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1 Introduction

In this article we consider reduced nominal phrases in the Nagasaki dialect of Japanese (hereafter, Nagasaki Japanese or just NJ), which is one of the dialects spoken on the islands of Kyushu. We argue that they involve ellipsis despite the fact that they apparently contain a pro-form.

Before going to Nagasaki Japanese, let us consider the examples from Standard Japanese (SJ) below:
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Example (1a) corresponds to *Though Haruna's attitude toward research is good*, which may be followed either by (1b) or by (1c). In (1b) the part corresponding to *attitude toward research* is repeatedly used. On the other hand, (1c) avoids the repetition and the relevant portion is missing. So SJ allows this kind of reduction of nominal phrases.

There have been two lines of analysis proposed for the reduction in question in the literature. One is what we call the NP-ellipsis analysis and it is proposed by Saito and Murasugi (1990), among others (see Jackendoff (1971) and Lobeck (1995) for discussions about NP-ellipsis, previously known as N'-deletion, in English and other languages). According to this analysis, the reduced nominal phrase in (1c) is analyzed as in (2).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(2)} & \quad [\text{DP } \text{Mariko-no } [\text{D'} [\text{NP } \text{kenkyuu-nitaisuru-taido } ] ] ] \\
& \text{Mariko-GEN research-toward attitude}
\end{align*}
\]

The whole structure is DP, the remnant genitive phrase *Mariko-no* is located in its specifier position, and the NP part containing the head noun *attitude* and the internal argument *toward research* is elided (we indicate ellipsis by strike-through). Note that one important consequence of the NP-ellipsis analysis is that the nominal phrase in Japanese must be the projection of a functional head selecting NP as its complement. To see why, let us look at (3).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(3)} & \quad [\text{NP } \text{Mariko-no } [\text{N'/NP } \text{kenkyuu-nitaisuru-taido } ] ] \\
& \text{Mariko-GEN research-toward attitude}
\end{align*}
\]

If the whole nominal phrase were an NP, as was standardly assumed until the early 1980s, it would be necessary to apply ellipsis to N’ or the lower segment of NP depending on whether the remnant genitive phrase is in the specifier position or is adjoined to NP, and it should not be allowed because
neither intermediate projections nor segments of adjunction can be targeted by transformations.

The other analysis of the reduction in question is what we may call the “pronoun plus haplology” analysis, which is proposed by Okutsu (1974) and has recently been revived by Li (2011) and Bae (2012). These researchers note that in SJ, the pro-form corresponding to the pronoun one in English is expressed as no, which happens to have the same phonetic form as the genitive marker (see also Kitagawa and Ross (1982)). Consider the following examples:

(4) a. Haruna-wa akai wanpiisu-o katta.
   Haruna-TOP red one-piece.dress-ACC bought
   ‘Haruna bought a red one-piece dress.’

b. Mariko-wa aoi no-o katta.
   Mariko-TOP blue one-ACC bought
   ‘Mariko bought a blue one.’

Here (4a) is intended to be followed by (4b), where the nominal expression wanpiisu ‘one-piece dress’ in (4a) is replaced with the pro-form no ‘one.’ From (1) and (4b), we can know that it is isomorphic to the genitive marker. The pronoun plus haplology analysis assumes that the reduced nominal in (1c) has the underlying form indicated below:

(5) [NP Mariko-no no ]
   Mariko-GEN one

In (5) the whole expression is headed by the pronoun no, which is deleted by haplology because we have a sequence of two phonetically identical expressions, namely the genitive marker no and the pronoun no. Just for convenience, we illustrate the analysis in such a way that the pronoun no, not the genitive marker no, is subject to deletion by haplology.

Recently Li (2011) and Bae (2012) have claimed that Japanese lacks D and hence DP (see Bošković (2008) and Fukui (1986), among others, for that issue). Accordingly, Japanese should not have NP-ellipsis, either, because NP-ellipsis must be licensed by D as indicated in (2). Therefore, they argue that reduced nominal phrases as in (1c) should not involve NP-ellipsis, but rather the pro-form. They point out that in the dialects of Japanese where the genitive marker and the pronoun have different phonetic forms, the pronoun does surface in their counterparts of (1c). Among the relevant dialects they mention is Nagasaki Japanese. We illustrate relevant facts in NJ below:
First, (6a) shows that the genitive marker in NJ is に: irrespective of the type of head nouns, the possessor Takuya is accompanied by に. Second, (6b) is the NJ counterpart of (4b): notice that the pronoun corresponding to one in English is expressed as と. Of interest to us is (7), where the pronoun と is overtly expressed and follows Mariko- nya: the sentence is literally translated as Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s one. This fact is directly predicted by the pronoun plus haplology analysis, which just says that haplology is not operative so that the pronoun comes to the surface. On the other hand, the NP-ellipsis analysis would have difficulty accommodating (7) since it would not assume that the pro-form is involved in NP-ellipsis.

As far as we can see, however, Li (2011) and Bae (2012) merely point out the existence of cases like (7), and stop short of showing whether reduced nominal phrases like the ones in (1c) and (7) really do not involve ellipsis. In order to resolve the issue, we have undertaken to examine whether reduced nominals in NJ really do not involve ellipsis, and what follows is an interim report of our research on NJ. What we have so far discovered indicates that although they apparently employ the pro-form strategy, cases like (7) actually involve ellipsis.

2 Reduced Nominal Phrases in Nagasaki Japanese

In this section, we take a close look at reduced nominal phrases in NJ. When we began to undertake this research, we thought that the possibility of sloppy interpretation could provide us with a litmus test to determine whether ellipsis is involved or not. This was based on the contrast between (8a) and (8b).

(8) a. John loves his wife, and Bill loves her, too.
    b. John loves his wife, and Bill does, too.

(9) a. Bill loves John’s wife.  <strict interpretation>
    b. Bill loves Bill’s wife.  <sloppy interpretation>
In (8a), the second clause contains the pronoun *her*, which we take to be anaphorically dependent on the object of the first clause. The example is limited to the so-called strict interpretation in (9a). In contrast, in (8b), the second clause has VP-ellipsis, and as is well-known, it is ambiguous between the strict interpretation in (9a) and the sloppy interpretation in (9b). So the sloppy interpretation in (9b) is only available with ellipsis.

Bearing that in mind, let us consider the following data from NJ:

(10) a. Satuma-n soko-n tonosama-e-n tyuusei-wa
    Satsuma-GEN it-GEN lord-to-GEN loyalty-TOP
    rikaidekiru batten,
    understandable though
    ‘Though Satsuma’s loyalty to its lord is understandable,’

b. Simabara-n to-wa rikaidekin.
    Shimabara-GEN one-TOP not.understandable
    ‘lit. Shimabara’s one is not understandable.’

(11) a. Shimabara’s loyalty to Satsuma’s lord is not understandable.
    b. Shimabara’s loyalty to Shimabara’s lord is not understandable.

In (10a) the pronoun *soko ‘it/there’* is intended to be bound by the first genitive phrase *Satsuma*. The sentence serves as the antecedent sentence for (10b), where the subject is a reduced nominal phrase consisting of the genitive phrase and the alleged pronoun *to*. In the context given, (10a) is ambiguous between the strict reading in (11a) and the sloppy reading in (11b). In particular, the possibility of the sloppy reading appears to suggest the involvement of ellipsis.

Things are not that simple, however. The reduced nominal phrase in English in (12), which is cited from Llombart-Huesca (2002), does permit sloppy interpretation, in spite of the fact that it contains the pro-form *one*.

(12) I saw Janet’s beautiful picture of her cat and Jack saw Julie’s ugly one.

We do not think that the existence of cases like (12) immediately leads to the conclusion that reduced nominals in NJ should be analyzed as involving pronominalization (in fact, Llombart-Huesca (2002) argues on the basis of cases like (12) that the construction with the pro-form *one* actually involves ellipsis). That said, it at least obscures the picture. So it is preferable if we can find clearer evidence for ellipsis.
For that purpose, we may consider the possibility of extracting an element out of an elided constituent. Let us consider the schematic representations below:

\[(13) \quad \begin{align*}
    &\text{a. } \ldots [XP \alpha X \beta] \ldots \\
    &\text{b. } \ldots \beta \ldots [XP \alpha X \tau] \ldots \\
    &\text{c. } \ldots \beta \ldots [XP \Rightarrow X \tau] \ldots 
\end{align*}\]

In (13a), XP contains some elements within it. Suppose XP is fated to be elided. But before ellipsis applies, some element internal to XP, say, \(\beta\), may evacuate from XP by movement, as shown in (13b); in (13c), ellipsis applies to XP, but \(\beta\) survives and is overtly expressed in the dislocated position. This kind of phenomenon is attested in a number of elliptic constructions such as sluicing, pseudogapping, and so on. The possibility of extracting an element can be used to test the involvement of ellipsis, because it necessitates the existence of full-fledged internal structure prior to reduction.

In this connection, let us consider the following examples in NJ:

\[(14) \quad \begin{align*}
    &\text{a. } \text{Haruna-n piano-n toariatukai-wa teineiya kedo}, \\
        &\quad \text{Haruna-GEN piano-GEN handling-TOP careful though} \\
        &\quad \text{‘Though Haruna’s handling of the piano is careful,’} \\
    &\text{b. } \text{Mariko-n to-wa sozatuya ne.} \\
        &\quad \text{Mariko-GEN one-TOP rough PART} \\
        &\quad \text{‘lit. Mariko’s one is rough.’} \\
    &\text{c. } \text{Mariko-n furuuto-n to-wa sozatuya ne.} \\
        &\quad \text{Mariko-GEN flute-GEN one-TOP rough PART} \\
        &\quad \text{‘lit. Mariko’s one of the flute is rough.’} 
\end{align*}\]

The subject in (14a) is headed by the noun corresponding to \textit{handling}, which takes two arguments, \textit{Haruna}, an external argument, and \textit{piano}, an internal argument. (14a) can be followed either by (14b), which is literally like \textit{Mariko’s one is rough}, meaning Mariko’s handling of the piano is rough, or by (14c), which is literally like \textit{Mariko’s one of the flute is rough}. Particularly important is (14c), where the internal argument of the missing noun, namely \textit{the flute}, survives reduction.\(^1\) For (14b), we assume that the phrasal constituent corresponding to \textit{handling of the piano} is understood. In analyzing (14c), let us keep the assumption that a phrasal constituent is

\(^1\) Incidentally, this is observed for Standard Japanese by Kimura (1994). The English counterpart with the pronoun \textit{one}, which results in ungrammaticality, is discussed by Jackendoff (1977).
missing. Then we are led to assume that (14c) should be analyzed as indicated below:

(15) \[DP\text{ Mariko-GEN} [DP\text{ flute-GEN}\ D'\ [\ldots [NP\text{ flute-handling}]] to] D]]\]

The two remnant genitive phrases are in the edge positions of DP; especially the internal argument flute-GEN must be dislocated by movement, and moreover, to θ-mark it, the head noun must be present underlyingly; finally ellipsis applies to elide the phrase containing the noun and the trace (or copy) of the internal argument. Thus, (14c) is an indication that the internal structure of NP exists in the underlying form, which is nothing but what the NP-ellipsis analysis postulates.

Another argument for the existence of ellipsis in NJ comes from what we call “covert” extraction. Let us explain step by step, beginning with the following example in SJ:

(16) Azia-no ikka-koku-no taitei-no sosiki-kara-no
Asia-GEN one-country-GEN most-GEN organization-from-GEN
dattai-wa mitomerareta.
withdrawal-TOP was approved
‘One Asian country’s withdrawal from most organizations was approved.’

In this example the subject nominal phrase contains two quantified phrases, one Asian country and most organizations. In (16), the former asymmetrically takes wide scope over the latter, which is natural in light of the widely accepted view that scope rigidity holds in multiply quantified structure in Japanese (Kuno (1973) and Kuroda (1971), among others): namely, when two quantifiers show up preserving the basic word order, the higher one asymmetrically takes wide scope over the lower one. Scope ambiguity can be obtained if we apply scrambling to the lower quantifier, as in (17), where we assume that the internal argument PP from most organizations is adjoined to DP by scrambling.

(17) Taitei-no sosiki-kara-no azia-no ikka-koku-no
most-GEN organization-from-GEN Asia-GEN one-country-GEN
dattai-wa mitomerareta.
withdrawal-TOP was approved.
‘lit. From most organizations one Asian country’s withdrawal was approved.’

Let us now combine (16) and (17) with NP-ellipsis. First, let us look at (18).
(18) a. Azia-no ikka-koku-no taitei-no sosiki-kara-no Asia-GEN one-country-GEN most-GEN organization-from-GEN dattai-wa mitomerareta ga, withdrawal-TOP was.approved though ‘Though one Asian country’s withdrawal from most organizations was approved,’

b. yooroppa-no ikka-koku-no-wa mitomerarenakatta. Europe-GEN one-country-GEN-TOP was.not.approved ‘one European country’s was not approved.’

(18a) has the same arrangement of the two quantifiers as (16) and is intended to be followed by the reduced sentence in (18b). According to Takahashi (2008b), both (18a) and (18b) have the scope interpretation in which one asymmetrically takes wide scope over most. This is natural because in (18a), the two quantifiers are arranged in conformity to the basic word order.

Let us now turn our attention to (19).

(19) a. Taitei-no sosiki-kara-no azia-no ikka-koku-no most-GEN organization-from-GEN Asia-GEN one-country-GEN dattai-wa mitomerareta ga, withdrawal-TOP was.approved though ‘lit. Though from most organizations one Asian country’s withdrawal was approved,’

b. yooroppa-no ikka-koku-no-wa mitomerarenakatta. Europe-GEN one-country-GEN-TOP was.not.approved ‘one European country’s was not approved.’

While (19b) is the same as (18b), (19a) is slightly different from (18a) in that the internal PP argument from most organizations is scrambled to precede one Asian country. Very interestingly, Takahashi (2008b) observes that (19a-b) are ambiguous in a parallel fashion, just as Fox (2000) notes for VP-ellipsis in English. That is, when (19a) has the reading in which most takes wide scope, (19b) too has that scope interpretation; similarly, when (19a) has the reading in which one has wide scope, (19b) too has that scope interpretation.

Below we illustrate Takahashi’s (2008b) analysis of (19a-b) with the reading where most scopes out one (just for convenience, we represent them with English words).
(20)  a.  [DP one Asian country’s [NP withdrawal from most organizations ]] ... 
   a’. [DP one European country’s [NP withdrawal from most organizations ]] ... 
   b. [DP from most organizations [DP one Asian country’s 
         [NP withdrawal _p]]] ... 
   b’. [DP from most organizations [DP one European country’s 
         [NP withdrawal _p]]] ... 
   c. [DP from most organizations [DP one Asian country’s 
         [NP withdrawal _p]]] ... 
   c’. [DP from most organizations [DP one European country’s 
         [NP withdrawal _p]]] ... 

(20a’-a”) show the underlying forms of (19a-b), respectively. (20b’-b”) are derived from (20a’-a”), respectively, by applying scrambling to the internal PP arguments in a parallel fashion. Finally, two ellipsis operations apply to (20c’-c”) to derive the surface form of (19b): NP-ellipsis elides NP and what is called argument ellipsis elides the scrambled PP internal argument.2 What is important in (20) is that in (20b”) extraction takes place out of the ultimately elided NP, though the effect of the extraction too is ultimately made invisible by argument ellipsis.

Bearing this in mind, let us consider (21), which is the NJ counterpart of (19).

(21)  a. Taitei-no sosiki-kara-azia-n ikka-koku-n 
         most-GEN organization-from-GEN Asia-GEN one-country-GEN 
         dattai-wa mitomerareta kedo, 
         withdrawal-TOP was.approved though 
         ‘lit. Though from most organizations one Asian country’s withdrawal was approved,’

   b. yooroppa-n ikka-koku-n to-wa mitomerarenyatta. 
      Europe-GEN one-country-GEN one-TOP was.not.approved 
      ‘lit. one European country’s one was not approved.’

In (21a), which is comparable to (19a), the internal PP argument is scrambled. It is followed by (21b), where the subject nominal phrase is reduced and has the alleged pro-form to. Though we have the alleged pronoun, (21b) can have the reading where most takes wide scope, provided that the preceding sentence (21a) also has that reading. Given the analysis in

---

2 Argument ellipsis is assumed in the literature to be available in Japanese grammar. Because of space limitation, we do not go into argument ellipsis here and just assume it is available. Interested readers are referred to Takahashi (2008a) and the references therein.
(20), (21b) ought to involve “covert” extraction of the internal PP argument, which necessitates the NP structure to be present underlyingly.

To sum up, it seems that NP-ellipsis is indeed available in NJ, where reduced nominal phrases in question are composed of genitive remnants and the alleged pro-form. Therefore, that such expressions exist in some dialects does not necessarily refute the NP-ellipsis analysis for Japanese.

3 An Analysis and Implications

If reduced nominals in NJ, which contain the alleged pro-form, actually involve ellipsis, how can we analyze them? Here we propose an analysis, pointing out one of its implications for SJ. But before getting to our analysis, let us note some further properties of the relevant construction in NJ. First of all, the alleged pro-form to never co-occurs with overt nouns, as shown below:

(22) a. *Haruna-n taido-wa Mariko-n taido to yorimo Haruna-GEN attitude-TOP Mariko-GEN attitude one than rippayatta. good
   ‘lit. Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s attitude one.’

   b. *Haruna-n taido-wa Mariko-n to taido yorimo Haruna-GEN attitude-TOP Mariko-GEN one attitude than rippayatta. good
   ‘lit. Haruna’s attitude was better than Mariko’s one attitude.’

In (22a) the overt noun taido ‘attitude’ occurs and precedes to, whereas in (22b) it follows it. Both sentences are impossible.

Next, in (23), we consider the location of to relative to the number (#) and classifier heads.

   ‘lit. Haruna bought Murakami’s three books.’

   b. Mariko-wa [Isaka-n to ni-satu]-ba katta. Mariko-TOP Isaka-GEN one two-CL-ACC bought
   ‘lit. Mariko bought Isaka’s two ones.’

In (23a), the object nominal phrase contains the noun hon, which is followed by the number/classifier expression sansatu. Here we simply assume that Japanese phrase structure is head-final, and hence in (23a), the noun should be structurally lower than the number/classifier heads. As
shown in (23b), the head noun book can be replaced by the alleged pro-form to, without causing any word order change. This indicates that to is also lower than the number/classifier heads.

Given these, we propose the structures below ((see Cheng and Sybesma (1999) and Watanabe (2006) for analyses of nominal phrases containing # and classifier heads).

(24)  a. \[ DP Isaka-n [ D' [ CLP [ #P [ NP honN ] to ] satu ] 2s ] D ] \]

\( (24a) \) is the structure of the reduced nominal in (23b), where to co-occurs with the number and classifier elements. The topmost projection is DP and the genitive phrase is in its specifier position; below DP we have the projections of # and classifier: since the final form is the number followed by the classifier, that is ni-satu ‘2-CL,’ we just assume either that the classifier head moves to # or that they are morphologically merged: in either case, what is important is that below Classifier Phrase, we have NP and the alleged pro-form to is actually an n head, which in turn selects NP, whose head is hon ‘book’ in this case. To derive the ultimate form, we assume that NP must undergo ellipsis in this configuration.\(^3\)

When there is no #/classifier head, we have the structure in (24b), which is the structure of the reduced nominal in (?) Mariko’s one, meaning Mariko’s attitude. Here too, the NP headed by the noun taido ‘attitude’ is the complement of the n head to. The NP must be elided to obtain the actual surface form.

To capture the obligatory ellipsis of the NP selected by to, we may assume that the n head to contains what Merchant (2001) calls the E(ellipsis)-feature, which instructs PF not to pronounce its complement. Or it may simply be a realization of the E-feature for NP-ellipsis.

We may apply the basic idea to SJ, as shown below:

(25) \[ DP Mariko-no [ D' [ NP taidoN ] no ] D ] \]

Just as to in NJ is reanalyzed as an n head, its counterpart in SJ, namely the so-called pronoun no, may be regarded as an n head, which selects an NP complement and demands that it be deleted because it contains an E-feature. As indicated in (25), if NP is elided, the genitive marker on Mariko is immediately followed by the n head no. We can follow the previous literature and assume that somehow, SJ does not tolerate a sequence of two

\(^3\) When an element is extracted from NP, as discussed in the previous section, it evacuates NP before deletion applies. See Aelbrecht (2009) and Baltin (2012), among others, for recent discussions concerning extraction out of elided constituents.
no's and that haplology deletes one of them to derive the surface form of reduced nominals such as the one in (1c). This amounts to a hybrid analysis of the NP-ellipsis analysis and the haplology analysis. An obvious advantage is that we can draw attractive features from both analyses, though we leave a detailed examination of this possibility to our future research.

4 Conclusion

To conclude, we provided some arguments that reduced nominal phrases with the alleged pronoun to in NJ actually involve NP-ellipsis. The mere presence of the alleged pro-form, therefore, does not suffice to deny the involvement of NP-ellipsis. In presenting our analysis, we suggested that the alleged pronoun is actually an n head with an E-feature for NP-ellipsis, whereby we can handle the fact that it never co-occurs with overt nouns. An important consequence is that the nominal phrase in Japanese cannot simply be NP: it must contain the projection of a functional head that licenses NP-ellipsis, though it is left open to identify exactly what category the functional head belongs to.
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