## 1. Introduction

(1) Goals of this study
a. To observe that in a certain context, a constituent which normally functions as a CP surprisingly behaves as if it were not.

(2) To propose that this phenomenon, which has been observed in many languages, can be explained by an instance of syntactic amalgamations (SAs) in the sense of Lakoff (1974), extending Kluck’s (2011, 2014) analysis.

c. To argue that several differences between the English-type SAs and their Japanese counterparts can be reduced by a common dependency which determines the syntactic amalgamation.

Although the empirical focus on SAs has been confined to English and a few Indo-European languages (see, e.g., Tsushima & Whitman 2000, Guimarães 2004, Grosu 2006, Kluck 2011, 2014, Johnson 2014, Bhattacharya 2017), it is shown that there is a comparable phenomenon in Japanese.

## 2. Observations

(2) Interrogative CPs behaving as indefinites (the wh+Cop+Q construction)

a. Osuro-ni [dare daita] ka ga iku to kiti

(‘it) I heard that [who is it] (= someone) would go to Oso.'

b. Tegami-ga [dare daita] ka to kara-todo(na)-raisi

(‘it) It seems that a letter has arrived from [who is it] (= someone/somehere).’

c. Mazu, [sgure-ga daite daita] ka ga mondai-da ha

(‘it) First of all, [whose it is] it is the problem.’

The constituents that usually serve as interrogative CPs are interpreted as indefinites.

(3) Semantic selection

a. Kimoo [dare daito] ka ga odottari-rossi

(‘it) It seems that yesterday, [who is it] (= someone) dined.’


(‘it) It seems that yesterday, it sneved heavily [where it is] (= somewhere).’

The wh-part determines the interpretation of the whole wh+Cop+Q construction.

(4) Conceeded questions

a. Taroo-ga [daite daita] ka o taizumeta-raisi

(‘it) That seems (that) Taroo asked [who is it] (= someone) to visit yesterday.’

b. Taro-ga [i no] [daite daita] ka to i no taizumeta-

(‘it) Taro asked [who] [the time it is] the time.’

The lexical ambiguity of the matrix verb in (4a) is disambiguated by the interpretation of the wh+Cop+Q construction, which never happens in concedued questions like (4b).

(5) Clausal embedding within wh+Cop+Q

a. Osuro-ni [dare daito] to Taroo-ga iteita ka-ga iku to kiti

(‘it) I heard that [who it is] Taroo said [that it is] (= someone, whose identity Taroo mentioned but I don’t remember) would go to Oso.’

b. Tegami-ga [dono onanokke] da to deketa-raisi

(‘it) It seems that Taroo said out with [who is it] (= some girl) to get a letter.’

c. Taro-ga [dono onanokke] da to Ziroo-ga iteita ka to deketa-raisi

(‘it) It seems that Taroo went out with [who is it] (= someone, whose identity Ziroo mentioned but I don’t remember).’

The wh+Cop+Q construction can be made complex with embedding and wh-type wh-expressions.

## 3. Proposals and Analysis

### 3.1 The sluicing-and-parenthesis-approach to SAs

(1) Similarity with sluiced parentheticals


(b) Bea hit someone – I think it was the professor in the face.

(2) CP

The matrix argument position is occupied by ParP whose internal argument is determined by the elements in its Spec.

ParP takes a CP complement, within which sluicing takes place.

The semantic content of the null element Λ is specified through ellipsis-identity.

### 3.2 Essentials of Kluck’s (2011, 2014) analysis

a. External syntax: The IC in SAs a parenthetical expression modifying a null element, which determines the “label” of the whole constituent.

b. Internal syntax: The IC involves ellipsis.

… [a [ic […[sentential kernel, [ic [par, [ic []], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]]]

In the analysis of the wh+Cop+Q construction to be developed, we adopt the essentials of Kluck’s (2011, 2014) analysis summarized in (13).

### 3.3 The wh+Cop+Q construction in Japanese as an instance of SAs

(14) Osuro-ni [dare daota] ka ga iku to kiti

(‘it) I heard that [who is it] (= someone) would go to Oso.’

Tegami-ga [dare daota] ka to kara-todo(na)-raisi

(‘it) It seems that a letter has arrived from [who is it] (= somewhere).

B. Taro-ga [i no] [dare daota] ka to i no taizumeta-

(‘it) Taro asked [who] [the time it is] the time.’

E. From a cleft construction by eliding the presupposition part.

The IC involving ellipsis is then assembled with the null element Λ as a parenthetical expression.

### 3.4 Cases with non-wh elements

a. Kono renshu-ka wa [Osuro daota] ka ni homon-ge arut-raisi

(I) heard that [who is it] (= someone) went to Oso.

b. Erika-ga [kekka daota] ka to yaita-ra

It seems that [who is it] (= somewhere).

… [a [ic […[sentential kernel, [ic [par, [ic []], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]], [ic []]]

Since cleft-focus is not limited to wh-phrases, the wh-part can be non-wh elements.

### 3.5 Internal syntax: Evidence for ellipsis from Case/postposition-marking patterns

(15) Kono renshu-ka wa [Osuro daota] ka ni homon-ge arut-raisi

I heard that [who is it] (= someone) went to Oso.

Erika-ga [kekka daota] ka to yaita-ra

It seems that [who is it] (= somewhere).

The IC involving ellipsis is then assembled with the null element Λ as a parenthetical expression.

Not only the whole IC but also the content kernel can be marked with a Case-marker/postposition.

It is even possible to double it (although the result may not be perfectly well-formed).

### 3.6 Background on SAs

(7) John invited [you’ll never guess how many people] to his party. (adapted from Lakoff 1974:321)

Following Kluck (2011, 2014), we bracket the packet interrupting clause (IC) and the underneath part that at least semantically functions as the “real” complement content kernel.

### 3.7 Clausal embedding (adapted from Guimarães 2004:61)

a. John has donated [who only his wife knows exactly how much money] to charity ever since he became rich.

b. John has donated [who Sarah once told me only that his wife knows exactly how much money] to charity ever since he became rich.

(9) Cross-linguistic availability and parametric variations: Romance (adapted from Guimaraes 2004:88-89)

a. Some invited 300 pessoas para você pode imaginar [who type of party]

b. Some invited 300 pessoas para você pode imaginar [what kind of party]

(10) Cross-linguistic availability and parametric variations: Germanic

a. Bob found [it was] a Strudel(essen)?

b. Bob found [you could believe what?]

(11) Asssessment relative and variable binding (adapted from Del Gobbo 2017:23)

a. [Every Christian, forgives John, who harms him.

b. Dono gakuren, mo [ni [hannahura] Yamada-sensei-ni kanyasurite]

(18) Binding into the IC in Japanese

a. Daremo-ga [dare daota] ka to soito, nothing [who is it] (= someone, whose identity his mother mentioned but I don’t remember).

b. Kanozuyi, wa [dare daota] ka to Hanako-ga iteita ka-ga kuru to iteita

(19) The difference between the English-type SAs and the Japanese ones can be straightforwardly captured, once we assume that the IC is introduced as parenthetical expressions.

The difference between (17) and (18) can thus be reduced to the independently attested one with respect to the way of introducing parenthetical expressions.

## 4. Summary

- The properties regarding the wh+Cop+Q construction can be captured in terms of the sluicing- and parenthetical approach to the syntactic amalgams in English.
- The attested difference between the English-type SAs and the Japanese counterparts can be reduced to the independently motivated properties of the languages.