

Author's name: Yosuke Sato
Title: LF Copy, Definiteness and Argument Ellipsis in Javanese
Affiliation: National University of Singapore
Address: Department of English Language and Literature, AS Block 5, 7 Arts Link,
National University of Singapore, Singapore 117570
E-mail: ellys@nus.edu.sg
Telephone: +65-6514-4088
Fax: +65-6773-2981

Abstract: Recent works (Oku 1998; Kim 1999; Saito 2007; Takahashi 2008a, b) hypothesize that certain null arguments in Japanese/Korean are best analyzed as involving LF Copy rather than null pronouns. Şener and Takahashi (2010) argue that this process is blocked by agreement on the basis of the comparative study of argument ellipsis in Japanese and Turkish. Specifically, both null objects and null subjects can be the targets of LF Copy in Japanese because of the absence of agreement whereas only null objects can be in Turkish due to the presence of subject agreement. Against this background, this paper provides new data on argument ellipsis from Javanese showing that agreement is not the sole key factor in controlling the LF Copy process. Javanese presents a challenge for the agreement analysis because it exhibits the same subject-object discrepancy as Turkish despite the lack of agreement. Drawing on evidence from the ban on indefinite subjects and subject *wh*-in-situ (Soemarmo 1970; Poedjosoedarmo 1977; Cole et al. 2002), I propose that it is the definiteness restriction on the subject position in Javanese which prevents the null subject as the by-product of LF Copy. This analysis provides a simple account for the robust subject-object asymmetry between Japanese and Turkish originally explained by the agreement parameter. Our analysis also correctly predicts the same asymmetry in Mandarin Chinese, given the well-known observation (Chap 1968; Li and Thompson 1981; Cheng and Sybesma 1999, *inter alia*) that this language exhibits a strong tendency for the preverbal subject position to be definite.

Keywords: argument ellipsis, LF copy theory, definiteness; Japanese, Turkish, Javanese

**LF Copy Theory and Definiteness at the Syntax-Discourse Interface:
New Evidence from Argument Ellipsis in Javanese**

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the phenomenon of argument ellipsis in Javanese, a Western Malayo-Polynesian language spoken in Indonesia, where subjects and objects are deleted under identity with overt linguistic antecedents in the preceding sentences/contexts. Researchers working on East Asian languages such as Japanese, Korean and Chinese (Huang 1991; Otani and Whitman 1991; Oku 1998; Kim 1999; Saito 2007; Takahashi 2008a, b) have shown that there are certain null arguments in these languages that involve PF-deletion/LF-copy rather than empty pronouns. One recent line of research on this topic, pursued by Saito (2007) and Şener and Takahashi (2010), has put forth a hypothesis that null subjects and objects in Japanese can be the by-product of LF Copy (Oku 1998), which copies a linguistic element from a full-fledged clause onto a corresponding empty slot in an elliptic clause, but this process is blocked by syntactic agreement. Şener and Takahashi (2010) have shown that this agreement-based theory of argument ellipsis provides an illuminating account for the curious typological discrepancy between Japanese and Turkish. Using the sloppy reading and quantificational readings as diagnostics for elliptic/LF-copied arguments, they demonstrate that both null subjects and null objects can be the targets of LF Copy in Japanese whereas only null objects can in Turkish. Şener and Takahashi (2010) suggest that it is the presence of subject agreement in Turkish and the absence thereof in Japanese which accounts for this semantic asymmetry.

Javanese presents an interesting typological issue within this context because it is an agreement-less language, just like Japanese, but exhibits the same subject-object asymmetry as

Turkish. I propose that the key factor controlling the LF Copy process of empty arguments in Javanese is the definiteness restriction on the subject position (Soemarmo 1970; Poedjosoedarmo 1977; Cole et al. 2002). For the copying process to yield the sloppy and quantificational readings, it has to target a linguistic antecedent in its indefinite use into the corresponding grammatical slot in an incomplete clause. However, this operation is blocked in subject position in Javanese because of the definiteness requirement imposed on the position. I show that this analysis correctly predicts that in Mandarin, null objects can show the sloppy/quantificational readings but null subjects can only exhibit the strict/E-type readings, because this language also shows the strong preference for the preverbal subject to be definite.

2. Argument Ellipsis, LF Copy and Syntactic Agreement

Recent works, including Oku (1998), Saito (2007) and Takahashi (2008a, b), have proposed that there are certain null arguments in Japanese that are best analyzed as the result of ellipsis rather than empty pronouns (Kuroda 1965; Ohso 1976; Hoji 1985; Saito 1985, among others). Here, I review two pieces of evidence in favor for this analysis. The first piece of evidence is concerned with the sloppy reading available for null objects and subjects. Consider examples (1a, b).

- (1) a. Taroo-wa zibun-no tegami-o suteta.
 Taro-NOM self-GEN letter-ACC discarded
 ‘*Lit.* Taro discarded self’s letter.’
- b. Hanako-mo *e* suteta.
 Hanako-also discarded
 ‘*Lit.* Hanako also discarded *e*.’

- c. Hanako-mo sore-o suteta.
 Hanako-also 3SG-ACC discarded
 ‘Hanako also discarded it.’

(1b) involves the null object which is anaphoric to the object in (1a). The missing object in (1b) can be interpreted as either Taro’s mother (strict reading) or Hanako’s mother (sloppy reading). The first interpretation can be taken care of if we assume the null pronoun in the object position. The second interpretation, however, would be mysterious if the empty object position were unanimously occupied by a null pronoun because pronouns only accept the strict interpretation. Thus, when the null object in (1b) is replaced with an overt pronoun (*sore* ‘it’) as shown in (1c), only the strict reading is available. Oku (1998) argues that the sloppy reading in (1b) arises due to LF Copy. According to this analysis, the LF representation for the example in (1b) is as in (2).

- (2) LF: Hanako-mo [NP **zibun-no** **tegami-o**] suteta.

In this representation, the NP *zibun-no tegami-o* ‘self’s letter’ is copied in the object position of the elliptic sentence in (1b) from the object position of the preceding clause in (1a). The sloppy reading obtains because *zibun* ‘self’ is bound to the subject *Hanako* after LF Copy.

Oku (1998) observes that subjects in Japanese can also be targeted for LF Copy. (3b) involves the null subject in the embedded clause anaphoric to the corresponding subject in (3a). Just like the null object in (1b), the null subject in (3b) allows the strict interpretation (“Hanako said that Taro’s child knew French”) as well as the sloppy interpretation (“Hanako said that Hanako’s child knew French.”)

- (3) a. Taroo-wa [zibun-no kodomo-ga eigo-o sitteiru to] itta.
 Taro-TOP self-GEN child-NOM English-ACC know that said
 ‘*Lit.* Taro said that self’s child knew English.’
- b. Hanako-wa [*e* furansugo-o sitteiru to] itta.
 Hanako-TOP French-ACC know that said
 ‘*Lit.* Hanako said that *e* knew French.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 84)

The second piece of evidence for the LF Copy analysis to Japanese null arguments comes from what Takahashi (2008a) calls the quantificational reading. Consider (4a, b):

- (4) a. Taroo-wa sannin-no sensei-o sonkeisiteiru.
 Taro-TOP three-GEN teacher-ACC respect
 ‘Taro respects three teachers.’
- b. Hanako-mo *e* sonkeisiteiru.
 Hanako-also respect
 ‘*Lit.* Hanako respects *e*, too.’
- c. Hanako-mo karera-o sonkeisiteiru.
 Hanako-also 3PL-ACC respect
 ‘Hanako also respects them.’

((4a, b) adopted from Şener and Takahashi 2010: 81-82)

(4b) allows two readings. One reading (the E-type reading; see Evans 1980) is that Hanako respects the same set of three teachers that Taro respects. The other reading (the quantificational reading) is that the set of three teachers that Hanako respects is different from the set of three teachers that Taro respects. The E-type reading can be easily accommodated by an empty pronoun. However, the quantificational reading would be unexpected because an overt pronoun (i.e., *karera* ‘they’) only allows the E-type reading, as shown in (4c). The LF Copy analysis, on the other hand, straightforwardly accounts for the quantificational reading. The example in (4b) has the LF representation in (5).

(5) LF: Hanako-mo [NP **sannin-no sensei-o**] sonkeisiteiru

In this representation, the quantified expression *sannin-no sensei-o* ‘three teachers’ is copied in the object position from the corresponding object position in the antecedent clause. As a result, it is not surprising that the understood object quantifier in (4b) behaves independently of its antecedent in the preceding clause, yielding the quantificational reading, as desired.

The quantificational reading also obtains for elliptic subjects. The null subject in (6b) permits the E-type reading (“the group of three girls who came to see Taro is the same as the group of three girls who came to see Ken”) as well as the quantificational reading (“the group of three girls who came to see Taro is different from the group of three girls who came to see Ken”).

(6) a. Sannin-no onnnanoko-ga Taroo-ni ai-ni kita.
 three-GEN girl-NOM Taro-DAT see-to came
 ‘Three girls came to see Taro.’

- b. *e* Ken-ni-mo ai-ni kita.
Ken-dat-also see-to came

‘*Lit. e* came to see Ken, too.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 84)

Şener and Takahashi (2010) conduct a comparative survey of Japanese and Turkish with respect to argument ellipsis. Just like Japanese, Turkish allows both null subjects and objects (Erguvanlı-Taylan 1984; Kornfilt 1987, 1997; Özsoy 1988; Turan 1995; Aygen 2001; Öztürk 2004). Şener and Takahashi (2010) observe that despite this similarity, in Turkish, null objects, but not null subjects, exhibit the sloppy reading and quantificational reading. Let us review basic facts below.

- (7) a. Can [*pro* anne-si]-ni ekeştir-di.
John his mother-3SG-ACC criticize-PAST
‘John criticized his mother.’

- b. Mete-yse *e* öv-dü.
Mete-however praise-PAST
‘*Lit. Mete*, however, praised *e*.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 87)

- (8) a. Can üç hırsız yakala-dı.
John three burglars catch-PAST
‘John caught three burglars.’

- b. Filiz-se *e* sorgula-dı.
 Phylis-however interrogate-PAST
 ‘*Lit.* Phylis, however, interrogated *e*.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 88)

The null object in (7b) allows not only the strict reading (“Mete praised John’s mother”) but also the sloppy reading (“Mete praised Mete’s mother”). Similarly, the null object in (8b) allows the E-type reading as well as the quantificational reading. That is, (8b) can read either as “Phylis interrogated the same three burglars whom John caught” (the E-type reading) or as “Phylis interrogated a set of three burglars, but it is different from the set of three burglars whom John caught” (the quantificational reading). Interestingly enough, however, null subjects in Turkish behave differently from null subjects in Japanese because the former permit neither the sloppy reading nor the quantificational reading. Consider (9-10):

- (9) a. Can [[*pro* oğl-u] İngilizce öğren-iyor diye] bil-iyor.
 John his son-3SG English learn-PRES COMP know-PRES
 ‘John knows that his son learns English.’
 b. Filiz-se [*e* Fransızca öğren-iyor diye] bil-iyor.
 Phylis-however French learn-PRES COMP know-PRES
 ‘*Lit.* Phylis, however, knows that *e* learns French.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 91)

- (10) a. Üç öğretmen Can-ı eleştir-di.
 three teacher John-ACC criticize-PAST
 ‘Three teachers criticized John.’
- b. *e* Filiz-i-yse öv-dü.
 Phylis-ACC-however praise-PAST
 ‘*Lit. e* praised Phylis.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 91)

Thus, (9b) has the strict reading (“Phylis knows that John’s son learns French”) but lacks the sloppy reading (“Phylis knows that Phylis’ son knows French”). Similarly, (10b) only allows the E-type reading where a set of three teachers who criticized John also praised Phylis.’

We have seen above that, although both Turkish and Japanese allow elliptic objects, subjects can be elliptic in Japanese but must be pronominal in Turkish. Adopting Saito’s (2007) theory of argument ellipsis, Şener and Takahashi propose that this typological difference is derived from the presence of subject agreement in Turkish and the absence thereof in Japanese. Chomsky (2000) maintains that the uninterpretable ϕ -features of a probe/functional head (T or ν) agree with and get erased by the matching interpretable ϕ -features of the closest goal/DP with an uninterpretable Case feature. Let us illustrate this system in (11):

- (11) ... T_{- ϕ -} ... DP_{- ϕ -, Case} ...
- Agree

In (11), the probe T searches for the goal DP. The DP here qualifies as a goal because it has an uninterpretable Case feature. Thus, the uninterpretable ϕ -features of the T are erased, together with the uninterpretable Case feature of the DP. With this background in mind, now consider what goes wrong with the elliptic subject in Turkish. Examples (12a, b) show that in Turkish, the form of the agreement suffix changes according to the subject in person and number.

- (12) a. (Ben) bu makale-yi yavaşyavaş oku-yacağ-ım.
 (I) this article-ACC slowly read-FUT-1SG
 ‘I will read this article slowly.’
- b. (Biz) her hafta sinema-ya gid-er-iz.
 (we) every week movie-DAT go-AOR-1PL.
 ‘We go to the movies every week.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 86)

Let us assume that the presence of subject agreement in (12a, b) means that the functional head T in Turkish possesses uninterpretable ϕ -features. These features, then, are erased by a DP with an uninterpretable Case feature. This step is shown in (13a). Suppose that after this operation, the DP in (13a) is copied onto the elliptic subject position, as shown in (13b). The derivation crashes at this point. The Case feature of the DP has already been checked and erased in the antecedent clause before LF Copy. Thus, the DP cannot serve as a licit goal to erase the uninterpretable ϕ -features of another probe/T in the consequent clause. As a result, the uninterpretable ϕ -features remain unchecked, causing the derivation to crash. This step is shown in (13c).

- (13) a. ...F₁ {-φ-} ... DP₁ {-φ-, ~~Case~~} ...
 b. * ...F₂ {-φ-} ... _____ ...
 c. * ...F₂ {-φ-} ... DP₁ {-φ-, ~~Case~~} ...

On the other hand, it has been a traditional observation in the literature (Fukui 1986; Kuroda 1988) that Japanese lacks agreement altogether, which means that functional heads such as T and *v* do not possess uninterpretable φ-features. As a result, a subject can be copied at LF from the antecedent clause onto a corresponding subject position in the consequent clause without causing the derivation to crash. This analysis also explains why objects can be elliptic both in Japanese and Turkish because these languages lack object agreement.

Şener and Takahashi provide further data from certain adjunct clauses and Exceptional Case-Marking/ECM constructions in Turkish showing that the presence of subject agreement is indeed the relevant factor that blocks the elliptic subject option. Firstly, Öztürk (2006) (see also Aygen 2001 and Kornfilt 2002) notes that the null subject does not require agreement in a certain type of adjunct clause as shown in (14B).

- (14) A: John₁ [Bill₂ gel-ince] mi gid-ecek?
 John Bill come-when Q go-FUT
 ‘Will John go when Bill comes?’
 B: Evet, [*pro*₂ gel-ince] *pro*₁ gid-ecek.
 Yes come-when he go-FUT
 ‘Yes, he will go when he comes.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 95)

Şener and Takahashi’s analysis thus predicts that the null subject can undergo LF Copy precisely in this construction. This prediction is indeed borne out by the fact that the null subject in (15b) permits the sloppy reading (“Phylis is pleased because Phylis’s son has learned French”).

- (15) a. Can [[*pro* oğl-u] [İngilizce öğren-ince] sevin-di.
 John his 3SG.POSS English learn-because be.pleased-PRES.PERF
 ‘John is pleased because his son has learned English.’
- b. Filiz-se [*e* Fransızca öğren-ince] sevin-di.
 Phylis-however French learn-because be.pleased-PRES.PERF
 ‘*Lit.* Phylis, however, is pleased because *e* has learned French.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 95)

Secondly, in ECM constructions exemplified in (16a, b), the form of the embedded verb is invariant regardless of the type of the ECM subject. If this is taken to mean that there is no subject-verb agreement in this construction, we predict that the null subject in such a context should be able to exhibit the sloppy reading. This prediction is once again borne out in (16b). (16b) allows the sloppy reading (“Susan thinks that Susan’s niece will start grade school”).

- (16) a. Pelin [[*pro* yeğen-i]-ni lise-ye başla-yacak] san-ıyor.
 Pelin her niece-3SG-ACC high school-DAT start-FUT think-PRES
 ‘Pelin thinks her niece will start high school.’

- b. Suzan-se [e ilkokul-a başla-yacak] san-ıyor.
 Susan-however grade school-DAT start-FUT think-PRES

‘*Lit.* Susan, however, thinks *e* will start grade school.’

(Şener and Takahashi 2010: 96)

3. **Argument Ellipsis in Javanese and the Irrelevance of Agreement**

Javanese is a Western Malayo-Polynesian language spoken by more than 75 million people in the central and eastern parts of the island of Java in Indonesia. It boasts a complex register system consisting of *krama* (formal), *madya* (semi-formal) and *ngoko* (informal) registers. It is a head-initial SVO language with an elaborate voice system (active voice, theme voice, accidental voice, and other various applicative voices) but lacks agreement or tense morphology. The data reported in this paper are in the *ngoko* register, and were elicited from and checked by three bilingual Indonesian-Javanese speakers from Kendal, which is a *kabupaten* (regency) in the northern division of Central Java and is about 34 kilometers west of Semarang, the capital of the province of Central Java. This fieldwork was conducted in Kendal and Singapore from December 2011 through February 2012.

The most important grammatical property of Javanese relevant for our present purposes is that it makes extensive use of pro-drop/topic-drop, just like Japanese, Turkish and other Asian languages with massive pro-drop. Javanese sheds a new light on the nature of parameters that allow/block argument ellipsis across languages. Below, I will provide new data collected from my fieldwork showing that in Javanese, objects can be elliptic but subjects can only be pronominal. This observation is paradoxical given Saito’s (2007)/Şener and Takahashi’s (2010) hypothesis that the LF Copy option is blocked by the presence of agreement because null

subjects in Javanese cannot be elliptic but Javanese is an agreement-less language just like Japanese. This consideration, then, raises the question what is an alternative key factor that blocks the elliptic option in Javanese as opposed to Japanese and Turkish.

Let us first consider object ellipsis in Javanese. Consider (17a, b) and (18a, b).

- (17) a. Esti seneng guru-ne.
 Esti like teacher-her
 ‘Esti likes her teacher.’
- b. Budi ya seneng *e*.
 Budi also like
 ‘*Lit.* Budi also likes *e*.’
- (18) a. Esti ketemu mahasiswa telu.
 Esti meet student three
 ‘Esti met three students.’
- b. Budi ya keteme *e*.
 Budi also met
 ‘*Lit.* Budi also met *e*.’

The null object in (17b) allows the strict reading as well as the sloppy reading. Similarly, the null object in (18b) allows both the E-type reading and the quantificational reading. These results show that the null object in Javanese can be elliptic, just like the null object in Japanese and Turkish. Let us now turn our attention to subject ellipsis cases illustrated in (19b) and (20b).

- (19) a. Esti ngomong [guru-ne isa basa Prancis].
 Esti say teacher-her can language French
 ‘Esti said that her teacher can speak French.’
- b. Budi ngomong [*e* isa basa Jepang].
 Budi say can language Japanese
 ‘*Lit.* Budi said that *e* can speak Japanese.’
- (20) a. Esti ngomong [mahasiswa telu teka arep ketemu dewe’e].
 Esti say student three come to meet her
 ‘Esti said that three students came to meet her.’
- b. Budi ngomong [*e* teka arep ketemu dewe’e].
 Budi say come to see him
 ‘*Lit.* Budi said that *e* came to see him.’

The example in (19b) permits only the strict reading. Similarly, the example in (20b) only allows the E-type reading. In this regard, the null subject in Javanese behaves like the null subject in Turkish, not like the null subject in Japanese. Below is a table which summarizes the type of null arguments available in the three languages examined thus far with respect to the availability of the sloppy reading and the quantificational reading.

	Japanese		Turkish		Javanese	
	Subject	Object	Subject	Object	Subject	Object
Sloppy Reading?	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Quantificational Reading?	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Agreement?	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO

Table 1: The Cross-Linguistic Distribution of the Null Arguments

As is clear from Table 1, null arguments in Javanese behave typologically just like null arguments in Turkish. However, this result is not expected under the agreement-based theory of LF Copy because Javanese possesses neither subject agreement nor object agreement. Given the compelling evidence presented in Şener and Takahashi (2010), the key role of syntactic agreement as controlling the LF Copy process in the comparative syntax of argument ellipsis in Japanese and Turkish seems undeniable. However, the interpretive patterns observed in Javanese clearly suggest that we are also in need of a new alternative parameter for Javanese which blocks the LF Copy option in the subject position. In the next section, I will show that the lack of subject ellipsis in Javanese can be accounted for by capitalizing a well-known transparent parallelism in Javanese between syntactic structure and information structure.

4. Argument Ellipsis in Javanese and Transparent Syntax-Information Structure Interface

As is well known across languages, there is a robust correlation across languages between information theoretic constructs such as topic and focus and grammatical constructs such as subject and predicate (Lambrecht 1994, Van Valin and LaPolla 1997). It is widely acknowledged in the literature on many Western Austronesian languages (see Soemarmo 1970 for Indonesian, Mashudi 1976 for Formal Malay and Soemarmo 1970 and Poedjosoedarmo 1977 for Javanese; see Davies 1999 for Madurese) that the grammatical position of subject corresponds strictly to the discourse notion of topic. Thus, in Javanese, only proper names and nouns marked with a demonstrative particle or the definite suffix can appear in this position. Cole et al. (2002) have proposed that this correlation becomes the inviolable part of the Javanese grammar such that the grammatical subject must be the topic. Since a topic, by their very nature, refers to an entity previously introduced into the discourse, it is definite and hence is not allowed to introduce a new discourse referent (Gundel and Fretheim 2004). Here, we review two arguments presented by Cole et al. in favor of this transparent mapping between subject and topic/definiteness. Firstly, in Javanese, an indefinite NP cannot appear in subject position, as illustrated in (21a).

- (21) a. * [NP Wong lanang] [VP gek turu].
 person male PROG sleep
 ‘A boy is sleeping.’
- b. [NP Wong lanang kuwi] [VP gek turu].
 person male that PROG sleep
 ‘The boy is sleeping.’

- c. [TP *pro* [VP *ono wong lanang gek turu*]].
 exist person male PROG sleep
 ‘There is a boy who is sleeping.’

(Cole et al.2002: 103)

The example (21b) shows that the same NP may appear in subject position when marked by the demonstrative *kuwi* ‘that’, which makes the NP definite. For an indefinite NP/discourse referent to be introduced, Javanese employs an existential construction, as shown in (21c).

Secondly, Javanese is a *wh*-in-situ language. Thus, *wh*-phrases can appear in a wide variety of positions as a direct object (22a, b), possessor (23a), indirect object (23b), and object of prepositions (23c).

- (22) a. Siti meh mangan **apa?**
 Siti FUT AV.eat what
 ‘What will Siti eat?’
 b. Tono wis ngambung **sapa?**
 Tono PAST AV.kiss who
 ‘Who did Tono kiss?’

(Cole et al.2002: 93)

- (23) a. Tono ngepruk kancane **sapa?**
 Tono AV.hit friend-poss who
 ‘Whose friend did Tono hit?’

- b. Tono ngei **sapa** apel kuwi?
 Tono AV.give who apple that
 ‘To whom did Tono give the apple?’
- c. Tono nulis surat kuwi nggo **sapa**?
 Tono AV.write letter that for who
 ‘For whom did Tono write the letter?’

(Cole et al.2002: 93)

Strikingly, however, the *wh*-in-situ strategy is unavailable for *wh*-phrases in subject position, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (24a, b). In such a case, Javanese must use the cleft construction, illustrated in (25a, b), which is headed by the complementizer *sing*.

- (24) a. * **Sapa** meh mangan apel?
 who FUT AV.eat apple
 ‘Who will eat the apple?’
- b. * **Apa** nggawe kowe seneng?
 what AV.make 2SG like
 ‘What makes you happy?’

(Cole et al.2002: 93)

- (25) a. **Sapa** sing meh mangan apel?
 who COMP FUT AV.eat apple
 ‘Who is it that will eat the apple?’

- b. **Apa** sing nggawe kowe seneng?
 what COMP AV.make 2SG like
 ‘What is it that makes you happy?’

(Cole et al.2002: 94)

Cole et al. propose that the constraint against *wh*-in-situ in subject position arises due to the transparent parallelism requirement between subject and topic. The subject position in Javanese is strictly reserved for a topic. Since all *wh*-phrases have inherent informational focus (Chomsky 1971, 1976; Jackendoff 1972), they are banned from appearing in the subject position in Javanese.

Now it is important to note that for the sloppy/quantificational reading to obtain in an empty argument position, it is crucial that the full-fledged NP is copied onto the empty argument position in *its indefinite use*. Examples from Japanese and Spanish make this point clear.

- (26) a. Seerusuman-ga Mary-no uchi-ni kita.
 salesman-NOM Mary-POSS house-to came
 ‘A salesman came to Mary’s house.’
 b. *e* John-no uchi-ni-mo kita.
 John-POSS house-to-also came
 ‘*Lit. e* came to John’s house, too.’

(Oku 1998: 166)

- (27) a. Un vendedor fue a la casa de María.
 a salesman went to the house of Maria
 ‘A salesman went to Maria’s house.’
- b. También *pro* fue a la casa de Juan.
 also *pro* went to the house of Juan
 ‘*Lit.* Also *pro* went to Juan’s house.’

(Oku 1998: 166)

In (27a), the salesman who visited John’s house may be a different salesman from the one who visited Mary’s house. This reading can be called the indefinite reading. As is well-known (see Kuroda 1992: ch1, Fukui 1995, and Hoji 1998 for extensive discussion), a bare nominal in Japanese such as *kuruma* ‘car’ can be variously interpreted as ‘a car’, ‘the car’, ‘cars’, ‘the cars’ and probably more. For our present purposes, it suffices to say that the “different-salesman” reading in (27a) obtains precisely because the LF Copy process can copy the NP into the empty subject position in its indefinite use. In (27b), however, the salesman who visited Juan’s house must be the same person who visited Maria’s house. This pattern comes as no surprise because *pro* must refer back to the entity already established in the previous discourse (i.e., the salesman who went to Maria’s house). Now, what is going on in Javanese, then, is that this indefinite use of the null argument cannot be copied onto the subject position in this language because the subject must be a topic and hence must be occupied by a definite discourse referent. Just like Japanese, Javanese allows bare nominal arguments in all grammatical positions. A bare nominal such as *buku* ‘book’ can be interpreted as ‘a book’, ‘the book’, ‘the books’ or

‘books’, as shown in (28a-c), with the single exception that the bare noun in subject position must be construed as definite/topics.

- (28) a. Buku larang.
 book expensive
 ‘{The book/the books/*A book/*books } {is/are} expensive.’
- b. Esti tuku buku.
 Esti buy book
 ‘Esti bought a book/the book/books/the books.’
- c. Esti nukokke uwong buku.
 Esti AV.buy man book
 ‘Esti bought {a man/the man/men/the men} {a book/the books/books/the books}.’
- d. Esti entuk informasi seko buku.
 Esti get information from book
 ‘Esti got information from a book/the book/books/the books.’

Despite the availability of the indefinite use of bare arguments, Javanese nonetheless does not allow the sloppy/quantificational reading. The reason is that that the subject position in this language is so syntacticized as to host only a *pro*/the definite use of the bare argument.

Our proposed analysis allows for a straightforward explanation for the central subject-object discrepancy between Japanese and English originally accounted by Şener and Takahashi (2010) through the agreement parameter. I have argued above that the availability of the sloppy/quantificational readings for empty subjects and objects obtains in Japanese because

there is no definiteness restriction observed on the subject or on the object position, as illustrated in (26a). Examples (29a, b) show that no such restriction also holds for the object position. The sentence in (29b) allows the reading where a salesman who Mary met is different from the salesman who John met.

- (29) a. Mary-wa kinoo seerusuman-ni atta.
 Mary-top yesterday salesman-dat met
 ‘Mary met a salesman yesterday.’
- b. John-mo kinoo e atta.
 John-also yesterday met
 ‘*Lit.* John met *e*, too.’

Turning our attention to Turkish, it is well known that the initial position hosts a topic. In unmarked sentences, this topic position is occupied by the subject. Erguvanlı-Taylan (1987), Taylan (1984), Kenelly (1997), and Kelepir (2001) observe that the preverbal subject in Turkish tends to be interpreted as definite (see also Enç 1991) unless it is marked overtly for indefiniteness with quantifiers. Thus, an inherently indefinite NP is at best awkward in the subject position, as shown in (30a). The direct object position, however, does not exhibit this restriction/tendency, as illustrated by the example in (30b).

- (30) a. **Bir adam** kitab-ı oku-du.
 a man book-ACC read-PAST
 ‘The man read the book.’ *Not*: ‘A man read the book.’

- b. (Ben) bir kitap oku-du-m.
 I a book read-PAST-1SG
 ‘I read a book.’

Our analysis thus correctly predicts that null subjects, not null subjects, can exhibit the sloppy/quantificational readings in Turkish because the subject position requires a definite/topic element. And this definiteness preference blocks the LF Copy process from targeting the empty subject slot.

Recall that Şener and Takahashi provide two pieces of evidence based on adjunct clauses and ECM-constructions that syntactic agreement is the conditioning factor for the LF Copy process; the otherwise unavailable sloppy reading obtains in these two contexts precisely because these constructions do not exhibit subject agreement. Our analysis can also cover these observations. First, the subject in the adjunct clause in question does not show the definiteness restriction imposed on the subject/topic position. The grammaticality of (31) illustrates that an indefinite NP such as *bir adam* ‘a man’ may occur in this position. Thus, our analysis correctly predicts that the sloppy reading is available in this type of adjunct clause.

- (31) John [**bir adam** gel-ince] mi gid-ecek?
 John a man come-when Q go-FUT
 ‘Will John go when a man comes?’

Second, Şener (2008) shows that the accusative subject in the ECM construction in Turkish receives a contrastive topic interpretation. Consider (32):

(32) A: What about John? Did Pelin tell you what he ate at the party?

B: I didn't know about John, but ...

Pelin [Mete-yi^{CT} istakoz-dan ye-di diye] duy-muş.

Pelin-NOM Mete-ACC lobster-ABL eat-PAST COMP hear-PAST

'Pelin heard that Mete ate the lobster (at the party).'

(Şener (2008), as cited in Takeuchi (2010: 121))

In (32A), Speaker A asks Speaker B what John ate at the party. In (32B), Speaker B does not know what John ate there but knows that Mete ate the lobster. In this example, then, *Mete* is construed as a contrastive topic rather than focus/new information. Indeed, the focus reading is impossible in the ECM subject position. This point is illustrated by the infelicity of Speaker B's answer to Speaker A's question in (33).

(33) A: Do you know who showed up at Mert's party?

B: I haven't asked Mert himself about it, but ...

Pelin [Sinan-ı^{CT} git-ti diye] duy-muş.

Pelin-NOM Sinan-ACC go-PAST COMP hear-PAST

'Pelin heard that Sinan went (to the party).'

(Şener (2008), as cited in Takeuchi (2010: 120))

The infelicity of Speaker B's reply in (33B) naturally falls in place if we assume that the accusative object in the Turkish ECM must be construed as a contrastive topic because the element in the answer which corresponds to the *wh*-phrase in the question must be a focus

element (Chomsky 1971, 1976; Jackendoff 1972). I maintain that the sloppy reading of the ECM accusative object in Turkish obtains because it is required/preferred by the contrastive topic interpretation imposed on the object. Thus, the example in (16a) introduces the proposition that Pelin thinks Pelin's niece will start high school. Then, the only reading in the following example in (16b) which would be compatible with the contrastive topic interpretation will then be the one where it is Susan's niece (the sloppy reading) rather than Pelin's niece (the strict reading).

Our current analysis makes an important prediction regarding the interpretive possibility of null subjects in Japanese as well. Sato (2008, in press) and Sato and Ginsburg (2006, 2007) investigate what they call Particle-Stranding Ellipsis in Japanese. This elliptic pattern, first noted by Hattori (1949, 1960) (see also Vance 1993 and Yoshida 2004), has emerged recently as a robust reply pattern used in colloquial dialogues, as shown in (34B).

- (34) A: Taroo-wa saikin doo sitteiru-no?
 Taro-TOP these days how doing-Q
 'How is Taro doing these days?'
 B: [_{NP} *e*]-wa kinoo kaisha-o yameta-rasii-yo!
 TOP yesterday company-ACC quit-seem-SFP
 'Lit. I heard that *e* (=Taro) quit his company yesterday!'

In this dialogue, as a response to Speaker A's question, which introduces *Taroo* as the topic of the discourse, Speaker B starts his reply with the non-contrastive topic-marker *-wa* without the accompanying NP. Yoshida (2004) and Sato (in press) observe that the PSE is a matrix, clause

phenomenon, which targets the sentence-initial topic only once. Under PSE, an NP immediately followed by the topic marker receives a topic interpretation. Thus, the null NP in (32B) must refer back to the most salient discourse topic already introduced by (31A), namely, *Taroo*. Now, given this property of the PSE, our proposed analysis predicts that the null subject should exhibit neither the sloppy nor quantificational reading precisely in such an elliptic context, even though both null subjects and objects in Japanese freely allow such readings elsewhere. Examples in (35B) and (36B) indeed show that this prediction is borne out.

- (35) A: Taroo-te zibun-no hatukoi aite-kara-no rabu retaaa-wa moo suteta-no?
 John-TOP self-GEN first love-from-GEN love letter-TOP already discarded-Q
 ‘Did Taroo already discard the love letter from his first love?’

B: [_{NP} *e*]-wa-ne, ootoo-no Jiroo-ga suteta-nda-yo.
 TOP-PRT brother-GEN Jiro-NOM discarded-COP-SFP
 ‘*Lit.* Jiro, a brother of John, discarded *e*.’

B’: [_{NP} *e*], ootoo-no Jiroo-ga suteta-nda-yo.
 brother-GEN Jiroo-NOM discarded-COP-SFP
 ‘*Lit.* Jiro, a brother of John, discarded *e*.’

- (36) A: Kinoo sotugyoosei-ga sannin Sato-sensei-ni aini kita-soo-da-ne.
 yesterday graduate-NOM three Sato-TIT-DAT to meet come-seem-COP-SFP
 ‘I heard that three students came to see Professor Sato.’

B:	[_{NP} <i>e</i>]-wa-ne,	Suzuki-sensei-ni-mo	aini	kita-mitai-da-yo.
	TOP-PRT	Suzuki-TIT-DAT-also	to meet	come-seem-COP-SFP
	‘ <i>Lit.</i> I heard that <i>e</i> came to see Professor Suzuki.’			
B’:	[_{NP} <i>e</i>],	Suzuki-sensei-ni-mo	aini	kita-mitai-da-yo.
		Suzuki-TIT-DAT-also	to meet	come-seem-COP-SFP
	‘ <i>Lit.</i> I heard that <i>e</i> came to see Professor Suzuki.’			

The example in (35B) instantiates the PSE case where the NP is intended to refer back to the topic ("self's love letter from his first love"). Crucially, the elided NP in (35B) allows the strict reading ("Jiroo discarded Taroo's love letter from Taroo's first love") but does not allow the sloppy reading ("Jiroo discarded Jiroo's love letter from Jiroo's first love"). Similarly, the example in (36B) is acceptable only under the E-type reading, under which the same three students came to see Professors Sato and Professor Suzuki. It is unacceptable with the quantificational reading where the group of three students who came to see Professor Suzuki is different from the group of three students who came to see Professor Sato. Importantly, however, the sloppy/quantificational readings surface once we replace the topic marker-stranding elliptic NP in (35B)/(36B) with the null subject without the topic marker *-wa*. This point is shown in (35B') and (36B'). (35B') allows both the sloppy and strict readings. In a similar vein, (36B') allows both the E-type and quantificational readings. These results therefore suggest that in addition to agreement, the definiteness of the subject position plays a key role in blocking the LF copy process not only in Javanese and Chinese but also even in Japanese, a language which otherwise allows the ellipsis of both subjects and objects.

Given our foregoing discussion, the plausible hypothesis seems to be that the LF Copy process is available as a general operation for null arguments unless blocked otherwise. I have shown that our approach in terms of the definiteness subject restriction allows for a simpler account for the comparative interpretive subject-object asymmetries among Japanese, Turkish and Javanese; it not only covers the comparative differences between Japanese and Turkish which were analyzed by Şener and Takahashi (2010) from the perspective of agreement but also accounts for the curious subject-object asymmetry in Javanese which would remain unexplained under their analysis. Table 2 summarizes the results of our cross-linguistic investigation.

	Japanese		Turkish		Javanese	
	Subject	Object	Subject	Object	Subject	Object
Sloppy Reading?	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Quantificational Reading?	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES
Agreement?	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO
Definite Subject?	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO

Table 2: Correlation between the LF Copy Process and the Definiteness Subject Requirement

This table makes clear the correlation between the definiteness restriction on subjects and LF Copy. One of the most important typological issues left for future investigations is, of course, how far the correlation between the availability of the LF Copy process and the definiteness requirement/preference on subjects may go both across languages and within languages. In the next section, I test this correlation with data from Mandarin Chinese. However, the results reported in this section amply suggest that the discourse notion of definiteness is likely to be the key parameter controlling the application of the strictly grammar-internal process.

5. The Definiteness Restriction/Preference in Mandarin Chinese

Our analysis opens a new way to approach the typology of null arguments in other languages which permit argument ellipsis. In this section, I wish to explore one consequence with respect to the status of null arguments in Chinese. As is well-known since Huang (1984), Mandarin makes extensive use of topic-based subject/object drop, as shown in (37a-c).

- (37) Speaker A: Zhangsan kanjian Lisi le ma?
 Zhangsan see Lisi ASP Q
 ‘Did Zhangsan see Lisi?’
- Speaker B: a. *e* kanjian ta le.
 see him ASP
 ‘[He] saw him.’
- b. Ta kanjian *e* le.
 he see ASP
 ‘He saw [him].’

‘[He] saw [him].’

(Huang 1984: 533)

It is well known in the literature on Chinese (see Chao 1968, Li and Thompson 1981, *inter alia*) that the preverbal subject NP must be definite. Thus, Cheng and Sybesma (1999) observe that Mandarin bare nouns can be interpreted as indefinite, definite or generic in postverbal position whereas they must be interpreted as definite or generic, but not as indefinite. This point is illustrated in (38a-c) and (39a-c).

- (38) a. Hufei mai **shu** qu le.
Hufei buy book go SFP
'Hufei went to buy a book/books.'
- b. Hufei he-wan-le **tang.**
Hufei drink-finish-ASP soup
'Hufei finished the soup.'
- c. Wo xihuan **gou.**
I like dog
'I like dogs.'

(Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 510)

- (39) a. **Gou** yao guo malu.
 Dog want cross road
 ‘The dog wants to cross the road.’ *Not*: ‘A dog wants to cross the road.’
- b. **Gou** jintian tebie tinghua.
 Dog today very obedient
 ‘The dog/dogs {was/were} very obedient today.’
- c. **Gou** ai chi rou.
 dog love eat meat
 ‘Dogs love to eat meat.’

(Cheng and Sybesma 1999: 510)

Given this tendency for the subject to be definite, our analysis predicts that that null subjects in Mandarin must be pronominal, as in Javanese. In other words, such an NP should exhibit neither the sloppy reading nor the quantificational reading. The interpretive patterns attested in (40-43) below show that the prediction is indeed borne out.

- (40) a. Zhangsan kanjian-le tade mama.
 Zhangsan see-PERF his mother
 ‘Zhangsan saw his mother.’
- b. Lisi ye *e* kanjian-le.
 Lisi also see-PERF
 ‘*Lit.* Lisi also saw *e*.’

- (41) a. Zhangsan shup [ziji de haizi mei na qian].
 Zhangsan say self GEN child NEG take money
 ‘Zhangsan said that his child did not take money.’
- b. Lisi ye shup [*e* mei na money].
 Lisi too say GEN take money
 ‘*Lit.* Lisi also said that *e* did not take money.’

(Takahashi 2008b: 415)

- (42) a. Zhangsan xi huan san wei lao shi.
 Zhangsan like three CL teacher
 ‘Zhangsan likes three teachers.’
- b. Lisi ye *e* xi huan.
 Lisi also like
 ‘*Lit.* Lisi likes *e*, too.’
- (43) a. San wei nu sheng lai jian Zhangsan.
 Three CL girl come see Zhangsan
 ‘Three girls came to see Zhangsan.’
- b. *e* ye lai jian Lisi.
 also came see Lisi
 ‘*Lit.* *e* came to see Lisi, too.’

As first observed by Huang (1991) and Otani and Whitman (1991), null objects in Chinese allow the sloppy interpretation. Thus, the elliptic object in (40b) can refer either to Zhangsan’s mother (the strict reading) or to Lisi’s mother (the sloppy reading). By contrast, Takahashi

(2008b) points out that the missing subject in (41b) can refer to Zhangsan's child (the strict reading) but cannot refer to Lisi's child (the sloppy reading). A similar subject-object asymmetry holds with respect to the availability of the quantificational reading. The null object in (42b) exhibits both the E-type and quantificational readings whereas the null subject in (43b) only allows the E-type reading.

Huang (1991) and Otani and Whitman (1991) have suggested that the sloppy interpretation of the null object in Chinese arises from the process of VP-ellipsis accompanied by V-raising. This analysis is attractive because it successfully reduces the ambiguity to that independently observed under VP-ellipsis (Williams 1977). The missing VP in (44b) allows both the strict ('Tom criticized John') and sloppy ('Tom criticized Tom') interpretations

- (44) a. John criticized himself.
 b. Tom did [_{VP} *e*], too.

Null subjects in Chinese do not allow the sloppy reading, on the other hand, because they are not contained within the ellipsis site in the first place. However, it is quite debatable whether we have independent evidence in favor of V-raising in Chinese. Our proposed analysis, by contrast, straightforward explains the subject-object asymmetry which is free from this controversy.

4. Conclusions

This paper has investigated the ellipsis of subjects and objects in Javanese in light of the recent hypothesis that certain null arguments in Japanese/Korean/Turkish are the result of LF Copy in the sense of Oku (1998) rather than empty pronominals. I have shown that the elliptic patterns

attested in Javanese cannot be entirely accommodated by the agreement-sensitive theory of LF Copy put forth in Saito (2007) and Şener and Takahashi (2010) because this language has no syntactic agreement like Japanese but only the empty objects can be elliptic, as in Turkish. Based on this result, I have hypothesized that an alternative parameter exists in Javanese which blocks the relevant process in the subject position is the definiteness restriction on the subject position, a familiar observation in the literature on Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. This analysis, I have further shown, also correctly predicts that Mandarin Chinese exhibits the same subject-object asymmetry as Javanese: objects, but not subjects, can be the target of LF Copy, in this language, because of its preference for definite subjects. It remains to be seen how persuasive the role of the definite subject requirement is in governing the LF copy option in many other languages which allow null arguments.

References

- Aygen, Gülşat. 2001. Finiteness, clause structure, and Case. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Chao, Yuen-Ren. 1968. *A grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cheng, Lisa and Rint Sybesma. 1999. Bare and not-so-bare-nouns and the structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 509-542.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1971. Deep structure, surface structure and semantic interpretation. In *Semantics: An interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*, ed. Danny Steinberg and Leon Jakobovits, 183-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1976. Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2: 303-351.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon, Kozue Inoha and Yassir Tjung. 2002. A constraint on *wh* in situ in Javanese. In *Proceedings of AFLA 8: The Eighth Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards, 91-106. MITWPL: Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT.
- Davies, William. 1999. Madurese and Javanese as strict word-order languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38: 152-167.
- Enç, Mürvet. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 1-26.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Erguvanlı-Taylan, Eser. 1987. The role of semantic features in Turkish word order. *Folia Linguistica* 21: 215-227.
- Evans, Gareth. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 337-362.
- Fukui, Naoki. 1986. A theory of category projection and its application. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Fukui, Naoki. 1995. *Theory of projection in syntax*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. and Thorstein Fretheim. 2004. Topic and focus. In *The handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward, 175-196. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hattori, Shiro. 1949. Gutaiteki Gengo tan'i to chuusyooteki 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.

- Hoji, Hajime. 1985. Logical form constraints and configurational structures in Japanese. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Hoji, Hajime. 1998. Null object and sloppy identity in Japanese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 127-152.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15: 531-574.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1991. Remarks on the status of the null object. In *Principles and parameters in comparative grammar*, ed. Robert Freidin, 56-76. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kelepir, Meltem. 2001. Topics in Turkish syntax: Clausal structure and scope. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Kennelly, Sarah D. 1997. Nonspecific external arguments in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları* 7: 58-75. Kebikeç Yayınları, Ankara.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1987. Turkish and the other Turkic languages. In *The world's major languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie, 619-644. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 2002. Functional projections and their subjects in Turkish clauses. In *The verb in Turkish*, ed. Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan, 183-212. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1965. Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1988. Whether we agree or not: A comparative syntax of English and Japanese. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12: 1-47.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1992. *Japanese syntax and semantics: Collected papers*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, Charles and Sandra Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mashudi, B. H. Kader. 1976. The syntax of Malay interrogatives. Ph.D. Dissertation, Simon Fraser University.
- Ohso, Mieko. 1976. A study of zero pronominalization in Japanese. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Oku, Satoshi. 1998. A theory of selection and reconstruction in the minimalist perspective. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Otani, Kazuyo and John Whitman. 1991. V-raising and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 345-358.
- Özsoy, Sumru. 1988. Null subject parameter and Turkish. In *Studies on Modern Turkish: Proceedings of the Third Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, ed. Hendrik E. Boeschoten and Ludo Th. Verhoeven, 82-91. Tilberg: Tilberg University Press.
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2004. Case, referentiality, and phrase structure. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Öztürk, Balkız. 2006. Null arguments and Case-driven Agree in Turkish. In *Minimalist essays*, ed. Cedric Boeckx, 268-287. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Poedjosoedarmo, Gloria. 1977. Thematization and information structure in Javanese. In *NUSA vol. 3, Miscellaneous studies in Indonesia and languages in Indonesia: Part II*, ed. Amran Halim, 34-43. Jakarta: Lembaga Bahasa Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1985. Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

- Saito, Mamoru. 2007. Notes on East Asian argument ellipsis. *Language Research* 43: 203-227.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2008. Case-stranding nominal ellipsis in Japanese: A preliminary sketch. *Snippets* 17: 9-10.
- Sato, Yosuke. In press. Particle-stranding ellipsis, phase theory and the privilege of the root. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- 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. by Changguk Yim, 293-300. Seoul: The Korean Generative Grammar Circle.
- Sato, Yosuke and Jason Ginsburg. 2007. A new type of nominal ellipsis in Japanese. In *Formal approaches to Japanese linguistics: Proceedings of FAJL 4*, ed. by Yoichi Miyamoto and Masao Ochi, 197-204. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy: MITWPL
- Şener, Serkan. 2008. Non-canonical Case licensing is canonical: Accusative subjects of CPs in Turkish. Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Şener, Serkan and Daiko Takahashi. 2010. Ellipsis of arguments in Japanese and Turkish. *Nanzan Linguistics* 6: 79-99. Nanzan University: Center for Linguistics.
- Soemarmo. 1970. Subject-predicate, focus-presupposition, and topic-comment in Bahasa Indonesia and Javanese. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 2008a. Quantificational null objects and argument ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 307-326.
- Takahashi, Daiko. 2008b. Noun phrase ellipsis. In *The Oxford handbook of Japanese linguistics*, ed. Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito, 394-422. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Takeuchi, Hajime. 2010. Exceptional Case-marking in Japanese and optional feature transmission. *Nanzan Linguistics* 6: 101-128. Nanzan University: Center for Linguistics.
- Turan, Ümit. 1995. Null vs. overt subjects in Turkish discourse: A centering analysis. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Van Valin, Robert D. and Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning, and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vance, Timothy. 1993. Are Japanese particles clitics? *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 27: 3-33.
- Williams, Edwin. 1977. Discourse and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 101-139.
- Yoshida, Tomoyuki. 2004. Syudai no syooryaku gensho: Hikaku toogoron teki koosatu (The phenomenon of topic ellipsis: a comparative syntactic consideration). *Nihongo kyooikugaku no siten* (Perspectives on Japanese language pedagogy), ed. by The Editorial Committee of Annals, 291-305. Tokyo: Tokyodo Publishers.