

snippets

Issue 5

January 2002

Contents

1. R. Amritavalli and Partha Protim Sarma. *A case distinction between unaccusative and unergative subjects in Assamese.*
2. Paolo Acquaviva and Mark Volpe. *Open-class roots in closed-class contexts: a question for lexical insertion.*
3. Andrew Kehler. *Another problem for syntactic (and semantic) theories of VP-ellipsis.*
4. Winfried Lechner. *Negative islands in comparatives.*
5. Sky Lee. *Telicity and VN-LV vs. VN-Acc-LV.*
6. Hans-Christian Schmitz and Bernhard Schröder. *On focus and VP-deletion.*
7. Ed Zoerner and Brian Agbayani. *A pseudogapping asymmetry.*

ISSN 1590-1807

Published in *Led on Line* - Electronic Archive by
LED - Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto - Milano - Italy
<http://www.ledonline.it>

January 2002

Copyright

The works included in *Snippets* are the property of their authors and are used by permission. Readers must apply the same principles of fair use to the works in this electronic archive that they would to a printed archive. These works may be read online, downloaded and printed for personal use, copied and freely distributed, or the URL of *Snippets* included in another electronic document. Any reference to material included in *Snippets* must cite the author and the source. The texts may not be published commercially (in print or electronic form), edited, or otherwise altered without the permission of the author.

Editors

Carlo Cecchetto (University of Milan-Bicocca)
Caterina Donati (University of Urbino)
Orin Percus (University of Florence/ University of Tübingen)

Review Board

Sigrid Beck (University of Connecticut)
Rajesh Bhatt (University of Texas)
Valentina Bianchi (Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa)
Daniel Büring (UCLA)
Danny Fox (MIT)
Hisatsugu Kitahara (Keio University)
Roumyana Pancheva (USC)
Josep Quer (University of Amsterdam)
Norvin Richards (MIT)
Anna Roussou (University of Patras)
Uli Sauerland (Universität Tübingen)
William Snyder (University of Connecticut)
Michal Starke (NYU)

E-mail: snippets@unimi.it

EDITORIAL STATEMENT

1. Purpose.

The aim of *Snippets* is to publish specific remarks that motivate research or that make theoretical points germane to current work. The ideal contribution is the ideal footnote: a side remark that taken on its own is not worth lengthy development but that needs to be said.

The best examples of what we have in mind are the earliest *Linguistic Inquiry* squibs. Some of these posed unobserved puzzles. For instance, a squib by Postal and Ross in LI 1:1 (“A Problem of Adverb Preposing”) noted that whether or not we can construe a sentence-initial temporal adverb with an embedded verb depends on the tense of the matrix verb. A squib by Perlmutter and Ross in LI 1:3 (“Relative Clauses with Split Antecedents”), challenging the prevailing analyses of coordination and extraposition, noted that conjoined clauses neither of which contain a plural noun phrase can appear next to an “extraposed” relative that can only describe by Bresnan in LI 1:2 (“A Grammatical Fiction”) outlined an alternative account of the derivation of sentences containing *believe* and *force*, and asked whether there were principled reasons for groups. Other squibs drew attention to particular theoretical assumptions. For instance, a squib dismissing any of the underlying assumptions (among them that semantic interpretation is sensitive to details of a syntactic derivation). A squib by Zwicky in LI 1:2 (“Class Complements in Phonology”) asked to what extent phonological rules refer to complements of classes. None of these squibs was more than a couple of paragraphs; all of them limited themselves to a precise question or observation.

One encounters many short comments of this kind in the literature of the seventies. We feel that there no longer is a forum for them. We want *Snippets* to help fill that gap.

2. Content.

We will publish notes that contribute to the study of **syntax and semantics in generative grammar**. The notes are to be brief, self-contained and explicit. They may do any of the following things:

- a. point out an empirical phenomenon that goes against accepted generalizations or that shows that some aspect of a theory is problematic;
- b. point out unnoticed minimal pairs that fall outside the scope of any existing theory;
- c. point out an empirical phenomenon that confirms the predictions of a theory in an area where the theory has not been tested;
- d. explicitly describe technical inconsistencies in a theory or in a set of frequently adopted assumptions;
- e. explicitly describe unnoticed assumptions that underlie a theory or assumptions that a theory needs to be supplemented with in order to make desired predictions;
- f. propose an idea for a pilot experiment in language acquisition or language processing that directly bears on theoretical issues;
- g. call attention to little-known or forgotten literature in which issues of immediate relevance are discussed.

3. Submission details.

We will solicit submissions issue by issue. A new submission deadline will be announced for each issue, and the submissions that we receive we will consider only for that issue. The submissions that we accept will be printed in the upcoming issue; none will be scheduled for a later issue.

It is important to us that readers will be able to copy the newsletter and freely distribute its content. Consequently, authors are advised that, when they submit to *Snippets*, we understand them as allowing their submission to be reproduced if published. At the same time, the rights for the notes themselves will remain with the authors. As a result, citation of *Snippets* material will have to indicate the author's name and the specific source of the material.

Submissions are to be a **maximum** of 500 words (including examples), with an additional half page allowed for diagrams, tables and references. Given that we envision the submissions themselves as footnotes, **the submissions may not contain footnotes of their own**. The ideal submission is one paragraph; a submission of five lines is perfectly acceptable. **We will not consider abstracts**.

We will accept electronic submissions at the address

snippets@unimi.it

and paper submissions at the address

Caterina Donati
Facoltà di Lingue
Università di Urbino
Piazza Rinascimento 7
61029 Urbino
ITALY

We strongly encourage electronic submissions. Electronic submissions may take the form of (a) the text of an e-mail message, or (b) an attached file. The attached file should be a simple text file, a Word file (Mac or Windows), or a Rich Text Format (RTF) file.

All submissions must state the name and affiliation of the author(s), and a (postal or electronic) return address.

4. Editorial policy.

Submissions will be reviewed by our editorial board, and review will be name-blind both ways. While we guarantee a response within 3 months of submission, **we will only provide a yes/no response to the submitter**. We will not request revisions (barring exceptional cases). Space constraints mean that we may reject a large proportion of submissions, but with this in mind we allow resubmission (once) of the same piece.

5. Distribution.

Our initial plan is to publish 2 or 3 times a year, with a maximum of 10 pages for each edition. Our goal in publishing the newsletter is to provide a service to the linguistics community, and *Snippets* will therefore be **free of charge**. There will be a limited number of copies, which we will send to institutions on request. Individuals who wish to take advantage of the newsletter should therefore ask their institutions to request a copy, and make their own copy of the institution's version. Individuals who are not affiliated with an institution and do not have access to the web version of the newsletter can request copies by writing to us at the postal address above. Further questions should be addressed to snippets@unimi.it.

1.

R. Amritavalli and Partha Protim Sarma - CIEFL *A case distinction between unaccusative and unergative subjects in Assamese*

javamrit@eth.net

Assamese (a language of Northeastern India) appears to distinguish subjects of unaccusative and unergative verbs via case-marking. The nominal inflection *-e* occurs only on unergative subjects ((1b)):

- (1) a. Ram pore / poribo / poril
Ram falls will fall fell
- b. Ram-e doure / douribo / douril
Ram-e runs will run ran

Subjects of transitive verbs are also marked with *-e*.

- (2) Ram-e kaam kore / koribo / koril
Ram-e work does will do did

Other verbs whose subjects fall into the classes illustrated in (1-2) reinforce the intuition that the non-occurrence of *-e* is linked to unaccusativity. (*-e* has the variants *i* and *ye, we* after vowels: *lora* ‘boy’ ~ *lorai*, *sowali* ‘girl’ ~ *sowaliye*, *tutu* (a name) ~ *tutuwe*. It appears on 2nd and 3rd person pronouns; 1st person pronouns exhibit no change.)

verb class (1a): *xuu-* ‘sleep’, *mor-* ‘die’, *aah-* ‘come’, *boh-* ‘sit’, *upaj-* ‘be born’, *jie-* ‘live’,
baas- ‘be safe’, *uTh-* ‘get up’, *jaa-* ‘go’

verb class (1b): *naas-* ‘dance’, *xator-* ‘swim’, *hāāh-* ‘laugh’, *juuj-* ‘fight’

verb class (2): *maar-* ‘beat, kill’, *saa-* ‘see’, *kaT-* ‘cut’, *jokaa-* ‘tease’, *likh-* ‘write’, *khaa-* ‘eat’

The data in (1) are of interest in realizing a well-known distinction between external and internal arguments through case marking: only unergatives and transitives have “real” subjects in the sense that they are projected as external arguments; the subjects of unaccusatives are underlying objects. Basque is reported to similarly distinguish external and internal arguments by ergative and absolutive case respectively (Laka 1993).

Traditionally, the \emptyset case on subjects of verb class (1a) is called ‘absolutive,’ and the *-e* of verb classes (1b) and (2) is called ‘nominative’ (see Goswami 1982:264 ff.); no ergative case is postulated in Assamese. But there is some reason to relabel *-e* “ergative.” A significant observation of Goswami’s is that “*-e* expresses instrumental case also” (example from Goswami):

- (3) *haat-e* ‘by hand, by the hand’.
-

This suggests that *-e* is linked to agentivity, and is consistent with its incompatibility with unaccusative subjects; in conjunction with the link between the Hindi ergative *-ne* and the Sanskrit instrumental, this leads to the proposal that *-e* is an ergative case.

Assamese also has an accusative case *-(a)k* on objects, but it appears overtly only on proper nouns and “particularized or emphasized” common nouns (examples from Goswami):

- (4) a. *ami bisnu-k puza karo* ‘We worship Vishnu’
 b. *moe lora-k matiso* ‘I have invited the boys (and not the girls or old persons)’

Under the conditions noted above (reminiscent of corresponding conditions in Hindi-Urdu), accusative *-(a)k* also appears on the logical object of the passive, and on the causee in causatives. In the causative sentences (5) below, notice that the case distinction between unaccusative and unergative subjects is neutralized when they appear as causees. The erstwhile subjects, the proper noun *Pona*, are all marked accusative, by *-(a)k*.

- (5) a. $V_{\text{unaccusative}} + \text{caus}$ *Ram-e Pona-k pelai* ‘Ram makes Pona fall’.
 b. $V_{\text{unergative}} + \text{caus}$ *Ram-e Pona-k dourai* ‘Ram makes Pona run’.
 c. $V_{\text{transitive}} + \text{caus}$ *Ram-e Pona-k kaam korowai* ‘Ram makes Pona work’.

Assamese (then) has a “mixed” nominative-ergative case system, which has an ergative, an absolutive, and an accusative. But it apparently has no nominative.

References

- Goswami, G. C. (1982) *Structure of Assamese*, Department of Publication, Gauhati University, Assam.
 Laka, I. (1993) “Unergatives that assign ergative, unaccusatives that assign accusative”, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 18: 149-172.

2.

Paolo Acquaviva - *University College Dublin*

Mark Volpe - *SUNY-Stony Brook*

Open-class roots in closed-class contexts: a question for lexical insertion

paolo.acquaviva@ucd.ie – markv58@yahoo.com

Recent work in Distributed Morphology which follow Marantz 1997, e.g. Harley and Noyer 1998 and Embick 2000, reject the notion of a lexical category. Instead, it is claimed that categorial distinctions depend on the syntactic context in which category-neutral ROOTS are inserted. A noun is a root inserted as complement to a Determiner, and a verb is a root inserted in a shell of functional heads including Tense.

On this theory, there is a clear separation between FUNCTIONAL MORPHEMES (f-morphemes), which fill f-nodes, and LEXICAL MORPHEMES (l-morphemes), which fill l-nodes. To fill an f-node F, a vocabulary item must be specified for a subset of F's features (Halle 1997). By contrast, to fill an l-node, a vocabulary item cannot have grammatical features (otherwise, it would block all other roots, cf. Marantz 1997). If this entails that the set of lexical bases and the set of functional morphemes have no member in common, facts like the following may be problematic.

The Turkish morphemes *çok* 'much/many/very' and *az* 'little/few' are closed-class quantifiers according to Kornfilt 1997: 432. Unlike adjectives, which syntactically precede the morpheme *bir* when it acts as an indefinite article, as in example (1a), *çok* and *az* appear between the article and noun, as in (b) and (c):

- (1)
- | | | | | |
|----|------------------|--------|-------|------------------|
| a. | buyuk | bir | kiz | |
| | big | a | girl | |
| | 'a big girl' | | | |
| b. | bir | çok | seker | (*çok bir seker) |
| | | much | sugar | |
| | 'a lot of sugar' | | | |
| c. | bir | az | seker | (*az bir seker) |
| | a | little | sugar | |
| | 'a little sugar' | | | |

- *çok* and *az* participate in various additional phenomena indicative of closed-class status, including the formation of quantifier compounds, e.g., *en az* ('least'), *en çok* ('most') (ibid.), the use of *az* as a comparative operator (Lewis, 1967: 54), and *çok* as a quantifier rather than a cardinality predicate when it hosts a possessive suffix: *çok-umuz* ('most of us') (Lewis 1967: 75).

However, in at least one instance, *çok* and *az* are input to the same derivational process as lexical bases. The passive suffix *-al* and the causative suffix *-t* derive intransitive unaccusative and transitive causative verbs from these two f-morphemes:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---|----|--|
| (2) | a. | az-al-mak
az-PASS-INF
'to decrease' (intr.) | b. | az-al-t-mak
az-PASS-CAUS-INF
'to reduce' (tr.) |
| (3) | a. | çoğ-al-mak
çoğ-PASS-INF
'to increase' (intr.) | b. | çoğ-al-t-mak
çoğ-PASS-CAUS-INF
'to increase' (tr.) |

In all other cases, these suffixes regularly target lexical bases (roots), either noun or adjective; there is no independent reason to think that the base of these verbs is a grammatical formative.

References

- Embick, D. (2000) "Syntax and Categories: Verbs and Participles in the Latin Perfect", *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Halle, M. (1997) "Distributed morphology: impoverishment and fission", *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 30.
- Harley, H. and R. Noyer. (1998) "Licensing in the non-lexicalist lexicon: nominalizations, vocabulary items, and the Encyclopedia", *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 32.
- Kornfilt, J. (1997) *Turkish*, Routledge, London.
- Lewis, G.L. (1967). *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Marantz, A. (1997) "No Escape from Syntax: Don't try to do morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon", *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*.

3.

Andrew Kehler - University of California - San Diego
Another problem for syntactic (and semantic) theories of VP-ellipsis

kehler@ling.ucsd.edu

A variety of data has been used to argue against theories of VP-ellipsis based on syntactic deletion or reconstruction (Fiengo and May 1994, *inter alia*), including voice alternations ((1)), nominalized antecedents ((2)), and split antecedents ((3)).

- (1) This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did.
(Vincent Della Pietra, p.c., cited in Kehler 2000)
- (2) Meanwhile, they sense a drop in visitors to the city. Those who do, they say, are taking cabs. (Chicago Tribune, courtesy Gregory Ward)
- (3) Mary wants to go to Spain and Fred wants to go to Peru, but because of limited resources, only one of them can. (Webber 1978)

This data has been used to argue instead for a semantic analysis (Dalrymple et al. 1991, Hardt 1992, Kehler 1993, *inter alia*). I add to this literature a previously unnoticed type of example that poses problems for both types of approach; consider (4) and (5).

- (4) Mary's boyfriend gave her his school picture, just as all schoolboys do.
- (5) A: Bob's mother cleans up after him all the time.
B: I'm surprised; most parents these days won't.

Informants agree that in addition to their strict readings, these examples have sloppy interpretations: (4) can mean that all schoolboys give *their girlfriends* their school pictures, and (5) can mean that most parents won't clean up after *their children*. The problem for a syntactic reconstruction approach is apparent, since there is no syntactic material available in the antecedent clause corresponding to "their girlfriends" in (4) nor "their children" in (5). Suitable material is likewise absent at the levels of logical representation assumed by semantic analyses.

Insight into what licenses the felicitous use of ellipsis in examples like (4) might be gotten by contrasting it with the variant in (6), which is highly marginal at best with a sloppy interpretation.

- (6) ??/* Mary's boyfriend gave her his school picture, and Bob did too.

Examples (4) and (6) differ in that the elided clause in (4) denotes a generalization of the antecedent clause whereas in (6) it does not. This suggests that in (4) a semantic representation of the missing material may be generated as part of the inference process that establishes the generalization relationship. These examples could thus add to a growing body of evidence

that inference and coherence establishment play crucial roles in determining when ellipsis is licensed (e.g., Kehler 2000).

References

- Dalrymple, M., S.M. Shieber and F. Pereira. (1991) "Ellipsis and Higher-Order Unification", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14, 399-452.
- Fiengo, R. and R. May. (1994) *Indices and Identity*, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 24, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Hardt, D. (1992) "VP Ellipsis and Contextual Interpretation", *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING-92)*, Nantes, 303-309.
- Kehler, A. (1993) "A Discourse Copying Algorithm for Ellipsis and Anaphora Resolution", *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL-93)*, Utrecht, 203-212.
- Kehler, A. (2000) "Coherence and the Resolution of Ellipsis", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23:6, 533-575.
- Webber, B. L. (1978) *A Formal Approach to Discourse Anaphora*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.

4.

Winfried Lechner - University of Tübingen *Negative islands in comparatives*

winfried.lechner@uni-tuebingen.de

It has been known at least since Lees 1961 that the *than*-clause of the comparative construction must not contain downward entailing operators such as negation:

- (1) a. Mary read more books than Bill read.
b. *Mary read more books than Bill didn't read.

Rullmann 1995 and von Stechow 1985 attribute the INNER ISLAND ('II') violation in (1b) (Ross 1980) to the assumption that the semantic composition rules do not yield a value for the *than*-clause. On their account, the *than*-clause denotes a set of degrees ((2a)) which is maximized. If negation intervenes, the set lacks a supremum, since it contains all degrees except the one which corresponds to the number of books Bill read:

- (2) a. ...[[than Bill read]] = max({d|Bill read d-many books})
b. ...[[than Bill didn't read]] = max({d|Bill didn't read d-many books})
= max($N^0 \setminus \{d|Bill \text{ read } d\text{-many books}\}$)

There is however a group of systematic exceptions to the negative island prohibition, indicating that the maximality account undergenerates. More specifically, II-violations are alleviated if the *than*-clause matches the matrix clause:

- (3) Mary read more books than she didn't read.

Intuitively, what appears to discriminate the PARALLEL COMPARATIVE in (3) from (1b) is the fact that the set denoted by the *than*-clause in (3) induces a pragmatic bi-partition on the domain of books (those books Mary read, and those she didn't read). The cardinality of these two sets can now be compared in a meaningful way.

Not all parallel comparatives license the obviation of II-effects. To begin with, alleviation of II-violations is not attested in parallel predicative comparatives ((4)), or in parallel attributive comparatives ((5)):

- (4) *Mary is taller than she isn't.
(5) *Mary read a longer book/longer books than she didn't read.

Moreover, II-violations persist in parallel amount comparatives with mass terms:

- (6) *Mary read more poetry than she didn't read.

It seems as if a bi-partition can be established only if the comparison relation operates on degrees that keep track of cardinality (as in *d-many books*), but not if these degrees measure

properties (*d-tall* in (4) and *d-long books* in (5)) or amounts (*d-much poetry* in (6)), i.e. degrees which cannot be (pragmatically) mapped to the individual count domain.

Finally, *less than*-comparatives equally fail to license exemptions to negative islands:

(7) *Mary read fewer books than she didn't read.

References

- Lees, R. B. (1961) "The English Comparative Construction", *Word* 17, 171-185.
Ross, J. (1980) "No Negatives in *Than*-Clauses, More Often Than Not", *Studies in Language* 4:1, 119-123.
Rullmann, H. (1995) *Maximality in the Semantics of Wh-Constructions*, doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts-Amherst.
von Stechow, A. (1984) "Comparing Semantic Theories of Comparison", *Journal of Semantics* 3, 1-77.

5.

Sky Lee - University of Wisconsin – Madison Telicity and VN-LV vs. VN-Acc-LV

slee16@students.wisc.edu

Miyagawa 1989 claims contra Grimshaw and Mester 1988 that there is a certain type of verbal noun (VN), i.e., unaccusative VNs, that does not allow the Japanese *VN-Acc-L[ight] V[erb]* construction.

- (1) a. **ya-ga mato-ni meichuu-o-shita.*
arrow-Nom target-at strike-Acc-did
'The arrow struck the target.'
b. *ya-ga mato-ni meichuu-shita.*
arrow-N target-at strike-did
'The arrow struck the target.'

To account for the ungrammaticality of (1a), where the unaccusative VN *meichuu* 'strike' is assigned accusative case by the LV *suru*, Miyagawa appeals to Burzio's (1986) generalization: a verb assigns an external theta-role iff it can assign case. The idea is that the LV in (1a) does not have an external theta-role to assign, due to the unaccusativity of its host VN *meichuu* 'strike', from which the LV receives theta-roles (cf. Grimshaw and Mester). In (1a), the LV assigns accusative case without assigning an external theta-role, violating Burzio's generalization. In contrast, (1b) is good, since the LV does not assign accusative case.

This snippet argues that the unaccusative analysis is insufficient to account for parallel Korean examples, and suggests a generalization.

Note the contrast between (2) with *activity* VNs and (3) with *accomplishment/achievement* VNs (cf. Vendler 1967):

- (2) a. *kongpwu-hata / kongpwu-lul-hata* 'study'
study-do study-Acc-do
b. *wuncen-hata / wuncen-ul-hata* 'drive'
drive-do drive-Acc-do
(3) a. *phakoy-hata / *?phakoy-lul-hata* 'destroy'
destruction-do destruction-Acc-do
b. *wanseng-hata / *?wanseng-ul-hata* 'complete'
completion-do completion-Acc-do

Focusing on the transitive VNs, we immediately see that the ungrammaticality in (3) cannot be attributed solely to Burzio's generalization. The Korean LV *hata* in (3) can have an external theta-role from the transitive VNs, which are not unaccusatives, by argument transfer. Therefore, the LV is allowed to assign accusative case, in accordance with Burzio's generalization. However, the examples are still unacceptable, comparing with (2). This contrast tells

us that activity VNs can, but accomplishment/achievement VNs cannot, be assigned accusative case by the LV *hata* in Korean.

Rather than a syntactic property like unaccusativity, a certain intrinsic semantic feature of VNs -- telicity -- appears to interact with the *VN-Acc-LV* construction. Interestingly, the *VN-Acc-LV* construction, unlike the *VN-LV* construction, forces a telic interpretation: it is clear in (4) that the entire event denoted by the *VN-Acc-LV* construction is bounded or temporally delimited. Given that in the ungrammatical cases (1a) and (3), which contain accomplishment/achievement VNs, we find an inherently telic VN together with the telic-oriented *VN-Acc-LV* construction, the ungrammaticality can perhaps be reduced to the semantic restriction that an eventuality may have only one delimitation (Tenny 1987, Simpson 1983, Levin & Rappaport 1995).

- (4) a. John-i hansikan-tongan/?*nayey ku cha-lul wuncen-hayssta. (atelic reading)
 John-Nom an hour-for/in the car-Acc drive-did
 ‘John drove the car for/*?in an hour.’
- b. John-i hansikan-nayey ku cha-lul wuncen-ul-hayssta. (telic reading)
 John-Nom an hour-in the car-Acc drive-Acc-did
 ‘John came to be able to drive the car in an hour.’
- c. John-i hansikan-tongan ku cha-lul wuncen-ul-hayssta.
 (repetition reading: semelfactive)
 John-Nom an hour-for the car-Acc drive-Acc-did
 ‘John drove the car repeatedly for an hour.’

References

- Burzio, L. (1986) *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*, Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Grimshaw, J. and A. Mester. (1988) “Light verbs and theta-marking”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 205-232.
- Levin, B. and M. Rappaport Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantic Interface*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Miyagawa, S. (1989) “Light verbs and the ergative hypothesis”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 659-668.
- Simpson, J. (1983) “Resultatives”, in B. Levin, M. Rappaport Hovav and A. Zaenen eds, *Papers in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.
- Tenny, C. (1987) *Grammaticalizing Aspect and Affectedness*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Vendler, Z. (1967) *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

6.

Hans-Christian Schmitz and Bernhard Schröder - University of Bonn On focus and VP-deletion

hcs@ikp.uni-bonn.de – bsh@ikp.uni-bonn.de

Kratzer (1991) discusses syntactic restrictions on the construction of focus alternatives in the sense of Rooth 1992. She presents an example with a focus in the antecedent of a deleted VP.

- (d0) Peter: “What a copy cat you are! You went to Block Island because I did. You went to Elk Lake Lodge because I did. And you went to Tanglewood because I did.”
Jane: “I only went to TANGLEWOOD because you did.”

By reconstructing the deleted VP, Jane’s objection becomes “I only went to TANGLEWOOD because you went to TANGLEWOOD.” For this sentence standard alternative semantics allows for the construction of an alternative set **A0** which comprises predicates like “went to Block Island because Peter went to Block Island” and “went to Block Island because Peter went to Tanglewood”, i.e. predicates of the form “went to x because Peter went to y”. Jane’s objection therefore excludes that she went to Tanglewood because Peter went to Block Island. Kratzer claims that this is not intended. The alternative set (**A1**) may only comprise predicates of the form “went to x because Peter went to x”. This restriction is due to syntactic, and not contextual reasons. In constructing an alternative set the focus in a formerly deleted VP must always be replaced by the same value as the corresponding focus in the antecedent VP. Kratzer’s view is widely accepted.

We did an experiment to test whether listeners always interpret utterances like Jane’s according to Kratzer’s hypothesis. We integrated a German analogue of Jane’s objection into two different German dialogues (d1,d2). As there is no VP-deletion in German, the German and English examples differ in their anaphoric means. The English example employs VP-deletion, the German ones pronominal anaphora. We placed the dialogues into a context where Peter went to Berlin (resp. Tanglewood), which inspired Jane, who then went to Dortmund (Block Island), Kiel (Elk Lake Lodge) and Berlin. After she came back, Peter went to Kiel and Dortmund, too.

- (d1) Peter: “Dich habe ich wohl zum Reisen angeregt. Du bist nach Berlin gefahren, weil ich nach Berlin gefahren bin. Du bist nach Kiel gefahren, weil ich nach Berlin gefahren bin. Und Du bist nach Dortmund gefahren, weil ich nach Berlin gefahren bin.”
(I inspired you. You went to Block Island because I went to Tanglewood. You went to Elk Lake Lodge because I went to Tanglewood. And you went to Tanglewood because I went to Tanglewood.)
Jane: “Nein, ich bin nur nach BERLIN gefahren, weil Du es gemacht hast.”
(I only went to TANGLEWOOD because you did.)
(d2) Peter: “Nachmacherin! Du bist nach Berlin gefahren, weil ich nach Berlin gefahren bin. Du bist nach Kiel gefahren, weil ich nach Kiel gefahren
-

bin. Und Du bist nach Dortmund gefahren, weil ich nach Dortmund gefahren bin.”

Jane: “Nein, ich bin nur nach BERLIN gefahren, weil Du es gemacht hast.”

(cf. d0)

We asked 23 test persons (tps) for (d1) and 24 tps for (d2) whether Jane was telling the truth. We further asked the tps to justify their answers by choosing possible reasons like “Jane went to Dortmund because Peter went to Berlin” or “Jane did not go to Dortmund because Peter went to Dortmund” from a list. From the answers we inferred which alternative sets the tps constructed in interpreting Jane's objection.

The majority (61%) of the tps for (d1) judged Jane's objection as false. The majority (67%) of the tps for (d2) judged her answer as true. According to the Fisher-test there is a marginally significant dependency of the tendency to judge Jane's objection as true on the dialogue context (p-value = 0.08198). This result together with the reasons given by the tps shows that most recipients of (d1) construct an alternative set **A2** which comprises predicates of the form “went to x because Peter went to Berlin (*Tanglewood*)”. **A2** is different from **A1**, both **A1** and **A2** are subsets of **A0**.

Tendencies of the interpretation of Jane's objection are dependent on the discourse context. We conjecture that this context dependency would be similar for the English examples in spite of the aforementioned linguistic difference. We expect a similar test with native English speakers to show that most recipients of (d1) construct an alternative set (**A2**) not compatible with Kratzer's hypothesis.

References

- Kratzer, A. (1991) “The Representation of Focus”, in A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich eds, *Semantics. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, de Gruyter, Berlin/ New York, 831-834.
- Rooth, M. (1992) “A Theory of Focus Interpretation”, *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75-116.

7.

Ed Zoerner - California State University – Dominguez Hills

Brian Agbayani - California State University - Fresno

A pseudogapping asymmetry

ezoerner@csudh.edu – bagbayan@csufresno.edu

Pseudogapping (PG) involves apparent verb deletion under identity, leaving a tensed auxiliary as a left remnant and usually a complement NP as a right remnant.

- (1) a. Robin can speak French, but she can't ~~speak~~ Italian
b. I admire Terry more than I do ~~admire~~ Dana

Levin (1979) analyzes PG as verb deletion under identity. Lasnik (1995, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c) offers an analysis of PG as overt raising of an NP complement to [Spec, Agr-oP] and subsequent Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE). Under this view, the PG structure of (1a) is derived as in (2):

- (2) [TP she can't [AGR-OP Italian [VP ~~speak~~-t]]]

With this account, Lasnik argues that non-NP remnants such as APs are sub-optimal.

- (3) *You probably just feel relieved, but I do ~~feel~~ jubilant. (Lasnik 1999b: 142)

However, according to Levin, PG improves if the subjects of the two clauses corefer and there is a polarity contrast, or the gap appears in a comparative. Contrast (4) (our example) with (3):

- (4) I don't feel jubilant, but I do ~~feel~~ relieved

We find that any selected complement can appear as a right remnant under these conditions.

- (5) a. I can depend on Merle, but I can't ~~depend~~ [PP on Sandy]
b. Kim wouldn't behave nobly, but she would ~~behave~~ [ADVP wisely]
c. I would say that Dana is misguided more than I would ~~say~~ [CP that she's wrong]

Moreover, this suggests (as Lasnik claims, but for other reasons) that the raising to [Spec, Agr-oP] is motivated to satisfy the EPP, independent of Case.

However, PG fails with copular *be*, a fact which appears problematic for this analysis.

- (6) a. *Robin won't be a doctor, but she will ~~be~~ [NP a lawyer]
b. *Kim shouldn't be at the park, but she should ~~be~~ [PP at the library]
c. *Dana has been angry more than she has ~~been~~ [AP sad]
d. *The reason for her success won't be that she's lucky, but it will ~~be~~

[_{CP} that she works so hard]

This asymmetry does not follow from Lasnik's analysis, since sentences involving *be* arguably contain Agr-o:

(7) The students are phonologists/*a phonologist

Such agreement facts suggest that the complement NP has raised to Agr. However, the raised element cannot serve as a right-remnant in PG:

(8) *The students won't be syntacticians, but they will ~~be~~ phonologists

By a natural extension of Lasnik's hypothesis, the presence of the AgrP in *be* sentences should allow overt raising of the remnant. The nonexistence of *be*-PGs is thus surprising.

Constraints on VPE also do not capture the asymmetry, since *be*-sentences readily undergo VPE:

(9) Robin will be a millionaire by this time tomorrow, and Kim will ~~be a millionaire by this time tomorrow~~ too

Since *be*-sentences do show overt raising to Agr-o and do allow for VPE, Lasnik's analysis of PG, which involves precisely these two phenomena, cannot predict the non-existence of PG with *be*. Without a natural principle or filter to exclude *be*-PGs, we may need to consider an alternative analysis of PG altogether.

References

- Lasnik, H. (1995). "A Note on Pseudogapping.", in MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 27: Papers on Minimalist Syntax, 143-63.
- Lasnik, H. (1999a) "Subjects, Objects and the EPP", presented at the 1999 LSA Linguistic Institute Workshop on the Role of Grammatical Functions in Transformational Syntax.
- Lasnik, H. (1999b) "On Feature Strength: Three Minimalist Approaches to Overt Movement.", *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 197-217.
- Lasnik, H. (1999c) "Pseudogapping puzzles", in S. Lappin and E. Benmamoun eds, *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*, Oxford University Press, New York, 141-74.
- Levin, N. (1979) *Main verb ellipsis in spoken English*, doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University. (Published 1986 by Garland Press, New York.)