Syntactic consequences of ellipsis identity: The cases of pronouns and polarity items

Jason Merchant
University of Chicago
merchant@uchicago.edu

3 November 2006; Chicago Syn/Sem Circle meeting*

1 The problem

(1) Bill collects butterflies. Jill does, too.

Two questions:

1. Is there syntax internal to the ellipsis site? (E.g., is there an actual VP in the second clause of (1)?)

2. The understood material is identical to some antecedent. Is the relevant kind of identity syntactic (defined over phrase markers of some sort) or semantic (defined over semantic representations of some sort)?

*Thanks to Kjersti and Alexander for hosting!
Is there syntax in the ellipsis site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is identity syntactic or semantic?</th>
<th>Is there syntax in the ellipsis site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sag 1976, Williams 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiengo &amp; May 1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung et al. 1995, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehler 2000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (incoherent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Previous research on the two ellipsis questions

(2) TP
     / 
    T   VP_A
   /   |
Bill   collects
        /   
      DP   butterflies

(3) TP
   / 
  T   VP
 /   |
Jill does/V_P
     /   
      DP   butterflies

Plan for tonight:
1. Review evidence that there’s syntax in the ellipsis site
2. Review evidence that identity is stated over syntactic representations
3. Examine consequences for polarity items
4. Examine consequences for DP structure
2 Evidence for the syntactic view of ellipsis identity

2.1 P-stranding generalization

(4) English
   a. Peter was talking with someone, but I don’t know (with) who(m).
   b. Who was he talking with?

(5) Swedish
   a. Peter har talat med någon; jag vet inte (med) vem.
      *Peter has talked with someone I know not with who
   b. Vem har Peter talat med?
      *who has Peter talked with

(6) Greek
   a. I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero *( me) pjon.
      *the Anna talked with someone but not I.know with who
   b. *Pjon milise me?
      *who talked.3s with

(7) Russian
   a. Anja govorila s kem-to, no ne znaju *( s) kem.
      *Anja spoke with someone, but not I.know with who
   b. *Kem ona govorila s?
      *who she talked with

Caveats: Chinese, Brazilian Portuguese (and possibly other Romance languages, esp. French and Italian); see Almeida and Yoshida to appear.

2.2 Case matching

(8) German (schmeicheln ‘flatter’ assigns dative, loben ‘praise’ assigns accusative; Ross 1969)
   a. Er will jemandem schmeicheln, aber sie wissen nicht, {
      *he wants someone.DAT flatter but they know not
      *wer / *wen / wem }.
      who.NOM who.ACC who.DAT
‘He wants to flatter someone, but they don’t know who.’

b. Er will jemanden loben, aber sie wissen nicht, {
    he wants someone.ACC praise but they know not
    *wer / wen / *wem}.
    who.NOM who.ACC who.DAT
‘He wants to praise someone, but they don’t know who.’

2.3 Locality effects


(9) a. *I read every book you introduced me to a guy who did.
   b. *Abby wants to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but
       I don’t remember which (Balkan language) Ben does. <want to
       hire someone who speaks t >
   c. *Which film did you refuse to see because Roger was so revolted
       when he did after renting?
   d. *They met a five inches taller man than you did.

2.3.2 Fragment answers to implicit salient questions (Morgan 1973, Merchant 2004)

(10) a. Does Abby speak Greek fluently?
    b. No, Albanian.
    c. No, she speaks Albanian fluently.

(11) a. Did Abby claim she speaks Greek fluently?
    b. No, Albanian.
    c. No, she claimed she speaks Albanian fluently.

(12) a. Will each candidate talk about taxes?
    b. No, about foreign policy.
    c. No, each candidate will talk about foreign policy.

(13) a. Did each candidate agree on who will ask him about taxes (at
    tonight’s debate)?
b. *No, about foreign policy.
c. No, each candidate agreed on who will ask him about foreign policy (at tonight’s debate).

2.3.3 Stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis (Reinhart 1991)

(14) *They caught the man who’d stolen the car after searching for him, but not the diamonds.

2.3.4 Gapping (Johnson 1996, 2006, Coppock 2001)

(15) *Some wanted to hire the woman who worked on Greek, and others Albanian.

2.3.5 Sluicing from inside DPs (Lasnik and Park 2004)

(16) *Books were sold to John, but I don’t know on which shelf.

2.3.6 Sluicing over implicit correlates (Chung et al. 1995, Hardt and Romero 2004)

(17) Tony sent Mo a picture that he painted, but it’s not clear with what.
   a. = <Tony sent him the picture t_{withwhat}>
   b. ≠ <Tony sent him a picture that he [painted t_{withwhat}]>

2.3.7 Contrast sluicing (Merchant 2001)

(18) She knows a guy who has five dogs, but I don’t know how many cats.
   a. = <he [–the guy who has the five dogs] has t>
   b. ≠ <she knows a guy who has t>

Conclusion: There is (regular, but unpronounced) syntactic structure inside ellipsis sites.
2.4 Voice mismatch tolerance

2.4.1 High/Big ellipses: No voice mismatches

In sluicing, fragment answers, gapping, and stripping, elided material and antecedent phrase must match in voice

(19) Sluicing
   a. *Joe was murdered, but we don’t know who. <murdered Joe>
   b. *Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know who by. <Joe was murdered>

(20) Fragment answers
   b. German
      i. Q: Wer hat den Jungen untersucht? A: *Von einer
         `who.NOM has the boy examined? by a
         Psychologin.
         `psychologist
         ‘Q: Who examined the boy? A: He was examined by a psychologist.’
      ii. Q: Von wem wurde der Junge untersucht? A: *Eine
          `by who.DAT was the boy examined a
          Psychologin.
          `psychologist.NOM
          ‘Q: Who was the boy examined by?’ A: A psychologist examined him.’

(21) Gapping
   a. *Some bring roses and lilies are by others.
   b. *Lilies are brought by some and others roses.

(22) Stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis
   a. *MAX brought the roses, not by AMY!
b. *Der Junge wurde von einer Psychologin untersucht, und ein the boy was by a psychologist examined, and a Kinderarzt auch. pediatrician.NOM too.

‘The boy was examined by a psychologist, and a pediatrician examined him, too.’

2.4.2 Low/Little ellipsis: Voice mismatches possible

(Most of the following attested examples from Kehler 2002:53; cf. Hardt 1993, Arregui et al. to appear)

(23) passive antecedent, active ellipsis
   a. This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did. <look into this problem>
   b. In March, four fireworks manufacturers asked that the decision be reversed, and on Monday the ICC did. <reverse the decision>. (Dalrymple 1991, cited by Kehler)

(24) active antecedent, passive ellipsis
   a. Actually, I have implemented it [=a computer system] with a manager, but it doesn’t have to be. <implemented with a manager>
   b. Steve asked me to send the set by courier through my company insured, and it was. <sent by courier through my company insured>
   c. The janitor should remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it needs to be <removed>.

Sag 1976:17 (1.2.3) Sag’s judgments on these is ‘*’

(25) a. Paul denied the charge, but the charge wasn’t by his friends.
   b. John had observed many of the enemy’s soldiers, but hadn’t been by them.

Sag 1976:75, footnote 2 to example (1.2.3):
Although this observation [that voice mismatches are bad, —JM] is surely in general correct, I have nevertheless noted the following peculiar examples of VPD ignoring the difference between active and passive.

a. Botanist: That can all be explained.
   Mr. Spock: Please do.

b. It should be noted, as Dennett does, that... (Lust (ms.))

Also note the following general type of discourse:

a. Speaker A: Someone mugged Tom yesterday.
   Speaker B: Oh yeah?
   Speaker C: You know, the same thing happened to Mary.
   Speaker B: Wow!
   Speaker A: You know, now that I think of it, Sandy was, too.

This last kind of discourse, which I suspect is rather common, probably shows more about memory (or processing) than it does about grammar. It’s clear that there is much more going on here than can be explained at the moment.

- Sag’s bad examples in (25) are actually pseudogaps.
- See Merchant 2006 for an analysis of this (and cf. Miller 1991, Coppock 2001 for partially dissenting data on voice mismatches in pseudogapping)

### 2.4.3 Different targets for deletion:

1. In high ellipses (sluicing, etc.), a clausal node that necessarily includes Voice

2. In low ellipses (VP-ellipsis), the verbal projection that is complement to Voice

   (27) a. *Joe was murdered (by someone), but we don’t know who.
(28)  

a. This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did.

b. \[DP\] This problem \[\text{was to have}\] \[vP\]

\[v[\text{Voi:Pass}][E]\] \[VP_A\]

\[\text{look}_\text{into}\] \[\text{DP}_1\]

\[\text{this problem}\]
(29)  
a. The janitor must remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be.

b. ...

c. ...whenever it is apparent that
Conclusion: VP-deletion does not include the Voice head

2.4.4 Another morphological argument


(30) In general, verbs (both regular and irregular) don’t require morphological identity
   a. Emily played beautifully at the recital and her sister will, too. <play beautifully at the recital>
   b. Emily took a break from her studies, and her sister will, too. <take a break from her studies>
   c. Emily sang the song {because|the way} she wanted to. <sing the song>

(31) Forms of be do require morphological identity
   a. Emily will be (beautiful) at the recital, and her sister will, too. <be (beautiful) at the recital>
   b. *Emily was beautiful at the recital and her sister will, too.
   c. Emily will be elected to Congress just like her sister was.
d. *Emily was elected to Congress {because|just like} she really wanted to.

Lasnik’s analysis: Forms of be are inserted fully inflected, while other verbs get their inflection in the course of the derivation.

Conclusion: Identity is between syntactic phrase markers

2.4.5 Other argument structure alternations cannot vary under ellipsis

Johnson’s 2004 arguments that VP-ellipsis is vP ellipsis

1. No transitive/unaccusative alternation

(32) a. This can freeze. *Please do. (Johnson 2004:7)
   b. *Bill melted the copper vase, and the magnesium vase did, too. (Sag 1976:160 (2.3.48)

If causative and anticausitive/unaccusatives differ in their v (as Mokilese and other languages may show morphologically, and as may be required to state the selectional restrictions of the passive Voice head to capture Perlmutter’s generalization; see Legate 2003 for arguments that even unaccusatives have a v), then we simply have to push up the Voice head and let it select for the vP which may introduce the external argument (as Collins 2006 proposes on independent grounds).

(33) a. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{This}_1 \\
\text{can} \\
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{Voi:Act} \\
v_{\text{unacc}} \\
\text{vP}_A \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{freeze } t_1
\end{array}
\]
2. Two positions for *again*:

- high (adjoined to VP/VoiP or higher) → ‘repetitive’ reading (event reading)
- low (adjoined to VP) → ‘restitutive’ reading (*again* operates on the internal state)

(34) The door was open. Ben closed it. It blew open. Maribel closed it again. (‘repetition’)

(35) The wind blew the door open and no-one closed it. Finally, Maribel closed it again. (‘restitution’)

Johnson 2004 observes that the restitutive reading is absent in VPE. The boxed [VP] in (36b) is not a possible target for deletion (since it is not the sister to a head with the E-feature), so (36a) cannot be generated.

(36) a. The wind blew the door open and no-one closed it. Finally, *Maribel did again. (Johnson 2004)
3 Consequences

3.1 Polarity Items


(37) John didn’t see anyone, but Mary did.
   a. ... but Mary did see someone.
   b. ... *but Mary did see anyone.
   c. $\exists x.\text{see}(\text{Mary}, x)$

(38) John saw someone, but Mary didn’t.
   a. $\neq$ ... but Mary didn’t see someone.
   b. ... but Mary didn’t see anyone.
   c. $\neg \exists x.\text{see}(\text{Mary}, x)$

Giannakidou 2000, to appear: PIs have a syntactic feature Pol: _ which is valued under Agree with a c-commanding ‘licensor’ such as negation. Generalize: Certain expressions have two morphological realizations, depending on their syntactic environment. Which morphology is realized is determined by agreement with a valuer.
(39) \[ TP \\
\underline{John} \quad \underline{didn’t} \\
\Sigma P \\
\Sigma[Pol:Neg] \quad vP \\
v \quad VP_A \\
\underline{see} \quad DP \\
D[Indef;Pol:_] \quad \underline{one} \]

(40) \[ TP \\
\underline{Mary} \quad \underline{did} \\
\Sigma P \\
\Sigma[Pol:Pos] \quad vP \\
v \quad \langle VP_E \rangle \\
\underline{see} \quad DP \\
D[Indef;Pol:_] \quad \underline{one} \]

(41) Lexical Insertion
   a. \([\text{Cat}D, \text{Indef}; \text{Infl}[\text{Pol:Neg}]\] \(\rightarrow\) any
b. [Cat[D, Indef]; Infl[Pol:Pos]] → some (sm)/a

c. \[\lambda f \lambda g \exists x [f(x) \land f(g)]\]


Similarly for other PIs: ever ∼ (at least) once, yet ∼ already (and until ∼ before, according to Sag 1976:158–160, and at all sim somewhat, from Klima 1964:282)

Other possibilities:

- scope the PI: the polarity sensitive part is scoped out, and the rest gets interpreted under existential closure.
- equivalently: the PI D combines with the restriction outside the ellipsis site (Sportiche 2000, Lin 2002, Johnson 2000, 2006)

3.1.1 Other determiners whose looks are deceiving

(42) The geriatrician, Dr. Rosanne M. Leipzig, suspected a silent infection — something the other doctors had missed because Mrs. Foley had no fever, as old people rarely do. ['Geriatrics Lags in an Age of High-Tech Medicine', New York Times, 18 October 2006, p. A1]

cf. German kein/Dutch geen (Jacobs 1980, de Swart 1996, von Stechow, and many others)

(43) Alle Ärzte haben kein Auto.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{all doctors have no car} \\
&\text{a. } = \text{For all doctors } x, \text{ it is the case the } x \text{ has no car. (de dicto)} \\
&\text{b. } = \text{There is no car } y \text{ such that all doctors have } y. \ (\text{de re}) \\
&\text{c. } = \text{It is not the case that every doctor has a car. (split)}
\end{align*}\]

Analysis: kein/ geen/no is an existential \((\lambda f \lambda g \exists x [f(x) \land f(g)])\) that takes narrow scope with respect to a higher, unpronounced, negation. Cf. negative concord uses of no in non-standard English varieties:
(44) They ain’t got no fever.

Sag 1976:312

(45) % Although John will trust nobody over 30, Bill will.

Potts 2000, 2002:

(46)  
   a. No-one in the department stole the file, as Joe alleged.  
   b. = Joe alleged someone in the department stole the file.  
   c. = Joe alleged no-one in the department stole the file.  
   d. \([NegP \ NEG [IP someone in the department stole the file]]\)  
   e. NegP

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   \text{NegP} & \quad \text{IP:} \\
   \lambda p[\neg p] & \quad [\exists x : \text{in.dept}(x) \land \text{steal}(\text{the.file})(x)]
   \end{align*}
   \]

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   \text{IP:} & \quad \text{PP:} \\
   [\exists x : \text{in.dept}(x) \land \text{steal}(\text{the.file})(x)] & \quad \lambda p : \text{allege}(p)(\text{joe})[p]  \\
   \lambda f[\exists x : \text{in.dept}(x) \land f(x)] & \quad \text{t1 steal the file}  \\
   \text{no-one in the dept.} & \quad \text{as Joe alleged}
   \end{align*}
   \]

Potts 2002:681(127)

(47) Alger did not do anything illegal, as Joe believed (the whole time / quite wrongly).
   a. \text{As-clause} = Joe believed the whole time that Alger did not do anything illegal
   b. \text{As-clause} = Joe believed wrongly that Alger did something illegal
Potts 2000:

(48) The company need fire no employees.
   a. $\neq$ The company is obligated to fire no employees. (*de dicto*)
   b. $=$ There are no employees $x$ such that the company is obligated to fire $x$. (*de re*)
   c. $=$ It is not the case that the company is obligated to fire employees. (split)

(49) John has few friends, and frankly, his brother doesn’t really, either. <have many$_{N\,PT}$ friends>

Klima 1964:280

(50) Feature conflation transformations
   a. *Indef*-incorporation:
      $$S: [\text{neg}] - X - \text{Quant} \implies \text{neg} - X - \text{Indef} + \text{Quant}$$
   b. *neg*-incorporation:
      (optional) $[\text{neg}]X[\text{Indef} + Y]_{\text{Quant}} \implies X - \text{neg} + [\text{Indef} + Y]_{\text{Quant}}$
      (obligatory) $[\text{Indef} + Y]_{\text{Quant}}[\text{neg}] \implies \text{neg} + [\text{Indef} + Y]_{\text{Quant}}Z$

(51) Morphological spell out rules
   a. $\text{Neg} + \text{Indef} + \text{Quant} \implies \text{no}$
   b. $\text{Indef} + \text{Quant} \implies \text{any}$
   c. $\text{Quant} \implies \text{some}$

Giannakidou and Merchant 2002 (Maryland Mayfest) proposes that some quantificational determiners may be high in the tree (rather, that a Q head high in the tree could serve as a scope-marker whose value was determined by Agree with an in situ DP). This can be turned on its head: the scope marker starts out with the Q-force determined, and values the lower determiner, which provides the restriction; quantification is over choice functions)

McCawley 1993, Johnson 2000, 2006, Lin
(52)  a. Few dogs eat Whiskas or cats Alpo.
    b. Carrie was a fat, not very interesting cat, kept mainly for mousing purposes, and the children ordinarily paid little attention to her, or she to them. [Edward Eager, Half Magic, Harcourt, New York, 1954, pp. 30–31]

(53) \[\Sigma P: \neg[\text{many}(dogs)(eat\_whiskas) \lor \text{many}(cats)(eat\_alpo)]\]

(54) ...ordinarily [NEG [[much(attention)(pay.to(her)(the.children))]]
or [much(attention)(pay.to(them)(she))]]
(55)  a. *Some will eat few Brussels sprouts or others <ate few> lima beans.
    b. I’ll give few Brussels sprouts to Mary or lima beans to Max.

Where is negation?

Highest ellipses (sluicing, fragment answer) don’t allow ‘ignoring’ negation:

(56)  Sluices

a. A number of senators have told me privately that they can’t support the amendment, but I’m not at liberty to reveal which ones.

b. Bush didn’t invite several senators to his prayer breakfast; the White House press office has a list of which.

c. Lately, Mark hasn’t been able to play the sonata flawlessly. I don’t know why.
    i. = why Mark hasn’t been able to play the sonata flawlessly
    ii. ≠ why Mark has been able to play the sonata flawlessly

d. Abby didn’t turn off the stove, but I don’t know when.
    i. = when she didn’t turn off the stove
    ii. ≠ when she turned off the stove

e. Few senators support one of the lobbyists’ balanced budget amendments—find out whose!
    i. = whose (balanced budget amendment) few senators support
    ii. ≠ whose (balanced budget amendment) many senators support

(exception: why not questions: No-one came, but we don’t know why (not) Only possible with why, as Sag 1976, Horn 1980 point out. Possible analysis: why sluices delete a lower piece of structure than other sluices; ‘not’ is the non-clitic spell-out of Σ (pace Merchant to appear). See van Craenenbroeck 2004 for a similar conclusion for D-linked wh-phrases (higher CP) vs. non-D-linked ones (lower CP).)
(57) Fragment answers
   i. = I didn’t invite Mark.
   ii. ≠ I did invite Mark.
   iii. cf. felicity of \textit{Well, I DID invite Mark}
b. Q: When was no-one in the shop? A: Between 5 and 6 o’clock.

Locality? Do NPIs always take narrowest scope, or can they take intermediate scope?

(58) a. Mark didn’t think that he had ever said anything incriminating, but Ben did <think that he had at least once said something incriminating>.
   b. = \neg [\textit{think}(\textit{mark}, \lambda w[\exists x : \textit{incriminating}(x) \land \textit{say}(\textit{mark}, x, w)])]
   c. ≠ \neg \exists x : \textit{incriminating}(x) \land [\textit{think}(\textit{mark}, \lambda w[\textit{say}(\textit{mark}, x, w)])]

(59) a. Sam can’t say anything.|It isn’t (likely to be even) remotely possible that Sam said anything.
   b. = \neg \Diamond \exists x [\textit{say}(\textit{sam}, x)]
   c. ≠ \neg \exists x \Diamond [\textit{say}(\textit{sam}, x)]

Question: Islands

(60) Mark would never read a book that contained a single heretical word, but Ben would, and did, the atheist.

a. Do you believe (*the claim) that anybody was looking for anything?
   b. *I never met that man who anybody tried to kill.

All feature-changing rules obey the same constraints as chopping rules [namely, islands —JM].
(63) Iteration (downward cascade licensing/valuing) is possible
   a. I can’t remember the name of {anybody|*somebody} who
      had any misgivings. (Ross 1967:249–250)
   b. Everybody who has ever worked in any office which con-
      tained any typewriter which had ever been used to type
      any letters which had to be signed by any administrator
      who ever worked in any department like mine will know
      what I mean.

3.1.2 Minimizers

Minimizers are different: they’re not ungrammatical in such contexts—
instead, they receive their ‘minimal’ interpretation; we have access

to the literal (or nonidiomatic) meaning, just as with idioms. (Horn

1989:400)

(64) a. John didn’t sleep a wink, but Mary did. (=sleep at least a
    minimal amount)
   b. John wouldn’t budge an inch, but Mary did. (= move at
    least a minimal amount)
   c. John didn’t lift a finger that day, but Mary did. (=do at
    least a minimal amount)
   d. Mark didn’t bat an eye|move a muscle when they told them
      they were fired, but Susan certainly did—in fact, she fell off
      her chair in surprise!
   e. John didn’t say a word, but Mary did. In fact, she said a
      lot of words/them!
   f. A: John spilled the beans. B: Really? Was he able to find
      them all again?

(65) a. John didn’t sleep a wink, but Mary did <sleep a wink>.
   b. Mark didn’t bat an eye|move a muscle when they told them
      they were fired, but Susan certainly did <bat an eye|move
      a muscle>—in fact, she fell off her chair in surprise!

(66) a. John didn’t sleep a wink, but Mary did sleep a wink—in
    fact, she slept all morning!
b. Mark didn’t bat an eye|move a muscle when they told them they were fired, but Susan certainly did bat an eye|move a muscle—in fact, she fell off her chair in surprise!

In certain (‘echoic’) contexts, minimizers differ from NPIs like anyone, at all:

(67) Q: Did John lift a finger? A: Yes, he lifted a finger. (=‘he did at least a minimal amount’) In fact, he helped a lot.

(68) Q: Did you eat anything/ at all this morning? A: *Yes, I ate anything/ at all this morning.

So the nature of the ‘problem’ with minimizers in ellipsis contexts is different: its solution is the solution we give to the well-formedness of dialogues like (66) and (67).

3.2 Pronominality

3.2.1 Sloppy identity in pronouns is insensitive to \(\phi\) features

(see Chung 2000 for examples and references)

(69) You think you’re going to win, but so does [everybody else in the race\(]_2 <\text{think they}_2\text{’re going to win}>.

(70) Only I did my homework.

a. SS: [Only I\(]_8\text{ did my}_8\text{ homework.}

b. LF: [\(\text{DP only I}_5\text{ }\lambda t_8\text{ did }s_8\text{’s homework }

(71) a. Feature transmission under variable binding

Transmit features of a moved phrase to all variables it binds.
(a Heim handout, cited by von Stechow 2003)

b. Feature deletion under semantic binding:

Delete the features to all variables that are semantically bound. (LF) (von Stechow 2003)
(72)  
  a. \(D^{+p, \phi:2s} \sim you\)
  
  b. You think \([DP D^{+p, \phi:}_1]\) be going to win, but so does
  \([\text{everybody else in the race}_2 <\text{think } [DP D^{+p, \phi:}_2]\text{ be}
  \text{going to win}>\).

Krater 2006: Bound variable readings sensitive to morphological cascade

(73)  
Ich bin der einzige, der meine Kinder
\(1s \text{ be.1s the.masc.sg only.one who.masc.sg 1s.poss children}
\text{versorg-t.} \)
\text{take.care.of-3s}

‘I am the only one taking care of my children.’ (No bound
variable reading possible)

(74)  
Wir sind die einzigen, die unsere Kinder
\(1p \text{ be.1/3p the.pl only.ones who.pl 1p.poss children}
\text{versorg-en.} \)
\text{take.care.of-1/3.p}

‘We are the only ones who take care of our children. (Bound
variable reading possible)’

Q: Are all pronouns (syntactically) ‘bound’?

(75)  
  a. He thinks he’s alive.
  
  b. \(\text{TOP}[\phi:3sm] [\text{[D:}\phi:1]}\text{think]} [\text{[D:}\phi:2] \text{be]} [\text{alive}]
  
  c. \(\text{Agree(TOP}[\phi:3sm], [\text{D:}\phi:1];\phi) \sim [\text{D:}\phi:3sm]\)
  
  d. \(\text{Agree(TOP}[\text{D:}\phi:3sm], [\text{D:}\phi:1];\phi) \sim [\text{D:}\phi:3sm]\)
  
  e. \(\text{TOP}[\phi:3sm] [\text{[D:}\phi:3sm]}\text{think]} [\text{[D:}\phi:3sm] \text{be]} [\text{alive}]

\[3.2.2\text{ Full DPs can be equivalent to pronouns inside ellipsis sites}\]

(76)  
  a. They arrested \([\text{the guy who lives over the garage}]_3\), though
  he\(_3\) thought they wouldn’t.
b. They arrested Alex\textsubscript{3}, though he\textsubscript{3} thought they wouldn’t.
c. They arrested Alex\textsubscript{3}, though he\textsubscript{3} didn’t know why.
d. They arrested the guy Alex\textsubscript{3} hired, though he\textsubscript{3} thought they wouldn’t.
e. They arrested \{the guy Alex\textsubscript{3} hired\}\textsubscript{2}, though he\textsubscript{3} thought they wouldn’t arrest \{*the guy Alex\textsubscript{3} hired | him\textsubscript{2}\}.

Claim: Pronouns are (‘minimally’ spelled out) definites

“pronominalization” (spelling out \{the [R pro]| or [the <NP>] as it, his, etc.

\[\textbf{the} [R_{<7,<e,e>}, pro_{<1,e>}]\]

(78) Elbourne 2005:180 (ch. 6)
a. Mary talked to no senator before the senator<he was lobbied.  
b. \[\textbf{DP} [\textbf{D} the i] [\textbf{NP} senator]\]  
c. \[\textbf{DP} [\textbf{D} the i] <[\textbf{NP} senator>] \rightsquigarrow he\]

(79) a. They arrested \{the guy who lives over the garage\}\textsubscript{3}, though he\textsubscript{3} thought they wouldn’t.
b. they wouldn’t <arrest \[\textbf{DP} [\textbf{D} the i] <[\textbf{NP} guy who lives over the garage]>]\>


(80) a. We will sell no wine before its time.
b. Since you are allergic to bis disulfide, you should drink no wine if its label says you shouldn’t.
c. you shouldn’t <drink it>
(81) a. Every boy kissed his mother when she told him to.
   b. ...when she told him to <kiss her>.

Two ingredients to making syntactic identity work here:

(a) Traces of DPs have to be complex, in particular like definites
(b) Pronouns have to be complex, like definites

Claim 1: Traces are syntactic definite descriptions
Fox 2002 ‘Trace conversion’ (Elbourne’s 2005 version)

(82) a. A girl talked to every boy. ⇒ (QR)
   b. [ every boy][λ2[a girl talked to every boy2] ⇒ (Trace conversion)
   c. [every boy][λ2[a girl talk to [[THE 2] boy]]]

(83) a. Since you are allergic to bis disulfide, you should drink no
   wine if its label says you shouldn’t.
   b. [no wine][λ1[you should drink [[THE 1] wine]]]
   c. if its label says you shouldn’t <drink [[THE 1] wine]]>

Can this be extended to names? (i.e., if the variable is free)

(84) a. Greek
   o      Alexandros
   the    Alexander
   ‘Alexander’
   b. colloquial German
      der     Hans
      the    Hans
      ‘Hans’
   c. Albanian
      Drit-a
      Drit(ë)-DEF
      ‘Dritë’
Are there ‘bound’ (covarying) uses of names? (Was Kripke wrong?)

(85) Elbourne 2005:181
   a. ??Mary talked to no-one called Alfred before Alfred was
      lobbied.
   b. John came home. ?*John turned on the TV.

(86) Every woman who has a husband called John and a lover called
     Gerontius takes only Gerontius to the Rare Names Convention.

(87) Kratzer 1996
   a. You accuse me of being a copycat: this year, you went to
      Taos, Sarasota, and Tanglewood, and I went to those places,
      too. But for Taos and Sarasota, my reasons for going were
      independent of you.
      I only went to Tanglewood because you did.
   b. \( \forall x : x \in \llbracket \text{tanglewood} \rrbracket^f, \llbracket \text{I went to x because you went to x} \rrbracket \rightarrow x = \text{tanglewood} \)
   c. \( \llbracket \text{tanglewood} \rrbracket^f = \{ \text{taos, sarasota, tanglewood} \} \)

3.3 Other examples of lexical splits

Examples of ‘lexical’ information apparently triggered from outside the
word it surfaces on (Yatsushiro and Sauerland 2006):

(88) Selbst die beliebteste Kanzler-in aller Zeiten macht
     even the most.popular chancellor-FEM of.all times makes
     Fehler.
     mistakes
   a. ‘Even the most popular female chancellor of all time can
      make a mistake.’
   b. ‘Even the most popular chancellor of all time can make a
      mistake.’
Also dependent plurals (Sag 1976:143–150)

(89) Dependent plurals allow for singular deletions
  a. John’s uncles are bachelors, but Betsy claims her uncle isn’t. 
     <a bachelor>
  b. The women gave lectures at museums, and Sam volunteered 
     to, also. <give a lecture at a museum>

(90) Inherent plurals do not:
    John has living parents, and Bill does, too.
    =<have living parents>, ≠<have a living parent>

4 Conclusions

(a) There's syntax in the ellipsis
(b) Elliptical identity is syntactic
(c) Surface properties of more items than we thought are determined 
    by their syntactic relations to other elements in the structure 
    (strong, and even most forms of weak, lexicalism are hopeless)
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