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I. Pseudogapping

(1)a If you don't believe me, you will σ the weatherman
    b I rolled up a newspaper, and Lynn did σ a magazine
    c Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't σ meteorology Levin (1978)

(2)a The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith guilty
    b ?John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will give Susan a lot of money

(3) You might not believe me but you will Bob


(5) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agr₀ followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995b)]

(6) Agr₀P
    /     \   
   NP    Agr₀'
    /     \   
  you   Agr₀   TP
    /     \   
  T     VP   
    /     \   
will   V'   
    /     \   
NP     V
    /     \   
  t     Agr₀P
    /     \   
   NP    Agr₀'
    /     \   
  Bob   VP   
    /     \   
  |     V'   
    /     \   
  V     NP   
         believe  t

(7) *You will Bob believe
(8)  AgrSP
    / 
   NP AgrSP'
  you / 
 AgrS / TP
   T / 
  will / VP
   NP / V'
   t / 
  V / AgrSP
  [strong F] / 
 NP AgrSP'
 Bob / 
 AgrV' VP
   | 
  V' / 
 NP believe t
[F]

(9) Once the matching feature of the lower lexical V is attracted, the lower V becomes defective (marked *, if you like). A PF crash will be avoided if either pied-piping or deletion of a category containing the lower V (VP Deletion = Pseudogapping in the relevant instances) takes place. [Lasnik (1999), developing an idea of Ochi (1999)]

II. Sluicing 1 [Infl raising]

(10) Sluicing - WH-Movement followed by deletion of IP (abstracting away from 'split Infl' details). [Saito and Murasugi (1990), Lobeck (1990)]

(11) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
     Speaker B: I wonder who Mary will see.

(12) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
     Speaker B: Who Mary will see?

(13)  CP / 
   NP / C'
  who / 
  C / IP
 [strong F] / 
 NP / I'
 Mary / 
 I / VP
 will | 
 [F] V'
 / 
 V NP
 see t

(14) *Who Mary will see?
(15) Who will Mary see?
(16) Assume that matrix interrogative C contains the relevant strong feature, with the matching feature of Infl raising overtly to check it. This leaves behind a phonologically defective Infl, which will cause a PF crash unless either pied-piping or deletion of a category containing that Infl (Sluicing) takes place.

III. Sluicing 2 [Island violations]

(17) I believe that he bit someone, but they don't know who (I believe that he bit)

(18) a *I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who I believe the claim that he bit  [Complex NP Constraint, noun complement]  
    b (??)I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who

(19) a *Irv and someone were dancing together, but I don't know who Irv and were dancing together  [Coordinate Structure Constraint]  
    b (??)Irv and someone were dancing together, but I don't know who

(20) a *She kissed a man who bit one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize which one of my friends she kissed a man who bit  [Complex NP Constraint, relative clause]  
    b (??)She kissed a man who bit one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize which one of my friends

(21) a *That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who that he'll hire is possible  [Sentential Subject Constraint]  
    b (??)That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who

All above from Ross (1969)

(22) a (*)I don't know which children he has plans to send to college  
    b He has plans to send some of his children to college, but I don't know which ones  Chomsky (1972)

(23) I don't know  
    CP  
    NP  
    which children  
    IP  
    VP  
    he  
    I  
    has plans to send t to college

(24) Chomsky suggests that * (# in Chomsky's presentation) is assigned to an island when it is crossed by a movement operation (the complex NP in (23)). An output condition forbidding * in surface structures accounts for the deviance of standard island violations.

(25) If a later operation (Sluicing in this case) deletes a category containing the *-marked item, the derivation is salvaged.

(26) For Chomsky (1972) the condition banning * applies at surface structure. The results are the same if, instead, it is a PF condition, as suggested by Lasnik (1995c), Lasnik (2001).

IV. The Case Filter
A. Amelioration of a constraint on Japanese ga/no conversion

(27) Taroo-ga / -no itta tokoro
    -NOM -GEN went place
    'the place where Taroo went'

(28) A Case-marked object blocks ga/no conversion.

(29) Taroo-ga /*-no hon -o katta mise
    -NOM/ -GEN book-ACC bought shop
    'the shop where Taroo bought a book'

(30) An object relative gap does not block ga/no conversion.

(31) Taroo-ga /-no e katta hon
    -NOM -GEN bought book
    'the book that Taroo bought'

(32) A null object does not block ga/no conversion.

(33) Hanako-ga /*-no Ziroo-o tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
    -NOM -GEN ACC take place -TOP Nagoya Castle is
    'The place that Hanako is taking Ziroo is the Nagoya Castle.'

(34) Hanako-ga / -no e tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
    -NOM -GEN take place -TOP Nagoya Castle is
    'The place that Hanako is taking (him) is the Nagoya Castle.'

(35) If relative gaps can be null pronouns, as argued for by
    Perlmutter (1972), Murasugi (1991), then these two instances
    are one.

(36) Now suppose these null pronouns are actually the results of
    ellipsis. Then if the blocking effect is the result of
    accusative Case checking, failure to check can be repaired by
    deletion.

B. A kind of exceptional Case marking normally available only
under A’-movement

(37) *I alleged John to be a fool

(38) Verbs of this class cannot normally license ‘exceptional’
    Case

(39) ?John, I alleged to be a fool
(40) ?Who did you allege to be a fool

(41) But they can under A’-movement (as first discussed by Kayne).

(42) John, I alleged to be a fool. *Mary alleged John to be a fool
    too.
(43) John, I alleged to be a fool. ?*Mary alleged him to be a fool
    too.

(44) John, I alleged to be a fool. Mary did [allege John to be a
    fool] too.

(45) John in (44) should be in violation of the Case Filter, but it
is fine, evidently repaired by deletion. This, along with Saito's analysis above, suggests the early version (Chomsky (1980)) of Case theory, where the Case Filter reflects a morpho-phonological requirement.

V. ECM configurations and Condition B

(46) *Johni injured himi
(47) *Johni believes himi to be a genius
(48) *Mary injured himi and Johni did too
(49) ?Mary believes himi to be a genius and Johni does too

(50) Suppose Postal (1966), Postal (1974) was right (contra Chomsky (1973)) that the relevant structural configuration for such obviation is based on the notion clause-mate. (For related discussion, see Lasnik (In press).)

(51) Weak pronouns must cliticize onto the verb.
(52) The detective brought him in
(53) *The detective brought in him

(54) Failure to cliticize in (49) is repaired by ellipsis.
(55) In (48), on the other hand, the pronoun and its antecedents are clause-mates independent of cliticization.

VI. Failure of repair - VP ellipsis

A. Island violations - VP ellipsis

(56) *They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do [\(_{vp} \text{want to hire someone who speaks} \)

(57) Compare (58), which also involves a relative clause island:

(58) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) [\(_{vp} \text{they want to hire someone who speaks} \)

(59) It appears that a certain senator will resign, but which senator [\(_{\text{it appears that}} \text{will resign}\) is still a secret

(60) Sally asked if somebody was going to fail Syntax One, but I can't remember who [\(_{\text{Sally asked if}} \text{was going to fail Syntax One}\)

(61) She said that a biography of one of the Marx brothers is going to be published this year, but I don't remember which [\(_{\text{she said that}} \text{is going to be published this year}\)

(62) *It appears that a certain senator will resign, but which senator it does [\(_{\text{appear that}} \text{will resign}\) is still a secret

(63) *Sally asked if somebody was going to fail Syntax One, but I can't remember who she did [\(_{\text{ask if}} \text{was going to fail Syntax One}\)
(64) "She said that a biography of one of the Marx brothers is going to be published this year, but I don't remember which she did [say that a biography of *t* is going to be published this year] [subject condition]

(65) Now notice that parallel 'failure of repair' obtains even when there was no violation in the first place.

(66) Extraction out of an embedded clause is typically fine and Sluicing is just as good, but VPE is bad:

(67) They said they heard about a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language they said they heard about

(68) They said they heard about a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language

(69) *They said they heard about a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language they did

(70) Similarly for extraction out of an object NP:

(71) They heard a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language they heard about

(72) They heard a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language

(73) *They heard a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language they did

(74) Even short movement of a direct object shows rather similar behavior:

(75) They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which Balkan language they studied

(76) They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which Balkan language

(77) ??They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which Balkan language they did

(78) Is VPE blocked when Sluicing is available (Sort of 'Delete as much as you can')?

(79) Someone solved the problem. Who (?did)?

(80) Is a VPE site precluded from containing a WH trace?

(81) I know what I like and what I don't    Merchant p.69 [See Fiengo and May (1994) for similar examples.]

B. Towards a Solution  [This section is based on joint work with Danny Fox, Fox and Lasnik (2001)]

(82) The constraint seems to be specific to VPE, and seems limited specifically to circumstances where an indefinite antecedes a WH-trace. In fact, in other circumstances, VPE can even repair actual island violations:

(83) *[How interesting] did Brio write [a t novel]

(84) a Pico wrote a more interesting novel than Brio did

Fred said that Mary talked to a certain girl, but I don't know which girl.

The Parallelism required for ellipsis is satisfied since the variables in the antecedent and the elided clause are bound by parallel operators and from parallel positions.

Now notice that in the structure, there are no intermediate traces in the elided portion (in angle brackets), indicating that there were no intermediate landing sites in the movement.

If there had been successive movement, under plausible assumptions the relevant portions of the antecedent and the ellipsis site would not be parallel, and this would prevent ellipsis.

But why is there no 'repair' with VPE?

VPE involves deletion of a smaller constituent than the clause that is elided in sluicing (VP vs. TP):

which girl [TP he T [AspP did <VP say that I talked to g(girl)>]]

*Fred said that Mary talked to a certain girl, but I don't know which girl he did.

The unacceptability of VPE follows if we assume that one of the two remaining maximal projections, AspP or TP, is an 'island' that must be circumvented by adjunction or repaired by deletion. [This roughly follows the claim of Chomsky (1986a) that all XPs are potential barriers.] Since the island is not deleted, the escape hatch is required, and a violation of Parallelism is unavoidable, assuming that movement is not allowed to proceed in one long 'island-violating' step followed by short successive steps. (Metaphorically, when you enter the subway, you must choose the express or the local.)

The somewhat less degraded status of very short movement cases such as (77) can now possibly be explained in terms of Pseudogapping (a variant of VPE where the survivor is first raised out of the inner VP in a shell structure, and that inner VP is deleted). The WH-trace can be completely outside of the ellipsis site. If I am right that the raising of the survivor is A-movement, it follows that long distance instances will not be possible.

[CP which Balkan language [TP they T [AspP did [VP tthey [AgrP twh [VP study-t]]]]]]
C. Long A-movement and VP ellipsis

(97) *Susan thought Mary studied Bulgarian and John did think Mary studied Macedonian

(98) A-movement from a Case checking position is barred.

(99) We must "prevent a nominal phrase that has already satisfied the Case Filter from raising further to do so again in a higher position." Chomsky (1986b, p.280)

(100) "...a [-Interpretable] feature is 'frozen in place' when it is checked, Case being the prototype." Chomsky (1995, p.280)

(101) *my belief [John to seem [t is intelligent]]

(102) "...a visible Case feature ... makes [a] feature bundle or constituent available for 'A-movement'. Once Case is checked off, no further [A-]movement is possible." Lasnik (1995c, p.16)

(103) "If uninterpretable features serve to implement operations, we expect that it is structural Case that enables the closest goal G to select P(G) to satisfy EPP by Merge. Thus, if structural Case has already been checked (deleted), the phrase P(G) is "frozen in place," unable to move further to satisfy EPP in a higher position. More generally, uninterpretable features render the goal active, able to implement an operation: to select a phrase for Merge (pied-piping) or to delete the probe." Chomsky (2000, p.123)

(104) Pseudogapping is A-movement of the survivor (to Spec of Agr₀) followed by VP ellipsis.

(105) 'Object shift' is optional in English. Hence [v V DP] must be a Case checking configuration.

(106) 'Long' Pseudogapping involves impossible A-movement from a Case position. This is not an island violation.

(107) But what of 'short' Pseudogapping?

(108) "...all operations within the phase are in effect simultaneous." Chomsky (2001)
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VP-ellipsis and sluicing are two of the best investigated instances of ellipsis and generally show remarkable similarities in the demands they make of the discourse, both usually necessitating some equivalent antecedent which is subject to some kind of parallelism. It is no exaggeration to say that debates over the nature of this parallelism have formed the core of most of the generative work on ellipsis over the last forty years. The reasons for theoretical interest in elliptical structures is obvious: in each case, the usual form-meaning correspondence appears to break down: there is meaning in ellipsis without form. In broad terms, there have been two answers to the puzzle posed by ellipsis structures: the nonstructural and the structural. Fix Your Stuff. Right to Repair. Store. Back Verizon Ellipsis 7. Edit. Full Screen. Options. History. Save to Favorites. Download PDF. Verizon Ellipsis 7 Screen Replacement. Written By: Scott Mangin (and 4 other contributors). Comments: 6. Favorites: 3. Completions: 7. Difficulty. Difficult. Steps. 7. Island Repair by Ellipsis agreement (as in the concept of cyclic Agree, see Legate (2005), Frank (2006), Lahne (2008)). However, these kinds of mechanisms do not seem applicable in the case at hand. They can propagate features along a projection line. However, this consequence is harmless: Either [\*] can be discharged vacuously, or it need not be discharged at all if there is no spell-out operation. Alternatively, if this consequence were to be avoided, an additional clause that ensures this could easily be added in (21): 304 Chapter 7. Island Repair by Ellipsis How can moved items (in particular, moved wh-phrases in sluicing constructions) avoid being assigned [\*]? The answer to this is twofold. claim that ellipsis can repair island violations, showing apparent examples to be illusory (Barros. to appear, a.o.). With the foundation of elliptical repair in doubt, the following question arises: To what extent, if any, can ellipsis make an ill-formed structure acceptable? The structure in (1), in which an XP has moved out of some elided YP, has been ascribed. Fragmentary utterances such as as \*short\*™ answers and subsentential XPs without linguistic antecedents are proposed to have fully sentential syntactic structures, subject to ellipsis. Ellipsis in these cases is preceded by A*-movement of the fragment to a clause-peripheral position; the combination of movement and ellipsis accounts for a wide range of connectivity and anti-connectivity effects in these structures. Example usage: data.frame(letters=c("a", "b", "c"), numbers=c(1,2,3), notes=c("do", "re", "mi")) letters numbers notes 1 a 1 do 2 b 2 re 3 c 3 mi. The function's signature includes an ellipsis, like this: function (..., row.names = NULL, check.rows = FALSE, check.names = TRUE, stringsAsFactors = default.stringsAsFactors()) {. [function definition here] }. I would like to write a function that does something similar, taking multiple values and consolidating them into a single return value (as well as doing some other processi