

Week 3

More on identity with the antecedent

October 5, 2009

1 Were we left last week

Last week, we had been looking at Merchant's (2001) identity condition on ellipsis, which is defined in terms of eGIVENNESS.

- (1) *Parallelism condition on ellipsis*
Only eGIVEN expressions can be elided.
- (2) *eGIVENness*
An expression E counts as eGIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo \exists -type shifting:
 - a. A entails the F-closure of E , and
 - b. E entails the F-closure of A .
- (3) *F-closure*
The F-closure of α , written $F\text{-clo}(\alpha)$, is the result of replacing F-marked parts of α with \exists -type variables of the appropriate type.
- (4) *\exists -type shifting*
 \exists -type shifting is a type-shifting operation that raises expressions to type $\langle t \rangle$ and existentially binds unfilled arguments.

Then, we applied these conditions to strict readings of VP ellipsis. The two necessary entailment conditions are satisfied because both instances of *her* carry the same index.

- (5) $Alicia_i$ loves her_i mother, and $Beatrix_k$ does [*love her_i mother*] too.
[= $Alicia$ loves $Alicia$'s mother, and $Beatrix$ loves $Alicia$'s mother]

The exercise left for today was the derivation of the sloppy reading of the same sentence. Clearly, we cannot assume the same representation, because $\exists[x$ loves $Alicia$'s mother] doesn't entail $\exists.[x$ loves $Beatrix$'s mother]

- (6) $Alicia_i$ loves her_i mother, and $Beatrix_k$ does [*love her_k mother*] too.
[= $Alicia$ loves $Alicia$'s mother, and $Beatrix$ loves $Beatrix$'s mother]

A solution: we can assume that pronouns act as variables, so their indices have to be determined contextually (obviating, for the sake of the argument, Principle B). So we can represent (6) as follows.

- (7) Alicia_i loves x_{??}'s mother and Beatrix loves x_{??}'s mother too.
[assume also (i) an assignment function to provide the x's with appropriate indices, and (ii) a morpho-phonological mechanism that assigns the correct form to the pronominal variables]

The gist of this solution is that only pronouns can be treated as variables. Referential expressions cannot. This much predicts the existence of minimal pairs like the following (from Rooth 1992).

- (8) a. John's coach thinks that he has a chance, and Bill's coach does too.
[strict/sloppy ambiguity]
b. John's coach thinks that John has a chance, and Bill's coach does too.
[unambiguous: strict reading only]

2 More apparent non-identity effects: vehicle change

Fiengo and May (1994) deal with sentences like the following:

- (9) Alicia thinks that Beatrix will win, and Beatrix does [think that Beatrix will win] too

The problem with this example is that the non-elliptical counterpart is ungrammatical due to a Condition C effect.

- (10) * Alicia thinks that Beatrix will win, and Beatrix thinks that Beatrix will win too.

Fiengo and May's solution is to propose a mechanism of *vehicle change*, whereby a referential expression can be turned into a pronoun under ellipsis. The implementation hinges on assuming that expressions come with two binary features, namely, [\pm anaphoric] and [\pm pronominal]. A referential expression is [$-$ pronominal]; under ellipsis, the specification of this feature switches to [$+$ pronominal], so...

- (11) Alicia thinks that Beatrix_i will win, and Beatrix_i does [think that she_i will win] too

3 Deep and surface anaphora

The main point of Hankamer and Sag (1976) is that there are two types of anaphoric processes (and, by extension, two types of ellipsis), namely, *deep* and *surface*.

- **Surface anaphora**

1. is transformationally derived from a full phrase.
2. has a complex internal structure.
3. requires an accessible linguistic antecedent.

4. some examples are: VP ellipsis, sluicing, stripping, gapping

- **Deep anaphora**

1. is not transformationally derived, but rather inserted as-is from the beginning.
2. has no internal structure.
3. does not require a linguistic antecedent (although it may have one).
4. some examples are: *do it* anaphora, Null Complement Anaphora.

The properties of deep vs. surface anaphora are very nicely exemplified in pages 402-424 of the article, but the main point is that there is a correlation between (a) the necessity of a linguistic antecedent, and (b) the presence of internal structure in the ellipsis site. Only ellipsis sites with complex internal structure require a linguistic antecedent.

Exercise Find out to what extent this correlation works in German/Polish/Swedish/Russian.

