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I. Pseudogapping

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

(4) NP-raising to Spec of Agrₒ ('Object Shift') is overt in English.

(5) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agrₒ followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]
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(7) *You will Bob believe
(9) Once the matching feature of the lower lexical V is attracted, the lower V becomes defective. 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) *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 he'll hire is possible [Sentential Subject Constraint]
b (??)That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who
(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)
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(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 (1995b), Lasnik (2001a).

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

(27) Saito (2001)
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. Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) configurations and Condition B

(46) *Johni injured himi
(47) *Johni believes himi to be a genius

(48) *Mary injured him, and Johni did too
(49) ?Mary believes him, 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 (2002).)

(51) Weak pronouns must cliticize onto the verb.
(52) The detective brought him in
(53) *The detective brought in him  Chomsky (1955)

(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.
(56) Potential problem, pointed out by Tom Roeper: In just those VP ellipsis situations where Condition B effects are ameliorated, so are Condition C effects. But this is unexpected since Condition C involves no locality, clause-mate or otherwise. A relevant example, parallel to (49) above, is the following:

(57) ??Mary believes Johni to be a genius and hei does too

Compare:

(58) *Hei believes Johni to be a genius

(59) And even though Condition C involves no locality, once again, we find amelioration only in non-local domain:

(60)a *Mary injured Johni and hei did too
   b *Hei injured Johni

(61) Perhaps this is not really so surprising, as Condition C effects often disappear under ellipsis. Another example is:

(62)a Mary thinks Johni is a genius and hei does too
   b *Hei thinks Johni is a genius

(63) It was facts like this that provided much of the motivation for the 'Vehicle Change' of Fiengo and May (1994). Fiengo and May show how + and -pronominal correlates can be equated for the purposes of ellipsis. Thus a name [-a, -p] and corresponding pronoun [-a,+p] count as identical. Fiengo and May's treatment is in terms of an LF copying theory of ellipsis, but nothing crucial changes if the equivalence is stated in terms of identity deletion.

(64) We now have a handle on the parallelism between Condition B and apparent Condition C in ellipsis contexts - (49) vs. (57). Even in the latter circumstance, the subject of the infinitival clause could actually be the pronoun him. The two examples then become identical for our purposes: it is failure of him to cliticize that is remediated by deletion.

(65) There are contexts where pronouns are disallowed, yet we still get apparent Condition C amelioration (a phenomenon noticed by Christopher Potts, and brought to my attention by Jason Merchant). The following is an example (though not of precisely a type discussed by Potts).

(66) *Hei said that I should show Susan Johni
(67) Mary said that I should show Susan John, but he didn't say that I should show Susan John/him

(68) *(He didn't say that) I should show Susan him

(69) Potts's point was that vehicle change won't account for the Condition C amelioration this time, since a pronoun in place of the name is still bad (though for other reasons).

(70) In this instance, the other reasons could be exactly what I appealed to earlier - the clitic nature of weak accusative pronouns. In that case, vehicle change would give the desired result.

(71) (68) then violates this PF requirement, and VP ellipsis deletes the PF violation.

(72) Mary showed Susan Billi even though hei didn't want her to.

(73) *Hei didn't want Mary to show Susan Billi

(74) *He didn't want Mary to show Susan him
(75) *Mary showed Susan him

VI. Failure of repair: Island violations - VP ellipsis

(76) *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 } t]\)  
Merchant (2001)

(77) Compare (78), which also involves a relative clause island:

(78) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) \[_{if} \text{ they want to hire someone who speaks } t]\)  
Merchant (2001)

(79) It appears that a certain senator will resign, but which senator \[\text{it appears that } t \text{ will resign}\] is still a secret  [adapted from Merchant]

(80) Sally asked if somebody was going to fail Syntax One, but I can't remember who \[\text{Sally asked if } t \text{ was going to fail Syntax One}\]  
Merchant, from Chung et al. (1995)

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

(82) *It appears that a certain senator will resign, but which senator it does \[\text{appear that } t \text{ will resign}\] is still a secret [that-trace]

(83) *Sally asked if somebody was going to fail Syntax One, but I can't remember who she did \[\text{ask if } t \text{ was going to fail Syntax One}\] [if-trace]

(84) *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 \[\text{say that a biography of } t \text{ is going to be published this year}\] [subject condition]

(85) But now notice that parallel 'failure of repair' obtains even when there was no violation in the first place.  [Lasnik (2001b)]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(94) Even short movement of a direct object shows rather similar behavior:
They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which Balkan language they studied.

They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which Balkan language.

They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which Balkan language they did.

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

Someone solved the problem. Who (?did)?

Is a VPE site precluded from containing a WH trace?

I know what I like and what I don't. Merchant (2001) [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 (2003).]

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

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 (1986) 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.)

An interesting consequence of this line of analysis: Movement must not be allowed to proceed in one long 'island-violating' step followed by short successive steps. If this were allowed, the ellipsis site could lack any intermediate traces, making it parallel to its antecedent. And the undeleted portion could be free of *s.

Metaphorically, when you enter the subway, once you have chosen the express, you can't switch to a local train at a local stop.
Since this account of the contrast between VPE and sluicing relies crucially on the fact that there is movement in the elided constituent but not in the antecedent constituent, a prediction is that if the antecedent clause is replaced with a clause that involves movement, both VPE and sluicing would be possible.

a I know which book John said that Mary read, but YOU don't know which one
b ?I know which book John said that Mary read, but YOU don't know which one he did.

Compare:

a I know that John said that Mary read a certain book, but I don't know which one.
b *I know that John said that Mary read a certain book, but I don't know which one he did.
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