Antecedent Contained Deletion

(1) Dulles suspected everyone Angleton did
(2) Dulles [\(\forall x \text{ suspected everyone Angleton did } [x, e]\)]
   suspected everyone Angleton did [\(\forall x e\)]

(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) [everyone [Op, Angleton did [\(\forall x e\)]], [Dulles [\(\forall x \text{ suspected } e\)]]

(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) [\(\forall x \text{ suspected everyone Angleton did } [x, e]\)]
(11) [\(\forall x \text{ suspected } e\)]

(12) a  (?*)John kissed Mary, but I wonder who Harry did [\(\forall x e\)]
b  (?*)John loves himself, but I wonder who Harry does [\(\forall x e\)]

(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)

(23) a  ?I expect everyone you do ___ to visit Mary
b  *I expect [that] everyone you do ___ will visit Mary
(24) a  ?I find everyone you do ___ to be qualified
b  *I find [that] everyone you do ___ is qualified
(25) a  ?I predicted no one you did ___ to be a liar
b  *I predicted [that] no one you did ___ has been a liar

(26) I expect that everyone you expect will visit Mary will visit Mary

(27) The configurations in the (b) examples permit ellipsis that is not antecedent contained:

(28) John expects that everyone Bill invites will visit Mary, and I expect that everyone you do [invite] will visit Mary

(29) Larson and May (1990): "whereas quantified subjects can be given scope out of infinitives, this is not generally possible with tensed complements." "...whereas [(30)a] permits a wide-scope reading for everyone vis-à-vis someone and believe, according to which for each person x there is someone who believes x is a genius, [(30)b] permits only a narrow-scope reading for everyone, according to which there is some person who believes genius to be a universal characteristic":

(30) a  Someone believes everyone to be a genius
b  Someone believes [that] everyone is a genius

(31) Everyone can raise out of its clause in (30)a, but not in (30)b. Similarly, everyone you did can raise out of its clause in (21)a, but not in (21)b, with the consequence that the ACD regress will be resolvable in (21)a, but not in (21)b.

(32) Williams (1986) similarly indicates that (33), which is quite similar to (30)b, lacks a broad scope reading for everyone:

(33) Someone thinks everyone saw you at the rally

(34) Interestingly, May (1988) sharply disagrees with Williams, calling the claimed lack of broad scope for everyone in (33) a "spurious datum", and reporting as a "standard observation" that a universal quantifier in this position can be understood as having broad scope. He goes on to state that "there does not seem to be any grammatical principle that can limit extraction from the complement subject position..."

(35) What did everyone buy for Max
(36) Who bought everything for Max
(37) Who do you think everyone saw at the rally
*John believed (that) everyone you did ___ was a genius
*I expect (that) everyone you do ___ will visit Mary
*I find (that) everyone you do ___ is qualified
*I predicted (that) no one you did ___ has been a liar

Who thought that Fred read how many of the books that Bill did
Who thought that Fred read how many of the books that Bill read

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):

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):

The fact that ACD regresses cannot be resolved by wh in situ argues that ACD must be resolved at 3-structure (Baltin (1987)) or that there is no LF wh-movement.

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.

Dulles suspected Philby, and Angleton did Burgess
Dulles spoke to Philby, who Angleton did as well
Mary stood near Susan, who Emily did as well
Mary stood near Susan, who Emily did as well
Speculation 1: Apparent ACD can involve pseudo-gapping, and pseudo-gapping involves raising to SPEC of AGR, and VP ellipsis.

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

*Dulles Philby* suspected *Mary*.

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

*John* arrived who was wearing a red hat

Extraposition? who

a I visited a man that John mentioned recently

b who

I visited a man recently who John mentioned

c ?*b*

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 [{$_{p}$[$_{p}$, stood near everyone] [$_{p}$, Op [Emily did [$_{p}$, e]]]}]

Mary [{$_{p}$[$_{p}$, stood near everyone] [$_{p}$, Op [Emily (did) [$_{p}$, stood near everyone]]}]

everyone [{$_{p}$[$_{p}$, Mary [$_{p}$, stood near $\bar{e}$] [$_{p}$, Op [Emily (did) [$_{p}$, stood near $\bar{e}$]]}]}]

Mary wondered which pictures of himself Bill saw

Mary wondered [$_{p}$, which picture of himself] [Bill saw [$_{p}$, which picture of himself]]

Mary mentioned the pictures of himself that Bill saw

Mary mentioned the pictures of himself that Bill saw

May wonder [the pictures of himself]


