Strong Features, Defective PF Objects, and Ellipsis

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) Not just deletion of V:

(3) 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

(4) Pseudogapping as VP ellipsis, with the survivor rescued by moving out of the elided VP. Jayaseelan (1990)

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


(7) Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of Agr₀ (rather than Jayaseelan's Heavy NP Shift) followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995), Lasnik (1999)]

(8) \[\text{Agr}_s P\]
    \[\text{Agr}_s'\]
    \[\text{you}\]
    \[\text{Agr}_s\]
    \[\text{TP}\]
    \[\text{T}\]
    \[\text{VP}\]
    \[\text{will}\]
    \[\text{NP}\]
    \[\text{V'}\]
    \[\text{t}\]
    \[\text{V}\]
    \[\text{Agr}_o P\]
    \[\text{Agr}_o'\]
    \[\text{Bob}\]
    \[\text{Agr}_o\]
    \[\text{VP}\]
    \[\text{V'}\]
    \[\text{V}\]
    \[\text{NP}\]
    \[\text{believe}\]
    \[\text{t}\]
(9) *You will Bob believe

(10) "For the most part – perhaps completely – it is properties of the phonological component that require pied-piping. Isolated features and other scattered parts of words may not be subject to its rules, in which case the derivation is canceled; or the derivation might proceed to PF with elements that are 'unpronounceable,' violating FI." Chomsky (1995, p.262)

(11) "Applied to the feature F, the operation Move thus creates at least one and perhaps two "derivative chains" alongside the chain $CH_F=(F,t_F)$ constructed by the operation itself. One is $CH_{FP}=(FF[F],t_{FP[F]})$, consisting of the set of formal features $FF[F]$ and its trace; the other is $CH_{CAT}=(\alpha,t_\alpha)$, $\alpha$ a category carried along by generalized pied-piping and including at least the lexical item containing F. $CH_F$ is always constructed, $CH_{CAT}$ only when required for convergence...As noted, $CH_{CAT}$ should be completely dispensable, were it not for the need to accommodate to the sensorimotor apparatus." [p.265]

(12) "Just how broadly considerations of PF convergence might extend is unclear, pending better understanding of morphology and the internal structure of phrases. Note that such considerations could permit raising without pied-piping even overtly, depending on morphological structure..." [p.264]

(13) In (14), if only the attracted features raise, but the V does not raise, a PF crash will ensue, but only if the offending item exists at that level. Deletion provides another way to salvage the derivation. When the lower VP is deleted without the V having raised, a PF crash is avoided and the result is acceptable Pseudogapping.

(14) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Agr}_P \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{Agr}'_s \\
\text{you} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{will} \\
\text{VP} \\
\quad \text{NP} \quad \text{V}' \\
\quad \text{t} \\
\quad \text{V} \quad \text{Agr}_P \\
\quad \text{[strong F]} \\
\quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Agr}_o' \\
\quad \text{Bob} \\
\quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \text{V}' \\
\quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \text{believe} \quad \text{t} \\
\quad \text{[F]} \\
\end{array}
\]
(15) 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 the Ochi (1999) implementation of the Chomsky (1995) proposal]

(16) Note that it isn't easy to see how this result could be replicated if feature movement is eliminated from the theory in favor of long distance agreement - Agree, since Agree, unlike feature movement, never renders an item defective. [Lasnik (2002)]

II. Sluicing 1 [Infl raising]

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

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

(19) Ross described Sluicing as an embedded question phenomenon, but there is also matrix Sluicing:

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

(21) 

(22) *Who Mary will see?
(23) Who will Mary see?

(24) 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.

-3-
III. Complementarity between movement and ellipsis? Sometimes, but not always.

(25) Mary will buy something.
(26) a What will she buy?
   b What?
   c *What will?

(27) A possible economy account: Suppose ellipsis always involves strong feature movement, with the ellipsis licensing head attracting a feature of the (head of the) XP to be deleted. This leaves a phonologically defective item. The damage can be obliterated by ellipsis (or, potentially, repaired by head movement).

(28) In (26)a, the 'repair' is by head movement of Infl to C. In (26)b, it is by IP deletion. Either suffices. But in (26)c, both operations have taken place.
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