence in (1b) has the underlying Cleft structure in (5), whose focus is the wh-phrase, and whose presupposition clause undergoes deletion.

(5) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top [CP [Mary ga kat-ta no] ga nani-o ka] wakara-na.i. Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Nom what-Acc Q know-not ‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what it is that Mary bought.’

The Cleft analysis has several advantages over the wh-movement analysis. The next subsection reviews the argument for the Cleft analysis.

2.2. The Arguments for the Cleft Analysis of JS

The following areas of Japanese syntax provide arguments for the Cleft analysis of JS: (i) the existence of the copula, (ii) the possibility of a pronominal subject, (iii) the optionality
of a Case-marker, (iv) a restriction concerning word order, and (v) island effects.\textsuperscript{2} The data below show a number of parallelisms between Cleft and JS in those areas, supporting the Cleft analysis of JS.

First, JS has an optional copula \textit{da} “be” after the wh-phrase, as shown in (6).

(6) Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga,
\text{Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but}
\text{boku-wa [naze ringo-o da ka] wakara-nai.}
\text{I-Top why apple-Acc be Q know-not}
‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why an apple.’

As (7a) shows, Cleft sentences involve a copula at the end of the sentence. The copula is optional in the case of embedded Cleft, as shown in (7b). This fact explains the optionality of the copula in JS under the Cleft analysis.

(7) a. \[\text{Top} \ [\text{Mary-ga kat-ta no]-wa [\text{FocP ringo-o da}]].\]
\text{Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Top apple-Acc be}
‘It is an apple that Mary bought.’

b. Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
\text{Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top}
\[\text{CP [Mary-ga kat-ta no]-ga nani-o (da) ka] wakara-nai.}\]
\text{Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Nom what-Acc(be) Q know-not}
‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what it is that Mary bought.’

On the other hand, regular wh-questions do not involve a copula as shown in (8), which would be a problem for the wh-movement analysis.

(8) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
\text{Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top}
\[\text{CP nanit-o [IP Mary-ga t\textsubscript{i} kat-ta (*da) ka]] wakara-nai.}\]
\text{what-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past (*be) Q know-not}
‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what Mary bought.’

Second, JS optionally has a pronominal subject \textit{sore-ga} ‘it-Nom’ before the wh-remnant as shown in (9).

(9) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
\text{Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top}
\[\text{CP (sore-ga) nani-o (da) ka] wakara-nai.}\]
\text{it-Nom what-Acc (be) Q know-not}
‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what it is.’

\textsuperscript{2} Another argument against the wh-movement analysis is that, as Kuwabara (1997) points out, JS is possible with a non-wh remnant (e.g. (i)), unlike English Sluicing (see also Takahashi 1994). Note that (i) could also be classified as embedded Stripping as it involves a non-wh remnant (See footnote 1).

(i) Haha-wa \[\text{CP [IP boku-no rusutyyuu-ni Tanaka-ga tazumeteki-ta] to}]\]
\text{Mother-Top I-Gen absence-during Tanaka-Nom come-to-see-Past that}
\text{it-ta ga, boku-wa Tanaka-ga to omowa-nai.}
\text{say-Past but I-Top Tanaka-Nom that think-not}
‘Mother said that Tanaka came to see me during my absence, but I don’t think that Tanaka.’
This fact can be accommodated under the Cleft analysis, if the pronominal subject is somehow derived from the clausal subject of Cleft. A Cleft sentence has a presuppositional clause as its subject (the underlined part in (10)). We assume that there is an operation that replaces the presuppositional clause with a pronoun and thus derives the pronominal subject in (9).

(10) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [\text{CP} [ Mary-ga kat-ta no]-ga nani-o (da) ka] wakara-nai.
    Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Nom what-Acc (be) Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what it is that Mary bought.’

There is no place for a pronominal subject in a regular wh-question such as (8). So the fact in (9) is hard to capture under the wh-movement analysis.

Third, the wh-remnant in JS may appear with or without the Case-marker. For example, the Accusative Case-marker –o is optional in (11).

(11) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [\text{CP} (sore-ga) nani(-o) (da) ka] wakara-nai.
    (it-Nom) what(-Acc) (be) Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what it is.’

Note that the focus of a Cleft sentence also allows for Case-marker drop, as shown in (12a) (an example of matrix Cleft) and (12b) (an example of embedded Cleft).

(12) a. \text{[TopP [Mary-ga kat-ta no]-wa [FocP ringo(-o) da]]}.
    Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Top apple(-Acc) be
    ‘It is an apple that Mary bought.’
    b. Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [\text{CP} [ Mary-ga kat-ta no]-ga nani(-o) (da) ka] wakara-nai.
    Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Nom what(-Acc) (be) Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what it is that Mary bought.’

Case-marker drop, on the other hand, is not allowed in regular wh-questions as shown in (13). Again, this is problematic for the wh-movement analysis of JS.

(13) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [\text{CP} nani,*(-o) [\text{IP} Mary-ga t\text{\_}kat-ta ka]] wakara-nai.
    what*(-Acc) Mary-Nom buy-Past Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what Mary bought.’

Fourth, Kizu (1997) shows that, in JS, a numeral quantifier must follow the sluiced wh-phrase it modifies. In the example in (14), the numeral quantifier \text{\textit{takusan}} ‘many’ cannot precede the modified wh-phrase \text{\textit{nani-o}} ‘what-Acc’.
(14) Mary-ga nanika-o takusan kat-ta ga, boku-wa
Mary-Nom something-Acc many buy-Past but I-Top
{nani-o takusan/*takusan nani-o} ka wakara-nai.
what-Acc many/ many what-Acc Q know-not
‘Mary bought something a lot, but I don’t know what a lot.’

Kizu shows that this restriction also applies to Cleft, as shown in (15a) (matrix Cleft) and (15b) (embedded Cleft), supporting the Cleft analysis of JS.

(15) a. [Mary-ga kat-ta no]-wa {ringo-o takusan/ *takusan ringo-o} da.
Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Top {apple-Acc many/ *many apple-Acc} be
‘It is apples a lot that Mary bought.’
b. Mary-ga nanika-o takusan kat-ta ga, boku-wa [CP [Mary-ga kat-ta
Mary-Nom something-Acc many buy-Past but I-Top Mary-Nom buy-Past
no]-ga {nani-o takusan/ *takusan nani-o} ka wakara-nai.
C-Nom what-Acc many/ *many what-Acc Q know-not
‘Mary bought something a lot, but I don’t know what a lot it is that Mary bought.’

There is no such restriction on wh-questions in general; the quantifier can either precede or follow the wh-phrase in (16).

(16) Mary-ga nanika-o takusan kat-ta ga, boku-wa
Mary-Nom something-Acc many buy-Past but I-Top
{nani-o takusan/takusan nani-o} Mary-ga kat-ta ka wakara-nai.
what-Acc many / many what-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past C know-not
‘Mary bought something a lot, but I don’t know what a lot Mary bought.’

Finally, the island restrictions of JS are the same as that of Cleft. We have seen in (11) and (12) that JS and Cleft may or may not have a Case-marker on its remnant/focus phrase. But as Hoji (1990) shows, Case-marked and non-Case-marked versions have different status with respect to island sensitivity. As shown in (17), Case-marked JS is island sensitive, while non-Case-marked JS is not.

(17) Mary-ga [NP [CP aru ronbun-o kai-ta] hito]-o hihansi-ta ga,
Mary-nom some paper-acc write-Past person-acc criticize-Past but
boku-wa dono ronbun(*-o) ka wakara-nai
I-Top which paper(*-Acc) Q know-not
‘Mary criticized [a person who wrote some paper], but I don’t know which paper.’

The same Case-marked/non-Case-marked distinction exists in Cleft; (18) shows that Case-marked Cleft, but not non-Case-marked Cleft, is island-sensitive.

(18) [CP Mary-ga [NP [CP kaita] hito]-o hihansi-ta no]-wa
Mary-nom write person-acc criticize-Past C-top
kono ronbun(*-o) da.
this paper(*-Acc) be
‘Lit. :It was this paper\textsubscript{1} that Mary criticized [the person who wrote t\textsubscript{1}].’

This fact follows if Cleft and JS share the same derivation, while such a similarity is not accounted for under the wh-movement analysis.

Based on these previous observations, we adopt the Cleft analysis of JS.
2.3. Arguments for the Cleft Analysis of JWS

This subsection shows that the arguments for the Cleft analysis reviewed above hold for JWS as well, supporting the Cleft analysis of JWS.

First, JWS allows an optional copula da ‘be’ in the same way as JS, as shown in (19).

(19) Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [naze ringo-o (da) ka] wakara-nai.
    why apple-Acc (be) Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why an apple.’

Second, JWS allows an optional pronominal subject sore-ga ‘it-Nom’. Note that the pronominal subject can either precede or follow the wh-phrase naze ‘why’, as exemplified in (20a) and (20b), respectively. We will come back to this observation in Section 4.

(20) Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa … 
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top … 
       (it-Nom) why apple-Acc (be) Q know-not
    b. [naze (sore-ga) ringo-o (da) ka] wakara-nai.
       why (it-Nom) apple-Acc (be) Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why it is an apple.’

Third, JWS allows Case-marker drop on the non-wh remnant; the non-wh remnant ringo ‘apple’ in (21) may or may not have the Accusative Case-marker.

(21) Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [(sore-ga) naze ringo(-o) (da) ka] wakara-nai.
       (it-Nom) why apple(-Acc) (be) Q know-not
    ‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why it is an apple.’

Fourth, there is a word order restriction between naze ‘why’ and the non-wh remnant in JWS, a similar type of restriction to Kizu’s (1997) word order restriction between a numeral quantifier and the wh-remnant of JS. As exemplified in (22), the non-wh remnant (e.g. ringo-o ‘Apple-Acc’) must not precede the wh-phrase naze ‘why’ in JWS.

(22) *Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
    [(sore-ga) ringo-o naze (da) ka] wakara-nai.
       (it-Nom) apple-Acc why (be) Q know-not

Crucially, the same restriction applies to Cleft with naze ‘why’ and a non-wh remnant, as shown in (23) (Kawamura 2007); when both naze and a non-wh phrase reside in the Cleft focus position, naze must precede the non-wh phrase.

(23) [Mary-ga kat-ta no]-wa [?naze ringo-o/ *ringo-o naze] na no?
    Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Top why apple-Acc/ *apple-Acc why be Q?
    ‘Why is it an apple that Mary bought?’
On the other hand, there is no such restriction on wh-questions with naze ‘why’, as is indicated by the fact that naze can precede or follow ringo-o ‘apple-Acc’ in (24).

(24) \{Naze ringo-o/ Ringo-o naze\} Mary-ga kat-ta no?
     Why apple-Acc/ apple-Acc why Mary-Nom buy-Past Q
     ‘Why did Mary buy an apple?’

Finally, there is a Case-marked/non-Case-marked distinction in JWS with respect to island phenomena in the same way as Cleft and JS; Case-marked JWS is island-sensitive, while non-Case-marked JWS is not.

(25) Mary-wa [NP [CP suruusing-no ronbun-o kaita] hito] -o hihansi-ta ga,
     Mary-top Sluicing-gen paper-acc wrote person-acc criticize-Past but
     boku-wa naze suruusing-no ronbun*o (da) ka wakara-nai.
     I-top why Sluicing-gen paper (-acc) (be) Q know-not
     ‘I heard Mary criticized a student who wrote a paper on Sluicing, but I don’t know why a paper on Sluicing.’ (asking for the reason of criticizing)

These five arguments all indicate that JWS, as well as JS, has properties similar to Cleft, and supports the analysis where JWS is derived in the same way as Cleft, rather than as regular wh-questions.

3. JWS is not Multiple Cleft

As we have mentioned in the introduction, JWS is apparently similar to Multiple Sluicing such as (3) in that there are multiple remnants. JWS involves a wh-remnant naze ‘why’ and a non-wh remnant, while Multiple Sluicing involves two wh-remnants. However, these constructions behave differently with respect to Case-marker drop.

Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002), who claim that JS is derived in the same way as Cleft, claims that Multiple Sluicing and Multiple Cleft share the same derivation. Their argument is based on the fact that both Multiple Sluicing and Multiple Cleft resist Case-marker drop, as exemplified in (26) and (27), respectively.

(26) Dareka-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
     Someone-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
     [dare*(-ga) nani*(-o) ka] wakara-nai.
     who*(-Nom) what*(-Acc) Q know-not
     ‘Someone bought something, but I don’t know who what.’

(27) [Kat-ta no]-wa Mary*(-ga) ringo*(-o) da.
     Buy-Past C-Top Mary*(-Nom) apple*(-Acc) be
     ‘It was Mary, an apple that e1 bought e2.’

Kawamura (2007), on the other hand, discusses Cleft with naze and a non-wh focus (e.g. (23)) and shows that such a sentence allows Case marker drop, as shown in (28).

---

3 As JS is possible with a non-wh remnant (See footnote 2), the fact that the second remnant is non-wh in JWS is not a priori reason to distinguish it from Multiple Sluicing.
Thus she concludes that sentences such as (23)/(28) should be distinct from Multiple Cleft.

We can conclude the same for the JWS, as JWS allows Case-marker drop as we have already seen in (21). JWS should not be treated merely as Sluicing which has multiple remnants. Especially, it will be argued in Section 4 that the wh-remnant naze ‘why’ in JWS has a special status distinct from Sluicing remnants in JS. Note that Sluicing with a wh-phrase other than naze ‘why’ and a non-wh remnant resists Case-marker drop, as shown in (29).

In order to reveal the special status of naze ‘why’ in ellipsis, we will discuss the source of the difference between ‘why’ and other wh-phrases in Section 4.

4. Base Generation of ‘Why’ and Focus

4.1. Special Properties of ‘Why’

The observation that why has different properties from other wh-phrases is not new in the literature. For example, Ko (2005) argues that Korean/Japanese ‘why’ is base-generated in [Spec, CP], while other wh-phrases in these languages undergo covert wh-movement to [Spec, CP] at LF.

Her argument is based on data of intervention effects between wh-phrases and Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) such as –sika ‘only’. (31a) shows that there is an intervention effect when a wh-phrase is lower than ‘only’. On the other hand, there is no intervention effect when ‘why’ is lower than ‘only’ as in (31b).

(28) [Mary-ga kat-ta no]-wa naze ringo(-o) na no?
Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Top why apple(-Acc) be Q
‘Why is it an apple that Mary bought?’

(29) Minna-ga nanika-o potluck-ni motteki-ta ga, boku-wa
Everyone-Nom something-Acc potluck-to bring-Past but I-Top
[dare*(ga) pan*(-o) ka] wakara-nai.
who*(Nom) bread*(-Acc) Q know-not
‘Everyone brought something to the potluck, but I don’t know who bread.’

That is, such a sentence has a property of Multiple Sluicing. Only JWS, which involves naze ‘why’ should be differentiated from these types of sentences.

Interestingly, JWS may have more than one non-wh remnant in addition to naze ‘why’, as shown in (30). In this case, the multiple non-wh remnants disallow Case-marker drop, indicating that this is a case of Multiple Sluicing.

(30) John-ga pan-o potluck-ni motteki-ta ga, boku-wa
John-Nom bread-Acc potluck-to bring-Past but I-Top
[naze John*(-ga) pan*(-o) ka] wakara-nai.
why John*(Nom) bread*(-Acc) Q know-not
‘John brought bread to the potluck, but I don’t know why John bread.’

In order to reveal the special status of naze ‘why’ in ellipsis, we will discuss the source of the difference between ‘why’ and other wh-phrases in Section 4.

(31) a. *Hanako-sika nani-o yoma-nakat-ta no?
Hanako-only what-Acc read-not-Past Q
‘What did only Hanako read?’

b. Hanako-sika naze sore-o yoma-nakat-ta no?
Hanako-only why it-Acc read-not-Past Q
‘Why did only Hanako read it?’
She attributes the lack of intervention effect with ‘why’ and the NPI ‘only’ to the fact that, unlike other wh-phrases, ‘why’ is base-generated in [Spec, CP]. (32a) and (32b) illustrate the structure of (31a) and (31b), respectively. In (32a), the object wh-phrase ‘what’ undergoes LF wh-movement beyond the NPI subject, which causes an intervention effect. ‘Why’ in (32b), on the other hand, is base-generated in [Spec, CP] and thus does not need to undergo LF-movement. The NPI subject ‘Hanako-only’ in this example has undergone scrambling past ‘why’ but this movement, under Ko’s assumption, does not induce intervention effects, unlike LF wh-movement. This is why only wh-phrases other than ‘why’ exhibit the intervention effects.\(^4\)

\[(32)\text{ a. } *[\text{IP Hanako-only] what-Acc read-not-Past] Q}] \quad \text{*intervention with LF-movement}\]

\[(32)\text{ b. Hanako-only [CP why t] it-Acc read-not-Past] Q}] \quad \text{no intervention with scrambling}\]

Based on her argument, we will assume below that naze ‘why’ in JWS is base-generated in [Spec, CP].

Then, what is the status of the non-wh remnant in JWS? We claim that the non-wh remnant is a focus phrase that is ‘associated’ with why. Bromberger (1992) observes that why, unlike other wh-phrases, can induce the so-called ‘association with focus’ effect. For example, the answer to a why-question changes depending on focus, as the two examples in (33) shows. When the subject Adam is focussed and thus is associated with why, the question is asking why Adam but not someone else ate the apple, while when the object the apple is focused, the sentence is asking for the reason why Adam ate the apple instead of some other food.

\[(33)\text{ a. } A: \text{Why did ADAM eat the apple?}\\ B: \text{Because he (Adam) is the one that Eve worked on.}\]

\[(33)\text{ b. } A: \text{Why did Adam eat the APPLE?}\\ B: \text{Because it (the apple) was the only food around.}\]

No such effect, on the other hand, is observed with wh-phrases other than why.

\[(34)\text{ a. } A: \text{When did ADAM eat the apple?}\\ B: \text{At 4 p.m. on July 7, 24,000,000 B.C.}\]

\[(34)\text{ b. } A: \text{When did Adam eat the APPLE?}\\ B: \text{At 4 p.m. on July 7, 24,000,000 B.C.}\]

\(^4\) The lack of intervention effects with ‘why’ does not extend to ‘why’ inside a declarative clause (e.g. (i)). Ko (2005) suggests that such ‘why’ must undergo LF-movement.

\[(i) \quad *\text{Hanako-sika [Taro-ga naze kuru to] iwa-nakat-ta no?} (cf. Miyagawa 1999)\]

*Hanako-only Taro-Nom why come that say-not-Past Q

‘What is the reason x such that only Hanako said that Taro will come for x?’

Naze in the JWS example (ii) apparently corresponds to the one in (i), (ii), however, cannot mean (iib). Only the Cleft interpretation in (iia) is possible. (For (ii) to mean (iib), the phrase Taro(-ga) must be absent.) Therefore, the type of naze in (i) is irrelevant to our JWS argument.

\[(ii) \quad \text{Hanako-ga [Taro-ga kuru to] it-ta ga, naze Taro(-ga) ka-wakara-nai.}\]

\text{Hanako-Nom Taro-Nom come that say-Past but why Taro(-Nom) Q know-not}\n
‘Hanako said that Taro came, but I don’t know why Taro.’

\[(a. \quad \ldots \text{ I don’t know why it is Taro that Hanako said will come.}\]

\[(b. \quad *\ldots \text{ I don’t know what is the reason x such that Hanako said that Taro will come for x.}\]
We follow Bromberger in that only why has the ability to induce association with focus, and the associated focus shows up as the second remnant of JWS after naze ‘why’. This is why other wh-phrases do not have a construction parallel to JWS (as shown in the fact that (29) is merely treated as Multiple Sluicing).

4.2. The Structure of JWS

Our conclusions so far are: the underlying structure of JWS is Cleft, naze ‘why’ in JWS is base-generated in [Spec, CP], and the non-wh phrase in JWS is a focused phrase associated with ‘why’. This subsection proposes an analysis of JWS which is compatible with these conclusions. The analysis is based on Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s (2002) analysis of JS.

Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) claim that both Cleft and JS are derived from the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction. The fact that the two constructions share the same underlying structure can account for the similarities between JS and Cleft, which are arguments for the Cleft analysis of JS in Section 2.

(35) illustrates the derivation of Cleft under Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s analysis. (35a) is an example of the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction. They assume that no is the Fin head and da is the Foc head.\(^5\) When Cleft is derived from this structure, a focused phrase inside TP undergoes focus movement to [Spec, FocP] as illustrated in (35b), and then the rest of FinP undergoes remnant movement to [Spec, TopP] as shown in (35c), resulting in the word order of Cleft.

\[\text{(35) a. [FocP } [\text{FinP } [\text{TP Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta} [\text{Fin0 no}] [\text{Foc0 da}]]

\]

\[\text{Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past C be 'It is that Mary bought an apple.'}
\]

\[\text{b. [FocP ringo-o [FinP [TP Mary-ga t1 kat-ta} [\text{Fin0 no}] [\text{Foc0 da}]]]

\]

\[\text{apple-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past C be 'It is an apple that Mary bought.'}
\]

\[\text{c. [TopP FinP [TP Mary-ga t1 kat-ta} [\text{Fin0 no}]\text{wa [FocP ringo-o [Foc} [\text{Foc0 da}]] Top0]

\]

\[\text{Mary-Nom buy-Past C Top apple-Acc be 'It is an apple that Mary bought.'}
\]

In order to capture the similarities between Cleft and JS reviewed in Section 2.2, Hiraiwa and Ishihara argue that JS is also derived from the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction. The derivation is shown in (36). Starting from the ‘no da’ sentence in (36a), the wh-phrase undergoes focus movement to [Spec, FocP] as shown in (36b), in the same way as the focus movement in the Cleft derivation (35b). Instead of the remnant movement in (35c), FinP-deletion occurs in JS as shown in (36c). Thus, the similarity between Cleft and JS is attributed to the shared derivation in their analysis.

\(^5\) In this construction, any phrase inside the sentence followed by ‘no da’ gets a focused interpretation. Especially, if a phrase has a prosodic prominence, it is interpreted as the focus as shown in the contrast in (i).

\[\text{(i) a. [CP TARO-ga kono ringo-o tabe-ta no} da.

\]

\[\text{TARO-Nom this apple-Acc eat-Past C be 'It is taro that ate this apple.'}
\]

\[\text{b. [CP Taro-ga KONO RINGO-o tabe-ta no} da.

\]

\[\text{Taro-Nom THIS APPLE-Acc eat-Past C be 'It is this apple that Taro ate.'}
\]
(36) Mary-ga nanika-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
Mary-Nom something-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
a. [FocP [FinP [TP Mary-ga nani-o kat-ta] [Fin0 no] [Foc0 da]] ka wakara-nai
Mary-Nom what-Acc buy-Past C be Q know-not
b. [FocP nani-o [FinP [TP Mary-ga t\_1 kat-ta] [Fin0 no] [Foc0 da]] ka wakara-nai
what-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past C be Q know-not
c. [FocP nani-o [FinP [TP Mary-ga t\_1 kat-ta] [Fin0 no] [Foc0 da]] ka wakara-nai
what-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past C be Q know-not
‘Mary bought something, but I don’t know what (it is that Mary bought).’

Given that JWS also exhibits properties of Cleft (Section 2.3), we propose the FocP in JWS is derived in the same way as (36). The difference, however, is that the wh-phrase naze ‘why’ is base-generated in [Spec, CP] in the case of JWS, as shown in (37a) (See Section 4.1). The wh-phrase undergoes focus movement to [Spec, FocP] as shown in (37b). This movement is induced by the focus association effect of why. Finally, FinP-deletion occurs as shown in (37c) to derive the JWS sentence.

(37) Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa …
Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top …
a. [CP naze [FocP [FinP [TP Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta] [Fin0 no] [Foc0 da]] ka
why Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past C be Q
b. [CP naze [FocP ringo-o [FinP [TP Mary-ga t\_1 kat-ta] [Fin0 no] [Foc0 da]] ka
why apple-Acc Mary-Nom buy-Past C be Q
… wakara-nai.
… know-not
‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why (it is) an apple (that Mary bought).’

Recall that JWS may have a pronominal subject sore-ga ‘it-Nom’ as shown in (20), and we assumed that the pronominal subject should be analogous to the presuppositional clause of the Cleft. Under Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s (2002) analysis, it means that it should be analogous to FinP in (35c). We propose that, instead of FinP deletion in (37c), FinP may undergo topicalization in the same way as the Cleft example (35c), deriving the structure in (38).

(38) Mary-ga ringo-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa
Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top
[CP naze [TopP [FocP [TP Mary-ga t\_1 kat-ta] [Fin0 no] [Foc0 da]] ga ringo-o [FinP
why Mary-Nom buy-Past C-Nom apple-Acc
[Foc0 da]] Top0] wakara-nai
be know-not

Then the topicalized FinP may be replaced with the pronominal subject, deriving the
sentences in (20b), repeated below as (39b). In the case of (39a), which is repeated from (20a), the pronominal subject is further scrambled above naze ‘why’. This is an example of subject scrambling in the same manner as (32b) in Ko’s (2005) analysis.

(39) Mary-ga ring-o-o kat-ta ga, boku-wa …
    Mary-Nom apple-Acc buy-Past but I-Top …
    \[ (sore-ga) \text{naze } t_1 \text{ ring-o-o } (da) \text{ ka} \text{ wakara-nai.} \]
    (it-Nom) why apple-Acc (be) Q know-not

a. [naze (sore-ga) ring-o-o (da) ka] wakara-nai.
   why (it-Nom) apple-Acc (be) Q know-not
   ‘Mary bought an apple, but I don’t know why it is an apple.’

In sum, our analysis based on Hiraiwa and Ishihara’s analysis can capture the similarities between Cleft, J, and JWS while maintaining the claim by Ko (2005) that why is base-generated in [Spec, CP] and Bromberger’s (1992) intuition that why can be associated with a focused phrase.

4.3. Against an Alternative Analysis

Finally, let us give an argument against a possible alternative to the analysis in Section 4.2. Kawamura (2007) discusses Cleft with naze ‘why’ and a non-wh focus, which we have seen share similar properties with JWS (i.e. the word order restriction in (23) and the possibility of Case-marker drop in (28)), and gives the following analysis. She claims that naze ‘why’ is bound by a wh-operator in [Spec, CP], and that naze and the non-wh focus in Cleft makes a constituent as shown in (40). There, naze is the specifier and the non-wh focus is the complement of the same projection FocP.

(40) FocP
    naze why Foc’
    Foc ring-o-o apple-Acc

One might take this analysis of why-Cleft and extend it to the analysis of naze and the non-wh remnant in JWS.

A problem with this analysis, however, is that more than one focused phrase can follow naze ‘why” in Cleft as shown in (41), as well as JWS (as we have already seen in (30)).

(41) [Potluck-ni motteki-ta no]-wa, naze John*-(-ga) pan*-(-o) na no?
    Potluck-to bring-Past C-Top why John*-(-Nom) bread*-(-Acc) be Q
    ‘Why is it John₁ bread₂ that e₁ brought e₂ to the potluck?’

---

6 The pronominal subject in JWS (e.g. (20)) has the Nominative marker –ga instead of the topic marker –wa in (38). Although we do not have a clear account of this fact, it should be attributed to the general property in Japanese that embedded subjects tend to be marked by the Nominative marker rather than the topic marker. A presuppositional clause subject in Cleft, too, is more natural when it is marked by –ga as shown in (10).
To accommodate (41), Kawamura must assume a multiple-complement structure, which is not a standard assumption. Moreover, (41) is not asking for the reason “why it is John” and the reason “why it is bread” simultaneously. Rather, it is asking “why there holds a bring-relation between John and bread”. Under this interpretation, ‘John’ and ‘bread’ shouldn’t be merely coordinated in the one and the same complement position of FocP, either. It would be hard to accommodate such examples under the assumption where naze and the non-wh phrase(s) make a constituent.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have seen that Japanese Why-Stripping (JWS) has similar properties with Japanese Sluicing (JS) and Cleft, supporting the Cleft-based analysis of both JS and JWS. Although JWS involves both naze ‘why’ and (a) non-wh remnant(s), it shows a distinct property from multiple Cleft (i.e. the possibility of Case-marker drop). Given these data, we give JWS the structure illustrated in (37c). We assume that JS and JWS are both derived from the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction (Hiraiwa and Ishihara 2002). JWS, however, is not a mere example of Cleft in that naze ‘why’ is base-generated in [Spec, CP] and the only focus of the Cleft is the non-wh remnant which resides in [Spec, FocP]. It is associated with why at LF, which is a special property of why according to Bromberger (1992). According to this view, naze ‘why’ in JWS is base-generated in the left-periphery, and the non-wh remnant undergoes focus movement. Evidence has been provided that JWS is distinct from Multiple Sluicing.
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