Pseudogapping in Japanese*

HIDEHARU TANAKA AND SHINTARO HAYASHI
Mie University and *Nanzan University*

1   Introduction

This paper aims to develop Funakoshi's (2016) claim that Japanese has an equivalent of the *pseudogapping* (PG) construction in English. English PG is exemplified by the *but*-clause in (1), where the main verb and its direct object are elided. We refer to a constituent XP immediately following the elided verb as a *remnant* (e.g. *Mary*) and to its counterpart in the antecedent clause as a *correlate* (e.g. *Tom*).

(1)   John won't give **Tom** his new toys, but he will _ **Mary** _.

In the literature, the derivation of PG is widely analyzed as *movement of the remnant* (Move-R) out of *VP ellipsis* (VPE) (e.g. Jayaseelan 1990, Lasnik 1995). For example, the ellipsis clause in (1) is derived as shown in (2).

(2) **English PG = Move-R + VPE**
[$_{TP}$ he [will [**Mary** [$_{VP}$ ~~give *t* his new toys~~]]]]

Importantly, this process is regulated by a semantic condition (e.g. Levin 1979), which we call *Contrast-R*. That is, the remnant may not be referentially identical with its correlate. For instance, the contrast in (3) shows that PG is blocked if the remnant refers to the same entity as the correlate does.

(3) a. That exhibit should have impressed **me**, but it didn't.
    b. * That exhibit should have impressed **me**, but it didn't **me**.

(Levin 1979: 46)

Given that English PG is characterized this way, Funakoshi (2016) first establishes that Japanese allows *verb-stranding VPE*, where V raises out of its VP and the VP is elided by VPE (see also Otani and Whitman 1991 and Hayashi 2015). He then suggests that Japanese also allows PG as in the form of (4), where Move-R out of VPE occurs along with V-Raising.

(4) **Japanese PG = Move-R + VPE (+ V-Raising)**
[$_{TP}$ Subj [[**XP** [$_{VP}$ ~~(Adjunct) *t*$_{XP}$ *t*$_V$~~]] V-T]]

His main argument for (4) is that it correctly predicts the availability of *null adjuncts*, i.e., when VP adjuncts are elidable. For example, consider (5).[1]

(5) a. *John-wa*   *zitensya-de*   ***Kyoto-ni-WA***   *it-ta-ga*,
    J-Top   bicycle-by   K-Dat-Top   go-Past-but
    Tokyo-ni-WA   *ika-nakat-ta*.
    T-Dat-Top   go-Neg-Past
    'John went to Kyoto by bicycle, but he didn't to Tokyo.'
    ✓'John didn't go to Tokyo *by bicycle*.'
    b. *John-wa*   *zitensya-de*   ***Kyoto-ni***   *it-ta-ga*,
    J-Top   bicycle-by   K-Dat   go-Past-but
    Tom-wa   ***Kyoto-ni***   *ika-nakat-ta*.
    T-Top   K-Dat   go-Neg-Past
    'John went to Kyoto by bicycle, but Tom didn't go to Kyoto.'
    *'Tom didn't go to Kyoto *by bicycle*.'

---

[1] Where the topic marker *wa* is presented in uppercase (i.e. *WA*), it is intended to be contrastively stressed.

Hare, the adjunct *zitensya-de* 'by bicycle' can be understood without being phonetically expressed in the second clause in (5a), but not in (5b), where the dative NPs in both clauses corefer. This contrast follows if Japanese allows PG. That is, while (5a) can elide the adjunct by PG, (5b) cannot trigger PG in breach of Contrast-R. Thus, the paradigm in (5) shows that PG is possible in Japanese as well as in English.

Under these premises, this paper reveals a crucial difference between English PG and Japanese PG, and discusses its implications for the analysis of PG in general. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 shows that the difference lies in what clause boundary constitutes a barrier to Move-R. Section 3 attempts to derive the difference by proposing that both languages employ Move-R and VPE, but they resort to different operations in moving remnants. Section 4 concludes by posing a potential challenge to Thoms's (2016) Scope Parallelism approach to the analysis of PG.

2   Data

This section is devoted to comparison of PG in English and Japanese, focusing on whether Move-R in each language may take place out of the following three classes of complement clauses: (i) finite clauses (*Fin-C*), (ii) subject-control clauses (*SC-C*), and (iii) object-control clauses (*OC-C*). These clausal environments are taken up because they have been well-studied in connection with English PG (e.g. Baltin 2000, Johnson 2008, Thoms 2016), and therefore provide a good testing ground for comparison with Japanese PG. To anticipate somewhat, it turns out that Japanese is a bit more tolerant than English with respect to Move-R.

We begin by succinctly reviewing what the literature has so far pinned down regarding Move-R in English. Curiously, Move-R in this language does not behave uniformly under the aforementioned three types of clauses, though none of them is standardly conceived of as an island for movement. First, Move-R out of Fin-C is prohibited. In (6), we intend to leave behind *asparagus* as a PG remnant, whose correlates *kale* is located inside Fin-C (i.e. *that*-clause). Although Contrast-R is respected, the PG clause is ill-formed.

(6)   *Will might decide [that Carrie should eat **kale**], but he won't ~~decide that Carrie should eat~~ **asparagus**.   (Johnson 2008: 71)

Second, it is known that English allows Move-R across SC-C. As shown in (7), *Sally*, whose correlate *Martha* is embedded inside SC-C, may surface as a PG remnant, suggesting that Move-R out of SC-C is fine in English.

(7)   Although I didn't try [to visit **Martha**], I did ~~try to visit~~ **Sally**.
                                                    (Baltin 2000: 42)

Third, Move-R across OC-C is blocked; (8) demonstrates that, *Sally*, whose correlate is embedded inside OC-C, cannot be left behind as a PG remnant. This means that PG clauses in English cannot be legitimately derived by applying Move-R out of OC-C, regardless of satisfaction of Contrast-R.

(8)   *Although I couldn't persuade Fred [to visit **Martha**], I could ~~persuade Fred to visit~~ **Sally**.   (Baltin 2000: 44)

We proceed to examine Move-R in Japanese. Before presenting a battery of relevant data, however, two caveats are in order. The first one has to do with classification of complement clauses in Japanese. In this paper, we assume the classification given in (9). Predicates like *omow* 'think' and *dangen su* 'assert' subcategorize for Fin-C, where a tensed verb is followed by the complementizer *to*. Furthermore, we assume, essentially following Fujii (2006), that clauses in which the mood particle *(y)oo* is sandwiched between a verbal stem and *to* are classified as SC-C, whereas those containing a tensed verb followed by *yooni* belong to OC-C.

(9)   a.   Predicates for Fin-C: *omow* 'think,' *dangen su* 'assert,' etc.
             Clause form: [… V-T-*to*]
       b.   Predicates for SC-C: *kokoromi* 'try,' *kessin su* 'decide,' etc.
             Clause form: [… V-*(y)oo-to*]
       c.   Predicates for OC-C: *tanom* 'ask,' *meirei su* 'order,' etc.
             Clause form: [… V-T-*yooni*]

The other one is related to choice of matrix predicates. In discussing PG in Japanese, we consistently employ so-called *verbal nouns* (VNs) like *dangen* 'assertion' and *kessin* 'decision,' which must be followed by the empty verb *su* 'do,' as matrix predicates (see (9)).[2] The purpose of this move is to eliminate the possibility that what we dub Japanese PG is derived by *Argument Ellipsis* (AE) applying to clausal complements, rather than Move-R + (V-stranding) VPE depicted in (4).[3] As shown in (10), it is possible to come by PG(-like) clauses with 'regular verbs' like *kokoromi* 'try,' as opposed to VNs such as *kessin* 'decision.'

---

[2] See Grimshaw and Mester (1988), Takahashi (2000), and references cited therein for general properties of VNs. See also Hayashi (2015), who argues that VNs do not move to T and remain in situ, unlike regular verbs.

[3] See Oku (1998), Saito (2007), and Sakamoto (2017) for details of AE in Japanese.

(10) ?*John-wa* [*zitensya-de* **Kyoto-ni-WA** *ikoo-to*] *kokoromi-ta-ga*,
      J-Top   bicycle-by K-Dat-Top   go-C   try-Past-but
      ~~*zitensya-de*~~ **Tokyo-ni-WA** ~~*ikoo-to*~~ *kokoromi-nakat-ta*.
               T-Dat-Top   try-Neg-Pres
      'John tried to go to Kyoto by bicycle, but he didn't to Tokyo.'

Our concern is that it is not immediately clear if the ellipsis clause in (10) genuinely exemplifies PG, derived via the Move-R + VPE strategy. Given that Japanese massively allows for AE, it seems plausible that the clause has the following representation, where AE applies to CP from which the dative element *Tokyo* has been extracted, without recourse to VPE.

(11) [*pro* [[**Tokyo**$_i$ [$_{VP}$ ~~[$_{CP}$ … t_i … go-C]~~ V]] T]]   (Move-R out of AE)

Fortunately, this analytical possibility is unlikely to arise with VN clauses. In general, VNs cannot be omitted by themselves to strand the empty verb; in order to elide them, everything inside VP must be left out as well, as illustrated in (12) with the VN *ryugaku* 'study abroad.'[4]

(12) *John-wa* **MIT-ni**   *han-tosi*   *ryugaku*   *su-ru-ga*, …
      J-Top   M-Dat   half-year study.abroad do-Pres-but
      'John will go to MIT to study for half a year, but …'
      a. *Tom-wa*   **MIT-ni**   *han-tosi*   *ryugaku*   *si-na-i*.
          T-Top   M-Dat   half-year study.abroad do-Neg-Pres
      b. * *Tom-wa*   **MIT-ni**   *han-tosi*   ~~*ryugaku*~~   *si-na-i*.
      c. * *Tom-wa*   **MIT-ni**   ~~*han-tosi*~~   ~~*ryugaku*~~   *si-na-i*.
      d. *Tom-wa*   ~~**MIT-ni**~~   ~~*han-tosi*~~   ~~*ryugaku*~~   *si-na-i*.
          'Tom won't (go to MIT to study for half a year).'

We take this character to be a hallmark of VPE, which enables us to safely assume that the case of Move-R with VN-ellipsis is unambiguously the case of Move-R out of VPE. For instance, we take (13) as a genuine case of PG, where Contrast-R is respected. Importantly, it is much better than a minimally different example such as (12c), where Contrast-R is violated.

(13) *John-wa* **NYU-ni-WA** *han-tosi*   *ryugaku*   *su-ru-ga*,
      J-Top   N-Dat-Top   half-year study.abroad do-Pres-but
      MIT-ni-WA ~~*han-tosi*~~   ~~*ryugaku*~~   *si-na-i*.
      M-Dat-Top   do-Neg-Pres
      'John will go to NYU to study for half a year, but he won't to MIT.'

---

[4] See Takahashi (2000: 145) for a similar observation.

This much said, let us move on to core data in Japanese. It is shown that the behavior of Move-R under the three environments is not uniform in this language either, but in a slightly different way than in English.

First, consider (14) below, in which we try to leave behind *Tokyo-ni-WA* as a PG remnant, with its correlate *Kyoto-ni-WA* embedded inside Fin-C. The result is severely degraded, which leads us to conclude that Move-R out of Fin-C is prohibited in Japanese.[5]

(14) **John-wa* [*Mary-ga* **Kyoto-ni-WA** *iku-to*] *dangen si-ta-ga*,
      J-Top   M-Nom   K-Dat-Top   go-C   assertion do-Past-but
                           Tokyo-ni-WA   (*mada*) *sitei-na-i.*
                           T-Dat-Top   yet   do-Neg-Pres
    'John asserted that Mary would go to Kyoto, but he didn't to Tokyo.'

Let us turn to SC-C. In the antecedent clause in (15) below, we have SC-C selected by the subject control predicate *kessin su* 'decide.' Here, *Tokyo-ni-WA*, whose correlate is buried inside SC-C, may stand as a licit remnant in the PG clause, indicating that Move-R across SC-C is permitted in Japanese as well. Note in passing that (16), where Contrast-R is not met, is far worse than (15), confirming that what is at work in (15) is indeed PG.

(15) ?*John-wa* [*zitensya-de* **Kyoto-ni-WA** *ikoo-to*] *kessin si-ta-ga*,
      J-Top   bicycle-by   K-Dat-Top   go-C   decision do-Past-but
                           Tokyo-ni-WA   (*mada*) *sitei-na-i.*
                           T-Dat-Top   yet   do-Neg-Pres
    'John decided to go to Kyoto by bicycle, but he didn't to Tokyo.'
(16) **John-wa* [*zitensya-de* **Kyoto-ni** *ikoo-to*] *kessin si-ta-ga*,
      J-Top   bicycle-by   K-Dat   go-C   decision do-Past-but
      Tom-wa   **Kyoto-ni**   (*mada*) *sitei-na-i.*
      T-Top   K-Dat   yet   do-Neg-Pres
    'John decided to go to Kyoto by bicycle, but Tom didn't to Kyoto.'

Finally, let us examine OC-C. The antecedent clause in (17) contains OC-C introduced by the object control predicate *meirei su* 'order.' What is of our interest here is that, its correlate sitting inside OC-C notwithstanding, *Tokyo-ni-wa* is allowed to appear as a PG remnant. Again, although (17) may not be perfect, it is much better than (18), which does not meet Contrast-R.

---

[5] In (14) - (18), the adverb *mada* 'yet' is placed before the stranded empty verb *si* 'do' (suffixed by the progressive/perfective morpheme *tei*, which is not hyphenated in the interest of space), because it makes good cases such as (15) and (17) sound still better for some reason.

(17) ?*John-wa Mary-ni* [***Kyoto-ni-WA*** *iku-yooni*] *meirei si-ta-ga*,
     J-Top   M-Dat   K-Dat-Top   go-C   order do-Past-but
     Tokyo-ni-WA   (*mada*) *sitei-na-i*.
     T-Dat-Top   yet   do-Neg-Past
     'John ordered Mary to go to Kyoto, but he didn't to Tokyo.'

(18) **John-wa Mary-ni* [***Kyoto-ni*** *iku-yooni*] *meirei si-ta-ga*,
     J-Top   M-Dat   K-Dat   go-C   order do-Past-but
     Tom-wa   ***Kyoto-ni***   (*mada*) *sitei-na-i*.
     T-Top   K-Dat   yet   do-Neg-Pres
     'John ordered Mary to go to Kyoto, but Tom didn't to Kyoto.'

The comparison of the two languages with respect to Move-R can be summarized as shown in Table 1.

	MOVE-R IN ENG	MOVE-R IN JPN
across Fin-C	*	*
across SC-C	✓	✓
across OC-C	*	✓

Table 1: Move-R in English and Japanese

It seems that Japanese is slightly more generous than English is, in that Japanese tolerates but English bans Move-R out of OC-C. What sense should we make out of this result? In the next section, we propose that the difference in question should be best attributed to the difference in the nature of Move-R employed in the two languages.

3   Claim

Our claim is that English and Japanese both employ VPE and Move-R, but they resort to different operations in moving remnants. Specifically, we propose that English Move-R is an overt instance of *Quantifier Raising* (QR) (e.g. Johnson 2008, Tanaka 2017a, b), while Japanese Move-R is what we call *semantically non-vacuous scrambling*, which is characterized later. In the following, we demonstrate that this distinction in the identity of Move-R derives the difference between English and Japanese PG.

Let us begin by showing what clause boundary is a barrier to QR. This question is answered in terms of the availability of inverse scope, which we assume is contingent upon QR. In a nutshell, Fin-C and OC-C block QR from inducing inverse scope across them, but SC-C does not, allowing the embedded quantifier to outscope the matrix one, as demonstrated by Baltin (2000), Johnson (2008), and Thoms (2016). For example, consider the paradigm in (19), which shows that inverse scope readings are only available to SC-C.

(19) a. **Someone** thinks [you should kiss **everyone**].
     ∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃   (Thoms 2016: 297)
   b. **Someone** tried [to visit **everyone**].
     ∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃   (Baltin 2000: 52)
   c. I persuaded **someone** [to visit **everyone**].
     ∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃   (Baltin 2000: 54)

Thus, if Move-R in English is QR, then it follows that it cannot get out of Fin-C or OC-C, because QR cannot, either.[6]

Let us then clarify the nature of semantically non-vacuous scrambling (SNVS), which we claim serves as Move-R in Japanese. We characterize SNVS in light of the distribution of *negative concord items* (NCIs). One example of NCIs is XP-*sika* 'only', and it has been suggested that XP-*sika* is interpretable only in the vicinity of or above the position of Neg within the same clause (e.g. Yoshimoto 1995, Miyagawa et. al. 2016). (20) below, for instance, demonstrates that XP-*sika* is uninterpretable if it remains within VP.

(20) a. * *John-wa*   [*zikan-naini*   ***Kyoto-ni-sika***   *tuka*]-***nakat-ta***.
        J-Top   time-in   K-Dat-only   arrive-Neg-Past
        'John arrived only at Kyoto in time.'
   b. *John-wa*   ***Kyoto-ni-sika***   [*zikan-naini*   *t*   *tuka*]-***nakat-ta***.
   c. ***Kyoto-ni-sika***   *John-wa*   [*zikan-naini*   *t*   *tuka*]-***nakat-ta***.

Capitalizing upon this fact, we suggest that any type of scrambling qualifies as SNVS if its application to an NCI can render it interpretable. For example, we claim that scrambling out of *while*-clauses does not count as SVNS, because it does not end up licensing XP-*sika*, as shown in (21).[7]

(21) a. * *Ana-wa* [***Tom-ni-sika*** *hanasikake-nagara*] *benkyo si-**na**-i*.
        A-Top   T-Dat-only   talk-while   study   do-Neg-Pres
        'Ana studies while talking only to Tom.'

---

[6] See Tanaka (2017a, b) for how it is theoretically ensured that the output of QR, which is covert in general, can be realized overtly in the case of PG.

[7] As illustrated in (i), scrambling out of *while*-clauses itself is possible (although slightly awkward), suggesting that *while*-clauses are a barrier only to SNVS.

(i) a. *Ana-wa*   *yoku*   [***Tom-ni*** *hanasikake-nagara*]   *benkyo*   *su-ru*.
        A-Top   often   T-Dat   talk-while   study   do-Pres
        'Ana often studies while talking to Tom'
   b. (?) ***Tom-ni***   *Ana-wa*   *yoku*   [*t*   *hanasikake-nagara*]   *benkyo*   *su-ru*

b. * ***Tom-ni-sika***
 T-Dat-only
 Ana-wa [***t*** *hanasikake-nagara*] *benkyo si-**na**-i.*
 A-Top   talk-while   study do-Neg-Pres

If Move-R in Japanese is SNVS in this sense, it should follow that Move-R out of *while*-clauses is ruled out. The unacceptability of (22) shows that this is the case, and (22) is clearly out in comparison with (23), where Move-R occurs out of the matrix VP.

(22) *Ana-wa [***Tom-ni-WA*** *hanasikake-nagara*] *benkyo su-ru-ga*,
   A-Top T-Dat-Top talk-while   study do-Pres-but
      Bill-ni-WA ~~hanasikake-nagara~~ ~~benkyo~~ *si-na-i.*
      B-Dat-Top   do-Neg-Pres
  'Ana studies while talking to Tom, but she doesn't to Bill.'

(23) *Ana-wa* ***Tom-ni-WA*** [*tabe-nagara*] *denwa* *su-ru-ga*,
   A-Top T-Dat-Top eat-while telephone do-Pres-but
     Bill-ni-WA ~~tabe-nagara~~ ~~denwa~~ *si-na-i.*
     B-Dat-Top   do-Neg-Pres
  'Ana makes calls to Tom while eating, but she doesn't to Bill.'

  Having suggested that SNVS serves as Move-R in Japanese, we now account for the behavior of the latter under the three types of clauses. If Move-R and SNVS are exactly the same type of movement, then scrambling out of Fin-C should not count as SNVS, because it is not an acceptable instance of Move-R. This prediction is borne out, and scrambling out of Fin-C leaves an uninterpretable NCI still uninterpretable, as shown in (24).

(24) a. * *John-wa* [*Tom-ga* *asita* ***Kyoto-ni-sika*** *iku-to*]
     J-Top T-Nom tomorrow K-Dat-only go-C
     dangen *si-**nakat**-ta.*
     assertion do-Neg-Past
     'John asserted that Tom would go only to Kyoto tomorrow.'
  b. * ***Kyoto-ni-sika*** *John-wa* [*Tom-ga* *asita* ***t*** *iku-to*]
     K-Dat-only J-Top T-Nom tomorrow go-C
     dangen *si-**nakat**-ta.*
     assertion do-Neg-Past

On the other hand, scrambling out of SC-C and OC-C should be able to serve as SNVS, given that the two types of clauses do not prohibit Move-R in Japanese. As shown in (25) and (26), this is also a correct prediction; scrambling out of SC-C and OC-C can render an otherwise uninterpretable NCI interpretable.

(25) a. * *John-wa*   [*asita*   *zitensya-de*   ***Kyoto-ni-sika***   *ikoo-to*]
        J-Top   tomorrow bicycle-by   K-Dat-only   go-C
        kessin   *si-**nakat**-ta.*
        decision   do-Neg-Past
        'John decided to go only to Kyoto by bicycle tomorrow.'

     b. ? ***Kyoto-ni-sika*** *John-wa*   [*asita*   *zitensya-de t*   *ikoo-to*]
        K-Dat-only   J-Top   tomorrow bicycle-by   go-C
        kessin   *si-**nakat**-ta.*
        decision   do-Neg-Past

(26) a. * *John-wa*   *Tom-ni*   [*asita*   ***Kyoto-ni-sika***   *iku-yooni*]
        J-Top   T-Dat   tomorrow   K-Dat-only   go-C
        meirei   *si-**nakat**-ta.*
        order   do-Neg-Past
        'John ordered Tom to go only to Kyoto tomorrow.'

     b. ? ***Kyoto-ni-sika*** *John-wa*   *Tom-ni* [*asita*   *t*   *iku-yooni*]
        K-Dat-only   J-Top   T-Dat   tomorrow   go-C
        meirei   *si-**nakat**-ta.*
        order   do-Neg-Past

Thus, if Move-R in Japanese is SNVS, then it follows that it can get out of SC-C and OC-C, because SNVS can, too.

In summary, we have shown that QR in English can only get out of SC-C, while SNVS in Japanese can get out of SC-C and OC-C. These results are given in Table 2, and exactly correspond to those in Table 1.

	QR in Eng	SNVS in Jpn
across Fin-C	*	*
across SC-C	✓	✓
across OC-C	*	✓

Table 2: QR in English and SNVS in Japanese

It is therefore reasonable to identify Move-R in English and Japanese with QR and SNVS, respectively, because this distinction derives the difference between Move-R in English and Japanese. That is, the former cannot get out of OC-C, because QR cannot, while the latter can get out of OC-C, because SNVS can.

4   Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that English PG and Japanese PG are uniformly characterized as Move-R out of VPE, minimally differing in the identity of Move-R. Before closing the paper, we would like to note that our study poses a potential challenge to Thoms's (2016) approach to English

PG; namely, it does not work for the analysis of Japanese PG. To make the point, let us begin by sharing Thoms's proposal.

Slightly departing from the widely accepted view on PG, Thoms maintains that the derivation of PG involves not only movement of the remnant but also movement of the correlate. To be more precise, he proposes that, while the remnant must move to the specifier of a *TP-internal Focus Phrase* (FocP), its correlate must also move to a parallel position by *covert QR*, as schematically shown in (27).

(27) Mary doesn't like **John**, but she does _ **Tom**.
 Covert QR: [Mary doesn't [$_{FocP}$ **John** λx. [like x]]]
 Overt Focus Movement: [she does   [$_{FocP}$ **Tom** λy. [~~like y~~]]]

Importantly, he attributes the covert QR of the correlate to a *Scope Parallelism* (SP) condition on ellipsis (including but not limited to PG) in (28), which requires that the correlate move to [Spec, FocP] so that the antecedent clause obtains a variable-binding relation syntactically parallel to that in the ellipsis clause.

(28) **Scope Parallelism in Ellipsis**
 Variables in the antecedent and the elided clause are bound from parallel positions.   (Thoms 2016: 295; see also Griffiths and Lipták 2014)

To simplify somewhat, Thoms's approach amounts to saying that Move-R is blocked whenever QR of the correlate is blocked. For instance, he claims that Move-R out of Fin-C should be ruled out as a violation of SP, because it is impossible for QR to extract the correlate out of Fin-C. Thus, there is a nontrivial difference between our approach and Thoms's, in that we do not postulate obligatory movement of the correlate, but Thoms does.

Here is a potential limitation with Thoms's approach. If the SP condition is a universal principle holding crosslinguistically, then it should follow that Japanese PG must also apply parallel movement of the correlate, regardless of whether the movement is overt or covert. We demonstrate that this is not the case. More specifically, we argue that the SP condition *undergenerates* for Japanese PG, incorrectly excluding acceptable instances. For example, considering the case of Move-R out of SC-C, we show that its availability does not rely on movement of the correlate, be it overt or covert. First of all, it must be the case that Move-R out of SC-C does not rely on covert QR of the correlate, because Japanese does not allow covert QR out of SC-C from the very beginning. This is illustrated in (29), where the embedded quantifier cannot outscope the matrix one.

(29) **Dareka-ga** [**dono-basyo-ni-mo** *ikoo-to*] *kessin si-ta.*
someone-Nom which-place-Dat-also go-C decision do-Past
'Someone decided to go to every place.'
∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃

Moreover, it is also true that Move-R out of SC-C does not rely on overt scrambling of the correlate. For instance, as shown in (30), the correlate need not overtly move over a matrix adjunct such as *sudeni* 'already', and may remain within the embedded SC-C.

(30) ?*John-wa* <u>*sudeni*</u> [*mata* **Kyoto-ni-WA** *ikoo-to*] *kessin sitei-ru-ga*,
J-Top already again K-Dat-Top go-C decision do-Pres-but
Tokyo-ni-WA *mada sitei-na-i.*
T-Dat-Top yet do-Neg-Pres
'John has already decided to go to Kyoto again, but he hasn't to To-kyo yet.'

Thus, for the availability of Move-R in Japanese, there is no need of covert or overt movement of the correlate. This means that Thoms's SP condition wrongly rules out the acceptable example in (30), and this fact requires his approach to dismiss the SP condition for the analysis of Japanese PG.

   In conclusion, our study has suggested that the SP condition defined as in (28) is not universal. We further point out that it may not be a valid generalization even for English PG. For instance, let us consider the fact that the PG construction cannot be used to answer *wh*-questions, which is observed by Thoms (2016).

(31) A: **What** (**else**) did he eat?
     B: *He did **a salad**. (Thoms 2016: 302)

The SP condition correctly rules out (31B), because the correlate (i.e. *what*) and the remnant (i.e. *a salad*) are not in parallel positions. However, as noted by Tanaka (2017b), the same account cannot be applied to (32B), because they appear to occupy parallel positions in this case.

(32) A: **What else** did he eat?
     B: ***A salad** he did. (Tanaka 2017b: 17)

Although we remain agnostic as to exactly why (31B) and (32B) are excluded, we suggest that their degraded status should be captured by other means than the SP condition. We hope that our suggestion stimulates further discussion of PG, as Thoms's insightful study has done it for us.

References

Baltin, M. 2000. Implications of Pseudo-gapping for Binding and the Representation of Information Structure. ms., New York University.

Fujii, T. 2006. Some Theoretical Issues in Japanese Control. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Funakoshi, K. 2016. Verb-stranding Verb Phrase Ellipsis in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 25: 113–142.

Griffiths, J. and A. Lipták. 2014. Contrast and Island-Sensitivity in Clausal Ellipsis. *Syntax* 17: 189–234.

Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester. 1988. Light Verbs and θ-Marking. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 205–232.

Hayashi, S. 2015. Head Movement in an Agglutinative SOV Language. Doctoral dissertation, Yokohama National University.

Jayaseelan, K. A. 1990. Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis* 20: 64–81.

Johnson, K. 2008. The View of QR from Ellipsis. *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. K. Johnson, 69–94, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miyagawa, S., N. Nishioka, and H. Zeijlstra. 2016. Negative Sensitive Items and the Discourse-configurational Nature of Japanese. *Glossa* 1(1): 33, 1–28.

Lasnik H. 1995. A Note on Pseudogapping. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 27: Papers on Minimalist Syntax*, ed. R. Pensalfini and H. Ura, 143–163.

Levin, N. 1979. Main Verb Ellipsis in Spoken English. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Oku, S. 1998. A Theory of Selection and Reconstruction in the Minimalist Program. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Otani, K. and J. Whitman. 1991. V-raising and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 345–358.

Saito, M. 2007. Notes on East Asian Argument Ellipsis. *Language Research* 43: 203–227.

Sakamoto, Y. 2017. Escape from Silent Syntax. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Takahashi, M. 2000. The Syntax and Morphology of Japanese Verbal Nouns. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Tanaka, H. 2017a. Pseudo-gapping: Evidence for Overt Quantifier Raising. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 23-1: 271–280.

Tanaka, H. 2017b. Pseudo-gapping: An Alleged Case for Scope Parallelism. lingbuzz/003821.

Thoms, G. 2016. Pseudogapping, Parallelism, and the Scope of Focus. *Syntax* 19: 286–307.

Yoshimoto, Y. 1995. The Terrain and Locality of Negative Polarity Items. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.