[REVIEW]

Pseudogapping and Ellipsis

By Kirsten Gengel, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013, xiv+185pp.

TAICHI NAKAMURA
*University of Fukui**

Keywords: *pseudogapping, ellipsis, focus, movement*

1. Introduction

The monograph under review, entitled *Pseudogapping and Ellipsis*, is a revised version of the author's dissertation submitted to the Universität Stuttgart, Germany. As the title suggests, the author boldly attempts to investigate and analyze ellipsis phenomena in general building on the findings of the analysis of Pseudogapping from the generative perspective. Thus, it not only contains a wide variety of Pseudogapping data, including hitherto unnoticed phenomena gathered from languages other than English (Chapter 2), and a concise but critical overview of the previous analyses (Chapters 3–5) but also explicates and gives new insights to the mechanisms underlying Pseudogapping and other ellipsis phenomena (Chapters 6–8). This review is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes the main points of each chapter. Section 3 makes a brief evaluation of the monograph.

2. Summary

The monograph is divided into 4 Parts: Introduction (Part I), Movement (Part II), Deletion (Part III) and A Uniform Account of Ellipsis (Part IV). Accordingly, my chapter summary is divided into 4 subsections.

* I am indebted to two anonymous *EL* reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. This study is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B), No. 15K16771 from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. All remaining errors and inadequacies are my own.

2.1. Part I. Introduction: Chapters 1–3

Chapter 1 sets the stage for and gives an overview of the research developed in the monograph. Chapter 2 then gives concise illustrations of Pseudogapping through its comparison with other ellipsis phenomena including VP-Ellipsis, Gapping, Sluicing and NP-Ellipsis, with special attention paid to the syntactic and semantic properties of ellipsis remnants. Moreover, some novel cross-linguistic examples are introduced, ranging from Scandinavian languages, European and Brazilian Portuguese, to French, though no analysis is attempted for them. Chapter 3 then reviews previous approaches of Pseudogapping. As an advocate of the VP-Ellipsis approach, the author assumes that pseudogapped remnants undergo movement and vacate VP before VP-Ellipsis applies, as shown in (1).

- (1) John invited Sarah, and Mary did [_{XP} Jane X [_{VP} ~~invite~~ *t*_{Jane}]].
-

The author then asks what type of movement pseudogapped remnants undergo, the main issue to be addressed in Part 2. Brief summaries are thus made of the A movement approach proposed in, for example, Lasnik (1995), the A-bar movement approach, including Jayaseelan's (1990) Heavy NP Shift account and his subsequent focus movement account (2001), and also Takahashi's (2004) eclectic account that utilizes both A and (rightward) A-bar movement. The chapter also includes a brief review of the alternative, the Gapping approach for Pseudogapping put forth in Zoerner and Agbayani (2000) and Agbayani and Zoerner (2004).

2.2. Part II. Movement: Chapters 4–5

Chapters 4 and 5 are devoted to thorough and critical examinations of the A and/or A-bar movement analyses.

In Chapter 4, the author first takes up Lasnik's (1995, among others) A movement analysis and discusses its theoretical and empirical problems. Given for independent reasons that object expressions undergo A movement and land at a position higher than VP adjuncts in English, as shown in (2), it seems to be not only plausible but also economical to derive pseudogapped remnants through the same A movement.

- (2) a. The DA accused two men_i during each other_i's trials.
(Lasnik (2001: 104))

- b. [... [_{XP} Obj X [_{VP} [_{VP} V *t*_{Obj}] Adj]]]
-

While Lasnik identifies the landing site of the A movement with Agr_oP and its driving force as the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) feature, the cur-

rent theory dispenses with Agr projections and also allows an EPP feature or an edge feature to drive A-bar movement as well as A movement (see Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2008, among others)).¹ Moreover, it is noted that Lasnik's analysis cannot account for the fact that pseudogapped remnants must receive contrastive focus, as shown in (3), where contrastively focused materials are in small capitals.

(3) John invited Jane, and Jill did *SUSAN*/*her/HER. (p. 54, (40))

The author also adds another empirical consideration that Takahashi (2004) has noted. As far as the example in (4) is grammatical (contrary to Lasnik's judgment), the direct object remnant should not be produced by A movement.

(4) Although he wouldn't give Bill the book, he would the paper.
(Takahashi (2004: 572))

(5)?*A letter was sent Mary. (Larson (1988: 362))

As shown in (5), a direct object cannot be passivized over an indirect object. Nonetheless, a direct object can be a pseudogapped remnant as in (4). This means that the direct object remnant is not produced by A movement. Thus, the author concludes that the EPP-based, A movement account is theoretically and empirically undesirable. The author then briefly discusses several pieces of what at first appears to be evidence for the A movement approach but they are shown in the first part of Chapter 5 to be dubious or are otherwise accommodated for under the A-bar movement approach: binding effects, parasitic gap licensing, licensing of control infinitives as remnants.²

¹ It is also pointed out that it is left unaccounted for why the A movement of object expressions is optional in contrast to the obligatory A movement of subject expressions.

² For example, Baltin (2003: 241) pointed out that an anaphor cannot have an antecedent within a pseudogapped VP when the former is contained within the pseudogapped remnant, as shown in (i).

- (i) a. Although I wouldn't introduce them to Tom and Sally, I would those people to each other.
- b. *Although I wouldn't introduce them to Tom and Sally, I would to each other.

Given that binding of reciprocals is licensed between A positions, the contrast indicates that the direct and indirect object remnants in (ia) occupy an A position, which then means that they undergo A movement. However, the author casts doubt on this argument giving the following example, cited from Baltin (2000: 16):

- (ii) *Although they don't like Tom and Sally, they do each other.

Since the subject *they* in the main clause occupies an A position, we would wrongly predict that it should be able to bind the remnant reciprocal, contrary to fact. Then, we

Much of the discussion in Chapter 5 is then devoted to the A-bar movement approach. First, the author gives a brief discussion of Jayaseelan's (1990) Heavy NP Shift analysis of pseudogapped remnants but accepts Lasnik's (1995, among others) refutation of this analysis, pointing out asymmetries in the distribution of pseudogapped remnants and shifted NPs (section 2). Then, the author goes on to adopt a focus movement approach (section 3). First, the author gives a cross-linguistic overview of focus movement phenomena within the verbal domain and their analyses in the literature.³ Second, the author rebuts Takahashi's (2004) eclectic approach by pointing out that pseudogapped remnants are always contrastively focused regardless of their functions or whether they are DPs or PPs, in addition to expressing the desirability of pursuing a simpler approach.⁴ Then, the author illustrates how focus movement derives pseudogapped remnants, building on Jayaseelan's (2001) analysis of focus movement. The derivation is given in (6), where focus movement is indicated by an arrow.

- (6) [_{TP} Mary T [_{FocP} Jane Foc [_{vP} *t*_{Mary} ν [_{VP} V *t*_{Jane}]]]]
- ↑

The pseudogapped remnant *Jane* undergoes focus movement and lands at Spec-FocP under the assumption that *vP* is the target of the deletion.⁵ In this way, the pseudogapped remnant is derived.

2.3. Part III. Deletion: Chapters 6–7

Part III discusses the semantics and syntax of focus and ellipsis, on which

have to assume that the remnant reciprocal occupies an A-bar position. Thus, Baltin's argument seems to be dubious. To account for the fact that pseudogapped remnants do not license parasitic gaps, the author also suggests that those remnants first undergo A movement before A-bar movement. If parasitic licensing is evaluated at this A movement step, then the inability of pseudogapped remnants to license parasitic gaps is accounted for. For further discussion, I would like to refer the interested reader to Sections 5.1 and 5.3.2.4 of the monograph.

³ It also invalidates the possibility that ellipsis yields a focus effect on its remnant rather than movement (see Baltin (2000, 2003) among others).

⁴ Under Takahashi's (2004) eclectic approach, where A movement and A-bar movement are both utilized to derive pseudogapped remnants, A movement is likened to a Scandinavian type of Object Shift. Thus, while the prepositional remnant is derived through A-bar movement, since, as is well known, Scandinavian Object Shift cannot apply to prepositional phrases, the nominal remnant is, in principle, derived through either movement (see Thráinsson (2001) among others).

⁵ The derivation does not hinge on any specific theory of phases. Thus, Spec-FocP will be replaced with the outer specifier of *vP* in the author's analysis.

basis the author proposes the focus movement analysis of Pseudogapping, extending this analysis to other ellipsis phenomena in Part IV.

Chapter 6 begins with the review of Rooth's (1992a, among others) *in-situ* approach for focus based on F(ocus)-marking and the alternative semantics, where every expression receives an ordinary denotation and a focus semantic denotation (induced by F-marking), the latter being the set of alternatives from which the former is chosen (section 6.1). The author adopts Kratzer's (1991) modified version of the approach in terms of F(ocus)-indexing, and further refines it so as to deal with the non-identity or contrastiveness involved in Pseudogapping, as well as the identity in VP-Ellipsis: if two elements receive different F-indexes, they are not identical and contrastive; if two elements receive the same F-index, they are identical (section 6.2). Assuming further with Kratzer (1991) that F-indexing applies in syntax, the author proposes that only expressions that receive different F-indexes undergo F-marking (section 6.3). Then, the author argues that F-indexing contributes to the process of focus movement and deletion: no expressions can undergo deletion if they contain differently F-indexed and thus F-marked elements; F-marked elements must escape the deletion sites in advance via focus movement.⁶

To formalize this contribution, the author first proposes a focus condition on deletion, building on especially Rooth's (1992b) approach for ellipsis, where semantic identity is assumed to hold between larger phrases containing the deletion target and its corresponding antecedent expression, in addition to syntactic identity between the target and the antecedent expression themselves (sections 6.4–6.8), the reason for which will be discussed in section 3 of this review. The focus condition is given in (7), where the subscripts A and E indicate the antecedent sentence and the elided sentence, respectively, in an ellipsis configuration, and $\|\alpha\|^o$ and $\|\alpha\|^f$ stand for the ordinary and focus semantic denotations of α , respectively.

(7) Focus Condition on Ellipsis

A constituent α in XP_E can be deleted only if there is an XP_A , where

- (i) $\|XP_A\|^o$ either is or implies an element of $\|XP_E\|^f$, and
- (ii) $\|XP_E\|^o$ either is or implies an element of $\|XP_A\|^f$.

⁶ Thus, as shown in (i), the contrastively focused expression does not undergo focus movement in the antecedent sentence, which does not involve deletion.

(i) John invited [Bill]_F more often than Bill did [him]_F. (p. 108, (29))

Note here that a mutual implication relation also licenses deletion, which will be taken up in section 3 of this review.

In Chapter 7, the author then proposes a general deletion mechanism that incorporates the Focus Condition on Ellipsis, building on Merchant's (2001) E-feature-based analysis. The syntax, phonology, and semantics of the E-feature are defined as follows:

- (8) a. The syntax and phonology of the E-feature
 $XP \rightarrow \emptyset / [_{YP} \dots Y_{[E]} _]$
 b. The semantics of the E-feature
 $\|E\| = \lambda p : p \text{ satisfies the Focus Condition on Ellipsis. } p$
 and $\neg \exists \gamma \in \|XP_A\|^f \text{ in the domain of } Y_{[E]}.$ ⁷

The E-feature gives to the phonological component an instruction not to parse the complement of the head bearing the feature, and to the semantic component, an instruction not to map the propositions constructed compositionally with the deleted parts if they disobey the Focus Condition on Ellipsis and/or contain a contrasting material γ in their deleted parts.

2.4. Part IV. A Uniform Account of Ellipsis

The final part of this monograph provides a uniform account of various elliptical structures, based on the interaction of the E-feature and focus movement. The derivations of Pseudogapping and VP-Ellipsis are schematically illustrated in (9), where *EA* stands for an external argument and $[E]$, the E-feature, and $[Foc]$, (being) F-marked. Note here that the author pursues the phase-based uniform analysis, contra Johnson (2004) and Merchant (2013, among others), where the “height” of the ellipsis is different between Pseudogapping and VP-Ellipsis.

⁷ In Pseudogapping, for example, the deleted part does not denote a proposition. The Focus Condition on Ellipsis would thus be never satisfied. Moreover, $\|XP_A\|^f$ is, by definition, a set of alternative propositions. Then, the second requirement would always be satisfied vacuously. The semantics of the E-feature should thus be rephrased. See section 3 of this review.

The E-feature located on ν licenses the deletion of VP in both cases. The only difference is that a contrastively focused material is contained in VP and, due to the semantics of the E-feature, it is extracted from the VP in (9a). The former derivation accounts for Pseudogapping and the latter, for VP-Ellipsis. In this way, the author links focus movement and deletion with the aid of the E-feature.

The author then extends the derivation of Pseudogapping to other ellipsis phenomena, including Sluicing, Fragment Answers, Gapping, and NP-Ellipsis. Assuming with Merchant (2001, among others) that *wh*-remnants and fragment answers are contrasted and focused in Sluicing and Fragment Answers, it is suggested that they occupy the Focus Phrase of the Rizzi (1997) style CP cartography through focus movement and the E-feature on the Focus head licenses the deletion of the complement TP layer. Rather controversially, the author further suggests that Gapping is also derived through TP-Ellipsis, based on the fact that gapped remnants assume contrasts. As in the cases of Pseudogapping and VP-Ellipsis, the phase-based uniform analysis is now maintained for the clausal domain. Finally, the author offers an account of NP-Ellipsis, completing full uniformity among verbal, clausal, and nominal phases. In this way, the author finally provides a uniform account of various elliptical structures.

3. Brief Evaluation

Due to space limitations, I can only give a very brief evaluation of the present monograph by pointing out two important contributions that it offers to the general theory of ellipsis and also potential problems.

One of the outstanding characteristics of the monograph is that the author takes an alternative approach to Merchant's (2001) E-Givenness approach for the semantics of the E-feature, given in (10).⁸

(10) E-Givenness

An expression E counts as e-Given iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo $\exists$ -type shifting,

(i) A entails $F\text{-clo}(E)$, and

(ii) E entails $F\text{-clo}(A)$. (Merchant (2001: 26))

(11) F-closure

The F-closure of α , written $F\text{-clo}(\alpha)$, is the result of replacing F-

⁸ But see note 7 of this review.

marked parts of α with $\exists$ -bound variable of the appropriate type (modulo $\exists$ -type shifting). (Merchant (2001: 14))

The reason is as follows. According to Schwarzschild's (1999) definition of Givenness, on which E-Givenness and F-closure are based, non F-marked elements are given and F-marked elements are not given. Hence, F-closure cannot apply to the antecedent and the elided sentences in (12) and it would wrongly result in the failure to satisfy E-Givenness and thus undergo deletion.

- (12) 'Gerard *Logan!*' The tall dog-walker, astounded, bending to look at me, knew me by sight, as I did him. (p. 122, (82))

Although the pronouns *me* and *him* are contrasted, we would have to treat them as given. The author successfully avoids the same problem, adapting Kratzer's F-indexing mechanism and Rooth's approach for ellipsis. As we have already seen, F-marking is superseded by F-indexing, which encodes the presence of contrast. Thus, the F-marking of the contrasted pronouns is licensed. Now, the focus and ordinary values of the antecedent and elided sentences satisfy the Focus Condition on Ellipsis in (7) and the sentence is correctly ruled in.⁹

Another curious point is that the Focus Condition on Ellipsis in (7) permits deletion even if just a mutual implication relation holds between the antecedent and elided sentences. Though the author does not point this out, this might also account for what Fox (2000) calls Indirect Parallelism cases of VP-Ellipsis.¹⁰ Let us consider the following example.

- (13) Mary admires every teacher, and some boy does <admire every teacher>, too. (Fox (2000: 79))

If Scope Parallelism had to hold directly, the inverse scope reading of the elided sentence would be blocked. As has been well known as Scope Economy since Fox (2000), Quantifier Raising is prohibited from applying when it has no semantic effect. Thus, the antecedent sentence only has the surface-scope reading. The same surface-scope relation would be required

⁹ The author gives another argument against E-Givenness, based on the sensitivity of VP-Ellipsis to voice alternation mismatches and argument alternation mismatches. According to Merchant (2013, among others), VP-Ellipsis is insensitive to the former but is sensitive to the latter. Assuming that both alternations affect truth conditions and thus entailment relations, the author argues that VP-Ellipsis should also be sensitive to voice alternation mismatches. However, Merchant explicitly stated that voice alternations do not affect truth conditions. Thus, the argument is less conclusive.

¹⁰ See also Ha (2006) and references therein for related discussions.

for the elided sentence. As Fox (2000) pointed out, however, the inverse scope reading is also available. Fox then argued that it is so predicted if we allow Scope Parallelism to hold indirectly through implication. Since the antecedent sentence implies the proposition that for every teacher there is a girl who admires him (namely, Mary) and its scope relation is structurally isomorphic to the one that we assign to the inverse-scope reading of the elided sentence, the elided sentence in (13) can have the inverse-scope reading.

While this study offers these important contributions, it also has several ramifications. First, the author complicates the semantics of the E-feature by incorporating the requirement that F-marked elements escape deletion sites (see also note 7 of this review). The requirement might, on the other hand, be simply attributable to a general condition on ellipsis such as Recoverability (see Chomsky (1965)). Second, it is not clear whether the author successfully extends the derivation of Pseudogapping to Gapping. The author assumes that TP coordination and TP deletion are involved in Gapping. Thus, the contrastive remnants are evacuated from the elided TP and land at the left peripheral positions (Rizzi's (1997) TopP and FocP). However, this would result in the remnants preceding the antecedent sentence because the left peripheral positions must layer above the coordinated TP structure. The author does not say anything as to how the correct word order is finally derived, even though the author uses the same logic to argue against the analysis of Gapping involving vP coordination and vP deletion. It is also unclear how the E-feature licenses the deletion of the second TP conjunct. Lastly, note that what the author identifies as NP-Ellipsis might not involve ellipsis at all but rather *one* substitution (see Baker (1978), among others). The author's example is given in (14).

(14) I saw a BLACK one yesterday. (p. 167, (68))

In these respects, the study deserves further investigation.

In sum, in spite of these shortcomings, the general theory of ellipsis the author attempts to develop not only provides a theoretically desirable, uniform account of ellipsis phenomena but also achieves greater descriptive adequacy.

4. Conclusion

In the end, the main contribution of the monograph is that the author reveals what mechanisms are involved to produce various elliptical phenomena by investigating the interaction between focus and ellipsis observed in

Pseudogapping. The findings should be taken into consideration by any researcher working on ellipsis.

REFERENCES

- Agbayani, Brian and Edward Zoerner (2004) "Gapping, Pseudogapping and Sideward Movement," *Studia Linguistica* 58, 185–211.
- Baker, Carl L. (1978) *Introduction to Generative-Transformational Syntax*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Baltin, Mark (2000) "Implications of Pseudo-Gapping for Binding and the Representation of Information Structure," ms., New York University.
- Baltin, Mark (2003) "The Interaction of Ellipsis and Binding: Implications for the Sequencing of Principle A," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21, 215–246.
- Chomsky, Noam (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, Noam (2000) "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework," *Step by Step: Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by Roger Martin, David Michaels, Juan Uriagereka and Samuel Jay Keyser, 89–155, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, Noam (2008) "On Phases," *Foundational Issues in Linguistics Theory*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta, 133–166, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Fox, Danny (2000) *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Ha, Seungwan (2007) "An Entailment Account of Scope Parallelism," *The Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics* 17, 158–169.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. (1990) "Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping," *Linguistic Analysis* 20, 64–81.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. (2001) "IP-Internal Topic and Focus Phrases," *Studia Linguistica* 55, 39–75.
- Johnson, Kyle (2004) "How to be Quiet," *CLS* 40, 1–20.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1991) "The Representation of Focus," *Semantik/Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, ed. by Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich, 804–825, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Larson, Richard K. (1988) "On the Double Object Construction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335–391.
- Lasnik, Howard (1995) "A Note on Pseudogapping," *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 27, 143–163.
- Lasnik, Howard (2001) "Subjects, Objects, and the EPP," *Objects and Other Subjects: Grammatical Functions, Functional Categories, and Configurationality*,

- ed. by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 103–121, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Merchant, Jason (2001) *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands and the Theory of Ellipsis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Merchant, Jason (2013) “Voice and Ellipsis,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 44, 77–108.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery,” *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, ed. by Lilian Haegeman, 281–337, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Rooth, Mats (1992a) “A Theory of Focus Interpretation,” *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Rooth, Mats (1992b) “Ellipsis Redundancy and Reduction Redundancy,” *Proceedings of the Stuttgart Workshop* 29, 1–26.
- Schwarzschild, Roger (1999) “Givenness, AvoidF and Other Constraints on the Placement of Accent,” *Natural Language Semantics* 7, 141–177.
- Takahashi, Shoichi (2004) “Pseudogapping and Cyclic Linearization,” *NELS* 34, 571–585.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur (2001) “Object Shift and Scrambling,” *A Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 148–202, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Zoerner, Edward and Brian Agbayani (2000) “Unifying Left-Peripheral Deletion, Gapping and Pseudogapping,” *CLS* 26, 549–561.

[received December 10, 2015, revised and accepted June 17, 2016]

Faculty of Education
University of Fukui
3–9–1 Bunkyo, Fukui,
Fukui 910–8507
e-mail: t-nakamr@f-edu.u-fukui.ac.jp