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I. Strong features, defective PF objects, and ellipsis

A. Pseudogapping and V Raising

(1)a If you don't believe me, you will *the weatherman*
b I rolled up a newspaper, and Lynn did *a magazine*c Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't *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. [Koizumi (1993); Koizumi (1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)]

(5) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of AgrO (driven by an EPP requirement of AgrO) followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]

(6) AgrP /
     NP __ AgrO'
     you __ TP
     AgrS / __ VP
     T __ / __ 
     will __ / __ 
     VP __ __ __
     t __ __ __ __
     V __ __ __ __
     AgrP __ __ __ __
     NP __ __ __ __
     Bob __ __ __ __
     AgrO __ __ __ __
     VP __ __ __ __
     V __ __ __ __
     NP __ __ __ __
     believe __ __ __ __

(7) AgrP /
     NP __ AgrO'
     Smith __ VP
     AgrO __ __ V'
     \ __ __ __
     V __ __ S.C.
     prove __ __ __
     NP __ AP
     t __ __ guilty

(8) *You will Bob believe
(9) *The Assistant DA will Smith prove guilty

(10) V raising is normally obligatory driven by a strong feature of the 'shell' V.

(11) AgrP /
     NP __ AgrO'
     you __ TP
     AgrO __ __ VP
     T __ __ __ __
     will __ __ __ __
     VP __ __ __ __
     t __ __ __ __
     V __ __ __ __
     AgrO __ __ __ __
     NP __ __ __ __
     Bob __ __ __ __
     AgrO __ __ __ __
     VP __ __ __ __
     V __ __ __ __
     NP __ __ __ __
     believe __ __ __ __

(12) Once the matching feature of the lower lexical V is 'attracted', the lower V becomes phonologically defective. A PF crash will be avoided if either pied-piping (normal V raising) 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)]

B. Sluicing and Infl Raising

(13) Sluicing - WH-Movement followed by deletion of IP (abstracting away from 'split Infl' details). [Ross (1969), Saito and Murasugi (1990), Lobeck (1990)]

(14) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
     Speaker B: I wonder who Mary will see.
(15) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
Speaker B: Who Mary will see?

(16) 
CP
/  \
NP  C'
  /  IP
C  [strong F]
/  \
NP  I'
Mary  /  \
  I  VP
      will  /  \
      [F]  V'
      /  \
      V  NP
see  t

(17) *Who Mary will see?
(18) Who will Mary see?

(19) In matrix WH interrogatives, Infl raising to C is normally obligatory driven by a strong feature of the interrogative C.

(20) Assume that the matching feature of Infl raises overtly to check the strong feature of C. This leaves behind a phonologically defective Infl, which will cause a PF crash unless either pied-piping (Infl raising to C) or deletion of a category containing that Infl (Sluicing) takes place.

II. Failure of Repair: The EPP

(21) Agr t
    \ /  \
   NP  Agr t'
      /  \ 
     she  Agr t
     /  \ 
    TP  VP
      /  \ 
     T  will  /  \ 
      NP  V'  t
      sleep

(22) Mary said she won't sleep, although she will sleep

(23) Agr t
    \ /  \
   NP  Agr t'
      /  \ 
     Agr t
     /  \ 
    TP  VP
      /  \ 
     [strong F]  T  will  /  \ 
      NP  V'  t
      she  |  [F]  sleep

(24) *Mary said she won't sleep, although will she sleep
(25) Why isn't deletion of a category containing the 'defective' item a viable alternative to pied-piping in this instance?
(26) What is the EPP?
(27) A certain head high in the clause has a strong feature, demanding overt movement for checking. Chomsky (1995)
(29) Agr (or T) requires a Spec. It does not suffice to check its 'EPP feature'.

(30) A possible alternative approach to the dichotomy: Boeckx and Stjepanovic (In press) suggest that the true generalization involves head movement, where ellipsis does provide an alternative to raising, vs. XP movement, where it doesn't.
(31) The derivational decision to pied-pipe involves considerable 'look-ahead' since the adverse effects of bare feature movement are not evident until PF, where deletion operates. If head movement is a PF process, the interaction is at least confined to one component. Conversely, if XP movement is syntactic, potential interaction between full movement and deletion would be across the Spell-out divide, thus involving look-ahead of a much greater degree.

III. Ellipsis and island violation repair

(32) I believe that he bit someone, but they don't know who (I believe that he bit)
(33) 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
(34) 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
(35) 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
(36) 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)
Ross argues that the phenomenon of island violation repair provides "evidence of the strongest sort that the theoretical power of [global] derivational constraints is needed in linguistic theory..."  [p.277]

If a node is moved out of its island, an ungrammatical sentence will result. If the island-forming node does not appear in surface structure, violations of lesser severity will (in general) ensue.  [p.277]

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)

I don't know  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{IP} \\
\text{which children} \\
\text{he} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{has plans to send} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{to college}
\end{array}
\]

Chomsky rejects global derivational constraints, and suggests [see also Baker and Brame (1972), and, for an opposing view, Lakoff (1970), Lakoff (1972)] that * (# in Chomsky's presentation) is assigned to an island when it is crossed by a movement operation (the complex NP in (40)). An output condition forbidding * in surface structures accounts for the deviance of standard island violations.

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

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 (2001).

Much more recently Chung et al. (1995) argue that the amelioration of island effects with Sluicing follows from their account, in which there is no movement or deletion involved, but a sort of LF copying.

However, Merchant (1999), following Ross (1969), provides very strong evidence that syntactic movement (and hence deletion) is involved in Sluicing constructions. The evidence involves:

'Case matching': In overtly Case inflected languages (such as German), the Case of the remnant is just what the Case of the fronted WH expression would have been in the non-elliptical form, and this is even true in the island violation configurations.

\[\text{Er will jemandem schmeicheln, aber sie wissen nicht, he wants someone.DAT flatter but they know not \{*wer / *wen / \\
\text{who.NOM who.ACC who.DAT} \}
\]

The results are the same if, instead, it is a PF condition, as suggested by Lasnik (1995b), Lasnik (2001).

In Chomsky's approach, "a new element is introduced..."  
Lakoff (1972, p.81)

Thus, a possible technical argument, due to Kitahara (1999), against Chomsky's approach:

"... a *-feature, which is not a lexical feature - since it appears nowhere in the lexicon - ... enters into a derivation as the output of certain movements. ...this assumption violates the Inclusiveness Condition."  p.79

Kitahara's alternative:

An expression is marginally deviant if its derivation employs an MLC-violating application of Attract.  p.80

Merchant (1999) rejects Chomsky's (1972) approach on empirical grounds, because of instances of...
IV. Failure of Island Violation Repair

(60) *They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do [VP want to hire someone who speaks *they]*

Merchant (1999)

Compare

(61) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) [VP want to hire someone who speaks *they]*

Merchant (1999)

(62) In fact, Chung et al. (1995) had already claimed that Sluicing and VP ellipsis diverge in this way, concluding that the latter, unlike the former, is an instance of deletion.

(63) We left before they started playing party games.

*What did you leave before they did [VP start playing *they]*?

(64) Note, though, that this case is consistent with Chomsky's account (which Chung et al. (1995) apparently do not consider), as the adjunct island is not eliminated in (63), unlike the situation in (60).

(65) Merchant, on the other hand, takes all ellipsis to be PF deletion (as far as I can tell), and argues that only some islands represent PF effects. Others, especially including relative clause islands, do not, and their violation therefore cannot be repaired by ellipsis.

(66) (61) is then reanalyzed as:

(67) They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) [IP she should speak *they*]

[See also Baker and Brame (1972)]

(68) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language - Guess which [she speaks *they*]

(69) No-one had a student who worked on a certain Balkan language, but I can't remember which Balkan language [IP he worked on *the*]

(70) No-one moved to a certain town - guess which! Merchant p.267

(71) Every linguist, met a philosopher who criticized some of his work, but I'm not sure how much of his work [IP every linguist met a philosopher who criticized *the*]

(72) Each of the linguists met a philosopher who criticized some of the other linguists, but I'm not sure how many of the other linguists

(73) !How many of the other linguists did the philosopher criticize

(74) Some of Merchant’s PF islands: COMP-trace effects; derived positions (topicalizations, subjects)

(75) It appears that a certain senator will resign, but which senator [IP it appears that *she* will resign] is still a secret

(adapted from Merchant p.219)

(76) Sally asked if somebody was going to fail Syntax One, but I can't remember who [IP Sally asked if *he* was going to fail Syntax One]

Merchant p.219, from Chung et al. (1995)

(77) She said that a biography of one of the Marx brothers is going to be published this year, but I don't remember which [IP she said that a biography of *the* is going to be published this year]

(adapted from Merchant p.220)

(78) *They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do [IP want to hire someone who speaks *they*]*

(79) *It appears that a certain senator will resign, but which senator does [IP appear that *she* will resign] is still a secret

(80) *Sally asked if somebody was going to fail Syntax One, but I can't remember who she did [IP ask if *he* was going to fail Syntax One]*

(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 she did [IP say that a biography of *the* is going to be published this year]*

(82) *They want to hear a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they do

(83) They want to hear a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they want to hear a lecture about

(84) They studied a Balkan language but I don't know which [IP they studied a Balkan language]

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

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

(87) Is a VP ellipsis site precluded from containing a variable?

(88) I know what I like and what I don't Merchant p.69 [See Fiengo and May (1993) for similar examples.]

(89) The constraint seems to be specific to VP ellipsis and seems limited specifically to circumstances where an indefinite antecedes a WH-trace. The nature of this constraint remains obscure.
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