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PART ONE: CONSTITUENCY AND ELLIPSIS

VSO ORDER IN FINITE CLAUSES

(1) a. Scioth an cat an t-eireaball den luch.
    cut the cat the tail off-the mouse
    'The cat cut the tail off the mouse.'

b. Mabhrisiann tú an fhaocha, tifidh tú na castáit
    if open[PRES] you the periwinkle see[FUT] you the twists c-be[PRES] in its half
    rear[GEN]
    'If you break open a periwinkle, you will see the twists that are in its hind parts.'

(2) verb < subject < object < oblique arguments < adverbials

What do we know about such structures? That they have schematic structures like (3):

(3)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{sciob} \\
\text{an cat an t-eireaball den luch}
\end{array}
\]

That is: all the material following the finite verb forms a constituent which excludes the verb.

THE EVIDENCE: every way of determining constituency in the language (syntactic and prosodic) suggests that the constituency break in (3) is real. See McCloskey (2011c).

RESPONSIVE ELLIPSIS

(4) a. Ar chuir tú isteach ar an phost?
    put-[PAST] you in on the job
    'Did you apply for the job?'

    put-[PAST] NEG-PAST put-[PAST]
    Yes. No.

The term Responsive Ellipsis is convenient but inaccurate; in fact reduced sentences like (4) have many uses which do not involve answering questions:

(5) coordinate structures:

a. Dúirt siad go dtiocfadh siad, ach ní tháinig ariamh.
    say [PAST] they c come [COND] they but NEG come [PAST] ever
    'They said that they would come but they never did.'

tag questions:

b. Beidh muid conainle, nach mbeidh?
    be [FUT] we frozen NEG-PAST be [FUT]
    'We'll be frozen, won't we?'

QUESTION: What are these single-word sentences?
ANSWER: The result of elision of the second major constituent of (3).

SOME PROPERTIES OF RESPONSIVE ELLIPSIS

In forms of English spoken in Ireland:

(6) A: Did you apply for the job?   B: I did.

AN IDENTIFICATION: In the language contact situations in which Irish dialects of English were formed, speakers identified Responsive Ellipsis in Irish with VP Ellipsis in English.

Filppula (1999, 166): A corpus-based study which showed that responses of the form in (6) are most frequent in those areas (e.g. County Clare) from which Irish has most recently disappeared.

A CORRECT IDENTIFICATION: Responsive Ellipsis in Irish in fact mirrors point for point the distribution and characteristics of VP ellipsis in English.

RESPONSIVE ELLIPSIS IN IRISH AND VP ELLIPSIS IN ENGLISH

Responsive Ellipsis:

- operates either sentence-internally or across a discourse (see (5a))
- appears in tag questions (see (5b))
- requires a discourse antecedent (see (7))
- supports the strict/sloppy ambiguities (see (8))
- gives rise to the ‘many pronouns’ puzzle (also known as ‘Dahl’s puzzle; see (9))
- may apply ‘backwards’ as long as the backwards anaphora condition is respected (see (10))
- supports the ‘antecedent contained deletion’ (acd) pattern (see (11))

DISCOURSE ANTECEDENT REQUIRED:
I cannot walk into a room in which the floor is filthy and announce:

(7) Glanfaidh.
    clean [FUT]
    'I will (clean it).'
SUPPORTS THE STRICT-SLOPPY AMBIGUITIES:

(8) Shúl an Taoiseach go raibh an toghachán buaithe aige agus shuí an tUachtarán fosta go raibh President also c was ‘The Prime Minister thought that he had won the election and the President also thought that he had.’

If the pronoun in the first conjunct of (8) refers to the PM, the second conjunct can mean (i) the President thought that the President had won or (ii) the President thought that the PM had won.

GIVES RISE TO THE ‘MANY PRONOUNS’ PUZZLE

(9) Dúirt Ciarán go labharfadh sé lena mhac agus dúirt Eoghan fosta go said Ciarán c speak (COND) he with-his son and said Eoghan also c labharfadh.

‘Ciaran said that he would speak to his son and Eoghan also said that he would.’

Three (not four) possible readings (see Dahl (1973), Fiengo & May (1994, 134–135), Fox (2000)):

a. Ciaran would speak to Ciaran’s son.
b. Eoghan would speak to Eoghan’s son.
c. Eoghan would speak to Ciaran’s son.

MAY APPLY ‘BACKWARDS’; if the ‘Backwards Anaphora Condition’ is met (Langacker (1969)).

(10) le heaglafear go bhfuil an theadh é for fear c you-would-think is is not any one of books the Island read again

‘Lest you think I have, I haven’t read any of the Island books.’

SUPPORTS THE ‘ANTECEDENT CONTAINED DELETION’ (ACD) PATTERN:

(11) a. ná beadh an fonn céanna air a bhí – NEG c would-be the eagerness same on-him c was ‘that there wouldn’t be the same eagerness on him that there was’

b. nuair a thug Séimin an i déi uirthi a thug when c gave the treatment on-her c gave ‘when Séimin meted out to her the treatment that he did’

In (11a), the elided material is within a relative clause modifying the subject. But the antecedent consists of the combination of that subject and its predicate.

IN BRIEF: this is the exact analog in Irish of VP Ellipsis in English. For the detailed evidence, see McCloskey (1991, 2011c).

ANALYTIC CHALLENGES

○ construct an understanding of Responsive Ellipsis internal to Irish that is reasonable and consistent with other findings about the syntax of the language
○ make the appropriate and necessary typological connections

That turns out to be intimately linked with an apparently independent problem—how to understand VSO order.

POSSIBLE ANALYSES OF VSO ORDER

An attractively simple possibility:

(12) TP

\[\text{[FIN]}\]

○ There is no raising of the subject (maybe because EPP is inactive)
○ The v/v amalgam fuses with Tense to create an inflected verb
○ On this view: Responsive Ellipsis just is VP Ellipsis. Which is pleasing, given the range of parallels just discussed.

A NECESSARY ELABORATION

BUT: Extensive evidence that the subject in fact raises out of VP.

A LOWER SUBJECT POSITION IN FAMILIAR CONTEXTS (McCloskey (2011b))

(13) a. ní raibh riabh diospóireachtaí fá na níthe seo COP[NEG] was ever debate about the things DEMON ‘there was never any debate about these things’

b. Bhi chomh maith mór-chuid daoine ann ná faca riabh cheana. be [PAST] as well many people there NEG c saw [S1] ever before ‘There were also many people there that I had never seen before.’

c. Bionn i gcónaí grúpaí beaga ann fosta, be [PRES-HABIT] always groups small in-it also ‘There are always small groups also.’
therefore:

(i) there are at least two postverbal subject-positions, one low (reserved for indefinites and typical of existential constructions) and one high.

(ii) Semantic and discourse-properties of the higher position are just those of the English (pre-verbal) subject position (McCloskey (2001)).

But the finite verb does not raise to c (McCloskey (1996a); Carnie (1995)).

So what is needed is for the syntactic region below c is something at least as complex as (14):

\[ (14) \]

(i) The ‘inflected verb’ is a fusion of four syntactic atoms: a verbal stem, a light verb v, the content of f1, the content of f2.

(ii) The subject begins life inside vp but raises to a position immediately below f2, itself below c.

(iii) Hence vso order.

\[ \]

gains in understanding:

\[ \]

○ we have an account of vso order which does not entail verb raising to c

○ we understand the constituency evidence that suggests that all material following the finite verb is a constituent (it is fip of (14))

○ we understand the evidence for two subject positions (a thematic position inside vp, and the specifier position of fip)

new challenges:

• Can we give an account of what f1 and f2 of (14) are—one that has some grounding internal to the language and within some reasonable typological landscape?

• Can we still understand Responsive Ellipsis as the formal and functional analog of English VP Ellipsis?

an apparent detour: the syntax of negation

nonfinite clauses:

\[ (15) \]

\( [ \text{(neg)} \text{ dp} \text{ dp} \text{ v} \text{ xp adjuncts} ] \)

\[ (16) \]

\( i \text{ ndiaidh é an teach a dhíolsell le n-a dheartháir after him the house sell [-fin] with his brother 'after he had sold the house to his brother' } \)

negation in nonfinite clauses: at the left edge of the clause, realized by the element gan

\[ (17) \]

\( B' \text{theart liom gan iad mé a fheiceáil ag caoineadh. } \)

I-would-prefer neg[-fin] them me see [-fin] cry [prog]

'T'd prefer that they not see me crying.'

often taken to be a complementizer, but that can’t be right:

\[ (18) \]

\( \text{Má chailleann tú agus gan eisean do mharbhadh} \)

if lose [pres] you and neg[-fin] kill [-fin]

'if you lose and he doesn’t kill you' ACO 473

(18) suggests that the marker of negation in nonfinite clauses is at the left edge of a constituent which is not c but which is rather the complement of c. That is, what is needed for (18) is the schematic structure in (19a). That in turn suggests (19b) for nonfinite clauses in general:

\[ (19) \]

a. \[ \]

b. \[ \]

in addition: evidence for an a-position to the left of negation, but to the right of the c-projection, in which dative subjects are licensed (see McCloskey (2001) for the details):

\[ (20) \]

\( \text{Conas d’aonaráin gan a bheith ag braistint aonarach?} \)

how to solitary-person neg [-fin] feel [prog] solitary

'How could a solitary person not feel solitary?' ACO 102
NEGATION IN FINITE CLAUSES

Always on c. Each complementizer has a 'negative' form which may never co-occur with any other expression of negation: ní and cha in root clauses, nach in embedded clauses.

(21) a. Creidim go gcuirfidh sí isteach ar an phost.
    I-believe c put [FUT] she in on the job
    'I believe that she'll apply for the job.'

b. Creidim nach gcuirfidh sí isteach ar an phost.
    I-believe NEG c put [FUT] she in on the job
    'I believe that she won't apply for the job.'

(22) a. Creidim gu-r.
    I-believe C- PAST put she in on the job
    'I believe that she applied for the job.'

b. Creidim ná-r.
    I-believe NEG–PAST– put she in on the job
    'I believe that she didn’t apply for the job.'

(23) a. An gcuirfidh sí isteach ar an phost?
    INTERR put [FUT] she in on the job
    'Will she apply for the job?'

b. Nach gcuirfidh sí isteach ar an phost?
    NEG INTERR C put [FUT] she in on the job
    'Won’t she apply for the job?'

(24) a. an post a-r chuir tú isteach air
    the job C-[PAST] put you in on-it
    'the job that you applied for’

b. an post ná-r chuir tú isteach air
    the job NEG-[PAST] put you in on-it
    'the job that you didn’t apply for’

(25) a. Má chuireann sí isteach ar an phost …
    if put [PRES] she in on the job
    'if she applies for the job, …'

b. Muna gcuireann sí isteach ar an phost …
    if-not put [PRES] she in on the job
    'if she doesn’t apply for the job, …'

(26) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{C} \quad \text{FIN} & \quad \text{ROOT} \rightarrow [/ni:/] \\
\text{C} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{FIN} & \quad \text{-ROOT} \rightarrow [/nax/]
\end{align*}
\]

How does c acquire the [NEG] feature?

(i) As a matter of inherent lexical specification?
(ii) As a consequence of raising of a lower independent head Neg to c (Guilfoyle (1990), Duffield (1995))?
(iii) None of the above?

NONE OF THE ABOVE

Clear evidence that c agrees with a lower head, which expresses semantic negation.

(27) Mur dtéighin agus iad càileadh, mhbhrfeadh siad mé.
    if-not go [COND] [S] and them lose [FIN] kill [COND] they me
    'If I were not to go and they were to lose, they would kill me.'

The logical form of (27) is (28):

\[
[ \neg p \land q ] \rightarrow r
\]

The logical form of (28) suggests the LF (syntactic) representation in (29):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CP} & \quad \text{FIN} \quad \text{COND} \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{XP} & \quad \& \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{NEG} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{POL} & \quad \text{PLOP} \\
\text{TP} & \quad \text{POL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

with coordination at the level of the complement of c (finite clause with nonfinite clause) and crucially negation only in the left conjunct.

That in turn suggests the analysis in (30):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CP} & \quad \text{FIN} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{POL} \\
\text{POL} & \quad \text{PLOP} \\
\text{TP} & \quad \text{POL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

c may bear an uninterpretable NEG feature which agrees with the semantically potent expression of negation in the head-position of its complement.

CRUCIAL: The relation between c and the negative POL in (29) is an instance of left-conjunct agreement.

This relation cannot be one of head movement because that would involve, for (27), a violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint.

REALIZATION: In finite clauses the probe is realized phonologically, the goal is not—an instance of head-marking.
SUMMING UP

- The semantically potent negation is in a position below c but above TP. Negation, however, in finite clauses is morphologically realized in c.
- c may bear an uninterpretable neg feature which enters into an agreement relation with the semantically active neg head immediately below it—indicated by the arrowless curve in (30)). Compare Kramer & Rawlins (2009, 2012).
- In nonfinite clauses, neg (morphologically gar) is realized in the lower (neg) position of (30).
- If there is a polarity-head (of which neg is one variant), we generalize (30) to (31): (Laka (1990), Zanuttini (1997), Cheng et al. (1996), Ladusaw (1992), Martins (1994), Potts (2002)).

(31)

```
CP
    C POLP
    POL TP
   T XP
```

NOTE ONE: For nonfinite clauses, pol is clearly higher than the subject—see (37).

NOTE TWO: For finite clauses, evidence for the same conclusion in the distribution of negative polarity items:

(32)

```
Ní tháinig duine ar bith 'mo chomhair.
NEG came person any near-me
'Nobody came near me.'
```

If npi's require semantic (rather than purely formal) licensing, (32) indicates that the subject is within the scope of a real negation—a result guaranteed by (31):

(33)

```
CP
    C POLP
    POL [NEG] TP
   T XP
```

AND THE OBVIOUS MOVE:
Verb movement in Irish finite clauses is raising to the head which expresses polarity.

CONSEQUENCES AND ENTAILMENTS

A PLEASING CONSEQUENCE OF THE ANALYSIS

- The parallelism between Responsive Ellipsis in Irish and VP ellipsis in English is restored. Both involve ellipsis of the complement of a (prosodically independent) polarity head—low in English (selecting v) but high in Irish (selecting t).
- Hence its naturalness in the responsive use

But VP ellipsis in English must be so construed (Martins (1994); Lobeck (1995); Potsdam (1997)):

(34) You can smoke in these rooms, but we suggest that you not.

(35) D’iarr mé air a theacht ach deir sé nach dtiocfadh.
past-ask I on-him come [-FIN] but say he NEG c come [FUT]
'I asked him to come but he says that he won’t.'

(36)

```
ENGLISH:
   C
    | that
     DP
      | T
       D
      | you
     POLP
   ELLIPSE
    | [NEG]
     VP
   not
```

(37)

```
IRISH:
   C
    | nach
     POLP
   ELLIPSE
    | [NEG]
     VP
```

```
V
  T
dtiocfadh
```

```
AN ENTAILMENT OF THE ANALYSIS

According to our proposal, the inflected verb in Irish is an object with a complex structure:

(38) a. [TENSE, POLARITY, STEM] ANALYTIC (UN-AGREEING) FORM

b. [TENSE, POLARITY, STEM, PERSON-NUMBER] SYNTHETIC (AGREEING) FORM

THEREFORE:

○ Every finite verb contains within itself an exponent of polarity, positive or negative.
○ If this is correct, the presence of that expression ought to be detectable.

A CURIOUS PHENOMENON AND A PROBE

(39) Cuir sios é. Ní raichidh sé sios.
put down it NEG go (PUT) it down

‘Put it down.’ ‘It won’t go down.’

Structures like (39) are curious in several ways:

(i) the subject unexpectedly survives ellipsis (see (41) below) even though it is always given
(ii) a weak pronoun is stressed
(iii) it is not the pronoun which is the semantic focus (unaugmented pronouns can otherwise never bear focal stress)
(iv) in semantic terms, it is the verbal stem which is focussed, not the pronoun

Greene (1973, 128):

In the latter conjugation, the normally enclitic pronouns may be stressed in emphatic replies … with a pronoun stressed equally with the verb (it should be noted that in this construction it is the action which is stressed, not the agent; … Stressed pronouns in this case have always their long vowel form, in Scottish Gaelic as well as in Irish.

HOW DO WE UNDERSTAND THIS CURIOUS PHENOMENON? Weak subject pronouns incorporate, forming a prosodic unit with the preceding finite verb (Chung & McCloskey, 1987; Doherty, 1996; Bennett et al., 2012). Independently we know that accents appear at the right edge of a phonological phrase:

(40) bán /bæd/ bán mór /bæd mɔːr/

that is: semantic focus on a subcomponent of the inflected verb has a prosodic exponent realized at the right edge of the prosodic constituent corresponding to the verbal complex.

SEMANTICALLY:

(41) \{ C \{TENSE, POLARITY, STEM \} FOCUS \} D \} THE VERBAL COMPLEX

VERUM FOCUS

Höhle (1992), Romero & Han (2004), Gutzmann & Miró (2011) among many others …

IN THE ABSENCE OF ELLIPSIS:

(42) amharcann siad air mar thear a bhí ag troid ar son saoíse, agus
look [PRES] they on-him as man c was fighting for-the-sake of freedom and
ná rhathe le saoíse
throid ‘they regard him as a man who fought for freedom, and he did fight for freedom.’

WITH ELLIPSIS:

(43) Ar shill tú ariamh gom beadh sé in Dáil Éireann?
inter [PAST] think [PAST] you ever c be [COND] he in Parliament  NEG-PAST
shill, leoga; níor shill MÉ
think [PAST] indeed NEG-PAST think [PAST] I

‘Did you ever think that he’d be in Parliament? Indeed I didn’t. I did not.’

(44) a. Cén aois anois tú, a Shéamais?
what age now you VOC Jim

‘How old are you now, Jim?’

b. Tá mé ag tarraingt ar na trí scór, a Rónán.
be [PRES] I draw [PROG] on the three score VOC
‘I’m almost sixty, Rónán.

(45) a. Mar sin ni raibh tú ag iarraidh jobannaí a chur i mbaoil?
then  NEG be [PAST] you try [PROG] jobs put [-FIN] in jeopardy

‘So you weren’t trying to put jobs at risk?’

b. O, ní raibh MÉ, ní raibh MÉ.
oh NEG was I NEG was I
‘Oh, I was NOT; I was NOT.

(radio interview)

BUT EQUALLY POSSIBLE:

(46) O, bhi MÉ, bhi MÉ.
oh was I was I
‘Oh, I WAS; I WAS.

(47) \{ C \{TENSE, POLARITY,ROOT \} D \} \} THE VERBAL COMPLEX

[FOCUS]

It follows that there must be an expression of polarity within the inflected verb.
SUMMING UP PART ONE

- Responsive Ellipsis in Irish (like its close kin VP ellipsis in English) is elision of the complement of the functional head \( \text{pol} \). The licensing polarity head, as a function of head movement through the clausal spine, ends up buried as a subpart inside the morphological expression of the inflected verb.

- The phenomenon of v	extsuperscript{erum} focus provides crucial evidence for this line of analysis in providing evidence that inside every inflected verb is a morphosyntactic expression of polarity.

- It is in virtue of the fact that it involves elision of the complement of the polarity head that Responsive Ellipsis is so well suited to the responsive function. That’s because the context for answers to Yes/No questions will characteristically evoke focus on the expression of polarity, and given-ness of the associated propositional content—on our analysis the semantic content of the complement of \( \text{pol} \)—thereby creating conditions ideally conducive for ellipsis (reduction to silence of the given).

- This does not entail that we identify Responsive Ellipsis with yes and no in English (see Kramer & Rawlins (2012) on ‘negative neutralization’ in English, which is available with yes and no, but unavailable for answers involving only ellipsis, in English and in Irish).

- There is no equivalent of Responsive Ellipsis in nonfinite clauses because in the absence of verb-fronting the polarity head has insufficient prosodic substance to act as a head-licenser for ellipsis, being either null (positive polarity) or realized only by \( \text{gan} \) (negative polarity), which is prosodically dependent. Compare English *You said that I should resign and I’ll.

Part Two: Identity and the Limits of Identity

(48) \[ \text{ELLIPSES} \]


Crucially: \( \nu \), \( \chi \), and \( \tau \) are inside the ellipsis-site in syntactic terms, although realized on the surface outside the ellipsis site. This is the inevitable logic of head-movement. As a consequence …

VERBAL IDENTITY AND ITS LIMITS

(49) a. *Níor cheannaigh mé teach ariamh, ach bhí i n-áiste a chuid dtálaí ai leis an bhfuil bheadh.

b. *Cé gur mhíl an bainisteoir na híomhreoirí inné, cháin frein.

c. *Níor éist sé i le-n-a cuid dtálaí ach labhair.

d. Cháin sé é féin, ach agh am chéanna chosán.

(50) Taroo-wa zibun-o semete-ga Ken-wa [ ] kabatta.
Taroo-top self-acc blamed-while Ken-top defended

‘While Taroo blamed self, Ken defended (self).’

But only the verbal stem is required to be identical:

(51) a. Chuireadh sé as do Bhreandán dul ar cuairt chuiuc an agus is put-past-habit it out to go- [FIN] on visit to her and cop[pres] annamh a théadh.

b. ní theastaíonn sin uaim. Cén fáth a dheadh dó? NEG wants that from me what reason C want cond

i. ‘I won’t want that. Why would I?’

f. Cé ní labharfadh mé focal amháin agus m’abharann is orm féin a bheas NEG speak [FUT] I word one and if speak [PRES] is on-me [REFL] be [FUT] an locht the fault

i. ‘I won’t speak a word, and if I do, the fault is mine.’

d. Gabh ar mo dhroim anseo. Chuaigh.

go [ IMPV] on my back here go [PAST]

‘Get up here on my back. He did.’

Nonfinite forms may antecede finite forms ((51a)); present tense forms may antecede conditional forms ((51b)); future tense forms may antecede present tense forms ((51c)); imperative forms may antecede finite past tense forms ((51d)) and so on. As far as I know, every combination of tense, mood, force and finiteness is possible on the verb of the antecedent clause and the verb of the ellipsis site, as long as the requirement is observed that the two stems be identical.
ANALYTIC CHALLENGES

- Why does the Verbal Identity Condition (VIC) hold?
- Why is inflectional material irrelevant to the calculation of identity for ellipsis?

THE OBVIOUS MOVE

- The Verbal Identity Condition holds because for all relevant (syntactic and semantic) purposes, the verb is inside the ellipsis site.
- Therefore it is no more surprising that verbal identity should be enforced in Responsive Ellipsis in Irish than it is that it should be enforced in VP ellipsis in English.

WORRIES

WORRY 1. If head movement leaves a trace like any other, it should be interpretable as a variable and that trace should in turn be available for ‘rebinding’ like the trace of phrasal movement. In that case there should be no Verbal Identity Condition.

WORRY 2. Shouldn’t the logic that ‘explains’ the Verbal Identity Condition also lead us to expect that the inflectional material expressed on the finite verb would also be required to be identical to corresponding material within the antecedent?

FACING THE FIRST WORRY:

HEAD MOVEMENT AND THE INTERFACES

RE-BINDING

(52)  a. Sandy gets on well with her advisor, but Christina doesn’t.
   b. John’s coach thinks he’ll do well, and Bill’s coach does as well. (Rooth (1992))
   c. Aubergines seem to do well here, but carrots don’t.

(53)  I can’t tell you which RELATIVES we should invite, but I know which FRIENDS we should.
      (Schuyler (2001))


(54)  \[\text{[VP … t …] } \Rightarrow \text{[VP… x …]}\]

Rebinding is available only under quite complex conditions (see especially Heim (1997)), but Hartman (2011) argues that those conditions could at least in principle be met.

AN ATTRACTIVE POSSIBILITY

(55)  Head-movement is an aspect of morphophonology (in the PF component) and therefore its effects are invisible to interpretive procedures (like ellipsis resolution/licensing), as argued by Chomsky (2000), Boeckx & Stepanović (2001), Harley (2004). See McCloskey (2010c), Schoormenner & Temmerman (2011) for the application to the Verbal Identity Condition.

THE CURRENT CONSENSUS

The hypothesis in (55) is not viable (see Roberts (2010, Chap. One) for a useful overview)

REASON ONE: EXPANDED LICENSING POSSIBILITIES:

(56)  a. *Which student does anybody not like?
   b. Which student doesn’t anybody like?
(57)  a. *I know why anyone didn’t help us.
   b. Why didn’t anyone help us?

Licensing of the NPI anybody in (56b) and (57b) seems to depend on the affixal negation being carried along with the fronted auxiliary to a position in which it commands the NPI. McCloskey (1996a), Kayne (2000, 2005), Roberts (2010)).

REASON TWO: LEXICAL SELECTION SENSITIVE TO COMPLEX HEADS DERIVED BY MOVEMENT

(i) If head movement is in the syntax, and
(ii) syntax is cyclic, and
(iii) selection is a relation between heads, and
(iv) head movement creates new heads, then
(v) those heads created by head-movement ought to be available, in principle, for selection by higher heads

(58)  *I remember who did she marry.


REASON THREE: EXPANDED SCOPE POSSIBILITIES

Lechner (2007), Szabolcsi (2011)

REASON FOUR: MAX ELIDE

Hartman (2011) argues that to get the relative distribution of VP Ellipsis and sluicing right, via the mechanism of MAX-ELIDE (Merchant (2001), Takahashi & Fox (2005)), it must be the case that verbal traces correspond to variables.

AN IMPORTANT PRELIMINARY

It does not follow that if head movement applies in the syntax, we lose an account of the VIC.

If a verb is of semantic type \( \alpha \) and its trace is of type \( \alpha \), then we have scope reconstruction. \( \lambda \)-conversion automatically puts the full semantic content of the verb in the position of its trace. (See Bittner (1993), von Stechow (2009) and Goldberg (2005) on the VIC.)

Therefore debates on the semantic effects of head movement are intimately linked with the question of whether or not verb-meanings involve variables over times and worlds. Such elements would serve the same function as individual-level variables in the nominal system, allowing quantifying in, therefore ‘rebinding,’ therefore no account of the VIC). Lechner (2007), Szabolcsi (2011)
Not every lottery ticket can be drawn.

b. NEGATIVE SPLIT READING: There are no circumstances in which all lottery tickets can be drawn.

c. \[ \neg \forall x \ldots \]

Reasoning:

○ The negative subject must be interpreted in a relatively low position so as to be commanded by neg (it is pronounced in SPEC,AGRP but interpreted in SPEC,TP, which is lower).

○ The modal can must be interpreted above the universal quantifier in the subject (to get the right scope order).

○ That is not the base position of the modal (which is lower than T).

○ Therefore the scope of the modal is fixed in a derived position.

○ Therefore head-movement is scope-expanding.

An alternative:

(60)

On an abstract high negation in English, see Ladusaw (1992), Potts (2002) among many others.

If scope reconstruction to the specifier of VP is available (see for instance Sauerland (2003)), the correct scope relations will result.

(61) Lechner’s STRONG CONSTRAINT (p. 8):

Strong quantifiers cannot reconstruct below T.

The argument, as Lechner recognizes (p. 18) stands or falls on the correctness of (61).

Workshop on Ellipsis, Nanzan University    July 2012
A FINAL SPECULATION

‘Extended projections’ (in the sense of Grimshaw) are phrase structural articulations of the featural content of phase-defining heads.
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