Overt movement triggered by Givenness and Alternatives – evidence from ellipsis

I. Antecedent Contained Deletion

English ACD is restricted to verb phrase ellipsis.

1. I will visit [dp every city[cp that you will visit]]

This is not the case for Polish (Szczegielniak 2005), or Hungarian (Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006) (C&L)

2. Ja będę odwiedzał [dp każde miasto[cp co ty I will visit every city that you będziesz odwiedzał]] will visit 'I will visit every city that you will'

3. Kornél azt a lányt hívta meg, akit Zoltánn. Kornél that-acc the girl-acc invited pv rel-who-acc Zoltán 'The girl who Kornél invited was the one who Zoltán did'

Why the difference between English and Polish/Hungarian?

C&L argue that this is because Hungarian has non-wh remnant sluicing:

4. János meghívott valakit és azt hiszem, hogy Bélát János pv-invited someone-acc and that-acc think that Béla-acc 'János invited someone and I think it was Béla whom he invited.'

The proposal in C&L is that if (4) is possible, then so is (3). Polish is more or less like Hungarian:

?5. Janek zaprosił kogoś i myślę że Jurka Janek invited someone and think that Jurka 'Janek invited someone and I think it was Jurek whom he invited'

This accounts for English, where the equivalent of (4) is out:

*6. John invited someone and I think that Bella it was who he invited

and thus equivalent of (3) is out too:

*7. John invited the girl that Susan invited

This could be due to many factors, IP deletion being restricted to wh-remnants, interaction with do-support.

The proposal is that Polish and Hungarian has the right combination of Givenness movement and/or overt Focus marking movement to allow 2,3, whereas English does not.

II. Givenness in the Syntax

Kučerova (2012) argues that Slavic has overt movement in order to accommodate the order constituents to Thematic Structure.

8. G-operator Kučerova (2012:5) A. Marks a point in the structure above which everything is given.

B. Applies recursively (by Functional Application; Heim and Kratzer 1998) and, as long as its sister is of an admissible semantic type

C. It freely propagates upwards, thus enforcing the structure to be divided between a given and a new part.
Givenness <-> Presupposition

An element is given only if it is presupposed (Sauerland 2005), while new elements cannot be presupposed.

If you can presuppose – you must:
Maximize Presupposition (after Heim 1991)
In context C use the most informative presupposition satisfied in C.
The proposal in Kučerova (2012:19) is that the operator is defined syncategorematically as in (62)
A and B are syntactic sisters and G applies to the combination of the meaning of B and the meaning of A whose meanings are combined by the rule of functional application:

9. \( G \)-operator:
\[
G([B]) = \begin{cases} 
\lambda A : Given([A]).G([B][[A]]) & B \text{ is of type } <\alpha, \beta> \text{ for some type } <\xi, \eta> \text{ other than } <s,t> \\
[B] & \text{for } B \text{ of type } <s,t>
\end{cases}
\]

Elements in the scope of G are marked as given via sisterhood and function application. It applies upwards until it terminates at type \(<s,t>=\text{proposition}>\).

The implication of this proposal is that what appear to be non-constituents can be marked as given Kučerova (2012:21).

10. a. What did Marie give to Pavel?
    b. Marie dala Pavlovi a nějakému cizímu chlapci knihu.
       ‘Marie gave Pavel and some other boy a book.’

11.a

(69)
III. Givenness movement

If we want just the object to be given in an SVO construction it has to be moved, or both S and V are also given = presupposed giving rise to presupposition failure.

   In context C use the most informative presupposition satisfied in C.

   The reference set toward which Maximize presupposition is evaluated, consists of all derivations that
   a. are based on the same numeration and free insertion of a G-operator, and
   b. make the same assertion.

*13. Only the object is given (S V || O):

The Object has to overtly raise above the Subject and verb in order for the correct placement of G-operator:

14.

The nature of this movement is unclear. It has to be overt. But not feature driven p-movement like in Zubizaretta (1996).

IV. Island sensitivity

15. DP coordination under a propositional type:

Examples from Czech Kučerova (2012):
16. **Coordinated DP adjoined to an atomic semantic type:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context:</th>
<th>Na programu była dyskusja o nové učitelce. on program was discussion about new teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Učitel’ka a (její) žáky to překvapilo. Teacher and her students it surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Nºžáky a učitel’ku to překvapilo. Nº students and teacher it surprised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same holds for Polish

17. a. Nauczycielkę i uczniów to zaskoczylo teacher and pupils it surprised

b. Uczniów i nauczycielkę to zaskoczyło students and teacher it surprised

**V. Polish OVS (Wiland 2009)**

18. a. Jan kocha Marię. (canonical SVO)

    Jan-NOM loves Mary-ACC
    `Jan loves Mary.'

b. Marię kocha Jan. (non-canonical OVS)

    Mary-ACC loves Jan-NOM
    `Jan loves Mary.'

Polish OVS no WCO effects (examples from Wiland 2009)

19. a. [Którego sąsiada], otruta jego, żona? (O_{wy},VS)

    Which neighbor-ACC poisoned his wife-NOM

b. ??[Którego sąsiada], jego, żona otruta? (O_{wy},SV)

    Which neighbor-ACC his wife-NOM poisoned

Weak Crossover should happen in both (19a) and (19b) since in both cases the object who has crossed over the pronoun 'his' embedded in the subject. This leads to WCO like in English:

?20 Who, does his, mother love t??

The proposal is that in Polish VP can raise to Spec T, with the subject in Spec-v.

21.

**VI. Ellipsis**

Following Merchant (2001) we assume ellipsis is sensitive to Givenness.

22. Definition of GIVEN, informal version Schwarzschild 1999 152:

    An utterance U counts as GIVEN iff it has a salient antecedent A and
    a. if U is type e, then A and U corefer;
    b. otherwise: modulo ∃-type shifting, A entails the Existential F-Closure of U.

23. F-closure (Schwarzschild 1999:151):

    Existential F-Closure of U =_{df} the result of replacing F-marked phrases in U with variables and existentially closing the result, modulo existential type shifting.

Derivation in Schwarzschild 1999:
see John has been used, see [MARY]₀ should count as GIVEN and hence the VP itself need not be F-marked:

24.

∃-type shifting of [see John] yields:  ∃y[y see John]
Replacing F-marked part of see [MARY]₀ with variable:
[see X]

∃-type shifting of [see X] yields:  ∃y[y see X]
∃-binding F-variables gives:  ∃X∃y[y see X]
∃y[y see John] ENTAILS  ∃X∃y[y see X]

24. Condition on ellipsis (built on Schwarzschild 1999)
Perlim:
α can be deleted only if α is or is contained in a constituent X that is given.

25. Derivation of VP raising to Spec-T and being given.
Note no need to have modulo Focus here:

The difference between Schwarzschild (1999) and Kučerova (2012) is that the latter does not assume that if not F-marked then Given since <G> terminates at <s,t>, CP is not F-marked and not deleted.

Relative Pronouns
Note (26) with a relative pronoun is bad:

*27. Ja będę odwiedzał [DP każde miasto]₁ [CP które ty będziesz odwiedzał₁]
will visit every city which you will'

Pronouns cannot undergo Givenness movement (Kučerova (2012:27) if a lexical entry of a gives rise to an existential presupposition, there is no need to introduce the presupposition by the G-operator as Maximize Presupposition is already satisfied. Pronouns never require to be marked by the G-operator, they should not undergo movement because of givenness.

28.a

The structure in (25) is the input for:

Polish relative clauses with 'co' = 'that' can have a resumptive:

29. Ja odwiedzić každe miasto co je Marek zna
I visit every city that Mark knows
'I visited every city that Mark knows'
But ellipsis does not allow a resumptive:

*30. \[ będźę odwiedzał [DP każde miasto, \[CP co je Marek I will visit every city that it Mark będziesz odwiedzał t₁ ] will visit 'I will visit every city which you will'

The claim is:
- Pronoun can be elided if pied piped in VP, via G-movement, but then it cannot raise out of VP.
- G operator will not trigger head movement – gapping is not ellipsis (Johnson 2011).

Prediction, if VP can be moved independently of pronoun ellipsis should be fine, relativizing an adjunct:

31. a. Ja zasne pod każdym mostem co pod nim Marek I fall asleep every bridge that under it Mark 'I fell asleep under every bridge that Mark did'
b. Ja zasne pod każdym mostem pod którym Marek I fall asleep every bridge under which Mark 'I fell asleep under every bridge under which Mark did'

Argument PP's not so good:

32. *a. Ja odpowiem na każdy temat co na go Marek I reply on every subject that on it Mark "I will reply to every subject that Mark will"b. ??a. Ja odpowiem na każdy temat na który Marek I reply on every subject on which Mark "I will reply to every subject on which Mark will"

VII. Focus
Contrast between rel pron. and complementizer disappears with overt Focus marking:

33.a będźę odwiedzał [DP każde miasto, \[CP co i ty I will visit every city that and you będziesz odwiedzał t₁ ] will visit 'I will visit every city that also you will'
b. będźę odwiedzał [DP każde miasto, \[CP które i ty I will visit every city which and you będziesz odwiedzał t₁ ] will visit 'I will visit every city which also you will'
i= meaning of also, but can occur with 'also'

34. będźę odwiedzał [DP każde miasto, \[CP co i ty również I will visit every city that and you also będziesz odwiedzał t₁ ] will visit 'I will visit every city that you will also'

Why does overt focus marking of the remnant subject make a difference?
Focus movement to Left Periphery?

35.

VIII. Conclusion
English has SU in Spec-T, no G-movement and no focus movement. Only Ellipsis at VP level possible, Polish also has:

34. Ja będę odwiedzał [DP każde miasto] [CP co/które ty]
    I will visit every city that/which
    będziesz odwiedzać]
    will visit
    ’I will visit every city that also you will’
- Overt G movement can account the contrast between 1 vs 2,
- Overt Focus movement can account for 1 vs 3, the facts in 33.
- No need for an E feature

IX. Ellipsis and Focus movement

Is there Focus movement in Ellipsis?
Wh-movement in sluicing is weird

A. Alleviates some islands

35. They hired a linguist who speaks some dialect, but I do not know which
    dialect they hired a linguist who speaks

B. Creates others (superiority, Stjepanović 2003)

36. a. Ko koga voli?
    who whom loves
    ‘Who loves whom?’
    b. Koga ko voli?

37. a. Neko voli nekog.
    somebody loves somebody
    ‘Somebody loves somebody.’
    b. Ko koga?
    who whom
    ‘Who (loves) whom?’
    c. *Koga ko?

C. Focus movement of wh in-situ (Farsi Toosarvandani 2008)

38. a. hads bezan [CP [TP rāmin chi xarid]].
    guess hit.2sg Ramin what bought.3sg
    ‘Guess what Ramin bought.’
    b. rāmin ye chiz-i xarid. hads bezan chi.
       Ramin one thing-IND bought.3sg guess hit.2sg what
       ‘Ramin bought something. Guess what.’

D. Lack of parasitic gaps in English pseudo-gapping (Baltin 2003)

*39 Although John didn't kiss MARY_i without looking at e_i, he did
    SALLY_j without looking at e_j.

But Ok in Dutch
40. dat John Marie, zonder e_i ann te kijken t_i gekust heeft.
    That John Mary without on to look kissed has
    "That John kissed Mary without looking at her"
41. Gengel (2007) Focus condition on ellipsis

A constituent α in XP_E can be deleted only if there is an XP_A, where
(i) ||XP_A|| either is or implies an element of ||XP_E||, and
(ii) ||XP_E|| either is or implies an element of ||XP_A||.

Intervention effects (Beck 2006)

42. General Minimality Effect:
The evaluation of alternatives introduced by an XP cannot skip an
intervening ~ operator.
*[Op1 …~C [/ …XP1 …]]

Generalization: A wh-phrase may not have a ~ operator as its
closest c-commanding potential binder.

Turkish (Beck 2006):
43.*a. Kimse kimi goormedi?
   anyone who-Acc see-Neg-Past?
   * whom did nobody see?
   b. Kimi kimse goormedi?
   who-Acc anyone see-Neg-Past
   * whom did nobody see?
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