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Abstract The standard approach for short answers is the one, like Merchant’s (2004), in which the remnant phrase undergoes focus movement to a peripheral position before deletion takes place. In this paper, I argue against this approach, supporting instead what we may call the in-situ approach to short answers, according to which the remnant phrase does not undergo focus movement to a peripheral position but rather simply stays in its original position. Given the inescapable problem in testing island sensitivity in such a wh-movement language as English, this paper investigates short answers in Japanese, a wh-in-situ language. I propose that Japanese short answers are directly derived from what Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) call ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction. This analysis immediately explains the island insensitivity of Japanese short answers. I also argue that the identification condition operative for licensing deletion in short answers is semantic in nature, hence compatible with the in-situ approach that inescapably incorporates deletion of a non-constituent. Finally, I argue that the two strategies provided by Merchant (2004) for getting over the inescapable problem in testing island sensitivity in English are ill-advised.
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1 Introduction
This paper aims to give support to the in-situ analysis of a certain type of ellipsis constructions according to which the remnant phrase, typically focused, does not undergo overt movement to a peripheral position but rather simply stays in its original position. One such analysis is proposed by Kimura (2010) for sluicing. Thus, in the sluice of (1a), for instance, what simply stays in situ and the final form is derived by deleting the material in TP except the wh-phrase, as indicated in (1b).

(1) a. She’s reading something, but I can’t imagine what.
   b. I can’t imagine [CP CQ [TP she’s reading what]]

One of the strongest motivations for such an analysis comes from the
island-insensitivity of this construction.

In this paper, I would like to argue that the same line of analysis is the most plausible for the construction of short answers, which is illustrated below:

(2) a. Who did she see?
   b. John.

The standard analysis for such a construction is the one, like Merchant’s (2004), that is comparable to the standard analysis of sluicing, one in which the remnant phrase undergoes overt movement to a peripheral position before deletion takes place. Thus, (2b) will have the following derivation (here the angled brackets mark the position from which movement takes place and FP stands for Focus Phrase):

(3) \[ [FP \text{ John}] [TP \text{ she saw John}]] \]

Alternatively, our in-situ approach will assign the following simple derivation to (2b):

(4) \[ [FP [TP \text{ she saw John}]] \]

The data most relevant for the plausibility of this analysis would be those which show island sensitivity, but in a language like English in which a question demands overt movement of a \textit{wh}-phrase, it will be impossible to make relevant examples, as noted by Merchant (2004), since if we try to embed the remnant phrase of a short answer within an island, it always gives rise to the situation in which the corresponding question violates such an island condition due to overt movement of a \textit{wh}-phrase. For this reason, it will make much sense to investigate the comparable construction in such a \textit{wh}-in-situ language as Japanese. The following illustrates the Japanese counterparts of short answers:

(5) a. Kanozyo-wa dare-ni atta no?
   \hspace{1cm} she -Top who-Dat saw Q
   \hspace{1cm} ‘Who did she see?’
   \hspace{1cm} -Dat be
   \hspace{1cm} ‘John’

Thus, the present paper aims to support the in-situ analysis of the construction of short answers by examining its Japanese counterparts.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, it is proposed that Japanese short
answers are directly derived from what Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) call ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction. It is demonstrated that this analysis immediately explains the island insensitivity of Japanese short answers. Section 3 investigates some arguments for the focus movement approach provided by Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006). It is shown that those arguments are not convincing enough to defeat the in-situ approach to Japanese short answers. Section 4 investigates Saito’s (2004) argument that the island insensitivity of Japanese short answers is attributed to the existence of a disguised construction of short answers which involves a null subject and the remnant phrase as its predicate. It provides counter-arguments to this analysis, claiming that a careful investigation of relevant data reveals that there are genuine instances of short answers that still exhibit island insensitivity. Section 5 addresses the question of what kind of identification condition is involved in licensing deletion of the material except the remnant focus phrase in short answers. In the course of the discussion, it is argued that one of the strategies provided by Merchant (2004) for testing island sensitivity of short answers is ill-advised. Section 6 argues against Merchant’s (2004) claim that multiple short answers can be exploited as a second strategy for testing island sensitivity of short answers. It is demonstrated that multiple short answers obey locality conditions totally different from single short answers, exactly like multiple sluicing, as shown in Lasnik (2006a). Section 7 concludes with a brief summary.

2 Short Answers Derived from the ‘No Da’ In-Situ Focus Construction

Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006) propose, along the lines of Merchant (2004), that Japanese short answers are derived from focus movement of the remnant phrase, followed by deletion of the target clause. They posit what Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) call the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction as the underlying structure for the construction of short answers. Such a focus construction is illustrated below:

(6) a. Taro-ga kono ringo-o tabeta.
    -Nom this apple-Acc ate
    ‘Taro ate this apple.’
  b. Taro-ga kono ringo-o tabeta no da.
  c. Taro-ga kono ringo-o tabeta no desu.

(6a) is a normal assertion sentence and (6b) illustrates the construction in question where the clause corresponding to (6a) is followed by the nominalizer no and the copula
da. (6c) illustrates the polite form of no da. Let us follow Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) in assuming that in this construction, the nominalizer no occupies Comp position, so that the nominalized clause is embedded as the complement of the copula da/desu, as shown below with the rough structure of (6b):

(7) \([_{CP} \text{Taro-ga kono ringo-o tabeta no]} \text{da/desu} \]

C

Hiraiwa and Ishihara observe that “any phrase in the nominalized CP that has phonological prominence receives a narrow focus interpretation,” (p. 38) as illustrated below (here and after, phonological prominence is represented in capital letters):

(8) a. \([_{CP} \text{TARO-ga kono ringo-o tabeta no]} \text{da/desu}. \]

-C Nom this apple-Acc ate C be

‘TARO ate this apple.’

b. \([_{CP} \text{Tao-ga KONO RINGO-o tabeta no]} \text{da/desu}. \]

c. \([_{CP} \text{Tao-ga kono ringo-o TABETA no]} \text{da/desu}. \]

With this background, Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006) claim that Japanese short answers are derived from such in-situ focus constructions by applying movement of the focused phrases into peripheral positions and deleting the nominalized CPs. Thus, (5b), for instance, will be derived as follows:

(9) a. \([_{FP} \text{[\downarrow \text{focus movement}]} \text{[\text{[\downarrow \text{deletion}]} \text{kanozyo-ga JOHN-ni atta no]} \text{desu}]} \]

b. \([_{FP} \text{JOHN-ni [\text{[\text{kanozyo-ga <John-ni> atta no]} \text{desu}]} \]

c. \([_{FP} \text{JOHN-ni [\text{[\text{kanozyo-ga <John-ni> atta no]} \text{desu}]} \]

Alternatively, our in-situ approach will claim that the focus movement involved in the step from (9a) to (9b) is superfluous, since (9a) already encodes the information of which phrase is focused. Thus, (5b), under this approach, is derived as follows:

(10) a. \([_{FP} \text{[\text{kanozyo-ga JOHN-ni atta no]} \text{desu}]} \]

b. \([_{FP} \text{[\text{kanozyo-ga JOHN-ni atta no]} \text{desu}]} \]

It does not seem to be the case that the ‘no da’ construction always requires a focused phrase to appear in the nominalized CP. See Kuno (1973) for more detailed descriptions of the semantic functions of this construction. This paper is concerned only with the variety of this construction that involves focus.
One may immediately raise the question what makes non-constituent deletion possible in this analysis. I follow Abe (2010a) in his assumption that “a target of deletion is a constituent and yet an actual deletion operation applies to it in such a way that a phrase carrying [Focus] evades such an operation.” (p. 10) I further assume that the target of deletion, called E(llipsis)-site by Abe (2010a), is subject to an identification condition applying in the semantic component that guarantees the deletion operation. I will postpone the discussion of this condition until Section 5.

An initial support for the in-situ analysis of short answers comes from their island-insensitivity. Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) note that the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction is immune to island conditions, providing the following example:


‘John criticized the person who wrote THIS ARTICLE.’

(Hiraiwa and Ishihara 2002, p. 39)

It is then predicted under the in-situ analysis that short answers are also immune to island conditions. Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006) themselves observe that this is indeed the case:


‘Lit. Tell me Q everyone saw a picture [Akira had taken where].’

b. Tokyo-de desu.

‘It is in Tokyo.’

(Nishigauchi and Fujii 2006, p. 4)

(13) a. Hanako-wa [kyoozyu-ga nani-o koogi-suru] tokoro-o rokuon-sita

‘Lit. Hanako tape-recorded a scene of the professor lecturing what?’

b. Gengogaku-o desu.

‘It is linguistics.’

(ibid., p. 23)

One more example involving an adjunct island is provided below:
Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006) simply follow the approach in terms of ‘island repair by deletion’, advocated by such works as Fox and Lasnik (2003) and Merchant (2004), according to which island violations are PF-related phenomena and the offending traces or those phrases which cause island effects can be remedied by just deleting a category containing them. I will not dwell on the detailed examination of the validity of such an approach here, but rather simply point out that the island-sensitivity observed above follows immediately under the in-situ approach of short answers.2

3 Is Focus Movement Involved in Short Answers?
Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006) provide two pieces of evidence for their claim that focus movement in involved in short answers. One has to do with the licensing of the NPI -sika, which, together with negation, means ‘only’, as illustrated below:

(15) Kono neko-wa maguro-sika tabe-nai.
this cat -Top tuna eat -not
‘This cat eats only tuna.’

Nishigauchi and Fujii claim that such a sika-phrase cannot appear alone in short answers, as shown below:

(16) a. Kono neko-wa nani-sika tabe-nai no?
this cat -Top what eat -not Q
‘Only what does this cat eat?’

b. (*).Maguro-sika desu.
tuna be
‘Only tuna.’ (Nishigauchi and Fujii 2006, p. 27)

2 See Abe (2010b) for some arguments against such an island repair approach as the one proposed by Fox and Lasnik (2003). See also Nishigauchi (2011) for arguing against Merchant (2004).
I am not sure whether such a short answer as in (16b) is as bad as Nishigauchi and Fujii judge with *. They further claim that a short answer without -sika is possible as an answer to (16a), as given below:

(17) Maguro desu.
    tuna be
But, as far as I can see, (17) is no better than (16b). At any rate, it appears that Nishigauchi and Fujii attribute the alleged unacceptability of (16b) to the focus movement of the sika-phrase in deriving the short answer, but it is not clear at all exactly what goes wrong with such focus movement. They note that simply dislocating a sika-phrase to a left-periphery does not make the resulting sentence unacceptable:

(18) Maguro-sika kono neko-wa tabe-nai no desu.
    tuna this cat -Top eat-not C be
    ‘This cat eats only tuna.’
They claim that this is “due to the equivocal status of left-dislocation;” (p. 27) it can be scrambling that is operative in such dislocation. They instead provide the cleft version of (18) as a genuine instance involving focus movement, as shown below:

(19) *Kono nego-ga tabe-nai no-wa maguro-sika desu.
     this cat -Nom eat -not C-Top tuna be
     ‘It is only tuna that this cat eats.’
However, as noted above, they do not explain exactly how focus movement of a sika-phrase causes ungrammaticality in such a cleft construction. Further, though I agree upon their judgment with (19), a slight modification of such a sentence seems to give rise to a much more acceptable one, as shown below:

(20) ?Kono nego-ga tabe-nai no-wa maguro-sika ka osiete.
     this cat -Nom eat -not C-Top tuna Q tell
     ‘Tell me whether it is only tuna that this cat eats.’
This suggests that the unacceptability of such a sentence as (19) should be attributed to some factors other than such a syntactic operation as focus movement. This in turn suggests that the somewhat insecure status of (16b) may be caused by similar factors.

The second piece of evidence for focus movement involved in short answers has to

---

3 In fact, Nishigauchi (2011) marks (16b) with ?, claiming that this sentence is basically acceptable.
do with binding possibilities of such a reflexive as *zibun-zisin*. As Nishigauchi and Fujii note, this reflexive requires local binding, as shown below:

    everyone-Nom -Nom self -Gen mother -Acc respect C said
    ‘Everyone said that Akira respects self’s mother.’

Nishigauchi and Fujii then provide the following example:

    everyone-Nom -Nom who-Acc respect C said Q tell
    ‘Tell me who everyone said that Akira respects.’

b. Zibun-zisin-no hahaoya-o desu.
    self -Gen mother -Acc be
    ‘Self’s mother.’

(Nishigauchi and Fujii 2006, p. 29)

They claim that “the reflexive that appears in this short answer can be coindexed either with the matrix subject or the complement subject.” (p. 29) They further note that such a behavior of the reflexive *zibun-zisin* parallels that of this reflexive appearing in the focus position of a cleft sentence, as shown below:

(23) [Minna-ga [Akira-ga sonkei-siteiru to] itta no]-wa zibun-zisin-no
    everyone-Nom -Nom respect C said C -Top self -Gen
    hahaoya-o desu.
    mother -Acc be
    ‘It was self’s mother that everyone said that Akira respects.’
    (ibid., p. 30)

Under the focus movement approach, *zibun-zisin* should be able to take the matrix subject as its antecedent in such a short answer as (22b), since this short answer will have the following derivation:

(24) a. \[
\text{FP } [\text{CP minna-ga } [\text{CP [Akira-ga ZIBUN-ZISIN-NO HAHAOYA-o …]] itta no] desu}\]
\[\text{focus movement}\]

b. \[
\text{FP ZIBUN-ZISIN-NO HAHAOYA-o } [\text{CP minna-ga } [\text{CP <zibun-zisin-no hahaoya-o> [Akira-ga <zibun-zisin-no hahaoya-o> …]] itta no] desu}]
\[\text{deletion}\]

c. \[
\text{FP ZIBUN-ZISIN-NO HAHAOYA-o } [\text{CP minna-ga } [\text{CP <zibun-zisin-no hahaoya-o> [Akira-ga <zibun-zisin-no hahaoya-o> …]] itta no] desu}]
\]

On the assumption that focus movement takes place in a successive-cyclic fashion, the
occurrence of *zibun-zisin* that is contained in the intermediate copy of the focused phrase is locally bound by *minna* ‘everyone’, hence being able to take this latter phrase as its antecedent. Under the in-situ approach, on the other hand, such an anaphoric relation should be prohibited, since the focused phrase that contains *zibun-zisin* stays in its original position. Thus, if the facts in question were just as Nishigauchi and Fujii claim, they would give strong support to the focus movement approach to short answers. However, the facts are not so clear as they claim. Though the contrast between (21) and its cleft version (23) with respect to the availability of the matrix subject reading is reasonably clear, the availability of such a reading to (22b) is at best unclear; as far as I can determine, my judgment on this example is just opposite to Nishigauchi and Fujii’s in that the relevant reading with (22b) is as hard to obtain as that with (21).

Thus, it will be safe to conclude that the two pieces of evidence for the focus movement approach that Nishigauchi and Fujii provide are far from decisive.

### 4. Is Subject Pronominalized in Short Answers?

Saito (2004) claims that “short answers in general have two distinct sources: they may have a *pro* subject or they may be derived from a cleft sentence by deletion of the subject CP.” (p. 46) With the latter strategy, such a Japanese short answer as (5b) will be derived in the following way, on the assumption that cleft sentences are derived from ‘*no da*’ in-situ focus constructions, as Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) propose:

(25)

\[
\text{a. } \left[ \text{TopP } \left[ \text{FP } \left[ \text{CP kanozyo-ga JOHN-ni atta no] desu} \right] \right] \right] \\
\quad \downarrow \text{ focus movement}
\]

\[
\text{b. } \left[ \text{TopP } \left[ \text{FP JOHN-ni [CP kanozyo-ga <John-ni> atta no] desu} \right] \right] \\
\quad \downarrow \text{ topicalization}
\]

\[
\text{c. } \left[ \text{TopP [CP kanozyo-ga <John-ni> atta no]-wa [FP JOHN-ni t_{CP} desu]} \right] \\
\quad \downarrow \text{ deletion}
\]

\[
\text{d. } \left[ \text{TopP [CP kanozyo-ga <John-ni> atta no]-wa [FP JOHN-ni t_{CP} desu]} \right]
\]

From the present point of view, this cleft approach to short answers can be taken to be on the same side as Nishigauchi and Fujii’s (2006) approach in that it also involves focus movement; the only difference between them resides in whether the deleted part undergoes topicalization or not. Thus, what has been said against Nishigauchi and Fujii’s approach above carries over to this cleft approach.

Saito (2004) addresses the question of why short answers are island-insensitive by
invoking the second source of this construction: they can involve a pro subject. He observes that sore ‘it’ can be inserted into such a short answer as the following, which appears to involve an island violation:

(26) a.  [Dono ginkoo-kara okane-o nusunda] doroboo-ga taiho-sareta no desu
    which bank -from money-Acc stole thief -Nom arrested-was C be ka?
    Q
    ‘lit. The thief that stole money from which bank was arrested?’

b.  (Sore-wa) Tokyo Ginkoo-kara desu.
    it -Top bank -from be
    ‘(It) is from Tokyo Bank.

Based upon this fact, Saito claims that when the overt pronoun sore does not surface, pro is inserted into the subject position. Since the subject as well as the predicate is simply base-generated, this construction does not involve any movement, hence not inducing island effects.

However, it is not at all clear how this ‘subject-predicate’ construction is properly interpreted. It is standardly assumed that when subject and predicate are mediated by a copula, what they express is either predicational (ex. John is tall.) or identificational (ex. The man over there is John.). The ‘subject-predicate’ construction in question does not seem to belong to either category, hence requiring a new way of interpretation. Saito (2004) bases his analysis in terms of a pro subject upon that of what he calls ‘bare-NP cleft’, such as the following:

(27) Kimi-wa [dono sensei-kara moratta] tegami-o nakusita no de
    you -Top which teacher-from received letter -Acc lost C be Q
    ‘lit. You lost the letter you received from which teacher?’

(28) a.  (Sore-wa) H-sensei desu.
    it -Top -Prof. be
    ‘(It) is Prof. H.’

b.  (Sono sensei-wa) H-sensei desu.
    that teacher-Top -Prof. be
    ‘(That teacher) is Prof. H.’

The short answer (28b) clearly shows that the subject-predicate relation involved here is identificational. But a word is necessary for what kind of subject-predicate relation is
involved in (28a). At first glance, it does not appear to be identificational, since *sore* does not refer to a person. However, such a question-answer pair as the following suggests that *sore* has a peculiar use of identification:

(29) a. Asoko-ni iru hito-wa dare desu ka?
   there be person-Top who be Q
   ‘Who is the person over there?’

   b. Sore-wa John desu.
   it -Top be
   ‘It is John.’

Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that such a short answer as exemplified in (28) that involves a bare NP has a structure exactly like what Saito suggests. However, it does not seem to follow from this that the same analysis can be applied to those cases of short answers that involve PP and NP with case markers. This is especially because the latter type of short answers do not have cases corresponding to (28b), a clearest case where the subject and predicate enter into an identificational relation.

Further, Saito’s analysis of short answers in terms of a base-generated *pro* subject raises the question whether it can properly capture the intended readings of short answers that involve island violations. Saito makes an objection to Takahashi’s (1994) claim that “Japanese sluicing is subject to Subjacency in general” by noting that “the data are not straightforward.” (p. 46) He provides the following example:

(30) a. [Dokoka-no ginkoo-kara okane-o nusunda] doroboo-ga taiho-sareta
   somewhere-Gen bank -from money-Acc stole thief -Nom arrested-was sooda.
   I-heard
   ‘I heard that the thief that stole money from a bank somewhere was arrested.’

   but I -Top it -Nom bank -from whether -Top know-not
   ‘But, I don’t know whether (it) is from Tokyo Bank.’ (Saito 2004, p. 47)

Saito takes (30b) as acceptable, hence constituting a counterexample to Takahashi’s claim. According to Saito’s analysis, the embedded question complement of (30b) can be analyzed simply as the base-generated subject *sore-ga* ‘it-Nom’ or a pro and the base-generated ‘predicate’ *Tokyo Ginkoo-kara* ‘from Tokyo Bank’, hence inducing no island violation. Though I agree that (30b) is acceptable, it does not seem that this
sentence has the intended reading, i.e., the one that will be derived from a structure violating the relative clause island condition. Thus, (30b) can be interpreted as (31a), but not as (31b):

(31) a. I don’t know whether the thief stole money from Tokyo Bank.

b. I don’t know whether the thief that stole money from Tokyo Bank was arrested.

This strongly suggests that even though the base-generated pro strategy is available to such a sluicing sentence as (30b), it does not give rise to a more complex reading like (31b) than a ‘simple clause’ reading like (31a).

Replying to Merchant’s (2001) claim that the apparent suppression of a relative clause island in sluicing is attributed to the availability of a ‘partial’ reading like (31a), Lasnik (2001) provides the following example to show that the apparent violation of the relative clause island is real:

(32) Every linguist, met a philosopher who criticized some of his, work, but I’m not sure how much of his, work [every linguist, met a philosopher who criticized t].

In this case of sluicing, the remnant wh-phrase includes the bound pronoun his, which functions as a variable of every linguist, hence guaranteeing the ‘whole’ reading of the sluice. Likewise, we can make a relevant Japanese sluicing on the model of this English sentence:

(33) a. Dono sensei,-mo [dokoka-no gakkoo-kara okane-o nusunda]
every teacher somewhere-Gen school-from money-Acc stole
dorobo-o tukamaeta sooda.
thief -Acc caught I-heard
‘I heard that every teacher, caught a thief that stole money from a school somewhere.’

b.?*Demo, boku-wa [(sore-ga) zibun,-no gakkoo-kara kadooka]-wa sira-nai.
but I -Top it -Nom self -Gen school-from whether -Top know-not
‘But, I don’t know whether (it) is from self,’s school.’
= ‘But, I don’t know whether every teacher, caught a thief that stole money from self,’s school.’

It is fairly clear that (33b) does not have the intended reading. Thus, this confirms our present claim that the subject pro strategy gives rise to no reading other than the ‘simple clause’ reading. This in turn defends Takahashi’s (1994) claim that “Japanese sluicing is
subject to Subjacency in general."

Going back to Japanese short answers, we can make a relevant example on the model of (33):

(34) a. Dono sensei_-mo [dono gakkoo-kara okane-o nusunda] doroboo-o
    every teacher which school-from money-Acc stole thief -Acc
    tukamaeta no desu ka?
caught C be Q
‘lit. Every teacher, caught a thief that stole money from which school?’

b. (Sore-wa) zibun_-no gakkoo-kara desu.
    it -Top self -Gen school-from be
‘(It) is from self,’s school.’

= ‘Every teacher, caught a thief that stole money from self,’s school.’

As far as I can see, the short answer (34b) is much better with the intended reading than (33b). If this is correct, then it strongly argues against the base-generated pro approach to the island insensitivity of short answers, since this approach fails to account for the contrast between (33b) and (34b). Further, the availability of the relevant reading to (34b) even with sore as its subject indicates that insertion of sore does not alter the structure of short answers in any crucial way. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that sore-wa ‘it-Top’ in such a short answer as (34b) is simply base-generated above the ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction, as indicate below, under the in-situ approach to short answers:

(35) \[\text{TopP sore-wa [FP CP dono sensei-mo [ZIBUN-NO GAKKOO-KARA okane-o nusunda] doroboo-o tukamaeta no] desu]}\]

Saito (2004) provides another type of truncated answers to show that the possibility of insertion of sore makes it insensitive to island conditions:

(36) a. Kinoo [dokoka-no ginkoo-kara genkin-ga nusum-areta toiu]
    yesterday somewhere-Gen bank -from cash -Nom stolen-was C

---

4 See Nishiyama et al. (1996) for the claim that what Takahashi (1994) takes as an instance of Japanese sluicing is in fact a species of clefting.

5 See Nakao and Yoshida (2005) for the claim that when sore is inserted in such a Japanese sluicing as (30b), it simply occupies the D position whose complement involves deletion of the presupposition part of a cleft.
I agree with Saito upon his judgment with (36b), according to which it can convey the following meaning:

(37) You heard the news yesterday that cash was stolen from Tokyo Bank, didn’t you? However, the reason for the apparent insensitivity to the pure complex NP island in this case should not be, given the above discussions, that (36b) can be analyzed as the base-generated subject and predicate construction. Rather, I claim, following Abe (2008), that (36b) is a pure instance of Japanese sluicing, more specifically one of what Chung et al. (1995) call the merger-type with a non-\(wh\)-phrase as its remnant. The merger type of sluicing is one in which the remnant phrase (typically a \(wh\)-phrase) has its corresponding antecedent (what Chung et al. call inner antecedent); in the case of (36), \(\text{dokoka-no ginkoo} \ ‘\text{a bank somewhere}’\) serves as such. Thus, (36b) is amenable to the in-situ analysis proposed by Kimura (2010), having the following derivation:

(38) \[
\text{[Top} (\text{sore-wa}) \text{[FP [CP \text{kinoo} \text{[TOKYO GINKOO-kara genki-na nusu-arare toiu]}}
\text{nyuuusu-o kikimasita] desyoo]]}
\]

Here \(\text{sore-wa} \ ‘\text{it-Top}’\) is simply base-generated in the Spec of TopP, as in (35), and \(\text{desyoo} \ ‘\text{must be}’\) is a variant of copula with a modality of confirmation, hence placed in the head of FP. Deletion applies to CP, as in the case of short answers, except the focused phrase \(\text{Tokyo Ginkoo-kara} \ ‘\text{Tokyo Bank-from}’\), deriving the surface form of (36b). Given this analysis, it immediately follows that such a truncated answer is insensitive to the island conditions.

Hasegawa (2006) makes the very interesting claim that contrary to such an instance of Japanese sluicing as exemplified in (30b) and (33b), to which she agrees on the cleft analysis, Japanese counterparts of such matrix sluicing as shown in (39) below are in fact genuine instances of sluicing; relevant examples are given in (40):

(39) a. A: Mary bought something. B: Really? What?
Hasegawa attributes the difference between matrix and embedded sluicing in Japanese to the obligatory existence of the question marker -ka in embedded questions. Following Cheng’s (1991) assumption that clausal typing is made by either a head or its specifier, Hasegawa claims that Japanese embedded sluicing cannot have the configuration characteristic to a sluice, since the obligatoriness of the question marker -ka prohibits the remnant wh-phrase from appearing in its Spec position. Japanese matrix sluicing, on the other hand, is free from the obligatoriness of a question marker, and hence nothing prohibits it from being analyzed in the same way as the English instances of matrix sluicing in (39). To support this claim, Hasegawa demonstrates that in contrast with embedded sluicing, matrix sluicing is insensitive to island effects, as shown below:

(41) a. A: Hanako-wa [Taro-ga nanika-o okutta] zyosei-o
    -Top -Nom something-Acc gave woman-Acc
    sagasiteiru rasii yo.
    be-looking-for seem
    ‘Hanako seems to be looking for the woman Taro gave something to.’

    B: Honto? Nani-o?
    really what-Acc
    ‘Really? What?’
    = ‘Hanako seems to be looking for the woman Taro gave what to?’

b. A: [Taro-ga nanika-o zenbu tabetyatta kara] Hanako-ga
    -Nom something-Acc all ate because -Nom
    okotta rasii yo.
    got-angry seem
    ‘Because Taro ate the whole of something, Hanako seems to have got angry.’
B: Honto? Nani-o?
really what-Acc
‘Really? What?’
= ‘Hanako seems to have got angry because Taro ate the whole of what?’

(41a) and (41b) show that matrix sluicing is insensitive to the complex NP island and the adjunct island, respectively. Likewise, we can respond to (36a) with the following:

(42) Eh! Dono ginkoo-kara?
yeah which bank -from
‘Yeah? From which bank?’
= ‘You heard the news yesterday that cash was stolen from which bank?’

Thus, Japanese matrix sluicing behaves like a typical case of sluicing with respect to island effects. Given this, it is not unreasonable to claim that (36b) is a variant of matrix sluicing in which the remnant phrase is a non-\textit{w-h}-phrase.

Finally, Saito (2004) notes concerning the derivation of short answers that “when a pro subject is disallowed for some reason, CP deletion becomes the only possible derivation,” and hence that “it is in this case that the Subjacency effects become visible.” (p. 44) He takes up multiple short answers for a case that does not allow a pro subject. He provides the following question-answer pair, cited from Nishigauchi (1990):

(43) a. [Dare-ga dare-ni kaita] tegami-ga mitukarimasita ka?
who-Nom who-Dat wrote letter -Nom was-found Q
‘lit. A letter that who wrote to who was found?’

b. (*)Tanaka-san-ga Nakasone-san-ni desu.
-Nom -Dat be
‘Mr. Tanaka to Mr. Nakasone.’
= ‘A letter that Mr. Tanaka wrote to Mr. Nakasone was found.’

(Nishigauchi 1990, p. 53)

Nishigauchi judges the multiple short answer in (43b) as unacceptable, though it does not sound bad to me. Agreeing upon Nishigauchi’s judgment, Saito (2004) claims that this is expected because “the answer is still illicit even with an overt pronoun in the subject position,” (p. 45) as shown below:

(44) (*)Sore-wa Tanaka-san-ga Nakasone-san-ni desu.
it -Top -Nom -Dat be (Saito 2004, p. 45)

If such a correlation really existed with respect to island effects and the possibility of
insertion of an overt pronoun, that would lend strong support to Saito’s position, but as far as I can see, the relevant data are not so clear as expected; I find both (43b) and (44) as acceptable as such a single short answer as (26b). Further, Saito notes that compared with such a case of single embedded sluicing as (30b), the embedded sluicing counterpart of (44) sounds worse:

(45) a. [Dareka-ga dareka-ni kaita] tegami-ga mitukatta sooda.
   someone-Nom someone-Dat wrote letter-Nom was-found I-heard
   ‘I heard that a letter that someone wrote to someone was found.’

   b. *Demo, boku-wa [(sore-ga) Tanaka-san-ga Nakasone-san-ni kadoooka]-wa
      but I -Top it -Nom -Nom -Dat whether -Top
      sira-nai.
      know-not
      ‘lit. But I don’t know whether (it) was Mr. Tanaka to Mr. Nakasone.’
      = ‘But I don’t know whether a letter that Mr. Tanaka wrote to Mr. Nakasone
      was found.’

Again, as Saito himself acknowledges, “the judgment for examples like [30b] and [45b] is subtle;” (p. 47) I find (45b) no more acceptable than (30b).

Overall, it will be safe to conclude that cases of multiple short answers do not really provide evidence for Saito’s position that the possibility of insertion of an overt subject correlates with island sensitivity.

5. Identification Condition on Deletion

I have argued for the in-situ analysis of short answers, so that such a short answer as given in (5b), repeated here with its corresponding question sentence, has the derivation given in (47) below:

(46) a. Kanozyo-wa dare-ni atta no?
   she -Top who-Dat saw Q
   ‘Who did she see?’

      -Dat be
      ‘John’
In this section, we consider what I call here identification condition on deletion, one regarding how a deletion site is identified. In the most straightforward case, the identification condition in question can be simply characterized in terms of strict identity. Thus, to take a VP-deletion case such as the following:

(48) John saw Mary and Bill did, too.

the elliptic VP site in the second conjunct is identified by the antecedent VP under strict identity, as shown below:

(49) John Past [VP see Mary] and Bill did [VP see Mary] too

In the case of short answers, however, such a simple notion as strict identity cannot be appropriate for characterizing the relevant identification condition.

As I mentioned in Section 2, I follow Abe (2010a) in assuming that “a target of deletion is a constituent and yet an actual deletion operation applies to it in such a way that a phrase carrying [Focus] evades such an operation.” (p. 10) I then assume that the target of deletion, called E(Allipsis)-site by Abe (2010a), is subject to an identification condition. To apply these assumptions to such a case of short answers as (47), we identify the CP as an E-site, to which deletion applies except the focused phrase JOHN-ni. Let us now consider what kind of identification condition is operative to this E-site. Obviously, it must be a possible answer to the corresponding question; in particular, the remnant phrase must be among the set of possible answers presupposed by the corresponding wh-phrase. This suggests that the identification condition in question must be semantic in nature. Notice that exactly for this reason, it is not the case that the more standard analysis of short answers, i.e., the one involving focus movement, will provide a more appropriate representation for identification.

Much the same situation arises with respect to what kind of identification condition is involved in the merger type of sluicing. Let us consider how a sluicing sentence such as (1a) is analyzed under the in-situ analysis.

(50) a. She’s reading something, but I can’t imagine what.

b. I can’t imagine [CP CQ [TP she’s reading what]]

In (50b), the embedded TP is an E-site, to which deletion applies except the focused wh-phrase what. The relevant notion for identification here has something to do with the
relationship between *who* and its inner antecedent *something*. Intuitively, the antecedent clause of the merger type of sluicing must be one that can serve as a presupposition for the sluice. Thus, as Chung et al. (1995) note, the inner antecedents of sluices must be indefinites, as shown below:

(51) She’s reading a book by Chomsky, but I can’t imagine what.
(52) a.*I know that Meg’s attracted to Harry, but they don’t know who.
    b.*Since Jill said Joe had invited Sue, we didn’t have to ask who.
(53) a.*She said she had spoken to everybody, but he wasn’t sure who.
    b.*She’s read most books, but we’re not sure what/which.

While the antecedent clause in (51) can serve as a presupposition for the sluice due to the fact that the inner antecedent of *who* is the indefinite *a book by Chomsky*, all the antecedent clauses in (52) and (53) fail to serve as such. Here again we find that the relevant notion for identification is semantic in nature. Hence, it is not the case that the more standard analysis of sluicing, namely the one that involves overt *wh*-movement, followed by TP deletion, is better off in providing a more appropriate representation for identification.

I propose the following as an identification condition relevant for both short answers and the merger type of sluicing:

(54) An E-site is identified with its antecedent if (i) they are semantically identical; or (ii) they are in the relation of *semantic inclusion*.

(55) $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are in the relation of *semantic inclusion* if (i) $\alpha$ constitutes a presupposition of $\beta$ or (ii) $\alpha$ satisfies the truth condition of $\beta$.

(54ii) is involved in such a case as (49) in which strict identity is at stake. (54ii) deals with the cases in point. According to (55), short answers are in the relation of *semantic inclusion* with their corresponding questions in the sense of (55ii) whereas in the merger type of sluicing, the sluices are in such a relation with their inner antecedents in the sense of (55i). With this characterization in terms of semantic inclusion, short answers and the merger type of sluicing can be seen to constitute a natural class regarding the identification condition involved.

Let us discuss what (55) says in a little bit more concrete way. First consider a sluicing case such as the following:

(56) She saw someone, but I don’t know who.

According to the in-situ approach of this construction, the sluice has the following
representation:

(57) \( [CP \text{ } C_Q \{TP \text{ } she \text{ } saw \text{ } WHO\}] \)

Note that the first sentence of (56), i.e., the antecedent clause of the sluice, serves as a presupposition of what is represented in (57), and hence the antecedent clause and the sluice is in the relation of semantic inclusion according to (55i). Thus the E-site of the sluice is identified with its antecedent clause according to (54), thereby being licensed as the target of deletion. As for the cases of short answers, first note that it has been standardly assumed that the semantic interpretation of a question is given in terms of its possible answers. Karttunen (1977), for instance, claims that the semantic interpretation of a question is regarded as a set of true propositions in a given world. Thus, (58a) has the meaning represented in (58b):

(58) a. Who did she see?
    
    b. \( \{P | \exists x: \text{person}(x) \land P = \text{she} \text{ } saw \text{ } x \land P \text{ } is \text{ } true\} \)

Given this, such an answer as the following is in the relation of semantic inclusion with its corresponding question (58a) in the sense of (55ii), as long as it constitutes a member of the set represented in (58b).

(59) She saw John.

Accordingly, in such a short answer as John, which is represented under the in-situ analysis as the following:

(60) \( [FP \{TP \text{ } she \text{ } saw \text{ } JOHN\}] \)

the TP is identified with its corresponding question (58a) due to a semantic inclusion holding via satisfaction of the truth conditions of (58a), hence serving as the target of deletion. The same thing carries over to short answers in Japanese, except that the target of deletion in this case is CP (cf. (47)).

Given the above characterization of identification condition, it is interesting to consider one of the strategies provided by Merchant (2004) for testing island sensitivity of short answers. He notes that “testing island sensitivities in fragment answers is not simple, however, since the simple questions that would test for them are themselves island violations.” (p. 687) As one strategy of avoiding this difficulty, he exploits short answers to “implicit salient questions”, such as the following:

(61) a. Does Abby speak Greek fluently?
    
    b. No, Albanian.

He claims that in (61), “the answer can take it that the questioner may be interested in
the answer to the question What language(s) does Abby speak?, in addition to the narrower answer to the yes-no question.” (p. 687-688) Under this assumption, it is the implicit constituent question that serves as the antecedent clause of such a short answer as (61b). That said, Merchant demonstrates that such a pair as in (61) exhibits island sensitivity, but not clause-boundedness, as shown below:

(62) a. Did Abby think Ben wrote the letter?
   b. No, Charlie.

(63) a. Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
   b. *No, Charlie.

(64) a. Did Ben leave the party because Abby wouldn’t dance with him?
   b. *No, Beth.

From this observation, he concludes that short answers are island-sensitive.

It is not at all obvious, however, whether an implicit constituent question that is assumed to mediate such a question-answer pair as in (61) is really operative in the grammar for identifying the elliptic site of its corresponding short answer. On the other hand, there is a more plausible analysis according to which such a pair is analyzed on a par with the so-called stripping construction, whose example is given below:

(65) Abby speaks Albanian fluently, not Greek.

As Reinhart (1991) observes, this construction exhibits island sensitivity rather than clause-boundedness, as shown below:

(66) a. Lucie will admit that she stole the diamonds if you press her, but not the car.
   b. *We have interrogated the burglar who stole the car already, but not the diamonds. (Reinhart 1991, p. 374)

Based upon such a fact, Abe and Hoshi (1997) propose that this construction involves leftward movement of the remnant phrase in the elliptic site as well as of its corresponding phrase in the antecedent clause. Thus, (65) will have the following representation:

(67) [FP ALBANIAN [TP Abby speaks <Albanian> fluently]], not [FP GREEK [TP Abby speaks <Greek> fluently]]

Since leftward movement is involved in this derivation, it is correctly predicted that stripping is sensitive to island conditions, but not clause-bound. Note that in this case, the identification condition at work here to license deletion of the TP of the second clause cannot be the one in (54), since the two TPs in question are not semantically
identical nor in the relation of semantic inclusion. Rather, this construction involves contrastive focus, and hence the identity condition in question is more appropriately characterized in terms of parallelism. We may say that parallelism is observed if the two comparable clauses have the same semantic formula, where such a formula is produced from its syntactic configuration by subtracting the chain that enters into contrastive focus by, say, the operation of F-closure in the sense of Schwarzchild (1999). According to this characterization, the comparable clauses in (67) have the same semantic formula, i.e., \([\lambda x. \text{Abby speaks } x \text{ fluently}]\), and the focus chain in one clause is contrasted with that in the other, based upon this formula. It is natural to reason that the requirement that leftward movement must apply to contrasted phrases in stripping will follow from the fact that the semantic formula in question is properly derived by forming an operator-variable chain of a contrasted phrase syntactically.

Given this characterization of stripping, it is quite natural to take such a short answer as (61b) as having the following representation:

(68) No, \([_{TP} \text{ALBANIAN}] \mid _{TP} \text{Abby speaks } <\text{Albanian}> \text{ fluently}]\]

Here, \text{Albanian} bears contrasted focus along with \text{Greek}, hence undergoing leftward movement to create the semantic formula \([\lambda x. \text{Abby speaks } x \text{ fluently}]\). By applying the same operation to the structure of (61a), thereby obtaining the same semantic formula, we are entitled to delete the TP of (68) under the identification condition in question. Then the paradigm of (62)-(64) falls into place under the present analysis. Importantly, we are then led to the conclusion that the type of short answers given in (61) is not the same species as those which have been dealt with under the in-situ approach. Thus, the strategy under consideration adopted by Merchant (2004) to test island sensitivity of short answers is ill-advised.

There is an interesting case of short answers in Japanese that is relevant to the present context. Watanabe (2004) claims that such negative polarity items (NPI) as \text{nanimo} ‘anything’ and \text{daremo} ‘anybody’ in fact belong to negative concord, based upon such a question-answer pair as the following:

(69) a. Nani-o mita no?
    what-Acc saw Q
    ‘What did you see?’

b. Nanimo.
    nothing
‘Nothing.’ (Watanabe 2004, p. 564)

Here nanimo means ‘nothing’, bearing negativity without any other negative item accompanied, which thus indicates that it functions as a negative concord item. An interesting question to raise in the present context is how to derive such a short answer that involves a negative concord item: Is it susceptible to the in-situ analysis or anything else, such as the stripping analysis suggested above? To consider this question, let us first note what Watanabe (2004) says about this construction: he claims in his fn. 6 that “a negative concord item serving as an elliptical answer is most natural when it is an answer to a yes-no question.” (p. 564) The relevant example is reproduced below:

(70) a. Nanika mita?
   anything saw
   ‘Did you see anything?’

b. Nanimo.
   nothing

It is quite likely that the reason why Watanabe finds such a pair as (70) most natural is that the answer given in (70b) belongs to the set presupposed by the yes-no question given in (70a), whereas such an answer does not belong to the set of possible answers presupposed in such a wh-question as (69a). The latter point is obvious, given Karttunen’s (1977) semantics of questions, according to which the semantic interpretation of (69a) is represented as follows:

(71) \{P \exists x: \text{thing}(x) \land P = ^\text{you saw} x \land P \text{ is true}\}

According to this set of true propositions, if any proposition is a member of this set, it presupposes that there is a thing x such that you saw x. Therefore, such an answer as in (69b) does not satisfy the truth conditions of its corresponding question (69a). It then follows that such a short answer cannot be analyzed in the same way as normal short answers that are susceptible to the in-situ analysis. If (69b) had the following representation under this analysis,\(^6\)

\[\text{This representation, if uttered in full, is ungrammatical and needs a negative form of mita ‘saw’ to be grammatical. The same thing also applies to (73). This indicates that nanimo behaves like a negative concord item just in the case of short answers. I do not have anything to say about why this should be the case. See Watanabe 2004 for relevant discussions.}\]

\[\text{23}\]
(72)  \[ [FP \ [TP \ (\text{watasi-wa}) \ \text{NANIMO} \ \text{mita}] ]

\[ \text{I} \ \text{-Top} \ \text{saw} \]

the TP could not be the target of deletion since it does not satisfy the identification condition stated in (54).

This leads us to consider the other possibility, namely the possibility of treating such a short answer as (69b) as a stripping case. Under this analysis, (69b) has the following representation:

(73)  \[ [FP \ \text{NANIMO} \ [TP \ (\text{watasi-wa}) \ <\text{namimo}> \ \text{mita}] ]

\[-\text{Top} \ \text{saw} \]

I suggest that in this case, \textit{nanimo} ‘nothing’ is contrasted with something that is presupposed by the corresponding question in (69a) as what I saw. Given this, the TP can undergo deletion under the identification condition in terms of parallelism, according to which \textit{nanimo} is contrasted with something on the basis of the formula \[\lambda x. \]

\[\text{I saw} \ x\].

There is a piece of evidence for this analysis: such a short answer that involves a negative concord item exhibits island effects. First, the following examples demonstrate that such a short answer is free from clause-boundedness:\footnote{Relating to the previous footnote, it is interesting to note that such a clause-bound-free property is not fully replicated in the full answers corresponding to (74b) and (75b), as shown below:}

(74) a.  \text{John-wa} \ [\text{Mary-ga} \ nani-o \ \text{mita} to] \ \text{itta no}?

\[-\text{Top} \quad -\text{Nom} \ \text{what-Acc} \ \text{saw} \ \text{C} \ \text{said} \ \text{Q} \]

‘What did John say that Mary saw?’

b.  \text{Nanimo}.

‘Nothing.’

= ‘There is no such thing \(x\), of which John said that Mary saw \(x\).’

\footnotetext{\(\)}

(i)  \text{John-wa} \ [\text{Mary-ga} \ \text{nanimo} \ \text{mita} to] \ \text{iwa-nakat-ta}.

\[-\text{Top} \quad -\text{Nom} \ \text{anything} \ \text{saw} \ \text{C} \ \text{say-not} \ \text{-Past} \]

‘John didn’t say that Mary saw anything.’

(ii)  *[\text{John-ga} \ \text{nanimo} \ \text{nusunda koto}] \ -\text{ga} \ \text{akiraka de nai}.

\[-\text{Nom} \ \text{anything} \ \text{stole} \ \text{fact} \ -\text{Nom} \ \text{obvious} \ \text{not} \]

‘It is not obvious that John stole anything.’

Again, I have nothing interesting to say about why such a difference holds. By the way, it has been a standard observation that a sentential subject does not constitute a barrier in Japanese. See Lasnik and Saito 1992 for a relevant discussion.
(75) a. [John-ga nani-o nusunda koto]-ga akirakana no?
    -Nom what-Acc stole fact -Nom obvious Q
    ‘lit. The fact that John stole what is obvious?’
   b. Nanimo.
   ‘Nothing.’
   = ‘There is no such thing x, of which it is obvious that John stole x.’

The following examples demonstrate that such a short answer exhibits island effects:
(76) a. John-wa [nani-o nusunda] hito-o mikaketa no?
    -Top what-Acc stole person-Acc happened-to-see Q
    ‘lit. John happened to see a person who had stolen what?’
   b. *Nanimo.
   ‘Nothing.’
   = ‘There is no such thing x, of which John happened to see a person who had
   stolen x.’

(77) a. John-wa [Mary-ga nani-o nusunda kara] okotteiru no?
    -Top -Nom what-Acc stole because angry Q
    ‘lit. John is angry because Mary stole what?’
   b. *Nanimo.
   ‘Nothing.’
   = ‘There is no such thing x, of which John is angry because Mary stole x.’

Thus, such a short answer involving a negative concord item belongs to the stripping
type rather than the normal one susceptible to the in-situ analysis.

6. Multiple Short Answers
Merchant (2004) provides a second strategy to circumvent the inescapable problem of
English short answers in testing island sensitivity: to use question-answer pairs in
multiple questions. Such a pair is illustrated below:
(78) a. Who’s more likely to be influencing who?
   b. The CIA John Foreman.        (Merchant 2004, p. 689, slightly modified)

The following examples are intended to demonstrate that multiple short answers are
island sensitive rather than clause-bound:
(79) a. Which lawyer said he was representing which war criminal?
   b. Cochran Milosevic, and Dershowitz Sharon.
(80) a. Which committee member wants to hire someone who speaks which language?
   b. *Abby Greek, and Ben Albanian. (ibid.)

Merchant then claims that “the presence of such island effects seems to be a remarkable piece of evidence in support of taking the derivation of fragments to involve an A’-movement that feeds ellipsis.” (p. 689)

However, this second strategy is also ill-advised, since it makes the unmotivated presupposition that single and multiple short answers should behave the same with respect to locality effects. Such a presupposition is clearly false in the case of sluicing. It has been well known since Ross (1969) that in what Chung et al. (1995) call the merger-type of sluicing, island effects are ameliorated and even disappeared, as shown below:

(81) a. They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don’t remember which language. (Merchant 2001, p. 87)
   b. Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn’t remember which. (ibid., p. 88)

On the other hand, Lasnik (2006a) observes that multiple sluicing in English, exemplified below, shows quite severe locality effects.

(82) ?One of the students spoke to one of the professors, but I don’t know which to which. (Lasnik 2006a, p. 4)

The following example shows that it is subject to the clause-mate condition:

(83) *One of the students said that Mary spoke to one of the professors, but I don’t know which student to which professor. (ibid., p. 8)

Further, Lasnik observes that even in such a case in which the two wh-remnants of English multiple sluicing are clause-mates, they exhibit clause-boundedness with respect to the readings available to them; consider the following examples:

(84) a. Fred denied that a certain boy talked to a certain girl.
   ????I wish I could remember which boy to what girl.
   b. Fred doubts that a certain boy talked to a certain girl.
   ??*I wish I could remember which boy to what girl. (ibid., p. 15)

As Lasnik stresses, such main verbs as deny and doubt make the matrix readings of the
sluices in (84) much clearer, and he finds those readings hard to obtain.8

The same point can be made with Japanese short answers. As is observed above, Japanese short answers do not show island effects. On the other hand, Nishigauchi and Fujii (2006) observe that multiple short answers in Japanese do show island effects:

(85) a. Dare-ga [Akira-ga doko-de totta] syasin-o mita no?
   who-Nom -Nom where took picture-Acc saw Q
   ‘Who saw a picture [Akira took where]?’

b. *Anna-ga Mosukuwa-de desu.
   -Nom Moscow -in be
   ‘Anna in Moscow.’ (Nishigauchi and Fujii 2006, p. 48, slightly modified)

In (85a), the second wh-phrase doko-de ‘where’ is embedded in the relative clause and thus it is natural to reason that this causes the unacceptability of the short answer given in (85b). Such an example as this suffices to demonstrate that multiple short answers obey more severe locality conditions than single short answers.

Let us pursue what kind of locality condition is involved in Japanese multiple short answers a little bit further. It seems that locality effects arise not from whether each phrase of multiple short answers is embedded within an opaque domain such as an island but rather from how far one phrase is separated from the other in their syntactic configuration. Let us first consider the following example, which is a repetition of (43):

(86) a. [Dare-ga dare-ni kaita] tegami-ga mitukarimasita ka?
   who-Nom who-Dat wrote letter -Nom was-found Q
   ‘lit. The letter that who wrote to whom was found?’

Lasnik (2006b) observes that in a variety of constructions, the effect of the clause-mate condition is ameliorated when the embedded subject co-refers to the matrix subject. Multiple sluicing is one such case, as illustrated below:

(i) *Each professor said that Susan was working on a different one of these topics, but I can’t remember which on which one.

(ii) ?Each professor, said that he, was working on a different one of these topics, but I can’t remember which on which one.

Lasnik (personal communication) also pointed out to me that the same effect also seems to hold for multiple short answers in English. Thus, while Merchant’s (2004) example (79) sounds O.K., it gets degraded if the embedded subject in (79a) is changed into a full NP such as John. This observation is naturally led to the expectation that multiple short answers in English exhibit the same locality effects as multiple sluicing in English, but I will not pursue this line any further here, leaving it for future research.
b. (*)(*)Tanaka-san-ga Nakasone-san-ni desu.

-Nom -Dat be

‘Mr. Tanaka to Mr. Nakasone.’

= ‘A letter that Mr. Tanaka wrote to Mr. Nakasone was found.’

(Nishigauchi 1990, p. 53)

As noted above with (43), Nishigauchi judges such a multiple short answer as (86b) is unacceptable as a reply to (86a), but it does not sound so bad to my ear. It is clear at least that this answer is far better than (85b). Further consider the following example:

(87) a. Dare-ga [Akira-ga doko-de sono syasin-o totta to] itteita no?

who -Nom where that picture-Acc took C said Q

‘Who said that Akira had taken that picture where?’

b. *Anna-ga Mosukuwa-de desu.

-Nom Moscow -in be

‘Anna in Moscow.’

(87a) does not involve any island, but (87b) is almost as bad as (85b) as an answer to (87a). This, together with the fair acceptability of (86b), strongly suggests that the relevant locality effects arise from the relative location of the two remnants of multiple short answers. One might conjecture that the clause-mate condition is at stake, but the following example shows that this is not the case:

(88) a. Dare-ga [doko-de Akira-ga sono syasin-o totta to] itteita no?

who -Nom where that picture-Acc took C said Q

‘Who said that Akira had taken that picture where?’

b. ?Anna-ga Mosukuwa-de desu.

-Nom Moscow -in be

‘Anna in Moscow.’

In (88a), doko-de ‘where’ is located at the top of the embedded clause, so that it is adjacent to the matrix subject dare-ga ‘who-Nom’, unlike in (87a). Interestingly, such a small change in word order in the question makes a rather clear impact on the acceptability of its corresponding answer. This improvement of acceptability cannot be accounted for by the clause-mate condition, since in neither (87b) and (88b) are the two remnants clause-mates. Rather, such a contrast strongly indicates the relevance of a
condition like Specified Subject Condition.⁹

7. Conclusions

In this paper, I have argued for the in-situ approach to short answers. Given the inescapable problem in testing island sensitivity in such a wh-movement language as English, we have investigated short answers in Japanese, a wh-in-situ language. I have proposed that Japanese short answers are directly derived from what Hiraiwa and Ishihara (2002) call ‘no da’ in-situ focus construction. This analysis immediately explains the island insensitivity of Japanese short answers. I have argued that the identification condition operative for licensing deletion in short answers is semantic in nature, hence compatible with the in-situ approach that inescapably incorporates deletion of a non-constituent. I have also argued that short answers and sluicing belong to the same class with respect to how the elliptic site is identified. Finally, I have argued that the two strategies provided by Merchant (2004) for getting over the inescapable problem in testing island sensitivity in English are ill-advised.
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