

## Particle Stranding Ellipsis in Japanese involves LF-copying, not PF-deletion\*

Hideaki Yamashita  
Yokohama City University

The aim of this paper is to show that particle stranding ellipsis (PSE) in Japanese involves LF-copying, and not PF-deletion, by providing novel data showing that there is an overt/covert asymmetry on extraction out of PSE, which patterns alike that of argument ellipsis (AE) (Sakamoto 2017, 2019); while overt movement out of the PSEed phrase is prohibited, covert movement out of it is allowed. Given that both AE and PSE show the uniform behavior with respect to an overt/covert asymmetry on extraction, they should be analyzed in a uniform way. I argue that LF-copying analysis of AE entertained in Sakamoto 2017, 2019 carries over to PSE.

### 1 Introduction

Based on Merchant's 2013 claim that the possibility of extraction is one of the most reliable diagnostic tests for ellipsis, the aim of this paper is to show that particle stranding ellipsis (PSE) in Japanese involves LF-copying, and not PF-deletion, by providing novel data showing that there is an overt/covert asymmetry on extraction out of PSE, which patterns alike that of argument ellipsis (AE) (Sakamoto 2017, 2019); while overt movement out of the PSEed phrase is prohibited, covert movement out of it is allowed.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, I will very briefly show the basic properties of PSE in Japanese. First, I note that varieties of particles can undergo PSE, which are reported in the previous literature. Then, I show that, contrary to the well-known observation that PSE is allowed in sentence-initial/strictly utterance-initial position (Yoshida 2001, 2004, Shibata 2014, a.o.), this is not necessarily correct, providing ample evidence (Abe 2008/2015, Nasu 2012b, Yamashita 2012, 2019). In Section 3, I will introduce the key observations that there is an overt/covert asymmetry on extraction out of PSE, which patterns alike that of argument ellipsis (AE), and discuss its theoretical implications, showing that PSE involves LF-copying, not PF-deletion. Section 4 is a conclusion.

### 2 PSE in Japanese: Basic Properties

#### 2.1 PSE-permitting particles in Japanese

(1) is the celebrated example of PSE reported by Hattori (1949, 1960), where the stranded particles bears a focus prosody (boosting its pitch accent, which is indicated by a boldface) and followed by a comma intonation (which is indicated by a comma).<sup>1,2,3</sup>

- (1) a. Speaker A:  
Tanaka-kun-wa?  
Tanaka-TIT-TOP  
'How about Tanaka?'
- b. Speaker B:  
\_ **-wa-ne\***(,) kaisha-o yameta-yo.  
\_ -TOP-DISCP company-ACC quit-SFP  
'Lit./Intended: (Tanaka)-TOP-DISCP, quit his company.'  
(Hattori 1960:452, with slight modifications)

\* I would like to thank Jun Abe, Norio Nasu, Yuta Sakamoto, Yosuke Sato, Yoshiyuki Shibata, and Asako Uchibori for a fruitful discussion. I regret to note here that I was not able to incorporate their feedback in this paper. All the usual disclaimers apply.

<sup>1</sup> All the Japanese examples are transcribed in the *Hepberun (Hebon)* system Romanization, except for long vowels, where I reduplicate vowels. The translations in single quotes are intended to give the (rough) structure of the examples and are not meant to be the correct English translations.

<sup>2</sup> But see Yamashita 2019:Sec.3.1 for cases where a comma intonation is not required with certain cases of PSE.

<sup>3</sup> See Sakamoto and Saito 2018a and Sato and Maeda 2019 for arguments that PSE indeed involves ellipsis, and not pro.

Although PSE has not received much attention in the literature in the last century, but has been started to be discussed in detail in the current century, especially the literature couched under the theory of generative grammar (Yoshida 2001, 2004, Sato and Ginsburg 2006, 2007, Sato 2008, 2012, Nasu 2010, et seq., Abe and Yamashita 2011, 2012, Goto 2012, Yamashita 2012, 2019, Shibata 2014, Sato and Maeda 2017, et. seq., Sakamoto and Saito 2018a, b, Takita 2019, a.o.). These studies revealed that a wide variety of particles and particle-like expressions can participate in PSE (see Yamashita 2019:80 for a detailed list and references discussing PSE-permitting particles).<sup>4</sup>

## 2.2 PSE need not be sentence-initial nor strictly utterance-initial

What is crucial to the present work is that, although it is indeed the case that PSE sounds best when it takes place at the sentence/utterance-initial position, it actually need not be either (i) sentence-initial (Yoshida 2004) or (ii) strictly utterance-initial (Shibata 2014). Many speakers allow and use it, and it is not difficult to come up with, and/or come across with actual examples of non-utterance-initial PSE appearing after a phonological content, such as argument DPs, adverbs, interjections, and clausal adjuncts, i.e., non-utterance-initial PSE is in principle possible.

### 2.2.1 PSE need not be sentence-initial nor strictly utterance-initial (1): Post-argument PSE

First of all, Abe (2008)/Abe (2015:Ch.5) observes the following examples, originally discussed by Takahashi (1994) and judged as ungrammatical, to be grammatical, on which I concur.

- (2) a. Speaker A:  
 Ken-ga [<sub>CP</sub>UConn-ga NCAA-ni katsu-to] itteru-rashii.  
 Ken-NOM UConn-NOM NCAA-in win-C says-seems  
 ‘It seems that [Ken says [that UConn will win the NCAA]].’
- b. Speaker B:  
 Boku(-ni)-wa, [\_-to(-wa)](,) omoenai-naa.  
 I-DAT-TOP -C-TOP think.POT.NEG-SFP  
 ‘Lit./Intended: I can’t think ([UConn will win the NCAA])-that(-TOP).’
- c. Speaker C:  
 Boku(-ni)-wa, [\_-ka(dooka)(-wa)](,) wakaranai-naa.  
 I-DAT-TOP -whether-TOP know.NEG-SFP  
 ‘Lit./Intended: I don’t know ([UConn will win the NCAA])-whether(-TOP).’  
 (Yamashita 2019:84; based on Abe 2008:164, with modifications; contra Takahashi 1994:275)

In (2)b and (2)c, speaker B’s utterance begins with an argument referring to himself (which is accompanied with a comma intonation), and this sentence-initial argument is followed by a PSE involving complementizers *-to* and *-ka(dooka)* (which can be followed by a topic marker).

### 2.2.2 PSE need not be sentence-initial nor strictly utterance-initial (2): Post-adverb PSE

Second, Nasu (2012b) offers following example with non-utterance-initial PSE preceded by an adverb.

- (3) a. Speaker A:  
 Mari-wa Ken-kara-ja-naku-te Gen-kara meeru-o moratta-no?  
 Mari-TOP Ken-from-COP-NEG-TE Gen-from mail-ACC received-Q  
 ‘Mari received a mail from Gen, and not Ken?’
- b. Speaker B:  
 Tabun, [\_-kara, moratta-n-daroo-ne.  
 probably\_-from received-NML-DAROO-SFP  
 ‘Lit./Intended: Probably, (Gen)-from, Mari received (a mail).’

<sup>4</sup> It is pointed out that not all the particle can undergo PSE (i.e., PSE-blocking particles; see Fujii 2016, Sakamoto and Saito 2018b, Sato and Maeda 2019), but I refrain from discussing this intriguing issue, and put it aside here, since it has no bearing to the present discussion.

- b'. Speaker B:  
 Tabun, Gen-kara moratta-n-daroo-ne.  
 probablyGen-from received-NML-DAROO-SFP  
 'Lit./Intended: Probably, from Gen, Mari received (a mail).'
- (Yamashita 2019:85; based on Nasu 2012b:7, with slight modifications)

In (3)b, speaker B's utterance begins with an adverb (which is accompanied with a comma intonation), and it is followed by a PSE involving a postposition *-kara*.

### 2.2.3 PSE need not be sentence-initial nor strictly utterance-initial (3): Evidence from actual utterances

Furthermore, it is not so difficult to find actual examples of non-utterance-initial PSE on TV, YouTube, conversation/dialogue, and so on. First, examples with non-utterance-initial PSE preceded by an interjection.

- (4) (Talking about one's favorite food.)
- a. Sho Hirano (King & Prince):  
 Nure-okaki-mitaina shokkan-no-mono-ga suki-desu.  
 nure-okaki-like texture-GEN-thing-NOM like-COP  
 'I like those food with the texture like nure-okaki.'
- b. Sanma Akashiya:  
 Nama-kuriimu-toka ka?  
 whipping.cream-TOKA Q  
 'Like whipping cream?'
- c. Sho Hirano (King & Prince):  
 Aa, -wa, suki-desu.  
 ah -TOP like-COP  
 'Lit./Intended: Ah, (whipping cream)-TOP, I like.'
- (Yamashita 2019:85–86; *Odoru Odoru! Sanma Goten!* NTV (Nippon Television Network Corporation), 2017/09/04, around 19:58.)

In (4)b, Sho Hirano's response begins with an interjection *aa-* 'ah' (which is accompanied with a comma intonation), and followed by a PSE involving a topic particle *-to* (which is accompanied with a focus prosody and a comma intonation) followed by an interjection.

Second, an example with non-utterance-initial PSE preceded by a clausal element, an adjunct clause.<sup>5</sup>

- (5) a. Director of TV show:  
 Go-jishin-ga netto-joo-de wadai-ni natteita-no-wa shitteimashita-ka?  
 HON-you-NOM on.internet topic-DAT became-NML-TOP knew-Q  
 'Did you know that you became a popular topic of conversation on the net?'
- b. Amin Khaleda:  
 Twitter-de wadai-ni natteita-no-de, -wa, shitteimashita-ne.  
 twitter-on topic-DAT became-NML-BECAUSE -TOP knew-SFP  
 'Lit./Intended: Because it became a popular topic of conversation on the twitter, I did know (that I became a popular topic of conversation on the net)-TOP.'
- (Yamashita 2019:86; *Futto Word 10*, NTV (Nippon Television Network Corporation), 2018/07/20, around 19:52)

Amin Khaleda's utterance in (5)b is quite interesting, since it shows that PSE involving a topic particle (which is accompanied with a focus prosody and a comma intonation) follows the adjunct *because*-clause.

These examples are only some of the actual examples one can find which shows that (i) PSE need not appear in the sentence-initial or strictly utterance-initial position (contra Yoshida 2004 and Shibata 2014) and (ii) there are

<sup>5</sup> Note in passing that Sato and Maeda (2019:371–372) discuss similar example, reporting it to be ungrammatical. To my ear, their example (their (32)) is no different from Amin Khaleda's actual utterance in terms of grammaticality, and I take it to be grammatical as an instance of PSE.

speakers who readily allow (or at least utter) non-utterance-initial PSE.<sup>6</sup> And to my ear, these sounds fine and natural. Thus I take the availability of non-utterance-initial PSE to be one of the basic properties of PSE. Although there are speakers (e.g., Sato and Maeda (2019) and their informants) who do not allow non-utterance-initial PSE, I presume that there are additional factors, be it phonological, pragmatic (Nasu 2012a, b, Sato and Maeda 2019), and/or processing, that make certain speakers that constrain them to forbid (or dislike) non-utterance-initial PSE. One such phonological conjecture can be found in Sato and Maeda 2019:Fn.6, which deals with the speaker variation involving interjection. But as far as I can see, their conjecture will not cover cases like Abe’s and Nasu’s examples as well as Amin Khaleda’s utterance. Thus, any analyses that dwell on the sentence-initial or strictly utterance-initial position need to be reconsidered. And the PF-deletion entertained most extensively in Sato and Maeda 2019 faces difficulty in accounting for possible cases of PSE taking place at the sentence-initial/strictly utterance-initial position, since it relies on Shibata’s (2014) observation that PSE is allowed only in the strictly utterance-initial position.

### 3 An Overt/Covert Asymmetry on Extraction Out of PSE

In this section, I will first go over Sakamoto’s (2017, 2019) arguments that AE in Japanese involve LF-copying, concentrating on an overt/covert asymmetry on extraction out of AE. And then, I show that PSE exhibits the same pattern, and argue that PSE involves LF-copying, not PF-deletion, just like AE; i.e., LF-copying analysis of AE entertained in Sakamoto 2017, 2019 carries over to PSE.

#### 3.1 An overt/covert asymmetry on extraction out of AE

Building essentially on Merchant’s 2013 claim that the possibility of extraction is one of the most reliable diagnostic tests for ellipsis, Sakamoto (2017, 2019) showed that LF-copying can, but PF-deletion cannot, account for the overt/covert extraction asymmetry involving movement out of AE; while (i) overt movement (e.g., scrambling, RTO, etc.) cannot, (ii) covert movement (e.g., null Op(erator)-movement in cleft and comparative deletion, QR of ‘all’ and ‘even’, etc.) can take place out of AE.

(6) #Overt movement (long-distance scrambling) out of AE (6)b is ungrammatical:

- a. [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub> [Ken-ga [CP UConn-ga t<sub>i</sub> katsu-to] itteru]]-rashii.  
NCAA-in Ken-NOM UConn-NOM win-C says-seems  
‘It seems that [the NCAA<sub>i</sub> Ken says [that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>]].’
  - b. \* [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub> [boku(-ni)-wa(-sa,)[CP Δ] omo-e-nai-naa]].  
NCAA-in I-DAT-TOP-DISC think-POT-NEG-SFP  
(Lit.) ‘[The NCAA<sub>i</sub> [I, can’t think Δ(=that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>)]].’
  - cf. OK if there is no AE:
  - b’. [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub> [boku(-ni)-wa(-sa,)[CP UConn-ga t<sub>i</sub> katsu-to](-wa)] omo-e-nai-naa]].  
NCAA-in I-DAT-TOP-DISC UConn-NOM win-C-TOP think-POT-NEG-SFP  
(Lit.) ‘[The NCAA<sub>i</sub> [I, can’t think [that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>]]].’
- (See Shinohara 2006; see also Sakamoto 2019:110)

(7) #Covert movement (null Op-movement in cleft) out of AE (7)b is grammatical:

- a. [Op<sub>i</sub> [Ken-ga [CP UConn-ga t<sub>i</sub> katsu-to] itteru]-no-wa] [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub>]-da.  
Ken-NOM UConn-NOM win-C says-C-TOP NCAA-in-COP  
‘It is [the NCAA<sub>i</sub>] [that Ken says [that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>]].’
  - b. [Op<sub>i</sub> [Ken-ga [CP Δ] itteru]-no-wa] [AAC-ni<sub>i</sub>]-da-yo, NCAA-ja-nakute.  
Ken-NOM says-C-TOP AAC-in-COP-SFP NCAA-COP-NEG  
(Lit.) ‘It is [the AAC<sub>i</sub>], not the NCAA, [that Ken says [CP Δ(=that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>)]].’
- (See Sakamoto 2017:281 (which is adapted from Takahashi 2013))  
(FYI: AAC = American Athletic Conference)

---

<sup>6</sup> More examples are available in Yamashita 2019:Sec.3. In addition, examples with multiple PSE are documented in Nasu 2012b and Yamashita 2019:Sec.4, contra Yoshida 2001, 2004, Sato 2008, a.o..

(8) #Covert movement (QR of ‘even’) out of AE yielding the matrix scope reading (8)b is grammatical:

- a. Ken-wa [<sub>CP</sub> Mari-ga oishii ringo-sae tabeta-to] omottei-nai.  
 Ken-TOP Mari-NOMtasty apple-even ate-C think-NEG Scope of ‘even’:  
 ‘Ken does not think [<sub>CP</sub> that Mari ate even a tasty apple].’ <sup>OK</sup>Embedded, <sup>OK</sup>Matrix
- b. Gen-mo [<sub>CP</sub>△] omottei-nai. Scope of ‘even’:  
 Gen-also think-NEG <sup>OK</sup>Embedded, <sup>OK</sup>Matrix  
 (Lit.) ‘Gen does not think [<sub>CP</sub> △(=that Mari ate even a tasty apple)], either.’  
 (Based on Sakamoto 2019:118–119)

Sakamoto (2019:Sec.4) in essence argues that the asymmetry in question can be captured in a straightforward fashion under the LF-copying analysis. Since LF-copying does not contain any phonological material, and hence it is impossible to apply overt movement out of LF-copied material. However, since covert movement do not contain any phonological material, it is possible to apply covert movement out of LF-copied material. Note that, as first pointed out by Shinohara (2006), the PF-deletion analysis of AE cannot account for the fact that overt movement (e.g., scrambling, RTO, etc.) cannot take place out of AE.

### 3.2 An overt/covert asymmetry on extraction out of PSE<sup>7</sup>

What is of significant interest for the present discussion is that, given that non-utterance-initial PSE is possible, as shown in Section 2.2 above, we can test whether the overt/covert extraction asymmetry holds for PSE. Following data reveals that the asymmetry holds; while (i) overt movement (long-distance scrambling) cannot (9), (ii) covert movement (null Op-movement in cleft and QR of ‘even’) can take place out of PSE (10) and (11). Note that the former point cannot be captured under the PF-deletion analysis (recall Shinohara’s (2006) well-known argument regarding AE). And more importantly, the point (i) and (ii) indicate that the parallel behavior of AE and PSE with respect to the overt/covert extraction asymmetry out of ellipsis sites call for the uniform analysis, i.e., LF-copying.

(9) #Overt movement (long-distance scrambling) out of non-utterance-initial PSE (9)b is ungrammatical:

- a. [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub> [Ken-ga [<sub>CP</sub>UConn-ga t<sub>i</sub> katsu-to] itteru]]-rashii.  
 NCAA-in Ken-NOM UConn-NOM win-C says-seems  
 ‘It seems that [the NCAA<sub>i</sub> Ken says [that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>]].’
- b. \* [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub> [boku(-ni)-wa(-sa), [<sub>CP</sub>△]-to(-wa)], omo-e-nai-naa].  
 NCAA-in I-DAT-TOP-DISCP -C-TOP think-POT-NEG-SFP  
 (Lit.) ‘[The NCAA<sub>i</sub> [I, can’t think △(=UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>)-that(-TOP)]].’
- cf. OK if there is no PSE:
- b’. [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub> [boku(-ni)-wa(-sa), [<sub>CP</sub>UConn-ga t<sub>i</sub> katsu-to](-wa)] omo-e-nai-naa].  
 NCAA-in I-DAT-TOP-DISCP UConn-NOM win-C-TOP think-POT-NEG-SFP  
 (Lit.) ‘[The NCAA<sub>i</sub> [I, can’t think [that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>]]].’

(10) #Covert movement (null Op-movement in cleft) out of non-utterance-initial PSE (10)b is grammatical:

- a. [Op<sub>i</sub> [Ken-ga [<sub>CP</sub>UConn-ga t<sub>i</sub> katsu-to] itteru]-no-wa] [NCAA-ni<sub>i</sub>]-da.  
 Ken-NOM UConn-NOM win-C says-C-TOP NCAA-in-COP  
 ‘It is [the NCAA<sub>i</sub>] [that Ken says [that UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>]].’
- b. [Op<sub>i</sub> [Ken-ga, [<sub>CP</sub>△-to], itteru]-no-wa] [AAC-ni<sub>i</sub>]-da-yo, NCAA-ja-nakute.  
 Ken-NOM -C says-C-TOP AAC-in-COP-SFP NCAA-COP-NEG  
 (Lit.) ‘It is [the AAC<sub>i</sub>], not the NCAA, [that Ken, says [<sub>CP</sub> △(=UConn will win t<sub>i</sub>)-c]].’

<sup>7</sup> While Sakamoto and Saito (2018a:353) have already shown that the covert extraction out of PSE is possible, based on inalienable possessor constructions, they were unable to show whether over extraction out of PSE is possible, mainly because they were assuming that PSE is available only in a sentence-initial/strictly utterance-initial position.



- Generative Grammar (SICOGG 14): Three Factors and Syntactic Theory*, ed. Bum-Sik Park, 78–97. Seoul, South Korea: The Korean Generative Grammar Circle.
- Hattori, Shiro. 1949. Gutai-teki gengo tan'i to chuushoo-teki gengo tan'i [Concrete linguistic units and abstract linguistic units]. *Kotoba* 2, 16–27.
- Hattori, Shiro. 1960. *Gengogaku-to Hoohoo [Linguistics and Methodology]*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Merchant, Jason. 2013. Diagnosing ellipsis. In *Diagnosing Syntax*, eds. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 537–542. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nasu, Norio. 2010. The distribution of particles in Japanese and the structure of CP. Paper presented at *GIST 2 Conference: Main Clause Phenomena*. Generative Initiatives in Syntactic Theory (GIST), Ghent University, Sept. 29–Oct. 1.
- Nasu, Norio. 2012a. Topic particle stranding and the structure of CP. In *Main Clause Phenomena: New Horizons*, eds. Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman, and Rachel Nye, 205–228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nasu, Norio. 2012b. Joshi-zanryuu-ga okoru buntoo-no ichi-ni-tsuite [On the sentence-initial position where particle stranding occurs]. *CLAVEL* 2, 1-12.  
[Downloadable: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/48512589.pdf>]
- Sakamoto, Yuta and Hiroaki Saito. 2018a. Overtly stranded but covertly not. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the West Coast Conference on Linguistics (WCCFL 35)*, eds. Wm. G. Bennett, Lindsay Hracs, and Dennis Ryan Storoshenko, 349–356. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Sakamoto, Yuta and Hiroaki Saito. 2018b. Some notes on stranded particles in Japanese. Talk given at *the 5th Workshop of the NINJAL Collaborative Research Project*, Tohoku University, Sendai, Miyagi, Japan, Dec. 1.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2008. Case-stranding nominal ellipsis in Japanese: a preliminary sketch. *Snippets* 17: 9–10.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2012. Particle-stranding ellipsis in Japanese, Phase Theory and the Privilege of the Root. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43: 495–504.
- Sato, Yosuke, and Jason Ginsburg. 2006. A new type of nominal ellipsis in Japanese: Further evidence for the LF Copy analysis. In *Proceedings of the 8th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar: Minimalist Views on Language Design*, ed. Changguk Yim, 293–300. Seoul, South Korea: The Korean Generative Grammar Circle.
- Sato, Yosuke, and Jason Ginsburg. 2007. A new type of nominal ellipsis in Japanese: Further evidence for the LF Copy analysis. In *Proceedings of the 4th Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics*, eds. Yoichi Miyamoto and Masao Ochi, 197–204. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Sato, Yosuke and Masako Maeda. 2017. Particle stranding ellipsis involves PF-ellipsis. In *Proceedings of the 19th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar: The Syntax-Morphology Interface in Generative Grammar*, eds. 171–190.
- Sato, Yosuke and Masako Maeda. 2018. Particle stranding ellipsis in Japanese, string deletion, and argument ellipsis. To appear in *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 25. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Sato, Yosuke and Masako Maeda. 2019. Particle stranding ellipsis involves PF-deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37: 357–388.
- Shibata, Yoshiyuki. 2014. A phonological approach to particle stranding ellipsis in Japanese. Poster presented at *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics (FAJL) 7*, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics and International Christian University, June 27–29.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3: 265–300
- Takita, Kensuke. 2019. Labeling for linearization. *The Linguistic Review* 37, 75–116.
- Yamashita, Hideaki. 2012. Reconsidering particle stranding ellipsis in Japanese. Ms. YNU.
- Yamashita, Hideaki. 2019. Reconsidering the nature of particle stranding ellipsis in Japanese. In *Festschrift for Professor Tomoyuki Yoshida on his 60th Birthday, ICU Working Paper in Linguistics* 7, eds. Yurie Hara, Shigeto Kawahara, and Seunghun J. Lee, 79–91. Mitaka, Tokyo: ICUWPL.  
[Downloadable: [https://icu.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository\\_uri&item\\_id=4697](https://icu.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=4697)]
- Yoshida, Tomoyuki. 2001. Paper presented at *Workshop on Universal Grammar (WUG)*, International Christian University, Mitaka, Tokyo, Japan, Aug. 20.
- Yoshida, Tomoyuki. 2004. Shudai-no shooryaku genshoo: Hikaku-toogoron-teki koosatsu [The phenomenon of topic ellipsis: A comparative syntactic consideration]. In *Nihongo Kyoiku-gaku-no Shiten [Perspectives on Japanese Language Pedagogy]*, eds. The Editorial Committee of Annals, 291–305. Tokyo: Tokyodo.