Syntactic Amalgams in Japanese*

Masako Maeda (Seinan Gakuen University)
m-maeda@seinan-gu.ac.jp

Kensuke Takita (Doshisha University)
ktakita@mail.doshisha.ac.jp

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.
   b. To propose that this hitherto-undiscussed phenomenon in question is best analyzed as an instance of syntactic amalgams (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 to independently motivated ones.

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

2. Observations

(2) *Interrogative CPs behaving as indefinite expressions (The wh+Cop+Q construction)*
   a. Osuro-ni **[dare da(tta) ka]**-ga iku to kiita
      Oslo-to who Cop Q-Nom go C heard
      '(lit.) I heard that **[who it is] (= someone)** would go to Oslo.'
   b. Tegami-ga **[dare/doko da(tta) ka]**-kara todoita(-rasii)
      letter:-Nom who where Cop Q-from arrived-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) a letter has arrived from **[who/where it is] (= someone/somewhere)**.'
      cf. Mazu-(ga) **(sore-ga) dare/doko da(tta) ka]**-ga mondai-da
      first it-Nom who where Cop Q-Nom problem-Cop
      '(lit.) First of all, **[who/where it is]** is the problem.'

➜ The constituents that usually serve as interrogative CPs are interpreted as indefinite expressions.

(3) *Semantic selection*
   a. Kinoo **[dare/*doko da(tta) ka]**-ga odotta(-rasii)
      yesterday who where Cop Q-Nom danced-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) yesterday, **[who it is] (= someone)** danced.'
   b. Kinoo **[doko/*dare da(tta) ka]**-ga ooyuki-data(-rasii)
      yesterday where who Cop Q-Nom heavy.snow-Cop-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) yesterday, it snowed heavily **[where it is] (= somewhere)**.'

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

(4) *≠ Concealed questions*
   a. Taroo-ga [dare da(tta) ka]-o **tazuneta**(-rasii)
      T.-Nom who Cop Q-Acc asked/visited-seem
      '(It seems that) (i) Taroo **asked** [who it is] / (ii) Taroo **visited** someone.'
   b. Taroo-ga {[CP (sore-ga) itu ka] / [DP zikan-o]} **tazuneta**
      yesterday it-Nom when Q time-Acc asked
      '(lit.) Taroo **asked** [what 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 concealed questions like (4b).

(5) *Clausal embedding within wh+Cop+Q*
   a. Osuro-ni **[dare da(tta) to Taroo-ga itteita ka]**-ga iku to kiita
      Oslo-to who Cop C T.-Nom said Q-Nom go C heard
      '(lit.) I heard that **[who Taroo said [that it is]] (= someone, whose identity Taroo mentioned but I don't remember)** would go to Oslo.'
   b. Taroo-ga **[dono onnanoko da(tta) ka]**-to dekaketa(-rasii)
      T.-Nom which girl Cop Q-with went.out-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) Taroo went out with **[which girl it is] (= some girl)**.'
   c. Taroo-ga **[[dono onnanoko da(tta) to Ziroo-ga itteita ka]**-to dekaketa(-rasii)
      T.-Nom which girl Cop C Z.-Nom said Q-with went.out-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) Taroo went out with **[which girl Ziroo said [that it is]] (= some girl, whose identity Ziroo mentioned but I don't remember)**.'

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

3. Proposals and Analysis

(6) *Main ideas*
   a. The wh+Cop+Q construction is an instantiation of SAs in the sense of Lakoff (1974).
   b. It involves ellipsis and parenthesis, following the spirit of Kluck's (2011, 2014) analysis.

➤ *Background on SAs*

(7) a. John invited **[you'll never guess how many people]** to his party. (adapted from Lakoff 1974:321)
   b. John is going to **[I think it's Chicago]** on Sunday. (adapted from Lakoff 1974:324)

➜ Following Kluck (2011, 2014), we call the bracketed part *interrupting clause* **(IC)** and the underlined part that at least semantically functions as the "real" complement *content kernel*.

(8) *Clausal embedding* (adapted from Guimarães 2004:61)
   a. John has donated [IC only his wife knows exactly how much money] to charity ever since he became rich.
   b. John has donated [IC Sarah once told me that [only his wife knows exactly how much money]] to charity ever since he became rich.

(9) *Cross-linguistic availability and parametric variations: Romance* (adapted from Guimarães 2004:85-86)
   a. *João convidou 300 pessoas **pra** [IC **você pode imaginar que tipo de festa**].
      John invited 300 persons to you can imagine what kind of party
      'John invited 300 people to [IC you can imagine what kind of party].'
   b. João convidou 300 pessoas [IC **você pode imaginar pra que tipo de festa**].
      John invited 300 persons you can imagine to what kind of party
      '*John invited 300 people [IC you can imagine to what kind of party].'

(10) *Cross-linguistic availability and parametric variations: Germanic*
   a. Bob found – [IC was it a Stradivarius?] – in his attic. (adapted from Kluck 2011:68)
   b. Bob found – [IC can you believe what?!] – in his attic. (*ibid.*)
   c. Bill heeft [IC **het was waarschijnlijk Bea**] gekust. (Dutch: adapted from Kluck 2011:52)
      Bill has it was probably Bea kissed
      'Bill kissed [it was probably Bea].'
   c'. Bill heeft [IC **waarschijnlijk was het Bea**] gekust. (*ibid.*)
   c". *Bill heeft [IC **het waarschijnlijk Bea was**] gekust. (*ibid.*)

➜ SAs are not only productive and available cross-linguistically but also reflect the basic syntactic properties of the languages.

3. Proposals and Analysis (cont'd)

➤ *The sluicing-and-parenthesis-approach to SAs*

(11) *Similarity with sluiced parentheticals*
   a. Bea hit someone – you'll never guess who – in the face. (adapted from Kluck 2011:293)
   b. Bea hit someone – I think it was the professor – in the face. (adapted from Kluck 2014:25)

(12) a.

   ✓ The matrix argument position is occupied by ParP, whose categorial status 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 Δ is specified through ellipsis-identity.

   b. Antecedent: Bea hit Δ in the face ➔ F-clo(A) = ∃x. Bea hit x in the face
   c. Ellipsis: Bea hit t_{who} in the face ➔ F-clo(E) = ∃x. Bea hit x in the face

(13) *Essences 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*.
   c. … [AP Δ [IC … **content kernel** … [ellipsis ···] …]]…

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

➤ *The wh+Cop+Q construction in Japanese as an instance of SAs*

(14) a. Osuro-ni [AP [IC [Osuro-ni e_i iku no]-ga **dare**$_i$ da(tta) ka] Δ]-ga iku to kiita
      Oslo-to Oslo-to go C-Nom who Cop Q -Nom go C heard
      '(lit.) I heard that [AP [who it is [that would go to Oslo]]] would go to Oslo.'
   b. Tegami-ga [AP [IC [tegami-ga e_i todoita no]-ga **doko**$_i$ da(tta) ka] Δ]-kara todoita(-rasii)
      letter-Nom letter-Nom arrived C-Nom where Cop Q -from arrived-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) a letter has arrived from [AP Δ [where it is [that a letter has arrived]]].'

➜ The wh+Cop+Q construction derives from a cleft construction by eliding the presupposition part.
➜ The IC involving ellipsis is then assembled with the null element Δ as a parenthetical expression.

(15) *Cases with non-wh elements*
   a. Kono resutoran-wa **[Osuro da(tta) ka]**-ni honten-ga aru(-rasii)
      this restaurant-Top Oslo Cop Q-in main.shop-Nom is-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) this restaurant's main shop is in **[whether it is Oslo]**.'
   b. Erika-ga **[keeki-ka kukkii da(tta) ka]**-o yaita(-rasii)
      E.-Nom cake-or cookie Cop Q-Acc baked-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) Erika based **[whether it is cakes or cookies]**.'

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

➤ *Internal syntax: Evidence for ellipsis from Case/postposition-marking patterns*

(16) a. Osuro-ni **[dare-ga da(tta) ka]** iku to kiita
      Oslo-to who-Nom Cop Q go C heard
      '(lit.) I heard that **[who it is] (= someone)** would go to Oslo.'
   a'.$^{?(?)}$Osuro-ni **[dare-ga da(tta) ka]**-ga iku to kiita
   b. Tegami-ga **[doko-kara da(tta) ka]** todoita(-rasii)
      letter-Nom where-from Cop Q-from arrived-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) a letter has arrived **[from where it is] (= somewhere)**.'
   b'. ? Tegami-ga **[doko-kara da(tta) ka]**-kara todoita(-rasii)

➜ 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).

➤ *External syntax: Evidence for parenthesis*

➜ Kluck (2011) points out that SAs in general express conventional implicature in the sense of Potts (2005), and argues in particular that ones like (7b) involving cleft express hedge interpretation.
➜ In this respect, Japanese SAs pattern with English both syntactically and semantically.

(17) *Independence of ICs in English-type SAs*
   a. *No professor$_i$ taught, [IC he$_i$ claimed it was a boring class]. (adapted from Kluck 2011:97)
   b. He$_i$ had been kissing, [IC the professor$_i$ finally admitted it was Bea]. (adapted from Kluck 2011:101)

(18) *Binding into the IC in Japanese*
   a. Daremo$_i$-ga [IC[dare da(tta) to soitu$_i$-no hahaoya-ga itteita ka]-to dekaketa(-rasii)
      everyone-Nom whoi Cop C his-Gen mother-Nom said Q-with went.out-seem
      '(lit.) (It seems that) everyone went out with **[who his mother said [that it is]] (= someone, whose identity his mother mentioned but I don't remember)**.'
   b. *Kanozyo$_i$-wa [IC [dare da(tta) to Hanako$_i$-ga itteita ka]-ga kuru to itteita
      she-Top who Cop C H.-Nom said Q-Nom come C said
      '(lit.) She said **[who Hanako said [that it is]] (= someone, whose identity Hanako mentioned but I don't remember)** would come.'

➜ 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.

(19) *Appositive relatives and variable binding* (adapted from Del Gobbo 2017:23)
   a. *Every Christian$_i$ forgives John, who harms him$_i$.
   b. Dono gakusei$_i$-mo [soitu$_i$-o hihansuru] Yamada-sensei-ni kansyasiteiru
      which student-also he-Acc criticize Y.-Prof.-to thank
      '(lit.) Every student$_i$ is appreciating to Prof. Yamada, who criticizes him$_i$.'

➜ Appositive relative clauses, a well-known class of parenthetical expressions, is opaque for variable-binding in English as in (19a) while Japanese does allow binding into them as in (19b).
➜ 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.