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On Soo pro-form replacement sentences†

YAMASHINA, Miyuki

【要 旨】
In this paper soo pro-form replacement sentences in Japanese are examined. There are two types of sentences containing the pro-form. One is where the pro-form substitutes for a clausal complement as in Hanako-wa soo omotteiru “Hanako thinks so,” and the other is a sentence where the pro-form is followed by the copula da, as in John-mo soo da “John did so, too.” Sakamoto (2016) gives a PF deletion analysis to the clausal complement sentences and accounts for the fact that only A-movement is allowed from the ellipsis site by following Bošković’s (2014) derivational approach to ellipsis. We will discuss some new data that appear to pose a problem for Sakamoto’s analysis and offer a solution to that problem. Then, we will also show that extension of his analysis to the second type of soo replacement sentences is not tenable.

【Key Words】Soo pro-form replacement, Ellipsis, Syntax, Generative grammar

0. Introduction
This paper examines Japanese pro-form soo substitution sentences illustrated in (1)-(2).

(1) a Bill-ga \[C_P \text{[TP kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta to]} \text{ it-ta ga},\]
Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but
“Bill said that John bought a book yesterday, and,”

b Jissai \[TP kinoo John-wa hon-o kat-ta\]
actually yesterday John-TOP book-ACC buy-PAST
“Actually he bought a book yesterday.”

c Bill-ga \[C_P \text{[TP kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta]} \text{ to]} \text{ itta ga},\]
Bill-NOM yesterday John-TOP book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but
“Bill said that John bought a book yesterday, but”

d Jissai \[soo\] \text{ da}
actually so COPULA
“actually it is so.”
(2)  a Hanako-wa [CP Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta to] omotteiru shi,  
    Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM Puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think and  
    “Hanako thinks that Taroo ate Puffer fish, and”  

    b Sachiko-mo [CP Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta to] omotteiru  
    Sachiko-also Taroo-NOM puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think  
    “Sachiko thinks that Taroo ate puffer fish, too.”  

    c Hanako-wa [CP Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta to] omotteiru shi,  
    Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think and  
    “Hanako thinks that Taroo ate puffer fish, and”  

    d Sachiko-mo [soo] omotteiru  
    Sachiko-also so think  
    “Sachiko thinks so, too.”  

(1b) and (2b) are non-elision sentences and (1d) and (2d) are corresponding elision version in which the pro-form soo seems to replace the TP kinoo John-ga hon-o katta “John bought a book yesterday” in (1b), and the embedded CP Taroo-ga Fugu-o tabe-ta to “that Taroo age puffer fish” in (2b). The copula da is also inserted in the sentence final position in (1d)\(^1\). For convenience, we will call the former type “soo da replacement sentences” and the latter “clausal complement replacement sentences,” and we will refer to both together as soo replacement sentences. In this paper we examine the structure of soo replacement sentences such as (1d) and (2d) and their syntactic behaviors. Sakamoto (2016) gives a syntactic analysis for examples such as (2c,d). We will attempt to extend his analysis to cases like (1c,d).

The organization of this paper is as follows; Section 1 gives a brief overview of some characteristics of the soo da replacement sentences in need of explanation. In section 2 as we review Sakamoto’s (2016) analysis of the clausal complement replacement, we will also examine details of the construction. A new set of extraction data that might pose a problem to his analysis will be discussed. In section 3, we will attempt to extend his analysis to soo da replacement sentences. It will be shown that Sakamoto’s analysis cannot be extended as it is to explain the data regarding sentences like (1c,d).

1. Properties of soo da replacement sentences

This section focuses on soo da replacement sentences. Examples of such sentences are given in (1c,d)(repeated here as (3)) and (4).
(3) a Bill-ga [TP kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta] to it-ta ga,  
   Bill-NOM yesterday John-TOP book-ACC buy-PAST COMP say-PAST but  
   “Bill said that John bought a book yesterday, but”

b Jissai [soo] da  
   actually so COPULA  
   “actually it is so.”

(4) a Hanako-wa [CP Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta to omotteiru shi,  
   Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think and  
   “Hanako thinks that Taroo ate Puffer fish, and”

b Sachiko-mo [soo da to] omotteiru  
   Sachiko-also so COP COMP think  
   “Sachiko thinks so, too.”

What soo substitutes for in (4b) seems to be the part “Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta”\(^2\).  
Unlike the clausal complement replacement sentences as in (2d), in (4b) the complementizer to “that” has to be present after the copula da.  
Soo da replacement sentences look similar to stripping sentences illustrated in (5) and (6)\(^3\).

**Stripping**

(5) a Bill-ga [CP kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta to] itta ga,  
   Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but  
   “Yesterday John bought a book, but”

b jissai Mary(-ga) da  
   actually Mary(-NOM) COPULA  
   “Actually Mary did.”

(6) a Hanako-wa [CP Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta to] omotteiru shi,  
   Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think and  
   “Hanako thinks that Taroo ate Puffer fish, and”

b Sachiko-wa [CP Mary(-ga) da to] omotteiru  
   Sachiko-TOP Mary(-NOM) COP COMP think  
   “Sachiko thinks Mary did.”
However, stripping sentences and *soo da* replacement sentences differ. As (7b) and (8b) show, scrambling an object DP in the second clause is fine in a stripping sentence, while it is not allowed in a *soo da* replacement sentence.

(7) a Bill-ga kinoo John-ga hon-o katta to itta ga,
    Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said and
    “Bill said that yesterday John bought a book, but”

    b zasshi-o jissai kinoo Mary(-ga) da
    magazine-ACC actually yesterday Mary-NOM COP
    “a magazine actually Mary did yesterday.”

(8) a Bill-ga kinoo John-ga hon-o katta to itta ga,
    Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but
    “Bill said that yesterday John bought a book, but”

    b *zasshi-o Jissai soo da
    magazine-ACC actually soo COP
    “a magazine actually he did.”

2. Sakamoto (2016)

2.1 Ellipsis as PF deletion

In this section I will discuss Sakamoto’s (2016) analysis of clausal complement anaphora *soo*. Sakamoto argues, based on the fact that the complement clause and *soo* can cooccur as in (9b), that *soo* heads a maximal projection which takes a CP as its complement, as illustrated in (10).

(9) a Taroo-wa Hanako-ga uti-ni kaet-ta to omotteiru
    Taroo-TOP Hanako-NOM home-at return-PAST COMP think
    “Taroo thinks that Hanako returned home.”

    b Ziroo-mo Hanako-ga uti-ni kaet-ta to soo omotteiru
    Ziroo-also Hanako-NOM home-at return-PAST COMP so think
    “Ziroo also thinks that Hanako returned home, too.”

(10) [SooP [ CP ] soo]

Thus, in his analysis, it is not that *soo* substitutes for the complement CP, but that the latter gets elided when the condition in (11) is met.
He shows that clausal complement ellipsis with soō is a case of surface anaphora (Hankamer and Sag (1976)) by pointing out the possibility of extraction out of the elided site and the availability of sloppy identity (Merchant (2013)). He claims that the extraction pattern the construction exhibits can be explained by assuming a PF deletion analysis of ellipsis. Sakamoto observes the following properties in terms of restrictions on extraction for clausal complement replacement with soō.

(12) ✓ = Extraction out of a soō phrase is possible.
     * = Extraction out of a soō phrase is NOT possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt A’-movement</th>
<th>Overt A-movement</th>
<th>OP movement</th>
<th>QR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction out of the pro-form soō (out of the complement CP of soō for Sakamoto) is possible via overt A-movement such as ECM (exceptional case-marking), covert operator movement like comparative deletion, and Quantifier Raising, but it is impossible if it is done by overt A’-movement such as long-distance scrambling. An ungrammatical case of overt A’-movement out of pro-form soō based on examples from the previous section is given in (13d).

(13) a Fugu-o Hanako-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omotteiru kedo,
Puffer fish-ACC Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think but
“Puffer fish, Hanako thinks that Taroo ate, but

b Dokuturudake-o Sachiko-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omotteiru
destroying angel-ACC Sachiko-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think
“destroying angel, Sachiko thinks Taro ate.”

c Fugu-o Hanako-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omotteiru kedo,
Puffer fish-ACC Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think but
“Puffer fish, Hanako thinks that Taroo ate, but

d * Dokuturudake-o Sachiko-wa soo omotteiru
destroying angel-ACC Sachiko-TOP so think
“destroying angel, Sachiko thinks so.”
In (13b), a non-elided case, the embedded object DP is scrambled to the clause initial position and the result is grammatical. In the soo replacement sentence in (13d), the same operation is applied but results in ungrammaticality.

A case where extraction of an element out of a soo site is possible is the exceptional case marking (ECM) case illustrated in (14).

(14) a Hanako-wa John-o orokanimo tensai-da to omotteiru kedo,
Hanako-TOP John-ACC stupidly genius-COP COMP think but
"Hanako stupidly thinks John to be a genius, but

b Sachiko-wa Bill-o orokamino soo omotteiru
Sachiko-TOP Bill-ACC stupidly so think
"Sachiko stupidly thinks Bill to be a genius."

In (14b) the subject DP of the embedded clause is accusative-case marked. (14b) is acceptable. (15b) is a parallel example in which the embedded subject DP is nominative case-marked. Extracting such a DP is not possible.

(15) a Hanako-wa John-ga orokanimo tensai-da to omotteiru kedo
Hanako-TOP John-NOM stupidly genius-COP COMP think but
"Hanako unwisely thinks John is a genius, but

b *Sachiko-wa Bill-ga orokamino soo omotteiru
Sachiko-TOP Bill-NOM stupidly so think
"Sachiko stupidly thinks Bill to be a genius."

He accounts for the above data by assuming: 1) What is deleted in ellipsis phases and phasal complements, 2) The CP deletion takes place when the higher phase head (= \(v\)) enters the derivation (= a Derivational approach to deletion), and 3) only phonological features are subject to deletion.

Thus, in (13d), the complement CP (= phase) of soo is elided when the matrix VP, which contains it, merges with the phase head \(v\). By the time the landing site for the object DP dokuturudake-o “destroying angel-ACC enters into the derivation, the object DP together with all the elements inside the CP complement of soo has already been phonologically deleted as illustrated in (16).
On the other hand, in the overt A-movement case exemplified in (14b), the embedded subject DP Bill is raised to the matrix Spec VP position. By the time this VP merges with *v* and the complement CP of *soo* is deleted, the DP is already outside that CP as in (17).

(17) a $[\text{VP Bill}_i-o \ [\text{SooP } [\text{CP } \ldots \text{t}_i \ldots ] \text{ soo}]] \text{omotteiru}$ (DP moving to matrix VP)

b $[\text{vP } [\text{VP Bill}_i-o \ [\text{SooP } [\text{CP } \ldots \text{t}_i \ldots ] \text{ soo}]] \text{omotteiru}]$ (v merging with VP)

Sakamoto’s analysis, thus, correctly accounts for the extraction pattern of the clausal complement replacement sentences.

2.2 Problematic case

Sakamoto’s analysis can explain cases of clausal complement replacement sentences as demonstrated in the previous subsection. In this subsection a new set of data, which might be problematic to his analysis, will be presented.

As Nakanishi (2016) and Goto (2011) discuss, the grammaticality of sentences like (13d) improves drastically when the particle *mo* “also” (or the topic marker *wa*) replaces the accusative case-marker *o*, as shown in (18).4

(18) a Fugu-o Hanako-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omotteiru kedo,
    puffer fish-ACC Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think but
    “Puffer fish, Hanako thinks that Taroo ate, but

b Dokuturudake-mo Sachiko-ga soo omotteiru
    destroying angel-also Sachiko-NOM so think
    “Destroying angel, too, Sachiko thinks so.”

When the fronted object DP appears with a focus marker, the sentence becomes acceptable. Even if we follow Yanagida (1996) in assuming that a focused element moves to a clause-internal focus position5, the grammaticality of these sentences cannot be explained by Sakamoto’s analysis. In (18) the *mo*-marked DP *dokuturudake-mo* “destroy-
ing angel-FOC” moves to the focus position in the embedded clause as schematized in (19).

(19) \[\text{...[SooP \[CP \[FP dokuturudake-mo \[v \[VP ... t_i ... \] ]]] soo]}...\]

The head v in the matrix clause merges with VP, at which point the CP dominated by SooP is elided, and the mo phrase is also deleted. The sentence is thus incorrectly ruled out. It may be that the mo-marked DP dokuturudake-mo “destroying angel-FOC” moves to the matrix focus position. This movement, thus, seems similar to the exceptional case marking (ECM) case as in (14b). If this movement is to a position lower than the matrix v, the sentence should be grammatical just as in the ECM case. However, as we will show below, this option does not seem available.

Intuitively, in example (18), the mo-marked DP acts as a topic of the matrix sentence. It seems to mean “As for destroying angel as well, the following statement holds; Sachiko thinks Taroo ate it.” If topics like the mo-marked DP are assumed to be base-generated in the matrix clause, Sakamoto’s analysis can potentially be maintained. In that case, “dokuturudake-mo” is never part of the CP complement of soo, and so it is not affected by deletion of that CP.

Now consider example (20).

(20) a Fugu-o Hanako-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omotteinai shi,
Puffer fish-ACC Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think but
“Puffer fish, Hanako thinks that Taroo ate, but

b Dokuturudake-mo Sachiko-wa soo omottei-nai
destroying angel-also Sachiko-TOP so think-not
“Destroying angel, too, Sachiko doesn’t think so.”

The interpretation of (20b) is that “Destroying angel as well, Sachiko does not hold the thought that Taroo ate it.” It does not have the interpretation “Sachiko does not think Taroo even ate destroying angel. That is, (20b) lacks the interpretation where mo-marked DP is in the scope of the negation. This contrasts with the non-elided counterpart (21).

(21) Dokuturudake-mo Sachiko-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omottei-nai
destroying angel-also Sachiko-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think-not
“Destroying angel, too, Sachiko doesn’t think Taroo ate.”

In (21), dokuturudake-mo “destroying angel-ACC” could be base-generated as a
matrix topic or moved from the embedded object position. This two possibilities give
the sentence ambiguity. Thus, the lack of the ambiguity for (20b) indicates that the mo-
marked DP is only base-generated in the matrix clause. If it were originated in the
embedded clause, we could expect the sentence to be ambiguous just like (21).

The following data may suggest that the above conclusion is on the right track.

(22) a Fugu-o Hanako-wa Taroo-ga tabe-ta to omotteiru kedo,
Puffer fish-ACC Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM eat-PAST COMP think but
“Puffer fish, Hanako thinks that Taroo ate, but

b ?* Dokuturudake-o-mo Sachiko-ga soo omotteiru
destroying angel-also Sachiko-NOM so think
“Destroying angel, too, Sachiko thinks so.”

(23) a Fugu-o Taro-wa tabe-ta shi
puffer fish-ACC Taro-TOP eat-PAST and
“Taro ate puffer fish, and

b ?*(pro) dokutusudake-o-mo soo da
destroying angel-also so COP
“Taro did a magazine, too.”

The particle mo attaches to a case-marked DP and when the fronted DPs appear
with both a case-marker and the focus particle mo, the sentences become unacceptable.
A widespread theory of case-feature checking is that such feature checking is done by
DPs moving to an appropriate position within the TP in which they originated. This
excludes the possibility of DPs with both a case-marker and mo to be base-generated
outside such a TP and hence ungrammatical examples such as (22) and (23) are cor-
rectly explained by Sakamoto’s analysis.

3 Extension of Sakamoto’s analysis to soo da replacement sentences

In this section we will examine if Sakamoto (2016)’s analysis can be extended to
explain soo da replacement sentences. Let us consider the sentences in (1c,d)(repeated
here in (24)).

(24) a Bill-ga kinoo [John-ga hon-o kat-ta] to itta ga,
Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but
“Bill said that John bought a book yesterday, but”
b  Jissai [soo] da  
   actually so COPULA  
   “actually it is so.”

Assuming so in (24b) takes a CP complement and heads a maximal projection as in Sakamoto’s analysis, the structure of (24b) will be (25).

\[
(25) \left[ \text{TP} \ jissai \ [vP[vP[CP \ \text{kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta]}] soo] da]} \right]
\]

The ungrammatical cases exemplified in (8)(repeated here as (26)) will be ruled out in the same way as (13b). Before its landing site is merged, the CP that includes the object DP *zasshi-o ‘magazine-ACC’ is phonologically elided as illustrated in (27).

\[
(26) \begin{align*}
\text{a Bill-ga kinoo John-ga hon-o katta to itta ga,} \\
\text{Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{“Bill said that yesterday John bought a book, but”}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b * zasshi-o jissai soo da} \\
\text{magazine-ACC actually soo COP}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{“a magazine actually he did.”}
\]

(27)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a TP jissai } [vP[vP[CP \ldots zasshi-o \ldots] soo] da]} [vP[vP[CP \ldots zasshi-o \ldots] soo] da] (v merging with VP)
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b TP } \ldots [vP[vP[CP \ldots zasshi-o \ldots] soo] da]}
\end{align*}
\]

In (27) when the head \(v\) merges with VP, the CP that contains the object DP *zasshi-o “magazine-ACC” is deleted and hence the extraction of the object DP should not be possible. Sakamoto’s analysis can thus rule out ungrammatical cases of *soo da replacement sentences.

At first sight, Sakamoto’s analysis seems to be extendable to *soo da replacement sentences, however, they are different at least in terms of co-occurrence restriction of so and the complement CP of so, and the subject DP extraction. That is, as shown in (28), in *soo da replacement sentences, *soo and the complement CP cannot appear together.
(28) a Bill-ga kinoo John-ga hon-o katta to itta ga,
   Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said but
   “Bill said that yesterday John bought a book, but”

b Mary-mo kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta to it-ta
   Mary-also yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said
   “Mary said that John bought a book yesterday, too.”

c “Mary-mo soo da to it-ta
   Mary-also soo COP COMP say-PAST
   “Mary said so, too.”

d * Mary-mo John-ga hon-o kat-ta to soo da to it-ta
   Mary-also John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST soo COP COMP say-PAST
   “Mary said so, that John bought a book yesterday.”

e * Mary-mo John-ga hon-o kat-ta to soo da it-ta
   Mary-also John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP soo COP say-PAST
   “Mary said so, that John bought a book yesterday.”

(28a,b) is a non-elided version. (28c) is a grammatical soo da replacement sentence. In (28d), the embedded CP and soo da with a complimentizer to “that” appear together. In (28e), soo da occurs without a complimentizer. Neither sentence is acceptable. The co-occurrence of soo and the embedded CP was a motivation for Sakamoto to assume the phrase structure such as (10). The fact that co-occurrence of the embedded CP and soo da is not possible makes us question whether we should postulate the same phrase structure.

In the clausal complement replacement case, subject DPs as well as object DPs cannot be extracted as shown in (29).

(29) a Hanako-wa John-ga nantonaku fugu-o tabe-ta to omotteiru kedo,
   Hanako-TOP John-NOM somehow puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think but
   “Hanako somehow thinks that John ate puffer fish, but,”

b * Sachiko-wa Bill-ga nantonaku soo omotteiru
   Sachiko-TOP Bill-NOM somehow soo think
   “Sachiko somehow thinks Bill so.”

When a soo da replacement sentence is embedded, it contrasts with the clausal
complement sentence.

(30) a Hanako-wa John-ga nantonaku fugu-o tabe-ta to omotteiru kedo,
Hanako-TOP John-NOM somehow puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COMP think but
“Hanako somehow thinks that John ate puffer fish, but,”

b Sachiko-wa Bill-ga nantonaku soo da to omotteiru
Sachiko-TOP Bill-NOM somehow so COP COMP think
“Sachiko somehow thinks that Bill ate puffer fish.”

Unlike the clausal complement replacement sentence in (29), (30) is grammatical. This contrast suggests that the attempt to extend Sakamoto’s analysis to soo da replacement sentences needs to be reconsidered.

In this section we examined to see whether Sakamoto’s analysis can be extended to soo da replacement cases. It was shown that the two types of soo replacement sentences behaves differently, which implies a difference analysis is required for soo da sentences.

† I thank Chris Tancredi for his valuable comments and discussion.

1 *da following the pro-form soo in (1b) is a copula. It is used in sentences such as (i).

(i) a John-wa gakusei da
John-TOP student COP
“John is a student.”

b Mary-wa kirei da
Mary-TOP pretty COP
“Mary is pretty.”

2 More precisely, soo da seems to substitute for the TP, since the following sentence is not grammatical.

(i) *Hanako-wa [Taroo-ga fugu-o tabe-ta da] to omotteiru
Hanako-TOP Taroo-NOM puffer fish-ACC eat-PAST COP COMP think
“(Intended) Hanako thinks that Taroo ate pufferfish.”

We will not discuss the details of the structure of soo da replacement sentences in this paper.
In Fukaya and Hoji (1999) the construction exemplified as (4a) is analyzed as stripping. Ishihara (2011) calls this type of sentences Predicateless Copula Construction (PCC, henceforth). Stripping in her analysis is sentences without copula da as in (i).

(i)  
Taroo-ga hon-o katta. Hanako-wa zasshi.  
Taro-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST Hanako-TOP magazine  
“Taro bought a book. Hanako did a magazine.”

The soo da replacement sentences also improve with mo as illustrated in (i).

(i)  
a Bill-ga kinoo John-ga hon-o kat-ta to itta ga,  
Bill-NOM yesterday John-NOM book-ACC buy-PAST COMP said and  
“Yesterday John bought a book and,”

b Zasshi-mo jissai soo da  
magazine-ACC actually so COP  
“Actually Mary did.”

Based on the interaction between VP adverbs and focused elements, Yanagida assumes that the focus position is between IP and VP. Though we are not committed with any specific position of the focus projection in a phrase structure in this paper, we assume that it is above vP by the syntactic position of the mo-marked DP.

List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genetive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>Past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRFCT</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTR</td>
<td>Contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>Complimentizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 In Fukaya and Hoji (1999) the construction exemplified as (4a) is analyzed as stripping. Ishihara (2011) calls this type of sentences Predicateless Copula Construction (PCC, henceforth). Stripping in her analysis is sentences without copula da as in (i).

4 The soo da replacement sentences also improve with mo as illustrated in (i).

5 Based on the interaction between VP adverbs and focused elements, Yanagida assumes that the focus position is between IP and VP. Though we are not committed with any specific position of the focus projection in a phrase structure in this paper, we assume that it is above vP by the syntactic position of the mo-marked DP.
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指示詞「そう」代入文に関する考察

山 品 みゆき

この論文では日本語の「そう」代入文について論じる。「そう」代入文には埋め込み節を置き換える「花子は明日晴れると思っているし、幸子もそう思っている」のような「そう」代入文や「ジョンは本を買ったし、ビルもそうだ」のような「そう」の後にコピュラが現れるものがある。埋め込み節の「そう」代入文に関してはSakamoto（2016）がその句構造と代入相当部分からの抽出に関する規制の分析を行ない、埋め込み節のそう代入文にはPFでの削除が行われていると主張している。本論文ではSakamoto（2016）の分析に一見問題となるような例文を取り上げ、彼の分析を維持するために新たな提案をする。また、「そうだ」文の特徴を明らかにし、Sakamoto（2016）の分析が「そうだ」代入文にはそのまま当てはまらないことを示す。