Wrap-up

Nicholas LaCara · University of Toronto   LIN 1231 · 4 December 2017

1   Clausal ellipsis

- Fragments as non-*wh* focus movement (Merchant 2004):

    (1)   Sally scammed somebody. Do you know who$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~Sally scammed t_i~~]?

    (2)   Bill$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~Sally scammed t_i~~].

- Open questions about how this focus movement occurs?

    – *Wh*-movement happens regardless of ellipsis and is typically thought to feed sluicing.
    – The unelided equivalent of (2) is not a valid answer to a question. Is the PF movement analysis of Weir (2014a) reasonable?

1.1   Multiple sluicing

- English appears to have multiple sluicing, but no multiple *wh*-movement

    (3)   I know that in each instance one of the girls got something from one of the boys.
        a.   ?But which from which?
        b.   *But which from which got something?

- Is this true (covert) *wh*-movement of the sort seen in English, uncovered when ellipsis deletes the clause (Richards 2001)?

- Or is the second *wh*-remnant special, as Lasnik (2014) contends?

- Is there any link to gapping (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Jayaseelan 1990)?

1.2   Multiple fragments?

- Existing theories of multiple sluicing, crossed with current theories of fragments as remnants, suggest that multiple fragments should exist. Do they?

    (4)   a.   Who gave the book to whom?
          b.   Sally to John.

- This looks like gapping, but it is not because it is not in a coordinate structure.

- If multiple fragments are real, are they subject to the same properties as multiple sluices?

1.3 Innovative uses

- Could contrastive dislocation be construed as a special form of fragment (Ott 2014; Ott and de Vries 2015)?

  (5) $[_{CP_1}$ [den Peter]$_i$ ~~habe ich gestern t_i gesehen~~] $[_{CP_1}$ den$_k$ habe ich gestern $\quad t_k$
           the   Peter   him have I   yesterday
       gesehen]
       seen
       'I saw Peter yesterday.'

- Could this analysis be extended to clitic left dislocation in Romance, which lacks movement of the pronoun to the left periphery? Is dislocation just different in different languages?

  (6) Este libro$_i$, Juan lo$_i$ compró.
       this book Juan it   bought
       'As for this book, Juan bought it.'

- The motivation is less clear here, since we do not have an exceptional case of V3. But the possibility remains to be investigated.

1.4 Two things we didn't talk about

1.4.1 *Stripping*

- We talked a bit about Weir's (2014b) analysis of *why*-stripping.

- But we did not talk about stripping in general, which strands a single constituent:

  (7) Abby speaks passable Dutch, and Ben, too.

- Another common variety is so-called *not*-stripping.

  (8) Harvey bought a pig, but not Sally.

- Stripping, like gapping, occurs only in coordinate structures (but the similarity of fragments makes it hard, sometimes to tell if you are looking at a fragment or at stripping).

- Is it distinct from fragments (or gapping for that matter)?

1.4.2 *Polarity ellipsis*

- It has been proposed that cases of *yes* and *no* actually involve clausal ellipsis (Kramer and Rawlins 2011).

  (9) a. Is Alfonso coming to the party?

       b.   Yes, ~~he is coming to the party~~.

- This does not necessarily involve extraction, but it probably interacts with it in various ways.

- For instance, Gribanova's (2017) discussion of polarity focus in Russian looks at cases where verbs appear to move to the position of the yes/no particles *da* 'yes' and *net* 'no'. Notice they accompany phrasal material:

(10)   Evgenija otpravila posylku v Moskvu?
          Evgenija sent   package to Moskow
          'Did Eugenia send the package to Moskow?'

     a.   Net. / Yes.
            No   / Yes

     b.   V Moskvu da, a   v Piter net.
            To Moskow yes, but to Piter no
            'To Moskow, yes, but to St. Petersburg, no.'

     c.   V Moskvu otpravila, a   v Piter ne   otpravila.
            To Moskow sent,   but to Piter NEG sent
            'To Moskow, yes, but to St. Petersburg, no.'

- This would be a case of verb-stranding clausal ellipsis.

2   Verb phrase ellipsis

- We can *wh*-move out of VPE sites. We can also topicalize things (Schuyler 2001)

(11)   I don't know which puppy you will buy,
            but I know which one$_i$ you should $[_{VP}$ ~~buy t_i~~ $]$.

(12)   The book I liked. The movie, I didn't $[_{VP}$ ~~like t_i~~ $]$.

- Thus, it outwardly looks like we have both *wh*- and non-*wh*-movements out of VPE sites, similar to clausal ellipsis.

- …*modulo* things like MaxElide (Merchant 2008), if it exists (Messick and Thoms 2016).

2.1   Pseudogapping

- Pseudogapping certainly looks like extraction from VPE, but the destination of the remnant is not the left periphery. Exactly where is a matter of some discussion (Jayaseelan 2001; Lasnik 1999; Richards 2001).

(13)   John could pull you out of a plane, like he did [his brother$_k$ [~~pull t_k out of a plane~~]].

- This looks a lot like a fragment – an element focus-moved out of an ellipsis site – but the domain of ellipsis is smaller.

- One wonder if there is any deeper link between these constructions, as Richards's (2001) analysis suggests. Is this viable in a Weir 2014a-like framework?

- The Jayaseelan (2001) suggestion point this way too, though in a different frame work. The remnant in a pseudogap moves to a clause-internal FocP, as opposed to a left-periphery FocP as with fragments.

2.2   Multiple remnants

- In LaCara 2015, I discuss inversion in *as*-parentheticals and compares them to a form of subject pseudogapping:

  (14)   Mary might have scammed Bruce, as might have Sally$_i$ [$_{\text{VoiP}}$ ~~t_i scammed Bruce~~].

- Related to the above question about the nature of pseudogapping and (multiple) fragments, some speakers seem to accept multiple remnants in *as*-parentheticals:

  (15)   %?Phil might have finished this movie, as might have Carl this book

- Depending on your view of how material escapes ellipsis sites, this may be predicted to occur. But judgments are touchy.

- The results of Sailor and Thoms (2014) certainly rely on the idea that there can be multiple remnants as a way of avoiding non-constituent coordination.

  (16)   He didn't [$_{vP}$ speak to Mary on Thursday] or [$_{vP}$ Bill$_i$ on Friday$_k$ [$_{vP}$ ~~speak t_i t_k~~]].

- This certainly looks like a variety of pseudogapping with multiple remnants.

2.3   Gapping…

- The age-old question: Is gapping VPE? It certainly behaves differently from pseudogapping.

  (17)   Bill ate the ham and Mary, the beans.

- But if it is VPE, how do we account for the various coordination-related restrictions on it (Johnson 2009)?

2.4   Antecedent contained deletion

- One thing we did not get to talk about at all is antecedent contained deletion, where the apparent antecedent for ellipsis contains the ellipsis site:

  (18)   I will [$_{vP}$ read every book that Sally does ~~vP~~].

- This happens in relative clauses, where there is operator movement out of the elided vP.

- This construction is a good reminder that ellipsis identity does not hold over surface structures. The typical analysis relies on QR to derive the correct antecedent (Sag 1976).

  (19)   [$_{QP}$ Every book that [$_{CP}$ Op_i Sally does [$_{\overline{vP_E}}$ ~~read t_i~~]]]$_k$ I will [$_{vP_A}$ read t_k]

3 Noun phrase ellipsis

- We do not understand NPE very well, and we certainly understand extraction from ellipsis sites even less well.

- Depending on you assumptions about possessives, we probably need to have some limited movement out of NPE sites:

  (20)   I read Bill's book, and you read Mary$_i$'s [$_{nP}$ ~~t_i~~ ~~book~~].

- We did see the claim that there is no noun-stranding NPE from Lipták and Saab (2014), but Sailor (2017) gave us reason to cast doubt on the explanation.

- But we don't seem to have A′-movement to the left periphery that we see in VPE and clausal ellipsis cases. Part of that is due to the simple fact that possessive DPs (probably the clearest case of NPE in English; Chisholm 2001) do not allow extraction.

  (21)   *?What$_i$ did you read [$_{DP}$ John's book about t_i].

- But even places where movement is relatively OK (like quantified DPs) is not possible in equivalent NPE sites. But is apparent NPE after quantifiers actually ellipsis?

  (22)   *Who did you see several pictures of, and who did you see many?

  (23)   *This is the man I saw several pictures of, and this is the woman who I saw many.

- Yoshida et al. (2012) argue that there is pseudogapping within DP:

  (24)   John read [$_{DP}$ Bill's book of poems] and [$_{DP}$ Mary's of music].

- So perhaps the problem has to do with moving material out of DP. But there is clearly a dearth of research her.

4 Non-constituent ellipsis

- Recall that the one of the main motivations behind all of this is to avoid positing non-constituent ellipsis.

- It's easy to lose sight of this motivation. But the move-and-delete approaches to various phenomena allow us to target constituents rather than stipulate individual operations that delete (sometimes discontiguous) strings.

- We may need to result to more elaborate devices to explain strange phenomena like gapping, but we ultimately wind up with a simpler theory for a broader number of constructions.

References

Chisholm, Matt. 2001. Ellipsis in DP. Master's thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz. URL http://www.theory.org/~matt/dpe_tree/dpe_tree.pdf.

Gribanova, Vera. 2017. Head movement and ellipsis in the expression of Russian polarity focus. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 35:1079–1121.

Jayaseelan, K. A. 1990. Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis* 20:64–81.

Jayaseelan, K. A. 2001. IP-Internal Topic and Focus Phrases. *Studia Linguistica* 55:39–75.

Johnson, Kyle. 2009. Gapping is not (VP) Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:289–328.

Kramer, Ruth, and Kyle Rawlins. 2011. Polarity particles: an ellipsis account. In *The Proceedings of the 39th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA Publications.

LaCara, Nicholas. 2015. Discourse Inversion and Deletion in *As*-parentheticals. In *Parenthesis and Ellipsis: Cross-linguistic and Theoretical Perspectives.*, ed. Marlies Kluck, Dennis Ott, and Mark de Vries, 219–245. Berlin: De Gruyter/Mouton.

Lasnik, Howard. 1999. Pseudogapping Puzzles. In *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*, ed. S. Lappin and E. Benmamoun, 141–174. Oxford University Press.

Lasnik, Howard. 2014. Multiple Sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17:1–20.

Lipták, Anikó, and Andrés Saab. 2014. No N-raising out of NPs in Spanish: ellipsis as a diagnostic of head movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32:1247–1271.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:661–738.

Merchant, Jason. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. Kyle Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Messick, Troy, and Gary Thoms. 2016. Ellipsis, Economy, and the (Non)uniformity of Traces. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47:306–332.

Ott, Dennis. 2014. An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2):269–303.

Ott, Dennis, and Mark de Vries. 2015. Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* .

Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in Language: Interactions and Architectures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sag, Ivan. 1976. Deletion and Logical Form. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.

Sailor, Craig. 2017. The Typology of Head Movement and Ellipsis: A reply to Lipták & Saab. URL http://http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002148, ms. University of Groningen. Accepted for publication in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*.

Sailor, Craig, and Gary Thoms. 2014. On the Non-existence of Non-constituent Coordination and Non-constituent Ellipsis. In *Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Robert E. Santana-LaBarge, 361–370. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Schuyler, Tami. 2001. Wh-Movement out of the Site of VP Ellipsis. Master's thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz.

Weir, Andrew. 2014a. Fragments and Clausal Ellipsis. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Weir, Andrew. 2014b. *Why*-stripping targets Voice Phrase. In *Proceedings of NELS 43*, ed. Hsin-lun Huang, Ethan Poole, and Amanda Rysling, 235–248. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA Publications.

Yoshida, Masaya, Honglei Wang, and David Potter. 2012. Remarks on "Gapping" in DP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43:475–494.