LF and the Syntax of Quantification: Antecedent Contained Deletion

(1) Dulles suspected everyone Angleton did
(2) Dulles (\(\forall y\) suspected everyone Angleton did \(\forall y e\))
   suspected everyone Angleton did \(\forall y e\)
(3) May argues that if the direct object undergoes QR before copying takes place, the regress is avoided. Instead of (2), we have (4):
(4) \([\text{everyone} \ [\text{Op}, \text{Angleton did} \ [\text{VP e}] ]]\ [\text{Dulles} \ [\text{VP suspected} \ [\text{Dulles} \ [\text{VP suspected} t ]]]]
(5) This analysis crucially relies on QR raising the entire quantificational expression, hence, argues for such an operation.
(6) John scratched his arm and Mary did too
(7) I turned in my assignment, but most of the other students didn't [turn in their assignments]
(8) Cheryl stops to look at any pretty flower she stumbles onto, and I do too
(9) Wyngaard and Zwart (1991) propose that 'Vehicle Change' of Fiengo and May (1994) can ignore the difference between a full NP and a variable. For example, (10) can be copied as (11):
(10) \([\text{everyone} \ [\text{Op}, \text{Angleton did} \ [\text{VP e}] ]]\)
(11) \([\text{everyone} \ [\text{Op}, \text{Angleton did} \ [\text{VP e}] ]]\)
(12) a (\*?) John kissed Mary, but I wonder who Harry did [e]
   b (\*?) John loves himself, but I wonder who Harry does [e]
(13) In (12), the NPs treated as identical are entirely dissimilar, while in (10)-(11), they have an obvious relation: they have the same index. Identity of indices is a constraint on this extended form of Vehicle Change.
(14) Dulles suspected everyone Angleton did
(15) *Dulles suspected Philby, who Angleton did
(16) (?Dulles suspected Philby, who Angleton did not
(17) (?Dulles suspected Philby, who Angleton did as well
(18) (?Dulles suspected Philby, and Angleton did
(19) Dulles suspected Philby, and Angleton did not
(20) Dulles suspected Philby, and Angleton did as well
(21) a ?John believed everyone you did ___ to be a genius
   b *John believed (that) everyone you did ___ was a genius
(22) The subject of a finite clause is incapable of hosting an ACD site. Larson and May (1990)
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(39)  *John believed (that) everyone you did ___ was a genius  
(40)  *I expect (that) everyone you do ___ will visit Mary  
(41)  *I find (that) everyone you do ___ is qualified  
(42)  *I predicted (that) no one you did ___ has been a liar  

(43)  Who thought that Fred read how many of the books that Bill did  
(44) = Who thought that Fred read how many of the books that Bill read  
(45) = # Who thought that Fred read how many of the books that Bill thought he had read  

(46)  Overt wh-movement does allow ACD resolution.  (47) is rather awkward, but is surely far better than (43) on the reading comparable to that of (45):  
(47)  How many of the books that Bill did you think that Fred read  
(48)  Similarly, overt extraction of a nominative wh-phrase permits ellipsis resolution, in contrast with the in situ nominative expressions considered above. Compare (42) above with (49):  
(49)  Who that you did did Harry predict has been a liar  
(50)  The fact that ACD regresses cannot be resolved by wh in situ argues that ACD must be resolved at S-structure (Baltin (1987)) or that there is no LF wh-movement.  
(51)  ?Dulles suspected Philby, who Angleton did not  
(52)  ?Dulles suspected Philby, who Angleton did as well  
(53)  Philby, who Angleton suspected, is likely to defect  
(54)  ?Dulles spoke to Philby, who Angleton did not  
(55)  ?Dulles spoke to Philby, who Angleton did as well  
(56)  Hornstein (1994): The regress is resolved by (covert) raising to SPEC of AGR. Indirect objects also raise at LF to SPEC of AGR. All other PPs are outside the VP to begin with, so they don’t cause a regress in the first place.  
(57)  a Dulles suspected Philby, who Angleton suspected as well  
   b Dulles spoke to Philby, who Angleton spoke to as well  

(58)  a ?Dulles talked about Philby, who Angleton did not  
   b ?Dulles talked about Philby, who Angleton did as well  
(59)  #Dulles talked about Philby, who Angleton talked as well  
(60)  Alternative: reanalysis, and raising of object of reanalyzed verb to SPEC of AGR. This correctly predicts a correlation with pseudo-passive:  
(61)  a Philby was spoken to  
   b Philby was talked about  
(62)  a *Mary stood near Susan, who Emily did not  
   b *Mary stood near Susan, who Emily did as well  
   c *Susan was stood near (by Mary)  
(63)  (62)c shows that stand near cannot reanalyze. Plausibly, a consequence of this inability is that the Case of the object of near will not be licensed in SPEC of AGR, but rather, internal to the PP (or perhaps in the SPEC of some functional projection just above the PP). The elided VP internal to that NP will thus not be able to escape the resolution regress.  
(64)  The Case approach might require a sort of Vehicle Change. In (65), t is the trace of movement to a Case-licensing position, hence, an A-trace, while its copy clearly must be a variable, or Op, will be vacuous.  
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(66)  Fiengo and May (1992) suggest that the kind of ACD we have been looking at (involving appositive relative clauses) involves 'pseudo-gapping', hence is not VP ellipsis at all.  
(67)  Dulles suspected Philby, and Angleton did Burgess  
(68)  a ?Dulles spoke to Philby, who Angleton did as well  
   b ?Dulles spoke to Philby, and Angleton did Burgess  
(69)  a ?Dulles talked about Philby, who Angleton did as well  
   b ?Dulles talked about Philby, and Angleton did Burgess  
(70)  a *Mary stood near Susan, who Emily did as well  
   b *Mary stood near Susan, and Emily did Harriet
Speculation 1: Apparent ACD can involve pseudo-gapping, and pseudo-gapping involves raising to SPEC of AGR, and VP ellipsis. In these constructions, the raising to SPEC of AGR, is overt (and the VP ellipsis at least can be deletion).

Consequence: In these constructions, the raising to SPEC of AGR, is overt (and the VP ellipsis at least can be deletion).

Speculation 2: (Roughly following Ura (1993) and Koizumi (1993)) Accusative NPs generally raise overtly to SPEC of AGR, with V raising overtly to a higher position. As usual, both movements are driven by a strong feature.

Why then is pseudo-gapping good, given that the V hasn't raised?

Suppose the relevant strong feature is a feature of the higher V. And suppose, following Ochi (1999), that raising of features to check a higher strong feature leaves behind a PF defective item.

Prediction: Deletion of (a category containing) an item that has 'lost' features by feature movement salvages the derivation.

The correlation seen above between reanalysis and ACD, which further motivated the raising to SPEC of AGR, approach, surprisingly breaks down when restrictive relative clauses are considered.

Mary stood near everyone Emily did

As noted by Hornstein (1994), and as I indicated earlier, the mechanism cannot be QR, since if QR can raise an entire quantificational expression, the minimalist goal of eliminating S-structure binding conditions in favor of LF ones cannot be attained.

A man arrived who was wearing a red hat

I visited a man that John mentioned recently

I threw something away I had no further use for

Dulles suspected everyone Angleton did

Mary stood near everyone Emily did

Mary stood near a woman yesterday who was distributing leaflets

Mary [\textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}}} \textit{stood near everyone}] [\textit{\texttt{op}} [Emily did \textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{e}}}]])

Mary [\textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}}} \textit{stood near everyone}] [\textit{\texttt{op}} [Emily (did) \textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}} stood near everyone}]])

everyone [\textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}}} Mary [\textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}}} \textit{stood near }] [\textit{\texttt{op}} [Emily (did) \textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}} stood near }]])]

Mary wondered which pictures of himself Bill saw

Mary wondered [\textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}}} which picture of himself] [Bill saw [\textit{\textsubscript{\texttt{op}}} which picture of himself]}

Mary mentioned the pictures of himself that Bill saw

Mary mentioned the pictures of himself that Bill saw [the pictures of himself]


