

Reconsideration of Japanese Right Dislocation Constructions (RDCs) in comparison with Germanic Languages

Kaori Furuya

University of North Texas

kaori.furuya@unt.edu

The ELSJ 14th International Spring Forum (May 8-9 2021)

1. Introduction

Basics:

- Ott and Dries (2016) argue that the bi-clausal analysis of Germanic RDCs is universally correct because the constructions can be derived in a manner familiar from deletion-based accounts of sluicing and fragment answers in the bi-clausal analysis.
- They provide cross-linguistic parallelisms drawn from Japanese as an unrelated language.

Claims :

- The aim is to show that the bi-clausal analysis or a uniform analysis of Japanese counterparts is insufficient, in comparison with Germanic languages.
- The aim to demonstrate that the preverbal null elements in Japanese constructions are not always *pro* (or ellipsis), right-dislocation (RD) is a heterogeneous phenomenon at least in Japanese.

2. Comparisons between Germanic languages and Japanese

2.1 RDCs with an adverb and a DP postverbally

Ott and De Vries (2016) observe that the distribution of adverbials is limited in the Germanic RDC (1). On their bi-clausal analysis, the existence of the adverbial(s) makes CP₁ and CP₂ differ in illocutionary force, inducing the ungrammaticality.

- (1) *Peter hat ihn offenbar getroffen, *den John Travolta (vielleicht)?* (German)
 Peter has him apparently met the John Travolta perhaps
 *'Peter apparently met him, (perhaps) John Travolta?' (ibid. 647)

The Japanese RDC can involve an adverbial pre- and optionally postverbally in (2).
 The construction yields a bi-clausal and a mono-clausal construction.

- (2) Context: Ken asked whether Mr. Tanaka made the box over other.
 Tanaka-san-ga [e] tukurimashita-yo **tegiwayoku sono hako-o.**
 Tanaka-Mr-Nom made-Prt efficiently the box-Acc
 ‘Mr. Tanaka made it_i; he made the box_i efficiently.’
 ‘Mr. Suzuki made the box efficiently.’

Likewise, a Japanese RDC with an adverb postverbally can yield two interpretations in (3).

- (3) Context: A friend wants to know whether Ken saw Naomi_i at the party the other day.
 Ken-wa *tasikani* [e]_i mita-yo, Naomi-o_i (*tabun*).
 Ken-TOP apparently saw-PRT Naomi-ACC probably
 i. ‘Ken apparently saw her_i; (probably) Naomi_i.’
 ii. ‘Ken apparently (*probably) saw Naomi_i.’

- ❖ Unlike German, Japanese RDCs allow adverbials to appear postverbally and yields a bi- and a mono-clausal interpretation.

2.2 Case obligatorily matches pre- and postverbally

Ott and De Vries (2016: 560-561) claim that (4) is an equative RDC. This construction involves a *wh*-phrase on the right periphery, and it is a declarative sentence. The postverbal *wh*-word is dative.

- (4) Context: Speaker A also wants to state that Peter danced with many girls but she did not know which of them
 A: Das weiß ich auch nicht, *mit welchen*. (German)
 That know I also not with which.DAT
 ‘Which of them (he danced with) I don’t know either.’ (ibid. 650)

Japanese RDCs allow a DP with and without an accusative Case marker postverbally in (5) and (6). Moreover, they can yield different interpretations.

- (5) Context: Mother asked a daughter [which book Ken bought]_i. Yet, her daughter didn’t know [which book Ken bought]_i.
 Watasi-wa [e] siranai, dono **hon-ka.**
 I-TOP not.know which book-Q
 ‘I do not know [e]_i; which book it is.’
 (6) Watasi-wa [e] siranai **dono hon-o-ka_i.**
 I-TOP not.know which book-ACC-Q
 ‘I do not know [e]_i; which book_j (Ken bought)

- ❖ Unlike, German, Japanese can have a mono-clause reading for (5) and (6) with different interpretations. Thus, the first clause and the second recovered clause do not always need to be identical.

2.3 Various categories postverbally

Ott and De Vries argue that Germanic RD is not confined to referential DPs; it applies to a wide range of categories in (7).

They claim that the categorial promiscuity presented is expected on the bi-clausal analysis since any category can undergo leftward movement in the second clauses of RDCs in their analysis.

- (7) a. ... dat ik *(dat) niet kan, [_{VP} *een boek schrijven*]. (Dutch)
 that I* (that not can a book write
 ‘... that I can’t do that, write a book.’
 b. ... dat ik *(erover) wil praten [_{PP} *over die kwestie*].
 That I* (about that want talk about that issue
 ‘... that I want to talk about that, about that issue.’
 c. ... dat hij *(dat) wel nooit zal worden, [_{AP} *rijk*].
 that he *(that PRT never will become rich
 ‘...that he’ll never be that, rich.’
 d. ... dat hij het (toen) niet gedaan heeft, [_{AdvP} *gisteren*].
 that he it (then not done has yesterday
 ‘... that he didn’t do it, yesterday.’ (ibid. 666)

Japanese also allows a variety of categories besides DPs to be right-dislocated in (8) and (9).

- (8) a. Suzuki-san-wa tomdati-ni [_e]_i okutta-yo [_{VP} *tegiwayoku okurimono-o*]_i.
 Suzuki-Mr-NOM friend-DAT sent-PRT skillfully gift-ACC
 ‘Mr. Suzuki sent his friend a gift skillfully.’
 b. Dress-o [_e]_i katta-yo, [_{PP} *Ginza-de*]_i.
 dress-ACC bought-PRT Ginza-on
 ‘I bought the dress on Ginza.’ (Simon 1989, 52)
 c. [_e]_i Eiga mita-yo, [_{AP} *sugoku omosiroi*]_i.
 movie saw very interesting
 ‘(I) saw a very interesting movie.’ (Simon 1989, 11)
 d. [_e]_i Nanika suru-no [_{AdvP} *itumo*]_i.
 something do-Q usually
 ‘Do you usually do something?’ (Simon 1989, 11)
- (9) Taro-ga [_e]_i itta-yo, [_S *Hanako-ga sono hon-o yonda to*]_i.
 Taro-NOM said-PRT Hanako-NOM that book-ACC read-COMP
 ‘Taro said that Hanako read that book.’ (Adapted from Abe 1999)

Kasai (2004) observes the failure to extract out of a null complement clause in (10).

Kasai proposes that once the deleted object clause is the null category in (10C) and thus that *Sono hon-o* cannot be preposed.

- (10) A: Sono hon-o_i Taro-wa [_S Hanako-ga *t_i* katta-to]_j itta.
 that book-ACC Taro-TOP Hanako-NOM bought-COMP said
 ‘Taro said that Hanako bought that book.’
 B: Ziro-mo [_S Hanako-ga ~~_____~~ sono hon-o ~~_____~~ katta-to] itta.
 Ziro-also Hanako-NOM that book-ACC bought-COMP said
 ‘Ziro also said that Hanako bought that book.’
 C: **Sono hon-o*_k Ken-mo [_S Hanako-ga ~~_____~~ *t_k* katta-to] _j itta.
 that book-ACC Ken-also Hanako-NOM bought-COMP said
 ‘Ken also said that Hanako bought that book.’ (Adapted from Kasai 2004: 181)

- ❖ The Japanese RDC (11) allows a clause to be postposed while the embedded object remains in the matrix clause.
- ❖ This suggests that the preverbal null object is not *pro*.

- (11) Sono hon-o_k Ken-mo [e]_j itta-yo [s Hanako-ga t_k katta-to]_j.
 that book-ACC Ken-also said Hanako-NOM bought-COMP
 ‘Ken also said that Hanako bought that book.’

❖ Unlike Germanic languages, the preverbal null category is not always pronominal in Japanese.

3 Analysis

Ott and De Vries’ (2016) proposal:

- (12) $[\text{CP}_1 \dots \text{correlate} \dots]$ $[\text{CP}_2 d\text{XP}_i [\dots t_i \dots]]$ (ibid. 645)
- host clause

My proposal for *some* Japanese RDCs:

The preverbal null category is a trace of the postposed element(s):

- (13) [s t_i Verb] XP_i
- (14) [s ... t_i Verb] [VP Adv (DP-Acc_i) t_v]_I for (2) (and (3))
- (15) [s t_i Verb] S_i for (5) and (6), (11)
- (16) [s t_i Verb] VP_i/PP_i/AP_i for (8)

4 Conclusion

- Contra Ott and De Vries’ claim of the universality of the bi-clausal analysis for RDCs, the present paper argues for the mono-clausal analysis of some Japanese RDCs with multiple constructions including adverbials postverbally
- The preverbal null element is not always *pro* at least in Japanese.
- The postposed elements in RDCs are not always a secondary piece of information added later for conformation or clarification. Instead, they are part of a single clause when deaccented (Simon 1989).

References:

- Abe, Jun. 1999. On directionality of movement: a case of Japanese right dislocation. Ms. Nagoya University.
- Kasai, Hironobu. 2014. On the nature of null clausal complements in Japanese. *Syntax* 17(2): 168–188.
- Ott, D. and M. d. Vries. 2016. Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(2): 639–690.
- Sato, Y. and Hayashi, S. 2018. String-Vacuous Head Movement in Japanese: New Evidence from Verb-Echo Answers. *Syntax* 21.1, 72-90.
- Simpson, Andrew and Arunima Choudhury. 2015. The Non-uniform Syntax of Postverbal Elements in SOV Languages: Hindi, Bangla, and the Rightward Scrambling Debate. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 46(3): 533-551.