Argument Ellipsis involving Argument with a Focus Particle

Although argument ellipsis (AE) is available in Japanese, **when arguments (NP/DP, PP, and CP) are suffixed with focus particles (e.g., *-dake* 'only', *-sae* 'even', *-mo* 'also', etc.), they fail to undergo AE** (Funakoshi 2012, Oku 2016, a.o.). For example, (1)b can hardly (if not, cannot) mean *Gen also read [only LGB]*, yielding 'focus particle' reading(1)b-1. However, as Moriyama (2017) observed, **what is of particular interest is that, (1)b can have the reading *Gen also read [LGB]*, –a 'non focus particle' reading– which lacks the reading with a focus particle (1)b-2**.

(1) a. Ken-wa LGB-dake-o yonda. b. Gen-mo _____ yonda.
K.-TOP LGB-only-ACC read G.-also read
'Ken read [only LGB].' 'Gen also read __.'
b-1. *'focus particle' reading: 'Gen also read [only LGB].'
b-2. OK'non focus particle' reading: 'Gen also read [LGB].' (Moriyama 2017: (4))

The aim of this work is to present new sets of evidence involving focus particles that shows **AE in Japanese (a) is constrained by anti-agreement analysis (AAA), and (b) is derived by LF-copying and not by PF-deletion *(or pro)*, which (c) can target 'bare' NP/XP not including Case and/or focus particle** (Oku 1998, Saito 2007, Sugisaki 2012, Takahashi 2014, a.o.) through scrutinizing Moriyama's 2017 observation and analysis of the phenomena in question.

(a) Saito (2007) argues for AAA which constraints that AE is allowed only in an environment where arguments do not participate in agreement/probe-goal relation with functional heads (e.g., v and T), which also accounts for the cross-linguistic distribution of AE (see also Takahashi 2014). And I assume with Moriyama who argues that the lack of 'focus particle' reading (1)b-1 can be captured under the AAA on the assumption that the licensing of focus particle is mediated by the Agree relation with a focus particle and its licensing functional heads (e.g., v, T) (Aoyagi 1998).

(b/c) However, I argue against Moriyama's arguments that AE (involving focus particle) (i) cannot be carried out by LF-copying and (ii) executed by PF-deletion. (i) Moriyama argues against the LF-copying analysis, claiming that LF-copying fails to account for the presence of 'non focus particle' reading (1)b-2 assuming that *LGB-dake-o* is the target of LF-copying (2). Instead, he proposes that PF-deletion accounts for it, assuming that what is deleted is *LGB-o*, and not *LGB-dake-o* (3).

(2) Ken-wa LGB-dake-o yonda. Gen-mo _____ yonda.
|_____↑ *LF-copying* (Moriyama 2017: (9))

(3) Ken-wa LGB-dake-o yonda. Gen-mo ~~LGB-o~~ yonda.
PF-deletion (Moriyama 2017: (23))

However, this PF-deletion analysis, as Moriyama (2017: p.244) admits, conflicts with the parallelism requirement, which makes it dubious. But what is critical is the premise that *LGB-dake-o* as a whole is the target of LF-copying. As Oku (1998) already noted, AE allows Case Mismatch (4) (see also other cases of mismatch of AE discussed in Sakamoto 2017), so it is reasonable to take the actual target in the usual AE (involving nominal arguments) is the bare 'NP' excluding Case particle (5). Note also that PF-deletion analysis fails to account for the Case Mismatch effect, not meeting the parallelism requirement (6).

(4) Ken-wa zibun-no hahaoya-ni atta-ga, Gen-wa (zibun-no hahaoya-o) oikaesita.
K.-TOP self-GEN mother-DAT met-but G-TOP self-GEN mother-ACC chased.away
lit: 'Ken met self's mother, but Gen chased away self's mother.' (Oku 1998)

(5) Ken-wa zibun-no hahaoya-ni atta-ga, Gen-wa _____ oikaesita.
|_____↑ *LF-copying of 'bare' NP*

(6) Ken-wa zibun-no hahaoya-ni atta-ga, Gen-wa ~~zibun-no hahaoya-o~~ oikaesita. *PF-deletion*

In addition, a PF-deletion analysis (as well as a pro analysis) cannot, but an LF-copying analysis can, account for the fact involving overt/covert extraction asymmetry discussed by Sakamoto 2019: while overt movement (e.g., scrambling and raising-to-object) out of AE is impossible (7), covert movement (e.g., null operator movement in cleft and comparative deletion, and QR) is possible (8). And *this contrast remains the same even when CP argument is suffixed with a focus particle*. Note also that (8b) is grammatical only under the 'non focus particle' reading. This is readily handled by LF-copying but not under PF-deletion (and the pro analysis) because what undergoes AE is LF-copy of "CP" excluding the focus particle, and it is possible to apply covert movement, but impossible to apply overt movement, out of LF-copied argument which has no overt/phonological content.

(7) a. [Kono biru-kara$_i$ Ken-ga [$_{CP}$ Mari-ga t$_i$ detekita-to](-dake) syoogen-sita]-si]
this building-from K.-NOM M.-NOM came.out-C-only testified-and
b. *[Kono biru-kara$_j$ Gen-mo _____ syoogen-sita]
this building-from G.-also testified
'[This building$_i$, Ken testified (only-)[$_{CP}$ that Mari came out t$_i$]], and
[This building$_j$, Gen testified _____, too].'

(8) a. [Op$_i$ Ken-ga [$_{CP}$ Mari-ga t$_i$ detekita-to](-dake) syoogen-sita]-no-wa
K.-NOM M.-NOM came.out-C-only testified-C-TOP
[kono biru-kara]$_i$ da-shi,
this building-from be-and
b. ^{ok} [Op$_i$ Gen-mo _____ syoogen-sita]-no-wa
G.-also testified-C-TOP
[kono biru-kara]$_i$ da.
this building-from be
'It was [from this building]$_i$ [that Ken testified (only-)[$_{CP}$ that Mari came out t$_i$]], and
It was [from this building]$_j$ [that Gen testified _____, too].'

Now, the remaining task is how to account for Moriyama's observation ((1)b-1 vs. (1)b-2) under the LF-copying analysis. I argue that, since a 'bare' NP can be the target of LF-copying ((5)), what is copied in (1) with 'non focus particle' reading (1)b-2 is only *LGB*, not including *-dake* and *-o* as shown in (9), which naturally accounts for why 'non focus particle' reading is the only available reading for (1)b. Note that the parallelism requirement is properly satisfied since what is "elided" is *LGB*. And this analysis extends to why (8)b allows only 'non focus particle' reading.

(9) Ken-wa LGB-dake-o yonda. Gen-mo _____ yonda.
LF-copying of 'bare' NP (LGB)
= only 'non focus particle' reading

Lastly, this LF-copying analysis also accounts for (10), where Case particle is dropped from (1), yet show the parallel behavior regarding the unavailability of 'focus particle' and the availability of 'non focus particle' reading.

(10) a. Ken-wa LGB-dake yonda.
K.-TOP LGB-only read
'Ken read [only LGB].'
b. Gen-mo _____ yonda.
G.-also read
'Gen also read __.'
b-1. *'focus particle' reading: 'Gen also read [only LGB].'
b-2. ^{OK}'non focus particle' reading: 'Gen also read [LGB].'

Ref. (selected): Aoyagi, H. 1998. Ph.D diss., USC. Funakoshi, K. 2012. *LI* 43:519–562. Oku, S. 1998. Ph.D diss., UConn. Oku, S. 2016. *Nanzan Linguistics* 11:57–70. Moriyama, K. 2017. 'Dake'-no Ko-sakujo. *LSJ* 155 *Handbook*: 240–245. Saito, M. 2007. *Language Research* 43:203–227. Sakamoto, Y. 2019. *LI* 50, 105–136. Sugisaki, K. 2012. *BUCLD* 36, 555–567.