

# LIN 1231: Advanced Syntax I

University of Toronto

Fall 2017

## Instructor

Dr. Nicholas LaCara

Office: ss 4089

Hours: Monday 15:00 PM – 17:00 PM

Email: [nick.lacara@utoronto.ca](mailto:nick.lacara@utoronto.ca)

## Location & Time

Room: ss 2116

Days: Monday

Time: 13:00 –15:00

Website: <http://individual.utoronto.ca/nlacara/teaching/1231F17>

## 1 Overview

The topic of this course will be extraction from (*i.e.*, movement out of) ellipsis sites. We will focus on what sorts of movement can happen, the constraints on this movement, and the unusual and unexpected properties it has. We will also look at a few phenomena that are not obviously elliptical which have received analyses where extraction from ellipsis sites has been proposed. Emphasis will be placed on recent developments in the field.

The goal is to familiarize students with issues arising from the interaction of two major syntactic phenomena (ellipsis and displacement) and the various applications of the results of this study. Topics will include fragment answers, gapping and pseudogapping, multiple sluicing, verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis, MaxElide, approaches to limited extraction, and the effects of focus.

## 2 Reading

This course will be run like a seminar, and we will be discussing and comparing work from several sources. Reading in will be drawn from various primary sources. Participants are encouraged to do as much of the reading as possible, but there will be certain core readings that everybody will be expected to have read (I will make it clear which ones you should).

The calendar below provides a proposed view of the topics we should cover and some associated readings, but we may deviate from this based on student interests and time constraints; students are encouraged to suggest readings. Information about what should be read and when will be kept up-to-date on the website.

## 3 Course requirements

### 3.1 Reading presentation

Students are required to lead the presentation and discussion of (at least) one reading in class. Depending on the number of enrollees, it may be necessary to present more than once. It is important that presentations of readings be summaries. They should not focus on every detail of the paper. In general, I will communicate with presenters about what material they should focus on.

In lieu of a reading presentation, students have the option of presenting their own relevant work in class. Please come talk to me as soon as possible if you are interested in this option.

### 3.2 Squib and term paper

Students in this course will write a final term paper. The paper must have to do with ellipsis in some capacity and should ideally discuss extraction from ellipsis sites.

The first step in this process will be a squib due on 30 October outlining the problem; at this stage, no solution need be proposed, though you are encouraged to consider possible approaches to the issue you describe. Squibs should be between 5 to 8 pages in length (and no more). I will respond to these squibs with suggestions, criticisms, and other comments (hopefully by 13 November). These comments will be designed to help you complete a full paper. You should come talk to me before the squib is due to talk about what you are considering for a paper topic.

Final papers are due on 6 December (the last day of classes). You should aim for between 15 and 20 pages. No paper should be fewer than 10 pages or longer than 25. If you feel you will need an extension, please let me know at least a week ahead of the due date. Both the squib and the paper will be turned in through the U of T portal.

## 4 Marks and evaluation

Marks in this course will be assigned following [the Department of Linguistics' grading policy](#). The Department of Linguistics follows the [University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy](#). Your overall mark for the course will be determined based on the following breakdown:

COMPONENT	%	DUE DATE
Reading presentation	20%	
Squib	15%	30 October
Final paper	65%	06 December

## 5 Academic Honesty

This course is governed by the University of Toronto's Code of Student Conduct and Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. Both of these can be accessed online via the site:

<http://www.utoronto.ca/academicintegrity/>

Suspected violations of these policies (including, but not limited to, plagiarism in submitted writing) will be reported to the Office of Student Academic Integrity.

## 6 Communication

You should feel free to communicate with me if you have any questions or concerns about the course. My email is listed on the first page of this syllabus, as are my office hours. If you cannot make my scheduled office hours, for whatever reason, we can schedule an appointment at a different time. If you do email me, please include ‘LIN 1231’ at the beginning of the subject line. I will try to respond to emails within 48 hours. Do not email me your assignments.

## 7 Topics

### 7.1 Background: Sluicing and VPE

In this class, we will be assuming the position that ellipsis sites contain unpronounced syntactic material (Hankamer & Sag 1976, Merchant 2001, Ross 1969, Sag 1976, Wasow 1972, *i.a.*). SLUICING – TP ellipsis with concomitant *wh*-movement – provides some of the best evidence for this position. We’ll begin by discussing Merchant’s (2001) rehabilitation of this hypothesis and the arguments that ellipsis must contain syntactic structure.

Similarly, verb phrase ellipsis (VPE) also permits *wh*-extraction. This is investigated Schuyler (2001). Given that VPE and sluicing are thought to be related, differing mostly in the size of the constituent they delete, one might expect extraction out of VPE sites to behave identically, but *wh*-movement out of ellipsis sites is rather more restricted than sluicing, *a problem we’ll return to*.

### 7.2 Fragments

FRAGMENT answers are phrasal answers to questions that do not appear in a sentence, like (1b). One answer to the question how they are generated is that the fragment is moved out of a clause that undergoes ellipsis, as in (1c).

- (1) a. What did Ashleigh buy?  
 b. A pig.  
 c. [CP A pig<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> Ashleigh bought *t<sub>i</sub>*]]

This idea is articulated in some detail by Merchant (2004), who proposes a sluicing-like derivation for fragment answers and tries to account for some of the ways in which the two phenomena differ. Weir (2014a) takes up this idea in his dissertation and addresses some of the issues with it. He identifies several reasons to adopt the elliptical approach, contrasting the a Merchant-like approach with those that assume fragments are generated without ellipsis at all. He also proposes that the requisite focus movement in fragment answers appears to be some sort of PF phrasal movement, an idea that we will see again in work on multiple sluicing and elsewhere.

### 7.3 Gapping and pseudogapping

GAPPING and PSEUDOGAPPING are two constructions that look remarkably similar. In both constructions, an entire verb phrase is left unpronounced with the exception of a single element, called the REMNANT (in the cases below, *swordfish*). However, they behave very differently.

- (2) a. Some have served mussels to Sue and others swordfish. *Gapping*  
 b. % Some have served mussels to Sue while others have swordfish. *Pseudogapping*

The general view is that pseudogapping is *bona fide* VPE out of which a phrase has been moved. Gapping is something else, but exactly what it is has remained contentious. Johnson (2009) makes a detailed comparison of the phenomena, proposing that both involve movement, but that only pseudogapping is elliptical. Gapping, on the other hand, is across-the-board movement mixed with some left-branch extractions.

Pseudogapping is also a strange beast, and various approaches pseudogapping have been proposed. The usual view is that it is movement out of a VPE site, but the nature of that movement is controversial. Jayaseelan (1990) proposes that it is the result of heavy NP shift out of a VPE site. Lasnik (1995, 1999), on the other hand, proposes that it is overt movement to SpecAgr<sub>O</sub>P. A similar idea can be found in Richards 2001, who proposes that it is the ellipsis-driven spell-out of typically covert movement. Returning to the subject, Jayaseelan (2001) proposes that it is movement to a clause-medial focus position, making it the middle-field equivalent to fragments. Similar processes have been proposed for the nominal domain by Yoshida et al. (2012).

#### 7.4 Multiple sluicing

MULTIPLE SLUICING has been a hot topic lately. It occurs when multiple *wh*-remnants are left over by clausal ellipsis. This occurs in many languages, even those that do not typically support multiple *wh*-movement:

- (3) I know that in each instance one of the girls got something from one of the boys. But which from which? (Bolinger 1978)

Assuming that all *in situ wh*-elements undergo covert movement, Richards (2001) proposes an analysis where the second *wh*-remnant undergoes exceptional overt movement driven by ellipsis. This sort of analysis underlies Abels & Dayal's (2017) investigation of multiple sluicing remnants. They assume that the second remnant is the pronunciation of the head of a covert movement chain when the tail has been deleted. They investigate the CLAUSE-MATE CONDITION, the apparent requirement that the second remnant must be extracted from the same clause as the first remnant.

Lasnik (2014), on the other hand, proposes that the apparent multiple *wh*-movement in English multiple sluicing is actually illusory. He instead proposes that the second *wh*-remnant is a pseudogapping remnant, based on the observation that constraints on the second remnant seem to be similar to the constraints on pseudogapping remnants. This avoids having to propose any exceptional multiple *wh*-movement (though it is subject to all of the typical questions about what pseudogapping actually is).

#### 7.5 Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis

VERB-STRANDING VPE occurs when a verb head-moves out of a VPE site, stranding it in an inflectional position. This makes it look as though all of the VP-internal material has disappeared, leaving only the verb behind, as in (4), and there is a lot of work focusing on distinguishing this from object drop phenomena.

- (4) Quando a Ana pôs os óculos na mesa, a Maria também pôs.  
 When the Ana put.PST the glasses on.the table, the Maria too put.PST  
 ‘When Ana put the glasses on the table, the Maria did too.’

*Portuguese (Cyrino & Matos 2002:(14a))*

An intriguing fact about verb-stranding vPE in many languages is that the verb (root) extracted from the vPE site must match the root in the antecedent clause even though neither verb is in the ellipsis site or antecedent on the surface. This is known as the VERBAL IDENTITY REQUIREMENT. Goldberg (2005) proposes that this can be reduced to the general identity requirement on vPE if verbs must reconstruct into their base positions. However, Gribanova (2013) shows that the requirement does not always hold in Russian, and that raises several questions for how to account for the verbal identity requirement. Lipták & Saab (2014) look for similar effects in the Spanish DP, but find none. They propose there is no N<sup>o</sup> movement, but Sailor (2017) will offers a different explanation.

## 7.6 MaxElide

MAXELIDE is a term given to the apparent preference for Sluicing when both vPE and sluicing are in principle available, as in (5).

- (5) Sally will read one of these books, but I don’t know which one (\*she will).

This phenomenon was first discussed by Merchant (2008) and was given an influential analysis by Takahashi & Fox (2005) based on the idea that the identity requirement on ellipsis is sensitive to LF representations: *Wh*-movement introduces traces into the ellipsis site, and these must be bound in a parallel way in both the antecedent and the ellipsis site. Hartman (2011) argues that this holds not only of A’-movement, but also of A-movement and head movement, arguing that all three leave traces. Still, there are unexpected restrictions on what elements can move. Messick & Thoms (2016) argue that MaxElide effects can be attributed to combinations of other independently attested phenomena.

## 7.7 Limited extraction

It is not possible to move anything that you want out of any give ellipsis site – some languages seem to limit what material can be extracted from an ellipsis site. Two sorts of proposals have popped up in recent years. One view holds that ellipsis is linked to cyclic spell-out (Chomsky 2000, 2001), and that only phases or phase-head complements may undergo ellipsis (Bošković 2014, Harwood 2013, Holmberg 2001, Rouveret 2012). Given the Phase Impenetrability Condition, this means that only material that makes it to phase edges before ellipsis occurs will ever escape an ellipsis site.

Another view is that certain heads trigger ellipsis when they merge (rather than waiting for deletion at PF) and that ellipsis sites, though not necessarily phases, become frozen (Aelbrecht 2010, Baltin 2012, Sailor 2017). This means that material must escape an ellipsis site before licensing heads merge. This makes noticeably different predictions about what material should escape ellipsis sites, especially in the domain of vPE. Aelbrecht (2016) proposes a hybrid of the approaches. LaCara 2017 argues that phase-based approach is inadequate for explaining the lack of verb-stranding in mainland Scandinavian languages.

## 7.8 Other things

There are several interesting ways that extraction has been used to explain various phenomena. [Ott \(2014\)](#) and [Ott & de Vries \(2015\)](#) explain contrastive left- and right-dislocation in Germanic as a special form of clausal ellipsis. [Weir \(2014b, 2017\)](#) looks at unusual sluicing-like constructions. [Sailor & Thoms \(2014\)](#) propose an elliptical analysis of apparent non-constituent deletions, [LaCara \(2015\)](#) argues that *as*-parentheticals with postposed subjects are, in essence, a special form of pseudogapping with subjects.

## 8 Calendar

This is a rough outline of the course. Readings are subject to change if necessary!

WK	DATE	TOPICS	READING	NOTES
1	11 Sept	Introduction	(No reading)	
2	18 Sept	Fragments	<a href="#">Merchant 2004</a> , <a href="#">Weir 2014a</a> : Ch 4	20 Sept last day to enroll
3	25 Sept	(Pseudo)gapping	<a href="#">Johnson 2009</a> , <a href="#">Lasnik 1999</a>	
4	02 Oct	Multiple sluicing	<a href="#">Abels &amp; Dayal 2017</a> , <a href="#">Lasnik 2014</a>	
<i>Thanksgiving: 9 Oct</i>				
5	16 Oct	Verb-stranding	<a href="#">Gribanova 2013</a> , <a href="#">Goldberg 2005</a> : Ch 4	
6	23 Oct	MaxElide	<a href="#">Hartman 2011</a> , <a href="#">Messick &amp; Thoms 2016</a>	
7	30 Oct	Limited extraction	<a href="#">Aelbrecht 2016</a> , <a href="#">Bošković 2014</a>	Squib due
<i>Reading week: 6–10 Nov</i>				6 Nov last day to drop
8	13 Nov	Noun stranding?	<a href="#">Lipták &amp; Saab 2014</a> , <a href="#">Sailor 2017</a>	
9	20 Nov	TPE: Applications	<a href="#">Ott 2014</a> , <a href="#">Weir 2014b, 2017</a>	
10	27 Nov	VPE: Applications	<a href="#">LaCara 2015</a> , <a href="#">Sailor &amp; Thoms 2014</a>	
11	04 Dec	Wrap-up, slippage	TBA	Paper due 06 Dec

## References

- Abels, Klaus & Veneeta Dayal. 2017. On the Syntax of Multiple Sluicing. In Andrew Lamont & Katerina A. Telzloff (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 47*, Ms., to appear.
- Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. *The Syntactic Licensing of Ellipsis* Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today. John Benjamins.
- Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2016. What ellipsis can do for phases and what it can't, but not how. *The Linguistic Review* 33(4). 453–482. doi:10.1515/tlr-2016-0011.
- Baltin, Mark. 2012. Deletion Versus Pro-Forms: An Overly Simple Dichotomy? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30(2). 381–423.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1978. Asking More than One Thing a Time. In Henry Hiz (ed.), *Questions*, 151–163. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bošković, Željko. 2014. Now I'm a Phase, Now I'm Not a Phase: On the Variability of Phases with Extraction and Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(1). 27–89.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin et al. (eds.), *Step by Step*, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Cyrino, Sonia M. L. & Gabriela Matos. 2002. VP ellipsis in European and Brazilian Portuguese – a comparative analysis. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 1(2). 177–195.
- Goldberg, Lotus. 2005. *Verb-Stranding VP Ellipsis: A Cross-Linguistic Study*. Monteval, QC: McGill dissertation.
- Gribanova, Vera. 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31. 91–136.
- Hankamer, Jorge & Ivan Sag. 1976. Deep and Surface Anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3). 391–428.
- Hartman, Jeremy. 2011. The Semantic Uniformity of Traces: Evidence from Ellipsis Parallelism. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(3). 367–388.
- Harwood, William. 2013. *Being Progressive is Just a Phase: Dividing the Functional Hierarchy*: University of Ghent dissertation.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2001. The syntax of yes and no in Finnish. *Studia Linguistica* 55. 141–175.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. 1990. Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis* 20(1-2). 64–81.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. 2001. IP-Internal Topic and Focus Phrases. *Studia Linguistica* 55(1). 39–75.
- Johnson, Kyle. 2009. Gapping is not (VP) Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2). 289–328.
- LaCara, Nicholas. 2015. Discourse Inversion and Deletion in As-parentheticals. In Marlies Kluck, Dennis Ott & Mark de Vries (eds.), *Parenthesis and Ellipsis: Cross-linguistic and Theoretical Perspectives.*, 219–245. Berlin: De Gruyter/Mouton.
- LaCara, Nicholas. 2017. Ellipsis is not Spell-Out: What Scandinavian tells us about ellipsis and phases Manuscript, University of Toronto. Under revision for the *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995. A Note on Pseudogapping. In Rob Pensalfini & Hiroyuki Ura (eds.), *Papers on Minimalist Syntax*, vol. 27 MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 143–163. Cambridge, Mass.: MiTWPL.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. Pseudogapping Puzzles. In S. Lappin & E. Benmamoun (eds.), *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*, 141–174. Oxford University Press.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2014. Multiple Sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17(1). 1–20. doi:10.1111/synt.12009.



- Lipták, Anikó & Andrés Saab. 2014. No N-raising out of NPs in Spanish: ellipsis as a diagnostic of head movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32(4). 1247–1271.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis* Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics. Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27. 661–738.
- Merchant, Jason. 2008. An Assymetry in Voice Mismatches in VP-ellipsis and Pseudogapping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(1). 169–179.
- Messick, Troy & Gary Thoms. 2016. Ellipsis, Economy, and the (Non)uniformity of Traces. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47(2). 306–332.
- Ott, Dennis. 2014. An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2). 269–303.
- Ott, Dennis & 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.
- Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In R. Binnick, A. Davidson, G. Green & J. Morgan (eds.), *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252–286. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Rouveret, Alain. 2012. VP ellipsis, phases and the syntax of morphology. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30. 897–963.
- Sag, Ivan. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Sailor, Craig. 2017. The Typology of Head Movement and Ellipsis: A reply to Lipták & Saab. Ms. University of Groningen. Accepted for publication in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*. <http://http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002148>.
- Sailor, Craig & Gary Thoms. 2014. On the Non-existence of Non-constituent Coordination and Non-constituent Ellipsis. In Robert E. Santana-LaBarge (ed.), *Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 361–370. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Schuyler, Tami. 2001. *Wh-Movement out of the Site of VP Ellipsis*: University of California, Santa Cruz MA thesis.
- Takahashi, Shoichi & Danny Fox. 2005. MaxElide and the Re-binding Problem. In Effi Georgala & Jonathan Howell (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory 15 (SALT 15)*, 223–240. Ithaca, New York: CLC Publications.
- Wasow, Thomas. 1972. *Anaphoric Relations in English*. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Weir, Andrew. 2014a. *Fragments and Clausal Ellipsis*: University of Massachusetts, Amherst dissertation.
- Weir, Andrew. 2014b. *Why-stripping targets Voice Phrase*. In Hsin-lun Huang, Ethan Poole & Amanda Rysling (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 43*, 235–248. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA Publications.
- Weir, Andrew. 2017. But write what? . In Nicholas LaCara, Keir Moulton & Anne-Michelle Tessier (eds.), *A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson*, 401–408. Amherst, Mass.: Linguistics Open Access Publications. doi:10.7275/R57D2S95.
- Yoshida, Masaya, Honglei Wang & David Potter. 2012. Remarks on “Gapping” in DP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(3). 475–494.