1. Introduction

Although Japanese is a strict head-final SOV language, various kinds of constituents may appear in the post-verbal position. Some concrete examples of this construction, called right dislocation, are given in (1).\(^1\)

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Taroo-ga ∆ katta -yo, ano hon -o
   \hspace{1em} Taroo-NOM bought-PRT that book-ACC
   \hspace{1em} ‘(lit.) Taroo bought, that book’
\item b. Taroo-ga ∆ inu -o hirotta -yo, ano kooen -de
   \hspace{1em} Taroo-NOM dog-ACC picked.up -PRT that park -in
   \hspace{1em} ‘(lit.) Taroo picked up a dog, in that park’
\item c. Taroo-ga ∆ okane -o nusunda-yo, ano saihu -kara
   \hspace{1em} Taroo-NOM money-ACC stole -PRT that wallet-from
   \hspace{1em} ‘(lit.) Taroo stole money, from that wallet’
\end{enumerate}

Dislocated phrases can be Case-marked NPs as in (1a) or PPs as in (1b-c).

There is a version of right dislocation where dislocated phrases lack their Case-markers/postpositions, as in (2).\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Right dislocated constituents are given in boldface, and the symbol ∆ indicates the gap corresponding to them. The particle -yo is attached to the verb to make the sentence more colloquial, as right dislocation is more natural in colloquial speech. Although various constituents including clausal arguments, adverbials, and prenominal modifiers can appear in the post-verbal position, I restrict myself to the cases where nominal elements are right dislocated, since pseudo-right dislocation counterparts (which are introduced below in the text) can be created only in these cases.

\(^2\) All instances of Case-marker/postposition do not appear to be able to be missing equally (cf. Endo 1996 and Fukutomi 2007). In particular, Case-markers can be missing more easily than postpositions. Furthermore, the fact that (2c) is degraded compared to (2b) for some speakers indicates that there are...
I call this version of right dislocation *pseudo*-right dislocation (PRD), as opposed to the “standard” right dislocation (SRD) in (1), where dislocated elements are Case-/postposition-marked. In the previous literature, PRD has been rarely studied in detail, and if any, it has been taken for granted that PRD is merely a sub-case of SRD (see, e.g., Endo 1996, Fukutomi 2007). The only exception I am aware of is Tanaka and Kizu (2006, 2007, henceforth T&K), who focus on right dislocations with Case-marked and Case-less NPs such as (1a) and (2a).3

The purpose of this paper is two-fold: First, building on the data by T&K, I provide a novel set of observations regarding PRD, comparing it with SRD. Then, I propose an account of the properties of PRD, claiming that it is derived from the bare-topic construction discussed by Taguchi (2009) (see also Endo 2007).

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 I provide a set of data regarding PRD. Section 3 proposes an account of the properties of PRD, and compares it with some potential alternative analyses. Section 4 concludes this paper.

2. Observations

This section provides a set of data concerning PRD, comparing it with SRD. Although it is shown that there are some similarities between SRD and PRD in Section 2.1, we see that they do behave differently in a significant way in Section 2.2.

---

3 I thank Hideaki Yamashita (p.c.) for reminding me the relevance of T&K. To be more precise, they also examine the behaviors of Case-marked and Case-less NPs in cleft and relative clauses, and argue that the three constructions behave in the same way.
2.1. Similarities between SRD and PRD

It has been observed at least since Kuno 1978 and Inoue 1978 that SRD is insensitive to Ross’ (1967) Right-Roof Constraint, which prohibits rightward movement from crossing a clausal boundary. That is, right dislocated phrases can participate in long-distance dependencies, as shown in (3). The fact that the examples in (3) are still grammatical even if the Case-makers/postpositions of the dislocated phrases are missing indicates that PRD is also insensitive to the constraint, on a par with SRD.

(3) a. Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ katta to] itteita-yo, ano hon -{o/Ø}
Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM bought C said -PRT that book-ACC
‘(lit.) Hanako said [that Taroo bought Δ], that book’

b. Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ inu -o hirotta to] itteita-yo, ano
Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM dog -ACC picked.up C said -PRT that kooen -{de/Ø}
park -in
‘(lit.) Hanako said [that Taroo picked up a dog Δ], (in) that park’

The second similarity between SRD and PRD is illustrated by the examples in (4). As shown in (4), if the dislocated phrase appears on the right-periphery of the embedded clause, the sentence becomes ungrammatical no matter whether the complementizer precedes or follows it. That is, SRD is restricted to the root clause (see Haraguchi 1973, Kuno 1978, Saito 1985, Abe 1999, and Tanaka 2001), and the same holds for PRD.

(4) a. *Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ katta (to) ano hon -{o/Ø} (to)] omotteiru -yo
Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM bought C that book-ACC C think -PRT
‘(lit.) Hanako thinks [that Taroo bought Δ, that book]’

b. *Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ inu -o hirotta (to) ano kooen -{de/Ø}]
Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM dog -ACC picked.up C that park -in
(to] omotteiru -yo
C think -PRT
‘(lit.) Hanako thinks [that Taroo picked up a dog Δ, (in) that park]’

2.2. Differences between SRD and PRD

Although SRD can participate in long-distance dependencies as shown in (3), it does exhibit island-sensitivity (see Simon 1989, Endo 1996, Abe 1999, and Tanaka 2001). T&K,
however, observe that island-effects disappear when Case-markers of dislocated phrases are missing. For instance, the example in (5) indicates that a violation of Complex NP Constraint is ameliorated if the dislocated phrase is not accompanied with the accusative Case-marker -o (based on Tanaka and Kizu 2007:221; judgments are theirs).

(5) Taroo-ga [NP[TP-Hanako-ga ∆ ageta] hito] -o sagasiteita -yo,
    Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM gave person -ACC was.looking.for -PRT
    ano ronbun-{*o/Ø}
    that paper -ACC
    ‘(lit.) Taroo was looking for the person who Hanako gave ∆, that paper’

Similar effects are observed for examples like (6a), which involves adjunct island, and (6b), where the postposition -de ‘in’ is intended to be missing.

(6) a. [Taroo-ga ∆ suteta kara] Hanako-ga totemo okotteiru-yo,
    Taroo-NOM discarded because Hanako-NOM very is.angry -PRT
    ano hon -{*o/Ø}
    that book-ACC
    ‘(lit.) [Because Taroo discarded ∆], Hanako is very angry, that book’

b. Hanako-ga [[∆ inu -o hirotta] hito] -o sitteiru -yo,
    Hanako-NOM dog -ACC picked.up person -ACC know -PRT
    ano kooen -{*de/Ø}
    that park -in
    ‘(lit.) Hanako knows [the person [who picked up a dog ∆]], (in) that park’

Thus, PRD behaves differently from SRD with respect to island-sensitivity.

The second difference has to do with reconstruction effects. Let us first consider the example in (7), adapted from Tanaka and Kizu (2007:222). T&K observe that the anaphor zibun ‘self’ within the dislocated element can be bound by either the matrix subject or the embedded subject in SRD, while it can only be bound by the matrix subject if the Case-marker is missing. Put differently, PRD exhibits “half-way” reconstruction (Tanaka and Kizu 2007:224).

(7) Taroo-ga_i [Hanako-ga_i Ziroo-kara ∆ moratta to] itteita -yo,
    Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM Ziroo-from received C said -PRT
(Pseudo-)Right Dislocation (Kensuke Takita)

{zibun-no_{ij} ronbun-o / zibun-no_{ij} ronbun-Ø}

self -GEN paper -ACC self -GEN paper

‘(lit.) Taroo said [that Hanako received Δ from Ziroo], self’s paper’

However, there are speakers including me who do not share their judgments: For them, neither of the subjects in (7) can antecede zibun ‘self’ if the Case-marker is absent. That is, SRD exhibits reconstruction effects, while PRD does never.

This pattern of judgments is confirmed by the examples in (8) and (9). The examples in (8) indicate that anaphors other than zibun ‘self’ within the dislocated phrases can be bound via reconstruction in SRD but not in PRD. Similarly, (9) shows that variable-binding is possible in SRD (see Abe 1999), while it is not in PRD.

(8) a. Taroo-ga_i [Hanako-ga_j Δ semeta to] itteita-yo, zibunzisin-Ø
Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM blamed C said -PRT self -ACC
‘(lit.) Taroo said [that Hanako blamed Δ], self’

b. [Taroo-to Hanako]-ga_i Δ uta -o utatta-yo, otagai -no,
Taroo-and Hanako-NOM song -ACC sang -PRT each.other-GEN
ie -Ø

‘(lit.) Taroo and Hanako sang a song Δ, (in) each other’s house’

(9) a. [Subete-no gaka] -ga_i Δ hometa -yo, sono, hito -no
all -GEN painter-NOM praised -PRT that person -GEN
sakuhin-Ø
work -ACC

‘(lit.) Every painter praised Δ, his work’

b. [Subete-no kodomo] -ga_i Δ uta -o utatta-yo, sono, ko -no
all -GEN child -NOM song -ACC sang -PRT that child -GEN
ie -Ø

‘(lit.) Every child sang a song Δ, (in) his house’

In the rest of this paper, I focus on this type of speakers.

The final difference between SRD and PRD is illustrated by the examples in (10). Tanaka (2001) observes that in SRD, the gap can be overtly filled by a full-fledged phrase identical to the dislocated one (indicated by italics).
(10) a. Taroo-ga *LGB-o* yonda-yo, \{LGB-o/Ø\}
    Taroo-NOM LGB-ACC read -PRT LGB-ACC
    ‘(lit.) Taroo read *LGB, LGB’

b. Taroo-ga *ano kooen-de inu-o* hirota -yo, \{ano kooen-{de/Ø}\}
    Taroo-NOM that park -in dog-ACC picked.up -PRT that park -in
    ‘(lit.) Taroo picked up a dog in that park, (in) that park’

When the Case-marker/postposition is missing, such “doubling” induces marginality.

The table in (11) summarizes the observations made so far. In the next section, I propose an analysis that can capture these observations.

(11) Table 1: Data summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SRD</th>
<th>PRD</th>
<th>Ex.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance dependency</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root restriction</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-sensitivity</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>(5)/(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction effects</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>(8)/(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Proposals and Analysis

3.1. Proposals

Before making specific proposals, let us review some of the previous approaches to Japanese right dislocation, as they constitute the basis of the analysis to be proposed. There are at least two kinds of major approaches, schematically given in (12). Under the approach in (12a), which is called the double preposing approach (see Kurogi 2007, Fukutomi 2007; see also Abe 1999 for a discussion), the XP which ultimately appears in the post-verbal position first undergoes leftward movement, and then, the rest of the clause (labeled as α) undergoes remnant movement, yielding the XP-final order. On the other hand, the approach in (12b), which is called the repetition and deletion approach (see Abe 1999, Tanaka 2001; cf. Kuno 1978), assumes that a Japanese right dislocation sentence consists of two near-identical clauses \(S_1\) and \(S_2\). The surface string is argued to be derived via leftward movement of XP
within $S_2$ followed by deletion of the rest of $S_2$. \footnote{See also Kayne 1994, Endo 1996 and Whitman 2000 for different implementations. Abe (1999) and Tanaka (2001) assume that the empty element within $S_1$ is pro, while Takita (2011) points out that it can be a result of ellipsis. I use $\Delta$ for it to suppress such analytical differences.}

(12) a.  \textit{Double preposing approach}
\[
[\text{XP}_i [a \cdots t_i \cdots V]\] \rightarrow [i \cdots t_i \cdots V][\text{XP}_i t_i]\]

b.  \textit{Repetition and deletion approach}
\[
[S_1 \cdots \Delta_i \cdots V], [S_2 \text{XP}_i [\cdots t_i \cdots V]]
\]

Although these approaches have certain advantages over the other, neither can successfully capture the observations made in Section 2, simply because they do not distinguish PRD from SRD (T&K’s analysis is reviewed in Section 3.3). \footnote{It is also proposed in the literature that the dislocated phrase undergoes rightward movement (see, e.g., Haraguchi 1973, Simon 1989, and Murayama 1999), or is base-generated in the right-edge of the clause (see, e.g., Sells 1999, Soshi and Hagiwara 2004). Takano (2010) proposes a PF-based analysis building on a different set of data (for instance, he assumes that SRD is \textit{not} island-sensitive). Although I do not review these approaches for reasons of space, it is worth noting that they share with the approaches in (12) the same problem regarding PRD (but see Section 3.3 for a potential variant of the base-generation approach).}

In this paper I assume without further discussion that the properties of SRD are best analyzed in terms of the repetition and deletion approach (see Takita 2011 and Yamashita 2011 for recent arguments). To capture the properties of PRD, then, I propose that their properties can be captured by the double preposing approach with a modification. Specifically, I claim that PRD is derived from the bare-topic construction (see Taguchi 2009), exemplified in (13), in the manner depicted in (14) (bare-topics are boxed).

(13) a. \boxed{Ano hon-Ø}, Taroo-ga $\Delta$ katta -yo
\begin{quote}
that book Taroo-NOM bought-PRT
\end{quote}‘(lit.) That book, Taroo bought $\Delta$’

b. \boxed{Ano kooen-Ø}, Taroo-ga $\Delta$ inu -o hirotta -yo
\begin{quote}
that park Taroo-NOM dog -ACC picked.up -PRT
\end{quote}‘(lit.) That park, Taroo picked up a dog $\Delta$’

c. \boxed{Ano saihu-Ø}, Taroo-ga $\Delta$ okane -o nusunda-yo
\begin{quote}
that wallet Taroo-NOM money -ACC stole -PRT
\end{quote}
‘(lit.) That wallet, Taroo stole money Δ’

(14) a. \[
\text{bare-topic \[ \ldots \Delta_i \ldots \text{V} \]} \] (cf. (13))

\text{\[ \alpha \] bare-topic \[ \beta \ldots \Delta_i \ldots \text{V} \]} (cf. (2))

I assume, following Taguchi (2009), that bare-topics are base-generated in the left-periphery, and related to the gap via non-movement dependency (cf. Kuno’s (1973) aboutness relation). Then, once the constituent labeled as \( \beta \) in (14a) undergoes movement across the bare-topic, the surface string of PRD results, as in (14b). In the next subsection, I illustrate how the proposed analysis can capture the properties of PRD.

3.2. Analysis

Let us start with the root restriction of PRD. As we have seen in (4) above, PRD is restricted root clauses. Taguchi (2009) observes that the bare-topics are also restricted to root clauses (see Taguchi 2009 for an account of the root restriction on bare-topics). For instance, the examples in (15) are ungrammatical, which are putative derivational sources of the examples in (4) under the proposed analysis.

(15) a. *Hanako-ga \[ \text{ano hon-Ø, Taroo-ga } \Delta \text{ katta to}] \text{ ometteiru -yo}
Hanako-NOM that book Taroo-NOM bought C think -PRT
‘(lit.) Hanako thinks [that that book, Taroo bought Δ]’

b. *Hanako-ga \[ \text{ano kooen-Ø, Taroo-ga } \Delta \text{ inu -o } \text{ hirotta to}]
Hanako-Nom that park Taroo-NOM dog -ACC picked.up C
think -PRT
‘(lit.) Hanako thinks [that that park, Taroo picked up a dog Δ]’

Hence, the root restriction on PRD is readily captured.

By assumption, bare-topics and their corresponding gaps are related via non-movement dependency. Hence, they can participate in long-distance dependencies as shown in (16), and they are island-insensitive as the examples in (17) indicate.

---

6 I leave it open the precise status of the gap in the bare-topic construction, although Taguchi (2009) assumes that it is pro.
(Pseudo-)Right Dislocation (Kensuke Takita)

(16) a. Ano hon-Ø, Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ katta to] itteita-yo
   that book Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM bought C said -PRT
   ‘(lit.) That book, Hanako said [that Taroo bought Δ]’

b. Ano kooen-Ø, Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ inu -o hirotta to]
   that park Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM dog-ACC picked up C
   itteita-yo
   said -PRT
   ‘(lit.) In that park, Hanako said [that Taroo picked up a dog Δ]’

(17) a. Ano hon-Ø, Hanako-ga [Taroo-ga Δ suteta kara] totemo
   that book Hanako-NOM Taroo-NOM discarded because very
   okotteiru-yo
   is.angry -PRT
   ‘(lit.) That book, [because Taroo discarded Δ], Hanako is very angry’

b. Ano kooen-Ø, Hanako-ga [Δ inu -o hirotta] hito] -o
   that park Hanako-NOM dog-ACC picked up person -ACC
   sitteiru-yo
   know -PRT
   ‘(lit.) That park, Hanako knows [the person [who picked up a dog Δ]]’

Since the examples in (16) and (17) can serve as the derivational sources of the PRD examples in (3) and (5), respectively, the availability of long-distance dependency and the island-insensitivity of PRD automatically follows.

Let us now turn to the reconstruction effects. As shown in (18) and (19), bare-topics never exhibit reconstruction effects either for anaphors or for bound variables. Since bare-topics are base-generated in the left-periphery by assumption, the required c-command relations are never attested, hence the ungrammaticality of the relevant examples.

(18) a. Zibunzisin-Ø, Taroo-ga [Hanako-ga Δ semeta to] itteita-yo
   self Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM blamed C said -PRT
   ‘(lit.) Self, Taroo said [that Hanako blamed Δ]’

b. Otagai -no, ie-Ø, [Taroo-to Hanako] -ga, Δ uta -o utatta-yo
   each other -GEN house Taroo-and Hanako -NOM song -ACC sang -PRT
   ‘(lit.) Each other’s house, Taroo and Hanako sang a song Δ’

(19) a. Sono hito -no sakuhin-Ø, [subete-no gaka] -ga, Δ hometa -yo
   that person -GEN work all -GEN painter-NOM praised -PRT
Under the proposed analysis, the PRD counterparts of (18) and (19) (see (8) and (9)) are derived by movement of the rest of the clause (namely the \( \beta \)-part of (14a-b)) across the bare-topics. The lack of reconstruction effects in PRD are then readily accommodated since such movement never establishes the required c-command relations. That is, the elements in the dislocated phrase are never bound because they are not c-commanded by the elements contained within the rest of the clause at any point of the derivation.

Finally, the marginality of doubling in PRD follows from the fact that the bare-topic construction somehow resists the gap to be realized as an identical full-fledged phrase, as shown in (20).

(20) a. ??\[\text{LGB-}\text{-} \text{Ø}, \text{Taroo-}\text{-} \text{ga}\] \( \text{LGB-} \text{-} \text{o}\) \text{yonda-} \text{-} \text{yo}\n\text{LGB} \text{Taroo-NOM} \text{LGB-ACC} \text{read -PRT}\n\text{‘(lit.) LGB, Taroo read LGB’}

b. ??\[\text{Ano kooen-}\text{-} \text{Ø}, \text{Taroo-}\text{-} \text{ga}\] \( \text{ano kooen-de}\) \text{inu-} \text{ACC}\text{hirotta -yo}\n\text{that park Taroo-NOM that park -in dog -ACC picked.up -PRT}\n\text{‘(lit.) That park, Taroo picked up a dog in that park’}

Since the examples in (20) are the putative source of the PRD examples in (10), their degraded status can be captured.\(^7\)

### 3.3. Notes on (Potential) Alternatives

Having established the close connection between PRD and the bare-topic construction, this subsection examines some potential alternative analyses.

As a first hypothetical alternative, suppose that PRD has a schematic structure given in (21), where a bare-NP (namely a nominal without a Case-marker or postposition) is directly base-generated in the \emph{right}-periphery of the sentence.

(21) \([\ldots \Delta_i \ldots V] \text{NP-}\text{-} \text{Ø}_i\)

\(^7\) At this point I have no concrete account for why the bare-topic construction resists doubling. I leave it for future research.
Assuming that the NP is related to the gap via non-movement dependency, this analysis can achieve the essentially same results that the proposed analysis does for island-insensitiveness and lack of reconstruction effects.

Nonetheless, the proposed analysis is superior to this alternative in the following respects. First, given the strict head-finality of Japanese, this alternative should stipulate that rightward base-generation is somehow restricted to root clauses. Second, this alternative must attribute all the properties of PRD to the fact that the “dislocated” element is indeed base-generated in the right-periphery. It seems, however, hard to test such a claim on independent grounds. On the other hand, the proposed analysis clearly predicts that PRD and the bare-topic construction behave exactly in the same way: For instance, it is predicted that when Case-markers/postpositions on right dislocated phrases fail to be missing (see footnote 2), such Case-markers/postpositions are also fail to be missing in the corresponding bare-topic construction counterparts, while such predictions are never available for the alternative in question. Hence, pursing this alternative does not seem promising.

The second hypothetical alternative is a combination of the repetition and deletion approach and the idea that PRD is derived from the bare-topic construction.\(^8\) (22) illustrates a schematic structure of PRD under this analysis. In (22), the bare-topic construction is repeated as S\(_2\), and everything except the bare-topic is deleted, yielding the desired word order of PRD.

\[
(22) \quad [S_1 \ldots \Delta_i \ldots V], [S_2 \text{bare-topic} \ldots \Delta_i \ldots V]
\]

Since the bare-topic construction is involved, this analysis can capture the following three properties of PRD in the same way as the proposed analysis does: the root restriction, island-insensitiveness, and the lack of reconstruction. This analysis cannot accommodate the marginality of doubling, however. To see this point, let us consider how the original repetition and deletion approach captures the possibility of doubling in SRD. As we have seen in (10), SRD allows the gap to be overtly filled by a full-fledged phrase identical to the dislocated one (the relevant example is repeated as (23a)). According to Tanaka (2001), this is possible because (23a) can have something like (23b) as its underlying source under the repetition and deletion approach. In (23b), S\(_1\) contains the full-fledged phrase instead of the gap, and this is possible because S\(_1\) and S\(_2\) are independent from each other. Then, the alternative under discussion wrongly predicts that PRD allows doubling just like SRD, because nothing

---

\(^8\) I thank Chizuru Nakao (p.c.) for pointing out this possibility.
prevents the gap within $S_1$ in (22) from being overtly realized as in (23c), which is as acceptable as (23b).

(23) a. Taroo-ga *LGB-o* yonda-yo, *LGB-o*
   Taroo-NOM LGB-ACC read -PRT LGB-ACC
   ‘(lit.) Taroo read LGB, LGB’

   b. $[S_1 \text{ Taroo-ga } LGB-o \text{ yonda-yo}], [S_2 \text{ LGB-}o_t \text{ [Taroo-ga } t_i \text{ yonda-yo]}]$ [\[ \]

   c. $[S_1 \text{ Taroo-ga } LGB-o \text{ yonda-yo}], [S_2 \text{ LGB-}O_t \text{ [Taroo-ga } \Delta_i \text{ yonda-yo]}]$ [\[ \]

Hence, this alternative is not adequate at least empirically.\(^9\)

The final alternative to be discussed is the analysis proposed by T&K. They argue that a sentence of long-distance Case-less right dislocation (namely our PRD) should involve what they call mixed A’-chains. In particular, they propose a schematic derivation in (24). In this approach, the thematic position is occupied by pro, and the null operator is base-generated in the adjoined position of embedded CP, binding pro, as in (24a). Then, the null operator undergoes movement to an appropriate position in order to be licensed.

(24) a. $[\ldots [\text{CP Op}_t [\text{CP } \ldots \text{pro}_t \ldots]] \ldots] \text{ NP}_i$

   b. $\text{Op}_t [\ldots [\text{CP } t_i [\text{CP } \ldots \text{pro}_t \ldots]] \ldots] \text{ NP}_i$

The resulting chain is called “mixed” because it consists of a binding relation and a movement relation (see also Kizu 2005 and references cited therein).

T&K’s analysis is especially designed to capture their judgments about reconstruction found in (25a) (see (7)). Recall that for them the anaphor within the dislocated element can be

\(^9\) A deeper question is why the structure in (22) is not available. One potential answer is that deletion within $S_2$ fails to be licensed. There are at least two possible ways of achieving this result. The first one is to attribute the impossibility of deletion to the fact that clausal ellipsis requires some focalized elements to be remnants in many cases (see Merchant 2001, van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, among many others). Since bare-topics cannot be focused, ellipsis cannot be licensed. The other is to relate it to the fact that bare-topics are base-generated elements; they cannot license ellipsis because they are base-generated so that they fail to establish an agreement relation with a functional head, which has been considered to be one of the crucial requirements for ellipsis licensing (see Lobeck 1990, Saito and Murasugi 1990). Although this is an important issue, addressing it is beyond the scope of this paper.
bound by the matrix subject but not by the embedded subject. They try to capture this observation by assigning a partial structure like (25b) to (25a) (the mixed A’-chain relation among Op, the trace of Op, and pro are indicated by the superscripted numeral).

(25)  a.  Taroo-ga [Hanako-ga, Ziroo-kara Δ moratta to] itteita -yo, Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM Ziroo-from received C said -PRT
    zibun-no_i-r Honbun-Ø
    self -GEN paper
    *(lit.) Taroo said [that Hanako received Δ from Ziroo], self’s paper

Recall that this paper focuses on the speakers who do not share the crucial judgments for the relevant cases with T&K (see (8 ) and (9 )). Hence, it is not possible to evaluate their analysis on this point. Instead, I point out some potential problems of their analysis. First, although they are not explicit about it, they seem to assume that the bare-NP in (24) is base-generated in the right-periphery. Hence, their analysis carries over the problems of the direct rightward generation approach discussed above.

More important problem has to do with the root restriction of PRD. T&K indeed argue that the schematic derivation in (24) is available not only for right dislocation with Case-less NPs but also for cleft constructions with bare-NP pivots and relative clauses (see footnote 3). As shown in (26), the latter two constructions are not restricted to root clauses (the NPs which structurally correspond to the ones in Case-less right dislocation are given in boldface).

(26)  a.  Taroo-ga [[Hanako-ga [Ziroo-ga Δ yonda to] itta no] -ga
    Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM Ziroo-NOM read C said C -NOM
    **kono hon da to** omotteiru
    this book COP C think
    ‘Taroo thinks that [it is this book [that Hanako said [that Ziroo read]]]’

    b.  Taroo-ga [[Hanako-ga [Ziroo-ga Δ yonda to] itta] Hon]-o katta
    Taroo-NOM Hanako-NOM Ziroo-NOM read C said book-ACC bought
    ‘Taroo bought [the book [that Hanako said [that Ziroo read]]]’
Then, it becomes unclear how their analysis prevents PRD from being embedded on a par with these two constructions.

To summarize, I examined three potential alternatives to the proposed analysis, and pointed out that all of them have certain conceptual and empirical problems.

4. Conclusion

In this paper I provided several observations regarding PRD, comparing it with SRD. Then I argued that the properties of PRD can be captured by proposing that it is derived from the bare-topic construction.
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