OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Contents

1

Introduction

In this book I put forward an account of Ellipsis in the framework of generative grammar. Based on the assumption that elliptical structures are sensitive to Focus, I show that the incorporation of a Focus feature in the syntactic derivation of Ellipsis allows a uniform treatment of various types of elliptical structure.

The theory of Ellipsis advocated in this book was developed on the basis of an in-depth investigation of the Pseudogapping construction, which is illustrated in (1).

(1)   This should make you laugh—it did me!

The majority of empirical data provided in the following chapters are thus examples of Pseudogapping, including hitherto unattested examples in languages other than English, e.g. the Scandinavian languages.

The choice of Pseudogapping as a starting point for the discussion on Ellipsis is chiefly motivated by the observation that Pseudogapping combines properties of other elliptical structures, in particular, properties of VP Ellipsis and Gapping, examples of which are given in (2) (VP Ellipsis) and (3) (Gapping).

(2)   Mary met Bill at Berkeley and Sue did too.

(3)   Claire read a book, and Heather a magazine.

In all three examples, the main verb is missing—*laugh* in (1), *meet* in (2), and *read* in (3). In VP Ellipsis (2), there is no overt object in the second part of the clause, but there is a finite auxiliary, *did*. In Gapping (3), in turn, there is an overt object, the so-called remnant, *a magazine*, but there is no finite auxiliary present in the structure. The Pseudogapping construction in (1) contains a finite auxiliary (*did*), like VP Ellipsis (2) (also *did*), and a contrastive remnant (*me*), like Gapping (3) (*a magazine*), thus combining the distinguishing features of the two other constructions.

This is particularly interesting in view of the fact that Gapping and VP Ellipsis are taken to be derived quite differently in current syntactic theory. Capitalizing on the presence of the contrastive remnant, there are researchers (e.g. Zoerner and Agbayani 2000; Agbayani and Zoerner 2004; Johnson 2005; 2009[2006]) who regard Pseudogapping as being related to the Gapping construction. On the other hand, in

view of the auxiliary that seems to license both VP Ellipsis and Pseudogapping, a number of researchers have claimed that Pseudogapping should be derived as VP Ellipsis, with the remnant having moved out of the VP prior to deletion (e.g. Jayaseelan 1990; Lasnik 1995). In my own work, I argue for the latter type of analysis.

If Pseudogapping is considered a particular instance of VP Ellipsis, the issue arises of how the movement of the contrastive remnant is achieved. The derivation of Pseudogapping (in terms of VP Ellipsis) has been taken to involve one (or more) of the following types of movement.

Heavy Noun Phrase Shift (HNPS)

In this analysis, the remnant, being contrastive, is moved out of the VP via Heavy NP Shift, i.e. rightward A-bar-movement. Alternatively, in a recent implementation of Heavy NP Shift based on Larson (1988), Johnson (2005) assumes that Heavy NP Shift is applied to Pseudogapping without actual movement of the object, and verb movement obtains to derive the final Pseudogapping structure.

Object Shift (OS)

In contrast to the Heavy NP Shift analysis, the Object Shift account, as proposed in Lasnik (1995, and subsequent work) involves A-movement of the remnant out of the VP, with the landing site of the remnant being the specifier of the Agr_O projection. The movement of the remnant in this type of analysis is motivated by an EPP-feature in Agr_O, which triggers movement of the object into its specifier position.

Focus Movement

Jayaseelan (2001) suggests that the movement in Pseudogapping is driven by a Focus feature on the Pseudogapping remnant. The landing site of this leftward movement is either the specifier position of a Focus projection above the vP layer or, in Chomsky's (2001; 2005) framework, the outer specifier of the vP projection.

From the theories mentioned above we can conclude that an analysis of Pseudogapping in terms of movement of the remnant out of the VP can thus be implemented with either A-movement or A-bar-movement. However, each of the movements proposed, with the exception of the first, requires additional qualifications as to why they should occur in English Pseudogapping, if they are not to be found elsewhere in the grammar of English. Moreover, as we will see, the Heavy NP Shift approach, while well-attested for English, also encounters problems with the distribution of the Pseudogapping remnants, which does not entirely coincide with the elements that usually undergo Heavy NP Shift.

The most universal movement of the choice provided above is the Focus Movement type, which is considered to be leftward A-bar-movement. In the theory I propose I adopt and further motivate this approach, which has its roots in

Jayaseelan's (2001) analysis. In my opinion, the Focus Movement analysis accounts not only for the distribution of remnants that occur in Pseudogapping but also for their focal properties—a dimension that has been rather neglected in the predominant approaches (it is only explicitly implemented in Jayaseelan's 2001 Focus Movement approach). A second reason to adopt the Focus Movement approach to Pseudogapping lies in its straightforward compatibility with the deletion operation that has been suggested in Merchant (2001) for Sluicing (and has been extended to other types of Ellipsis). Merchant's E-feature can be implemented such that it interacts with the Focus on the remnant, a condition which, although easily derived from Merchant's (2001) approach, has not been made explicit. I thus attempt to specify the relation between deletion and Focus, and proceed to show that it is the interaction between the two features, i.e. the E-feature, which specifies a particular portion of the syntactic structure for phonological deletion, and the Focus feature that derives Pseudogapping. The Focus Movement approach to Ellipsis can thus be summarized as follows: Focus Movement only obtains if it is necessary to move contrastive material out of the phrase that is specified for deletion.

With this very general assumption, we can account not only for Pseudogapping but also for other types of Ellipsis, such as Sluicing (which I analyse as involving Focus, too), Fragment answers, and, more controversially, Gapping and NP Ellipsis. The relevant examples of Sluicing (4), Fragments ((5), from Merchant 2004), and NP Ellipsis ((6), from Lobeck 1995) are given below (cf. (3) above for an example of Gapping).

(4)   I should invite someone, but I don't know **who**.

(5)   a. Who did she see?
       b. **John**.

(6)   Although John's friends were late to the rally, **Mary's** arrived on time.

In each of these cases, the boldface element moves to a higher position in the structure, driven by Focus, and the remainder of the phrase (the complement) can then be deleted.

1.1 The puzzle

On the basis of the data above, the central questions that this book aims to answer can be formulated as follows. The first question is concerned with the movement of the remnant out of the Ellipsis site:

(i)   What is the nature of the movement that is assumed for the Pseudogapping remnant? Is it A-movement, or A-bar-movement, or a combination of both? How can the movement be implemented in the current syntactic framework?

As already indicated above, I adopt a Focus Movement approach, and show how Focus Movement can be implemented in the syntactic derivation of Pseudogapping. A second question that I consider in my discussion on movement is the following:

(ii) What is the status of the verb that is to be deleted in Pseudogapping? Does it raise from V to *v*, as often assumed in non-elliptical contexts? If it does not raise, what are the factor or features that could block this movement?

I argue that verb raising and deletion of the verb are in complementary distribution, i.e. that the verb does not raise in elliptical structures. In this respect, I follow Lasnik's (1995 and subsequent) analysis. My technical implementation differs from his, however, in that it makes explicit use of Merchant's (2001) E-feature.

The position of the verb leads to a third question. If verb raising is a matter of debate in elliptical structures, then the size of deletion is affected by the assumptions we make about verb movement. Specifically, as paraphrased in (iii) below, the size of the structure targeted by deletion has to be determined.

(iii) In Pseudogapping, is the part of the structure to be deleted the VP, as previously assumed for both VP Ellipsis and Pseudogapping? Or is it rather, as recently suggested in Merchant (2007), the entire *v*P? If it is the *v*P, how does the derivation proceed to accommodate the deletion of the entire phase, e.g. in a phase-based theory?

Given the specification of the elided structure by means of the E-feature, I propose that the deletion site is the VP, which is compatible with a phase-based theory of deletion.

The fourth and final question I address in this book is the possible extension of my analysis for Pseudogapping to other types of elliptical structure, making use of the combination between Focus and deletion.

(iv) If Pseudogapping can be derived via Focus Movement and subsequent deletion, are other elliptical structures also amenable to this analysis?

I argue that it is indeed possible to derive a variety of elliptical structures with the analysis I developed for the Pseudogapping phenomenon. I thus conclude that a uniform account of Ellipsis is feasible, and show how the Focus-and-Deletion approach can be implemented in a phase-based framework.

1.2 Overview of the book

The overall organization of this book roughly corresponds to the order in which I presented questions (i)–(iv) above. The book is divided into four parts.

Part I contains the pertinent data discussed in the book (Chapter 2), and a brief overview of the literature on Pseudogapping (Chapter 3). Chapter 3 also features a

short discussion of the analyses that I reject in my own account of Ellipsis, i.e. analyses that consider Pseudogapping to be an instance of Gapping. Part I thus provides the empirical and theoretical background for the subsequent investigation of movement, Focus, and deletion.

Part II is concerned with the question of movement in Pseudogapping. In Chapter 4, I discuss object movement in terms of A-movement, and the EPP, which is considered to be the trigger for Object Shift in Lasnik's (1995; 1999a) analysis of Pseudogapping. I will show, however, that the EPP requirement for objects, as proposed in Lasnik's (e.g. 1999a; 2001a) theory, which covers not only Pseudogapping but also Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) structures and particle shift, cannot derive the information-structural differences between these phenomena and the Pseudogapping construction. In Chapter 5, I provide a discussion of A-bar-movement in the derivation of Pseudogapping, i.e. Heavy Noun Phrase Shift and Syntactic Focus Movement. I adopt the Syntactic Focus Movement approach.

In Part III, I investigate the semantic background of the Focus feature I assume and its interaction with Ellipsis in Chapter 6, before I turn to the deletion process in elliptical structures (Chapter 7). With regard to the licensing of deletion, I build on Merchant's (2001) E-feature approach, but offer a modification of the E-feature to establish a more direct interaction between Focus and deletion and show how this is built into the syntactic derivation.

In Part IV, I extend the analysis of Pseudogapping to other elliptical structures in Chapter 8 and offer a uniform account of Ellipsis. Chapter 9 concludes the book.

2

An Overview of the Data

In this chapter, I will provide empirical data of the phenomena that I will discuss in the course of this book. I will be mainly concerned with elliptical structures that occur in the lower part of the clause, notably Pseudogapping, and VP Ellipsis, but will also cover Sluicing, Fragment answers, Gapping, and NP Ellipsis.[1] The main focus of this book is on English, given that Pseudogapping has hitherto only been attested for English. In the present chapter, however, I will also provide some data from the Scandinavian languages, and one French example and one Portuguese example, without attempting an analysis for these in subsequent chapters.[2]

2.1 Elliptical structures in English

Below, I give an overview of the elliptical structures found in the grammar of English: VP Ellipsis (in 2.1.1), Pseudogapping (2.1.2), Gapping (2.1.4), Sluicing, Fragment answers, and Bare Argument Ellipsis (2.1.6.), and NP Ellipsis (2.1.7).

2.1.1 VP Ellipsis

VP Ellipsis in English is characterized by the presence of a finite auxiliary in front of the elided part of the structure. Moreover, VP Ellipsis can be constructed backwards, with the Ellipsis site in the first part of the sentence, as in (1) (but not always, as illustrated in (4)). VP Ellipsis often is assumed to involve special polarity marking, which is encoded with the emphatic marker *too*, or negation.

(1) Because Pavarotti couldn't [VP e], they asked Domingo to sing the part.
     (Lobeck 1995: 20, her (37))

---

[1] I will not treat Right-Node-Raising or Bare Argument Ellipsis in any detail, and will only take the influence of the particularities of the structure of comparative constructions (as opposed to coordinate structures) into account where necessary.

[2] Given the odd character of the French and Portuguese examples, I have not yet investigated them in closer detail, but hope to do so in future research. While I believe that some generalizations are possible with respect to the Scandinavian examples, which I will point out, I merely add the Romance examples to give an indication of which languages might be interesting for further empirical research.

(2) John talked to Bill on Tuesday but Mary didn't [e] until Wednesday.
     (Lobeck 1995: 21, her (43))

(3) a. Mary met Bill at Berkeley and Sue did [e] too.
     b. Mary met Bill at Berkeley although Sue didn't [e].
     c. Charlie thinks that Mary met Bill at Berkeley, but Sarah knows that Sue didn't [e].
     (Lobeck 1995: 22, her (45))

(4) a. *Sue didn't [e] but John ate meat.
     b. Because Sue didn't [e], John ate meat.
     (Lobeck 1995: 22, her (47))

(5) I can't go back to Madison now, but I can ø next week.
     (Levin 1978: 235, her (39))

Examples such as (2) and (5), where there is an element that seems to follow the Ellipsis site, are sometimes assumed to be instances of Pseudogapping rather than VP Ellipsis. The Pseudogapping construction is illustrated in the following section.

2.1.2 Pseudogapping

In this section I provide a number of Pseudogapping examples, and also point out generalizations concerning its distribution, and its status with respect to VP Ellipsis. As can be seen in example (6), for instance, Pseudogapping characteristically has a finite auxiliary in front of the Ellipsis site, and some contrastive material, most often a DP or a PP, following the Ellipsis site. As we will see below, this contrastive remnant makes Pseudogapping resemble the Gapping construction.

(6) He realized he could make more money in some other position than he can ø farming.
     (Levin 1978: 229, her (3a))

(7) Growing up, Joachim, 40, spent more time cooking than he did watching television.
     (Women's Health, October 2007 edition, p. 22)

(8) Colleagues sometimes assume that my interest in writing problems come from finding solutions to my own. Not really. It started, instead, because I wrote fluently; I enjoy writing almost as much as I do talking about it.
     (Robert Boice, *Professors as Writers*, New Forums Press, 1990, p. 2)

(9) i felt so sorry for this Valentine and decided to send it to you 'cause i knew you'd make it feel happy and wanted...like you did ø me!
     (Levin 1978: 229, her (3b), text on a Valentine's Day card)

(10)   We have less weeks term than we do holidays.
        (A. McNay, p.c.)

(11)   I had been wondering, you know, if she meant to hit her over the head and put
        her in the car the way she did you.
        (Dick Francis, *Hot Money*, audiotape, Durkin Hayes, 1988)

(12)   Speaker A: Drinks like that knock me over.
        Speaker B: They would ø me.
        (Levin 1978: 230, her (12))

(13)   Does that make you mad? It would me!
        (Levin 1986: vii)

(14)   I'm not citing their analysis so much as I am their data.
        (Levin 1986: 12, her (4))

(15)   I'm sure I would like him to eat fruit more than I would cookies.
        (Levin 1986: 15, her (7))

(16)   I think you need to show yourself more than you do anyone else.
        (Levin 1986: 16, her (13))

Descriptively speaking, Levin (1978: 229) distinguishes between regular Pseudogap-
ping, causative Pseudogapping, and comparative Pseudogapping.

   Causative Pseudogapping typically occurs with non-agentive experiencer causative
verbs such as *bother, interest, scare*; more specifically, *psych verbs* that take an
experiencer object such as *annoy, embarrass, fascinate, surprise*; and another group
of verbs that can be classified as non-emotive causatives, such as *knock NP out, wake/
keep NP up*, or *take NP X long to V* (cf. (8) above). In causative Pseudogapping, the
remnant is exclusively animate, usually human, and often a personal pronoun that
introduces new information (Levin 1978: 229, 231).

   Moreover, there is sometimes a generic character present in Pseudogapping, as
illustrated in (17) (Levin 1978: 231, her (17)).

(17)   Speaker A: Cream rinse makes my hair get oily faster.
        Speaker B: It (usually) does ø mine ø, too.

Comparative Pseudogapping (with adverbial comparatives), as in (13) above, for
instance, and (18) below (Levin 1978: 231, her (21)), is the most widely accepted type
of Pseudogapping.

(18)   It makes me feel as bad as it does ø you ø.

Sometimes a Pseudogapping configuration is ungrammatical in coordinate structures
(as in (19)) but perfectly grammatical in comparative structures (as in (20)) (both
examples from Levin 1978: 232, her (22a, b)).

(19)   *You probably just feel relieved, but I do ø jubilant.

(20)   I probably feel more jubilant than you do ø relieved.

There are also instances of Pseudogapping with remnants introduced by a preposition,
as illustrated in (21) below.

(21)   And because we can communicate so much visually—for instance, by the
        expressions on people's faces—you don't need quite so many words as you
        do in a novel, where so much is carried by the dialogue.
        (Sue Birtwistle and Susie Conklin, *The Making of Pride and Prejudice*, Penguin/
        BBC Books, London, 1995, p. 13)

In general, Pseudogapping becomes more acceptable once there is sufficient contrast
present in the structure, as Levin (1978: 232) notes. This is obviously true for
comparative structures, and, according to Levin, non-comparative structures
improve once there is a different polarity in the antecedent and the second conjunct,
and once there is Focus stress.

   While there are certain classes of verbs that seem to be favoured in Pseudogapping,
other verbs seem to be categorically ruled out. These verbs include psych perception
verbs such as *smell, taste, sound, look*, and verbs requiring a stative complement, such
as *seem, appear*, and *turn out* (Levin 1978: 233). In contrast to these verbs, Pseudo-
gapping with stative verbs requiring an NP complement, such as *own, contain*, and
constitute, is more acceptable. This pattern is illustrated in the following examples
((22) and (23), from Levin 1978: 233, her (28) and (30)).[3]

(22)   a. ? This bottle might contain sulfuric acid, but it shouldn't ø copper sulfate.
        b. ?? This bottle might contain sulfuric acid, but it doesn't ø copper sulfate.

(23)   Speaker A: These leeks look/smell/taste terrible.
        Speaker B: a. *Your steak will ø better.
                   b. *The onion rings do ø even worse.

2.1.3 Differences between Pseudogapping and VP Ellipsis

Johnson (1996b: 15) notes, citing Levin (1986), that there are some differences between
VP Ellipsis and Pseudogapping, illustrated in (24) (Johnson 1996b: 15, his (45); Levin
1986: 53, her (8) and (9)), where VP Ellipsis is possible in the antecedent VP, and
Pseudogapping is rather marginal.

---

[3] Levin (1978: 233) notes that the auxiliary *do* is worse than a modal in these structures. Note, however,
that the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (23) (her (30)) may stem from a ban on adjectival remnants in
general.

(24) a. Although it doesn't always _ , it sometimes takes a long time to clean the hamster's cage.
      b. ??Although it doesn't _ Sally, it takes Karen a long time to clean the hamster's cage.

As Levin (1986) notes, Pseudogapping and VP Ellipsis differ slightly, most obviously with respect to what has later been called the Backwards Anaphora Constraint (cf. Lobeck 1995). Johnson (1996a: 83) gives the examples in (25) (his (25)), to show that VP Ellipsis is licensed in the first conjunct, whereas Pseudogapping is not (an observation already made in Sag 1976).

(25) a. Although Holly doesn't [e], Doc eats rutabagas.
      b. *Although Mag doesn't [e] eggplants, Sally eats rutabagas.

Moreover, as Johnson (1996a: 83) and Lasnik (1995 and subsequent papers) point out, Pseudogapping is not able to target only a part of a prepositional phrase, as illustrated in (26) (taken from Johnson 1996a: 83, his (27a)).

(26) *Sally will stand near Mag, but he won't [e] Holly.

There is some counterevidence to this claim, however, as shown in (27) below (Levin 1986: 74, fn. h, her (13)), and taken up in e.g. Lasnik 1999c).

(27) You have to sign onto it [the printer] like you do ø the terminal.

Further, Pseudogapping is not able to move only a part of a noun phrase, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of the example in (28) below (e.g. Johnson 1996a: 83, his (27b); cf. also Lasnik's discussion of similar data (e.g. Lasnik 1999c)), an observation originally made by Tomioka (1997).

(28) *While Holly didn't discuss a report about every boy, she did [e] every girl.

In contrast to these examples, VP Ellipsis seems fine in these contexts, as shown in (29) (Johnson 1996a: 84, his (28b–d)). However, as Lasnik points out (p.c.), this is not yet proof that the two phenomena are different in nature—it may well be the case that an additional movement constraint applies in Pseudogapping, which may result in the difference in acceptability.

(29) a. Sally will stand near every woman that you will [e].
      b. I know which woman HOLLY will discuss a report about, but I don't know which woman YOU will [e].
      c. Holly discussed a report about every boy that Berman had [e].

Johnson (2001: 463) also notes that Pseudogapping is more restricted with respect to the sloppy reading for pronouns. Consider the contrast between (30a) and (30b) (Johnson 2001: 464, his (87)). In (30b), the only possible interpretation is that Frank

had given chocolates not to his own sweetie, but to Fred's sweetie. Johnson (2001: 464) speculates that this difference in interpretation might be due to the special contrast condition holding in Pseudogapping, without specifying how this might be implemented.

(30) a. Fred$_1$ gave flowers to his$_2$ sweetie because Frank$_2$ had _ .
          _ = given flowers to his$_2$ sweetie.
          _ = given flowers to his$_1$ sweetie.
      b. Fred$_1$ gave flowers to his$_1$ sweetie because Frank$_2$ had _ chocolates.
          _ ≠ given chocolates to his$_2$ sweetie.
          _ = given chocolates to his$_1$ sweetie.

Pseudogapping does not only differ from VP Ellipsis, as illustrated above; it also differs in several respects from Gapping, which is introduced in the next section.

2.1.4 *Gapping*

As already indicated, Gapping and Pseudogapping are—at least on the surface—very similar structures. More specifically, Gapping, as in (31) and (32), has a contrastive remnant, like Pseudogapping, without having the finite auxiliary in front of the Ellipsis site.

(31) Mary met Bill at Berkeley and Sue [e] at Harvard.
      (Lobeck 1995: 21, her (42a))[4]

(32) Claire read a book, and Heather a magazine.

However, Gapping seems to be more restricted than Pseudogapping, as we will see in the comparison of the two constructions in the next section.

2.1.5 *Differences between Pseudogapping and Gapping*

Pseudogapping is not restricted to coordinations to the extent we find in Gapping. Compare the ungrammatical Gapping examples in (33) to the corresponding grammatical Pseudogapping examples in (34) (Johnson 1996b: 17, his (47d,e,f) and (48c,d)). Clearly, Pseudogapping tolerates a wider variety of conjunctions.

(33) a. ?*Vivek likes Chinese action films, but Nishi ~~likes~~ sci-fi movies.
      b. *Sam ate something, but Mittie ate nothing.
      c. *Some ate natto TODAY, because others ~~ate natto~~ YESTERDAY.

(34) a. Vivek might like Chinese action films, but Nishi doesn't _ sci-fi movies.
      b. Some will eat nattoo TODAY, because others had _ YESTERDAY.

---

[4] Howard Lasnik (p.c.) points out that examples such as (31) are highly controversial in the literature, since they are considered ungrammatical by many speakers, including himself.

A further constraint is found with respect to embedding in general. Consider the contrast illustrated in (35) (Johnson 1996b: 18, his (53)). In (35a), Pseudogapping targets material within the embedded clause, which is not possible in Gapping, as shown in (35b).

(35) a.   Mittie ate nattoo, and I thought that Sam had _ rice.
      b.   *Mittie ate nattoo, and I thought that Sam ate rice.

Similarly, it is possible for Pseudogapping to have material as antecedent that is embedded in the antecedent clause, which is impossible in Gapping, as illustrated in (36) (Johnson 1996b: 18, his (54)).

(36) a.   Either CHUCK thought Mittie had eaten NATTO or LIZ has _ RICE.
      b.   *Either CHUCK thought Mittie has eaten NATTO or LIZ has eaten RICE.

A further difference between Pseudogapping and Gapping concerns the scope of negation. In Pseudogapping, the negation is restricted to the first clause; in Gapping, however, as shown in (37), the negation scopes over both conjuncts (Johnson 1996b: 19, his (57)). This can indeed be due to the fact that in Pseudogapping, unlike Gapping, the relevant part of the sentence is not deleted (Howard Lasnik, p.c.).

(37) Kim didn't play bingo and Sandy didn't sit at home all evening.

Evidently, one must conclude from the comparison of Pseudogapping with VP Ellipsis and Gapping that the three constructions seem to differ to a great extent. In the course of this book, notably in Chapter 8, I will come back to these differences, and show that a unified account of these constructions is nevertheless possible, in the sense that the differences between them fall out, in part at least, from the consequences of the analysis that I propose.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will provide a short discussion of other elliptical constructions in English that not only involve a missing verb but delete a greater part of the structure: Sluicing, Fragments, NP Ellipsis, and Bare Argument Ellipsis (Stripping). I conclude the chapter with a discussion of cross-linguistic instantiations of Pseudogapping.

2.1.6 Sluicing, Fragment answers, and Bare Argument Ellipsis

The Sluicing configuration, made known by Ross (1969), is most commonly treated as IP Deletion. It strands a *wh*-element as remnant, as indicated in (38) to (44) below (example (38) is from Lobeck (1995: 20), her (39); (39) to (44) correspond to Merchant's (2004: 664) example (7)).

(38) We want to invite someone, but we don't know who [e].

(39) Jack bought something, but I don't know what.

(40) A: Someone called.
      B: Really? Who?

(41) Beth was there, but you'll never guess who else.

(42) Jack called, but I don't know when/how/why/where from.

(43) Sally's out hunting—guess what!

(44) A car is parked on the lawn—find out whose.

Fragment answers, on the other hand, strand a single constituent as an answer to a previous question, as illustrated in the dialogue in (45) and the 'implicit' dialogue in (46) (both examples from Merchant (2004: 661: his (1) and (2)).

(45) Abby and Ben are at a party. Abby asks Ben about who their mutual friend Beth is bringing as a date by uttering: 'Who is Beth bringing?' Ben answers: 'Alex.'

(46) Abby and Ben are at a party. Abby sees an unfamiliar man with Beth, a mutual friend of theirs, and turns to Ben with a puzzled look on their face.
      Ben says: 'Some guy she met at the park.'

A related construction is Bare Argument Ellipsis (Stripping) in (47) (Lobeck 1995: 27, her (66)), which also strands one constituent in a verb-free environment, but maintains a property associated with VP Ellipsis, namely, the polarity markers *too* or *not*.[5]

(47) a. Jane gave presents to John, but not [e] to Geoff.
      b. Jane loves to study rocks, and [e] geography too.
      c. Jane loves to study rocks, and John [e] too.

A last, large complex of elliptical configurations is found in the DP. The so-called NP Ellipsis can have a number of remnants, of which I will only give a few in the next section. As the main topic of this book is the VP domain, I will only consider NP Ellipsis in terms of the unified approach that I will formulate in Chapter 8.

2.1.7 NP Ellipsis

NP Ellipsis is widely attested in English, and comes in two variants, so to speak, with and without *one*-insertion. In this book I will concentrate more on the structure without *one*-insertion, i.e. on examples such as the ones given in (48)–(51) below. In this instance of Ellipsis, the deletion site comprises the material following the

---

[5] As a detailed analysis of Stripping and its relation to VP Ellipsis would lead us too far afield from the original topic of this book, I will not attempt an analysis of this particular Ellipsis phenomenon.

possessive element, the NP in (48), or an NP introduced by selected quantifiers (49), numerals (50), or demonstratives (51).

(48) Although John's friends were late to the rally, [$_{NP}$ Mary's [e]] arrived on time. (Lobeck 1995: 20, her (38)).

(49) John called out the children's names, and many/few/all/each/some [e] answered. (Lobeck 1995: 45).

(50) The students attended the play but two [e] went home disappointed. (Kester 1996: 195).

(51) Although she might order these [e], Mary won't buy those books on art history. (Kester 1996: 195).

In the remainder of this chapter I will return to Pseudogapping and provide some cross-linguistic data.

2.2 Pseudogapping cross-linguistically

As mentioned in the introduction, Pseudogapping has previously only been attested for English, with the potential exception of Korean Pseudogapping (cf. Kim 1997), which, however, patterns more with English VP Ellipsis. In view of the Object Shift approach proposed in the literature on Pseudogapping (notably in Lasnik 1995, and subsequent work), the question arises whether Pseudogapping should exist in languages that make regular use of Object Shift, i.e. the Scandinavian languages. As we will see in the next section, this presumption is borne out.

2.2.1 *Pseudogapping in Norwegian, Danish, and Icelandic*

Instances of Pseudogapping can indeed be found in the Scandinavian languages, as a preliminary survey has shown.[6] While Swedish does not allow Pseudogapping, Icelandic as well as two Mainland Scandinavian languages, Norwegian and Danish, do have a construction that resembles English Pseudogapping. Let us look at each of these languages in turn.

---

[6] The Norwegian examples were provided by Jorunn Hetland (p.c.); the Icelandic data by Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (p.c.). Further data that support the empirical judgements above but are not listed here were provided in personal communications by Arne Martinus Lindstad (Norwegian), Øystein Nilsen (Norwegian), Torgrim Solstad and Catherine Fabricius-Hansen (Danish), Maria Melchiors (Danish), Anders Holmberg (Swedish), Ida Larsson (Swedish), Kjartan Ottósson (Icelandic), and Nicole Déhé (Icelandic data on the double object construction).

2.2.1.1 Pseudogapping in Norwegian   The examples in (52) and (53) below illustrate Pseudogapping in Norwegian, (with '_' indicating deleted material). The examples in (52) show Pseudogapping with a prepositional complement, while the examples in (53) are instances of the dative construction in Norwegian.

(52) a. Peter kan vente lenger på Mari enn Paul kan _ på Kari.
          Peter can wait   longer for Mari than Paul can   for Kari
          'Peter can wait longer for Mari than Paul can for Kari.'

      b. Peter vil vente lenger på Mari enn Paul vil _ på Kari.
          Peter will wait   longer for Mari than Paul will for Kari
          'Peter will wait longer for Mari than Paul will for Kari.'

      c. Peter skal lese flere bøker for Mari enn Paul skal _ for Kari.
          Peter shall read more books for Mari than Paul shall   for Kari
          'Peter shall read more books for Mari than Paul shall for Kari.'

      d. Per har lest flere bøker for Kari enn Paul har _ for Mari.
          Per has read more books for Kari than Paul has   for Mari
          'Per has read more books for Kari than Paul has for Mari.'

      e. Per vil   leke lenger med Mari enn Paul vil _ med Kari.
          Per will(wants to) play longer with Mari than Paul will with Kari
          'Per will play longer with Mari than Paul will with Kari.'

(53) a. *Mary vil gi Susan mange penger og Paul [vil _ Jane en bok].
          Mary will give Susan much money and Paul will Jane a book
          'Mary will give Susan much money, and Paul will Jane a book.'

      b. *Mary vil gi mange penger til Susan og Paul [vil _ en bok til Jane].
          Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will a book to Jane
          'Mary will give much money to Susan, and Paul will a book to Jane.'

      c. Mary vil gi mange penger til Susan og Paul vil _ til Jane.
          Mary will give much money to Susan and Paul will to Jane
          'Mary will give much money to Susan, and Paul will to Jane.'

      d. Mari vil gi flere bøker til Siri enn Pål vil _ til Kari.
          Mary will give more books to Siri than Paul will to Kari
          'Mary will give more books to Siri than Paul will to Kari.'

      e. *Mari vil gi Siri flere bøker enn Pål vil _ Kari.
          Mary will give Siri more books than Paul will Kari
          'Mary will give Siri more books than Paul will Kari.'

      f. *Mari vil gi Siri flere bøker enn Pål vil _ CDer.
          Mary will give Siri more books than Paul will CDs
          'Mary will give Siri more books than Paul will CDs.'

(52c) is in sharp contrast to its counterparts with a non-prepositional direct or indirect remnant, which were rated unacceptable. This also holds in the case of the usually more accepted comparative in the examples in (52e) and (52f).

2.2.1.2 Pseudogapping in Danish   The Danish examples in (54) and (55) are very similar to the Norwegian examples above.

(54)   a. Peter kan vente længere på Maria end Paul kan på Kari.
         Peter can wait   longer   for Maria than Paul can for Kari
         'Peter can wait longer for Mary than Paul can for Kari.'

       b. Peter vil vente længere på Maria end Paul vil på Kari.
         Peter will wait longer   for Maria than Paul will for Kari
         'Peter will wait longer for Mary than Paul will for Kari.'

       c. Peter skal læse flere bøger for Mari end Paul skal for Kari.
         Peter will read more books for Mari than Paul will for Kari
         'Peter will read more books for Mary than Paul will for Kari.'

       d. Per har læst flere bøger for Kari end Paul har for Mari.
         Per has read more books for Kari than Paul has for Mari
         'Per has read more books for Kari than Paul has for Mari.'

As in Norwegian, the examples in (54) are all acceptable in Danish. The dative construction in Danish, given in (55), also patterns with the judgements for Norwegian, as illustrated below.

(55)   a. *Mary vil give Susan mange   penge og Paul vil Jane en bog.
         Mary will give Susan much-PL money and Paul will Jane a   book
         'Mary will give Susan a lot of money and Paul will Jane a book.'

       b. *Mary vil give mange   penge til Susan og Paul vil en bog.
         Mary will give much-PL money to Susan and Paul will a   book
         'Mary will give a lot of money to Susan and Paul will a book.'

       c. Mary vil give mange   penge til Susan og Paul vil til Jane.
         Mary will give much-PL money to Susan and Paul will to Jane
         'Mary will give a lot of money to Susan and Paul will to Jane.'

       d. ?Mary vil give flere penge til Susan end Kirsten vil til John.
         Mary will give more money to Susan than Kirsten will to John
         'Mary will give more money to Susan than Kirsten will to John.'

       e. Mary wil give Susan flere penge end Paul vil Peter.
         Mary will give Susan more money than Paul will Peter
         'Mary will give Susan more money than Paul will Peter.'

Interestingly, though, the judgements for the Norwegian sentences in (53d) and (53e) differ from the judgements on the Danish sentences in (55d) and (55e). While (53d) is

fine in Norwegian, it is rated marginal in Danish (55d). In contrast, (55e) is fine in Danish, while it is unacceptable in Norwegian (53e).

Clearly, this discrepancy between Danish and Norwegian merits a thorough investigation, which is unfortunately beyond the scope of this book.

Let us now turn to Icelandic.

2.2.1.3 Pseudogapping in Icelandic   As in the examples above, I provide the examples with prepositional complements in the first group of sentences in (56) and then turn to the dative construction examples in (57).

(56)   a. Pétur hefur lesið fleiri bækur fyrir Kara-ACC en   Páll hefur _
         Peter has   read more books for Kari   than Paul has
         fyrir María-ACC.
         for Maria.
         'Peter has read more books for Kari than Paul has for Maria.'

       b. (?)Pétur vill   biða lengur eftir María en Páll vill _ eftir Jóni.
         Peter will (wants-to) wait longer after Maria than Paul wants after Jóni.
         'Peter will wait longer for Maria than Paul will for John.'

       c. Pétur vill   leika lengur við Maríu en Páll vill_   við Jóni.
         Peter wants-to play longer with Maria than Paul wants-to with John.
         'Peter wants to play longer with Maria than Paul wants with John.'

(57)   a. María myndi skila fleiri bókum til Péturs en Páll myndi_ til Jóns.
         Maria will   return more books to Peter than Paul will   to John.
         'Maria will return more books to Peter than Paul will to
         John.'

       b. ??María myndi skila fleiri bókum til Péturs en Páll myndi blöðum _
         Maria will   return more books to Peter than Paul will newspapers
         til Jóns.
         to   John.
         'Maria will return more books to Peter than Paul will newspapers to John.'

       c. *María myndi gefa Pétri fleiri bækur en Páll myndi _ blöð.
         Mary will   give Peter more books than Paul will   newspapers.
         'Mary will give Peter more books than Paul will newspapers.'

       d. ??María myndi gefa Pétri fleiri bækur en Páll myndi _ Jóni.
         Mary will   give Peter more   books than Paul will   John.
         'Mary will give Peter more books than Paul will John.'

While the comparison between the three Scandinavian languages above becomes even more complex given the data from Icelandic, there seems to be one common factor in all three languages: a marked preference for prepositional remnants

(in Icelandic in particular). Interestingly, this also seems to hold in other languages. Consider the data from Portuguese, as illustrated in the next section.

2.2.2 Pseudogapping in Portuguese

Given the generalization that some Scandinavian languages employ prepositional remnants in a construction similar to Pseudogapping in comparative structures, the question arises whether other languages actually exhibit a similar pattern with Ellipsis in comparatives. It seems that Portuguese might be a case in point. Consider the following data from European and Brazilian Portuguese.[7] The example in (58) (Brazilian Portuguese) shows that the Ellipsis structure is ungrammatical with a bare remnant, i.e. with a non-prepositional remnant, in both coordinate and comparative structures. Once the determiner is added to the object, which is possible, the sentence improves, and is considered only slightly marginal, as illustrated in (59) (Brazilian Portuguese).

(58) a. *Joao convidou Maria, e   Sarah vai _ Jane.
          John invited   Mary, and Sarah will _ Jane.
          'John invited Mary and Sarah will Jane.'

       b. *Joao vai convidar Maria mais vezes do que Sara vai _ Pedro.
          John will invite   Mary more often than Sarah will _ Pedro.
          'John will invite Mary more often than Sarah will Pedro.'

(59) ?Joao tem   convidado ao   Pedro mais vezes do   que Sara
       John has   invited   to-the-   Pedro more often than Sarah has
       tem _ ao Joao.
       to-the-John.
       'John has invited Pedro more often than Sarah has John.'

In European Portuguese, on the other hand, the use of the article with proper names is much more common (if not the default). In (60) (European Portuguese) below, we see that this does not yet make a coordinated structure with Ellipsis grammatical, but that the comparative structure in (61) (European Portuguese) is judged grammatical.

(60) *O John convidou a Sarah,   e   a Mary   vai _ a Jane.
       the-John invited the-Sarah, and the-Mary will _ the-Jane.
       'John invited Sarah, and Mary will Jane.'

(61) O Joao tem   convidado a Sara   mais vezes do que a Maria
       the-Joao has invited   the-Sara more often than   the-Maria
       tem _ a Joana.
       has _ the-Joana.
       'Joao has invited Sara more often than Maria has Joana.'

---

[7] I am very grateful to Sonia Cyrino and Gabriela Matos for providing these examples.

It seems, then, that a Pseudogapping-like construction is available in Portuguese (in both Brazilian and European Portuguese), but only with the preposition/definite article preceding the proper name. In European Portuguese, where the use of the determiner in front of the proper name is more common, the construction is considered more natural than its counterpart in Brazilian Portuguese. While both variants of Portuguese make use of regular auxiliaries in these constructions, a second Romance language, French, exhibits a Pseudogapping-like construction only with modal auxiliaries, as we will see in the next section.

2.2.3 Pseudogapping in French

Busquets and Denis (2006) note that there is a construction of modal Ellipsis in French that resembles English Pseudogapping, as illustrated in (62) (Busquets and Denis 2006: 13, their (41), glosses and translation mine).[8]

(62) Alice ne   peut pas s'   acheter de jouets, mais [des livres] elle (*le) peut.
       Alice (neg) can not refl. buy   of-toys, but of-books,   she   (it) can.
       'Alice cannot buy herself toys, but books, she can buy.'

They point out that in this instance, the object *des livres* seems to have moved out of the entire clause, not only out of the Ellipsis site. In my opinion, these examples can thus be aligned with the cases of Pseudogapping involving topicalization in English, first noted by Levin and given in (63) below (Levin 1986: 47, her (18)).

(63) Some of these materials I use. And some I don't ∅.
       (*Writers at Work*)

Levin (1986: 47) suggests that in these cases, since the non-topicalized counterparts are very awkward, the topicalization is necessary: the object in question does not carry enough contrast with respect to the antecedent. However, this is not quite the case in the French example above. Nevertheless, we could hypothesize that in the French example, topicalization (or Focus Movement) is employed to establish the relevant contrast in Pseudogapping. Obviously, this idea requires extensive qualification, especially with respect to Focus Movement in French.

Let us now move from the data to the theoretical discussion in the next chapter.

---

[8] See also Authier (2010) and Dagnac (2010) on the topic of French VP Ellipsis.