A typology of stranded phonologically weak elements[1]

Željko Bošković

University of Connecticut

Abstract: The paper presents a unified account of a number of superficially very different cases from Japanese, Serbo-Croatian, German, and Dutch where a phonologically weak element is stranded without a host. It proposes a new typology regarding when a phonologically weak element can be stranded where adjacency to a prosodic boundary is necessary for such stranding, with parametrization regarding the strength of the prosodic boundary: it can be an utterance boundary (‖) or an intonational-phrase boundary (#), or either ‖ or # (in the last case, both boundaries can license the stranding). Furthermore, the difference in the direction of adjacency to the prosodic boundary mirrors the difference in the adjacency to the host: if the relevant element is a prefix/proclitic, both the host and the prosodic boundary follow it, if it is an enclitic/suffix, they both precede it.

Keywords: clitics, particle-stranding ellipsis, prosodic phrasing, preposition stranding

1. Introduction

The literature occasionally notes cases where phonologically weak elements are stranded, with no host. There are very few accounts even of individual cases of this sort, and no attempts at a unified account even at a descriptive level of the phenomenon as a whole, the discussion of individual cases being highly construction specific. This short paper is the first attempt at a unified account. The paper will suggest a typology of conditions under which the host of phonologically weak elements can be dropped. The account will unify a number of cases from various languages which have previously been treated separately, in particular, Japanese, Serbo-Croatian, German, and Dutch.

I will argue that all these superficially different cases where the host of a phonologically weak element is missing do have something in common, namely adjacency of the relevant element to a prosodic boundary, which will be taken to be a prerequisite for such stranding. Furthermore, I will offer a new typology where the type of a prosodic boundary matters with such stranding, in particular what matters is whether the prosodic boundary is an intonational(I)-phrase boundary (#) or an utterance boundary (‖).

In the following discussion I assume the standard prosodic hierarchy: utterance/I-phrase/phonological phrase/prosodic word (see for example Nespor and Vogel 1982, 1986, Selkirk 1986, Hayes 1989). What will matter for our purposes are the first two, where utterance is the highest level unit and I-phrases correspond, roughly, to individual clauses and certain elements that are flanked by pauses, like appositives, parentheticals, and heavy fronted constituents (see the discussion below). Utterance boundaries, on the other hand, are found only utterance initially/finally.

2. Particle-stranding ellipsis in Japanese

---

[1] I thank two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and suggestions.

The first case I will consider is Japanese particle-stranding ellipsis, a rather interesting phenomenon which elides the host of a suffix (see Yoshida 2004; Sato and Ginsburg 2007; Goto 2012; Sato 2012; Nasu 2012; Shibata 2014; Sakamoto and Saito 2018; Sato and Maeda 2019; Yamashita 2020; Takita 2020, Fujiwara 2022). The phenomenon is illustrated by (1), where the host of the topic particle *wa*, which is normally a suffix, is elided (throughout, the relevant stranded elements will be given in bold; note that particle-stranding ellipsis is not limited to the topic particle—the phenomenon is quite general, affecting all suffixal particles, see the references cited above).

(1) A: Taroo-wa ki-ta   no.
       Taro-TOP come-Past Q
        'Has Taro come?'
    B: **-wa**   mada ki-masen.
       -TOP yet   come-NEG.POLITE
      '**e** (=Taro) hasn't come yet.'

The phenomenon occurs only sentence initially. It is often assumed that particle-stranding ellipsis occurs only in matrix clauses based on examples like (2), where the topic particle whose host is elided is the initial element of an embedded clause.

 (2) 'Who do you think at that time killed Taro?'
    *John-wa   sono toki [CP **-wa**, Mary-ga   korosi-ta   to] omot-ta.
     John-TOP that time   **-TOP** Mary-NOM kill-PAST C   think-PAST
     Intended 'John thought at that time that **e** (=Taro), Mary killed.'
                                                                     (Sato 2012)

Shibata (2014), however, shows that particle-stranding ellipsis is possible in embedded clauses, as long as there is no overt matrix clause material that would precede the particle (see also Sato and Maeda 2019, Takita 2020), which means that the stranded particle simply needs to be utterance initial. This is illustrated by (3). In (3), the relevant nominal is the subject of the embedded clause—the nominal is elided, with its nominative suffix stranded. What is important here is that due to *pro*-drop in the matrix clause and the head-final status of Japanese, the subject of the embedded clause, which is affected by particle-stranding ellipsis, is utterance initial although it is located in the embedded clause (note that this is a context where the subject of the embedded clause cannot undergo movement into the matrix clause, hence it must be located in the embedded clause).

(3) 'Will John quit his job?'
    -ga   sigoto-o yameru ka dooka-wa   sira-nai   kedo,   sooiu uwasa-wa aru.
    -NOM job-ACC quit   Q whether-TOP know-NEG though such rumor-TOP exist
    'Though I don't know whether **e** (=he) will quit his job, there is such a rumor.'
                                                                     (Shibata 2014)

The data in (4) further illustrate the utterance initial requirement. Note also that (4b) does not improve with a pause/intonational-phrase boundary following *tabun*, which will be relevant for the discussion of Serbo-Croatian below.

(4) 'What will John do if you say you want to study abroad?'
    a. **-wa**   tabun   hantaisu-ru   darou kedo,   settokusu-ru   tumori.
       -TOP probably disagree-PRES may   though persuade-PRES will
       'Though, speaking of **e** (=John), he may probably disagree, I will persuade him.'
    b. *Tabun(#) –**wa** hantaisu-ru   darou kedo,   settokusu-ru   tumori.
       probably   **-TOP** disagree-PRES may   though persuade-PRES will
                                                (Nasu 2010)

The above data show that particle-stranding ellipsis is not a matrix phenomenon. Following Shibata (2014), I assume that the phenomenon is prosodically conditioned. In particular, the above data indicate that it can occur only adjacent to an utterance boundary (see below regarding the direction of adjacency). In (1), the relevant element is located in the matrix clause and in (3) in an embedded clause. However, in all the good cases, (1), (3), and (4a), the relevant element is utterance initial, i.e. it is adjacent to an utterance boundary. This is not the case with the unacceptable examples in (2) and (4b).

3. Unsupported enclitics in Serbo-Croatian
Consider now Serbo-Croatian (SC) auxiliary enclitics. SC auxiliary enclitics cannot occur sentence initially. Thus, (5a) contrasts with (5b) (note that SC is a pro-drop language).

(5) a.***Sam** stavio narandžu na taj izuzetno   veliki kuhinjski sto.
      am put   orange on that extremely big   kitchen   table
      'I put an orange on that extremely big kitchen table.'
    b. cf. Ja sam stavio narandžu na taj izuzetno   veliki kuhinjski sto.
         I am put   orange   on that extremely big   kitchen   table

The copious literature on SC enclitics generally ignores the fact that, as noted in Bennett (1987), Bošković (2001), Browne (1975), Percus (1993), and Schütze (1994), for most speakers, auxiliary enclitics can occur after a sentence internal-pause, as illustrated by (6).

(6) Na taj izuzetno   veliki kuhinjski sto#   **sam**   stavio narandžu.
   on that extremely big   kitchen   table am   put   orange
   'On that extremely big kitchen table, I put an orange.'   (Percus 1993)

Another example of this type is given in (7).[2]

---

[2] Auxiliary verbs in SC behave in the same way in all relevant respects when they function as a copula. Note also that SC differs from Slovenian, where both examples like (6)-(7) <u>and</u> examples like (5a) are acceptable,

(7) Problemi o   kojima ćemo razgovarati# **su** kompleksni.
   problems about which will converse   are complex
    'Problems that we shall discuss are complex.'   (Bennett 1987)

The phenomenon is not found only with heavy fronted constituents, as shown by (8), where the pause is induced by the presence of an appositive.

(8) Ja, tvoja mama, # **sam** oprala narandžu.
   I   your mother   am washed orange
    'I, your mother, washed an orange.'   (Bošković 2015)

What is behind the contrast between (5a) and (6-8), i.e. why does the sentence-initial vs sentence-internal pause difference matter? It is standardly assumed (see for example Nespor and Vogel 1982, 1986, Selkirk 1986, Hayes 1989) that unless interrupted by an element that forms a separate intonation domain, each clause is mapped into a single I-phrase, with the CP edge corresponding to an I-phrase boundary. Some elements, such as appositives, parentheticals, and heavy fronted constituents, form separate I-phrases, evidence for which is provided by the fact that they are followed by pauses. This means that (6)-(8) are parsed into more than one I-phrase, since the fronted heavy constituent and the appositive form separate I-phrases, with a new I-phrase starting after these elements, which are in fact obligatorily followed by a pause (# thus indicates a pause as well as an I-phrase boundary).

   Importantly, the difference between (5a) and (6)-(8) can then be straightforwardly stated in prosodic terms: in (6)-(8) the enclitic is adjacent to a pure I-phrase boundary, while in (5a) it is adjacent to an utterance boundary. I thus suggest that SC auxiliary enclitics can be stranded only when adjacent to a pure I-phrase boundary.[3, 4]

   Comparing now the relevant phenomena in SC and Japanese, they in a sense represent a mirror image of each other: the relevant element can occur without a host in SC only when adjacent to a sentence-internal pause—it cannot when adjacent to a sentence-initial pause; in Japanese, on the other hand, the relevant element can occur without a host only when adjacent to a sentence-initial pause—it cannot when adjacent to a sentence-internal pause.

   Example (9) further confirms this for Japanese; the contrast between (1) and (9) confirms that adjacency to an utterance boundary is needed in Japanese, adjacency to an I-phrase boundary being insufficient.

(9) A: 'Will John come?'
   B: *Eetto(,)   **-wa** ki-masen.
       well   **-TOP** come-NEG.POLITE

---

the reason being that in Slovenian, the relevant elements can be either enclitics or proclitics (see for example Bošković 2001).

[3] The way prosodic phrasing works, when there is an utterance boundary there is also an I-phrase boundary. What I mean by "pure I-phrase boundary" is the situation where there is only an I-phrase boundary (below, for ease of exposition I will also use "I-phrase boundary" to refer to such a situation).

[4] For another perspective on the contrast in question, see Bošković (2015).

'Well, he won't come.'   (Shibata 2014)

I suggest that in both cases, adjacency of the relevant element to a prosodic boundary matters, this being a prerequisite for the stranding under investigation. However, there is a parameterization as to the type of the prosodic boundary, where what matters is whether the prosodic boundary is an I-phrase boundary (#) or an utterance boundary (‖). In the Japanese case, adjacency to an utterance boundary is needed, while in the SC it is adjacency to an I-phrase boundary. As a result, the Japanese suffixes under consideration can occur only sentence-initially, while the SC enclitics under consideration can only occur after a sentence internal-pause.

4. Preposition stranding in German and Dutch

Consider now restrictions on preposition (P)-stranding in German and Dutch. Den Besten and Webelhuth (1990) and Thiersch (2017) show that P-stranding in German and Dutch is possible only if the preposition is adjacent to the verb or its trace. Illustrative examples from German are given in (10). Note that the stranded preposition is adjacent to the verb in (10a-b) and to its trace in (10e).

(10) a. Er hat da$_i$ noch nicht [das Vorwort [t$_i$ **von**]] gelesen.
          he has it yet   not   the foreword   of read
          'He hasn't yet read the preface of it.'
    b. Er hat da$_i$ [das Vorwort t$_j$]$_k$ noch nicht [t$_i$ **von**]$_j$ t$_k$ gelesen.
       he has it the foreword   yet   not   of   read
    c. *Da$_i$ hat er noch nicht [t$_i$ **von**] das Vorwort gelesen
         it   has he yet not   of   the foreword read
    d. *Da$_i$ hat er [t$_i$ **von**] noch nicht das Vorwort   gelesen
         it   has he of   yet   not   the foreword read
    e. [$_{VP}$ t$_k$ t$_j$ gelesen]$_m$ hat er da$_i$ [das Vorwort]$_k$ noch nicht [$_{PP}$ t$_i$ **von**]$_j$ t$_m$
             read   has he it   the foreward yet   not   of
                                                                  (den Besten and Webelhuth 1990)

I suggest a reinterpretation of these data, which unifies the German data in question with the Japanese/SC data from above. The suggestion is that at least in the above cases, where the preposition is not adjacent to the noun,[5] the verb is the host of the stranded preposition, and the host can be missing only when the preposition is adjacent to an utterance boundary in German. This is the case in (10e). German P-stranding is then subject to the same prosodic condition as Japanese particle-stranding.

There is a difference in the direction of adjacency, which is, however, principled: If the relevant element is a prefix/proclitic both the host and the prosodic boundary follow it, if it is an enclitic/suffix, they both precede it. The German case instantiates the former scenario, and the Japanese case and the SC case instantiate the latter scenario.

_____

[5] I assume that when the preposition is adjacent to the higher noun, i.e. the noun that takes the PP as its complement, as in *Da hat er [das Vorwort **von**__] noch nicht gelesen*, it undergoes reanalysis with the noun (see, for example, Hornstein and Weinberg 1981), hence the issue of licensing it does not arise.

Furthermore, I argue that Dutch minimally differs from German, in a similar way Japanese differs from SC. In contrast to German, it is possible to strand the preposition in (11) in Dutch.

(11) a.Ik heb daar$_i$ boeken [t$_i$ **op**]# en [op deze tafel] gelegd
  I have there books   on   and on this table   put
  'I have put books there and on this table.'
  b.?Daar$_i$ heb ik boeken [t$_i$ **op**]# en [op deze tafel] gelegd
    there have I books   on   and on this table   put   (Bošković 2020)

Crucially, a prosodic boundary, namely #, must follow the stranded preposition (see Bošković 2020). German disallows (11). I suggest that in Dutch, the stranding is also possible when the preposition is adjacent to a pure I-phrase boundary (as well as ‖ — (10e) is in fact acceptable in Dutch).[6] There is then no need to posit a syntactic difference between German and Dutch here: a similar prosodic difference regarding the strength of the prosodic boundary to the one found with SC and Japanese, discussed in sections 3 and 2 respectively, is at work here.[7]

---

[6] There is another interesting aspect of (11): it involves extraction from a conjunct. Bošković (2020) shows that (11) is part of a larger class of exceptions to the Coordinate Structure Constraint: an element that is base-generated at the edge of the first conjunct, or undergoes obligatory movement to its edge, can extract. In other words, the Coordinate Structure Constraint holds only for successive-cyclic movement via the conjunct edge. I refer the reader to Bošković (2020) for relevant discussion, as well as a number of other cases that illustrate the generalization in question.

[7] Interestingly, while the literature on particle-stranding ellipsis in Japanese generally claims that particles can only be stranded when sentence initial, a few authors disagree with this claim, giving examples where the stranded particle is not sentence-initial (Nasu 2012, Abe 2015, Yamashita 2019). Importantly, a pause still precedes the particle in the examples they give, as in the representative example in (i), with the comma indicating a pause (and an I-phrase boundary).

(i) Jim-ga [UConn-ga   NCAA-ni   katu to] itteru ga,
   Jim-NOM Uconn-NOM NCAA-DAT win C   say   but
   'Jim says that Uconn will win NCAA, but'
   a. ?Boku-ni-wa, Δ-**to-wa**,   omoenai.
       I-DAT-TOP   C-TOP not.seem
   'It does not seem to me that-Δ.'   (Abe 2015)

It appears then that we are dealing here with speaker variation where for the speakers who accept examples like (i), Japanese patterns with Dutch, in that adjacency to either an utterance boundary or an I-phrase boundary matters (see here Fujiwara 2022, who also explicitly notes that he and his informants do not accept examples like (i) (and (ii) below), which indicates that we are indeed dealing with speaker variation here).

  Importantly, the authors who give examples like (i) as acceptable also disagree with the general claim made in the literature on particle-stranding ellipsis that particle-stranding ellipsis cannot occur twice in the same sentence. Thus, Nasu (2012) gives (ii). Note that this is not surprising—each stranded particle is still adjacent to a pause/an I-phrase boundary in (ii).

(ii) A: Taro-wa   Osaka zyanakute Tokyo-ni   it-ta   no?
     Taro-TOP Osaka not   Tokyo-DAT go-PAST C
     'Did Taro go to Tokyo, not Osaka?'
   B: Δ-**Wa**, Δ-**ni**,   it-ta   n   desu.
       TOP   DAT say-PAST Fin Foc
     lit. 'ΔTOP went ΔDAT '   (Nasu 2012)

5. Conclusion

In summary, I have proposed a new typology regarding when a phonologically weak element can be stranded where adjacency to a prosodic boundary is necessary for such stranding, with parametrization regarding the strength of the prosodic boundary: it can be ‖ (an utterance boundary) or # (an intonational-phrase boundary), or either ‖ or # (in the last case, adjacency to either of these prosodic boundaries suffices). Furthermore, the difference in the direction of adjacency to the prosodic boundary mirrors the difference in the adjacency to the host: if the relevant element is a prefix/proclitic, both the host and the prosodic boundary follow it, if it is an enclitic/suffix, they both precede it.

Needless to say, the above discussion represents a preliminary investigation, additional cases of stranded weak elements should be examined and tested with respect to the suggestions made above. However, the hope is that the above discussion provides a fresh perspective to examine, and unify, such elements in various languages.[8]

Finally, given that sensitivity to the distinction between utterance and intonational phrase boundaries is not frequently observed, it is worth noting here that Bošković (2015) shows that Serbo-Croatian clitic placement, in particular, the traditional distinction between after-the-first-word and after-the-first-constituent clitic placement, is also sensitive to the distinction between utterance and intonational phrase boundaries.

---

[8] A speculative note is in order. Slovenian clitics may in some cases stand on their own, without a host to attach to (see Priestly 1993, Bošković 2001, 2016, Dvořák 2007, Franks 2010, Franks and King 2000, Golden and Milojević Sheppard 2000, among others), as illustrated by (i) with the pronominal clitic *ga* 'him'.

(i) A **ga**   poznaš? **Ga**.
     Q him.acc know   him.acc
     'Do you know him? I do.'   (Dvořák 2007)

Notice that in such cases the clitic is both left and right adjacent to an utterance boundary. There is another exceptional property of Slovenian clitics. As noted in footnote 2, Slovenian auxiliary and pronominal clitics can be either proclitics or enclitics. It may be possible to tie together these two exceptional properties of Slovenian clitics. Consider what it takes to be fully stranded, like *ga* in (i). What is relevant here is adjacency to an utterance boundary. Suppose that it is not enough to satisfy the directional adjacency condition, namely if the relevant element is an enclitic the prosodic boundary must precede it, and if the relevant element is a proclitic the prosodic boundary must follow it, but that "wrong" directional adjacency is also not allowed: if the relevant element is an enclitic, a prosodic boundary that could license it could not follow it (this may actually hold only for utterance boundary licensing). A prediction of this would be that only elements which can be either proclitics or enclitics, in other words, which have no directionality requirement for attachment, could be fully stranded. Slovenian exactly fits this. It is particularly important in this context that Bošković (2001) gives a number of empirical arguments that Slovenian clitics are not ambiguous between being proclitics and enclitics, where the same form would be ambiguous between a proclitic and an enclitic, they are actually not specified for the directionality of attachment. At any rate, the account suggested here would make the Slovenian situation principled: that Slovenian clitics can be stranded and that they are not specified for the directionality of attachment would not be accidental properties of Slovenian clitics, since the former would depend on the latter (this would be a one-way correlation though, since other factors would also be relevant here, including those discussed in this paper). At any rate, a prediction would be that only elements that in principle can be either proclitics or enclitics can be fully stranded.

References

Abe, Jun. (2015) *The In-situ Approach to Sluicing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bennett, David C. (1987) Word order change in progress: The case of Slovene and Serbo-Croat and its relevance for Germanic. *Journal of Linguistics* 23:269-287.

Besten, Hans den, and Gert Webelhuth. (1990) Stranding. In Günther Grewendorf and Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), *Scrambling and barriers*, 77-92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bošković, Željko. (2001) *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena.* Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.

Bošković, Željko. (2015) On prosodic boundaries. In Gerhild Zybatow, Petr Biskup, Marcel Guhl, Claudia Hurtig, Olav Mueller-Reichau, and Maria Yastrebova (eds.), *Slavic grammar from a formal perspective: The 10th anniversary FDSL conference*, 93-104. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Bošković, Željko. (2016) On second position clitics crosslinguistically. In Franc Marušič and Rok Žaucer (eds.), *Formal Studies in Slovenian Syntax. In honor of Janez Orešnik*, 23-54. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bošković, Željko. (2020) On The Coordinate Structure Constraint, Across-the-Board-Movement, phases and labeling. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, Cora Pots and Tanja Temmerman (eds.), *Recent developments in Phase Theory*, 133-182. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Browne, Wayles. (1975) Serbo-Croatian enclitics for English-speaking learners. In Rudolf Filipović (eds.), *Contrastive analysis of English and Serbo-Croatian*, Vol. 1, 105-134. Zagreb: Institute of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb.

Dvořák, Boštjan. (2007) Slovenian clitic pronouns and what is so special about them. *Slovenski Jezik – Slovene Linguistic Studies* 6: 209-233.

Franks, Steven. (2010) Clitics in Slavic. *Glossos* 10: 1-157.

Franks, Steven, and Tracy King. (2000) *A handbook of Slavic clitics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fujiwara, Yoshiki (2022) *Movement approach to ellipsis.* PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Golden, Marija, and Milena Milojević-Sheppard. (2000) Slovene pronominal clitics. In Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic phenomena in European languages,* 191-207. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goto, Nobu. (2012) A note on particle stranding ellipsis. In Bum-Sik Park (ed.) *Proceedings of the 14th Seoul International Conference on Generative Grammar (SICOGG)*, 78–97. Seoul: Hankuk Publishing.

Hayes, Bruce. (1989) The prosodic hierarchy in meter. In Paul Kiparsky and Gilbert Youmans (eds.), *Rhythm and meter. Phonetics and phonology*. Vol. 1, 201-260. San Diego: Academic Press.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Amy Weinberg. (1981) Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 55–91.

Nasu, Norio. (2012). Zyosi-Zanryu Ga Okoru Bunto No Iti Nituite [On Sentence-Initial Positions for Particle Stranding].” *CLAVEL* 2, 1–12.

Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. (1982) Prosodic domains of external sandhi rules. In Harry van der Hulst and Neil Smith (eds.), *The structure of phonological representation, Part 1.,* 225-255. Dordrecht: Foris.

Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. (1986) *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Percus, Orin (1993) The captious clitic: Problems in Serbo-Croatian clitic placement. Ms., MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Priestly, Tom. 1996. Slovene. In Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic Languages*, 388-451. London: Routledge.

Sakamoto, Yuta, and Hiroaki Saito. (2018) Overtly stranded but covertly not. In Wm. G. Bennett, Lindsay Hracs, and Dennis Ryan Storoshenko (eds.) *Proceedings of the 35th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 349–56. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

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 Robert Ginsburg. (2007) A New Type of Nominal Ellipsis in Japanese. In Yoichi Miyamoto and Masao Ochi (eds.), *Proceedings of FAJL 4: Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics*, 197–204. Cambridge, MA: Department of Linguistics, MITWPL.

Sato, Yosuke, and Masako Maeda. (2019). Particle stranding ellipsis involves PF-deletion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 37: 357–88.

Schütze, Carson. (1994) Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology-syntax interface. In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley and Tony Bures (eds.), *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21, 373-473. Cambridge, MA: Department of Linguistics, MITWPL.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. (1986) *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure.* Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press.

Shibata, Yoshiyuki. (2014) A phonological approach to particle stranding ellipsis in Japanese. Paper presented at *Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics* 7, National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics and International Christian University, Tokyo, June 27-29.

Takita, Kensuke. (2020) Labeling for linearization. *The Linguistic Review* 37: 75–116.

Thiersch, Craig. (2017) Remnant movement. In Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, second edition, 1–77. New York: Wiley.

Yamashita, Hideaki. (2019) Reconsidering the nature of particle stranding ellipsis in Japanese. In Yurie Hara, Shigeto Kawahara and Seunghun J. Lee (eds.), *ICU Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 7, 79–91.

Yamashita, Hideaki. (2020) Particle Stranding Ellipsis in Japanese Involves LF-Copying, Not PF-Deletion. In *Pre-Proceedings of the 161th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*, 230–36.

Yoshida, Tomoyuki. (2004) Syudai No Syooryaku Gensho: Hikaku Toogoron Teki Koosatu [The Phenomenon of Topic Drop: A Comparative Syntactic Consideration]." In *Nihongo Kyooikugaku No Siten* [Perspectives on Japanese Language Pedagogy], 291–305. Tokyo: Tokyodo.