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**Ellipsis**

**INTRODUCTION**

Ellipsis in linguistics refers to a construction whose phonological form is missing relative to the form that construction should have considering the meaning it denotes. Mismatch between form and meaning requires that meaning associated with the gap be somehow recoverable; in that sense, ellipsis differs from deletion, such as deletion of features. In general, ellipsis requires the missing Phonetic Form (PF) form to denote information that is given from a linguistic context. Thus, ellipsis is a form of marking givenness, which in turn can be argued to be a reflex of presuppositionality, and can be classified as a type of anaphora. Existence of presuppositions is a universal language trait, so it is not surprising that, as far as we know, there are no languages that lack ellipsis constructions altogether. However, there is cross-linguistic variability as to what can be elided, and what cannot be elided. This suggests that ellipsis interacts with modules of grammar that are sensitive to language variation. Two predominant schools of thought assume that either we have lexical variation as to what silent pro-forms languages can have, or we have a complex interaction of syntax, semantics, and prosody that generates different forms of ellipsis. The latter approach requires that, at some level of the grammar, there is an abstract enough representation of the ellipsis site so that it can be licensed as an anaphor that is associated with a clear antecedent in the linguistic signal. A lot of research has been devoted to establish the appropriate level at which the elided anaphor can be structurally identified with its antecedent. This research has raised many interesting questions about the nature of the syntax-semantics interface, as well as to the syntax-prosody interface, and the possible existence of a prosody-semantics interface. These include, among others, questions such as: (i) is there a fully-fledged
syntactic structure in the elided anaphor? (ii) what licenses ellipsis remnants: movement, focus, prosody, all the above? (iii) what are the identity conditions that need to hold between an elided anaphor and its linguistic antecedent? Attempts at answering these and other questions has led to some fruitful and exciting research that has impacted our understanding of how language works.

COMPILATIONS OF ARTICLES

There have been numerous complications compilations of articles in both book and journal form that aim to capture the diverse and rich field of ellipsis research. General compilations include Baltin 2014, Johnson 2008, and Lappin and Benmamoun 1999. More narrowly defined compilations include Kluck, et al. 2014, which focuses on parenthesis and ellipsis; Merchant and Simpson 2012, which deals with sluicing; Schwabe and Zhang 2015, which concentrates on ellipsis in conjunction; and Schwabe and Winkler 2003, where the topic is ellipsis licensing at the interfaces.

Baltin, Mark, ed. 2014. Structural approaches to ellipsis. *Lingua* 151. [class:journalArticle]

The volume is a compilation of papers from Linguistic Society of America’s Annual Meeting in 2011. It reflects the debates and questions on syntactic approaches to ellipsis.


This volume discusses to some key questions in the study of ellipsis: What characterizes ellipsis? Under what conditions is it possible? What kinds of meanings are allowed to go unspoken?

This volume addresses the interaction of parenthesis and ellipsis.


This volume discusses semantic and computational aspects of ellipsis.


This volume is dedicated to the analysis of sluicing in a range of languages from Europe, Asia, and Africa. This volume is dedicated to the analysis of the role of identity in licensing ellipsis.


This volume is dedicated to the analysis of sluicing in a range of languages from Europe, Asia, and Africa.


The volume explores the nature of ellipsis by examining the interfaces of syntax with semantics, phonology, and discourse.
The volume addresses issues of conjunction and ellipsis in both syntax and semantics.

**ELLIPSIS AS ANAPHORA**

Elided structures were given a structural treatment in Ross 1967 and most of the nomenclature comes from that dissertation. Not only were terms such as sluicing, and sprouting coined in this dissertation, but the work also introduces the reader to the first structural attempt at understanding elided constructions. Sag 1976 and Hankamer and Sag 1976 first proposed that Ellipsis ellipsis is a type of anaphora in the sense that an elided construction requires an antecedent. However, not every null anaphor is an instance of deletion. Both Sag 1976 and Hankamer and Sag 1976 argue for a distinction between deep and surface anaphora in order to narrow down what constitutes linguistically, as opposed to pragmatically, licensed ellipsis. Good examples of deep anaphora are definite personal pronouns, whereas ellipsis would be an instance of surface anaphora since it requires a linguistically salient antecedent, whereas a pronoun does not. This distinction has been challenged in Williams 1977, which argues that anaphora can have a unified syntactic account. The idea is further developed in Williams 1997 where it is assumed that the relationship between anaphors and antecedents in ellipsis is a Phonetic Form (PF) – Logical Form (LF) PF-LF one. Treating ellipsis as an anaphoric relationship raises the interesting question of how are other anaphors are treated when they are elided. Fiengo and May 1994 provides the reader with a first fully fledged approach to pronominal behavior in ellipsis sites. The idea is simple, but profound: pronominals are indexed and such indices are treated as variables, hence ambiguity in elided constructions.

This book tackles the issue of how anaphors obtain their denomination via indexing and provides an account of anaphor behavior in ellipsis constructions.


This paper develops the idea in Sag 1976 that ellipsis is an anaphoric relation that requires a linguistic antecedent.


This paper takes issue with the distinction between deep and surface anaphora developed in Sag 1976.

This paper proposes that anaphoric relations in ellipsis are determined by a Disanaphora law whose application is governed by the Blocking Principle.

**ELLIPSES AND INFORMATION STRUCTURE**

Information structure plays a crucial role in Ellipsis ellipsis licensing. Rooth 1992 and Schwarzschild 1999 argue that elided strings are given from a discourse point of view, whereas ellipsis remnants are focused, or contrasted, as Konietzko and Winkler 2010 and Winkler 2011 propose. There is debate as to how the mapping between information structure and phonology is executed. For example, Tancredi 1992 assumes the connection is direct, but Winkler 2011 and others have assumed that syntax plays a role, and both Rooth 1992 and Schwarzschild 1999 argue that semantics also plays a role. Both Schwarzschild 1999 and Merchant 2001 have proposed that the relationship between the ellipsis anaphor and antecedent is that of identity at information structure, with Merchant 2001 suggesting that the anaphor and antecedent mutually entail each other modulo focus. Finally, AnderBois 2014 argues that Merchant’s semantic homeomorphism condition on ellipsis is not sufficient for sluicing, and that a Question Under Discussion (QUD) approach to wh-questions in tandem with Merchant’s conditions provides the correct base for analyzing sluicing structures.


This paper proposes that sluicing is licensed by a connection between the remnant wh-word and issues introduced by existential quantification and disjunction as well as truth conditions of the antecedent.

The paper argues for a fine-grained information structure that encodes contrast in order to account for Contrastive Ellipsis.


The book develops a model of sluicing and ellipsis licensing based on mutually entailing E-Givenness based identity.


The paper introduces an Alternatives semantics approach to ellipsis licensing, where focus triggers an Alternatives semantics denotation allowing semantic isomorphism between the anaphor and antecedent, which accompanied with syntactic identity conditions allows for ellipsis.


The paper argues for a connection between Givenness, accent placement, and ellipsis that is based on domain- specific constraints operating in the syntax-interpretation interface.

This dissertation examines the effects of de-accenting—the removal of phonological accent from a constituent—on interpretation.

Berlin, and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. [class:book]

The book argues for a focus-based licensing account of ellipsis remnants.

**MAXELIDE AND PARALLELISM IN ELLIPSIS**

Rooth 1992 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*) proposes that ellipsis is a form of radical de-stressing but with stricter identity requirements. Givenness requires presuppositionality, but ellipsis requires some form of additional, more narrow than in de-accenting via givenness, identity between the anaphor and antecedent. A parallelism requirement between the anaphor and antecedent is argued by Potsdam 2007 to be derivable from Merchant 2001’s the mutual entailment condition of Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*). However, it is not clear if restrictions on the size of ellipsis can be purely derived from parallelism. Takahashi and Fox 2005 observes that ellipsis involving variable binding cannot apply to just a sub-portion of a de-stressed string;, instead, once triggered it needs to elide a maximal string. This predicts correctly that sluicing and vP ellipsis are in complementary distribution. Takahashi and Fox 2005 calls this condition MaxElide and it is assumed to be a primitive. However, Thoms 2014 and Messick and Thoms 2016 propose that it can ultimately be derived from parallelism requirement on ellipsis.


This paper argues that we can derive the effects of MaxElide! from parallelism conditions.

Based on data from Malagasy sluicing the paper argues that parallelism can be derived from semantic conditions such as mutual entailment.


This paper shows that ellipsis in re-binding contexts must apply to the largest possible constituent.


This squib based on data from Scottish Gaelic argues that MaxElide can be derived from parallelism requirements.

**DOES ELLIPSIS HAVE SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE?**

There is a debate as to the nature of the gap in ellipsis. It appears to carry meaning, but does it have syntactic structure? Sag 1976 (cited under *Ellipsis as Anaphora*), Williams 1977 (cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*), and Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*) assume an ellipsis anaphor does have internal syntax, and that what is elided is a constituent. In many cases, this implies some form of mechanism licensing evacuation of remnants (syntactic or post-syntactic) in order to remove them from a structure that is to be elided. For example, Merchant 2001 argues that an elided structure is semantically licensed via homeomorphism with the antecedent, but ellipsis has syntactic structure that manifests itself in connectivity effects such as case matching between the remnant
and the correlate. For example, sluicing requires connectivity of the wh-remnant in order for it to have the same case as the antecedent. The assumption is that the wh-expression receives case, and the wh-moves to CP before the IP is elided. Because case would have to be assigned by a structure that has undergone ellipsis, we need to assume that the remnant has undergone movement out of the ellipsis site that contains case-assigning syntactic structure. Chung 2013 provides support for such an approach by showing that we need syntactic identity conditions not only because of case, but also in order to account for argument structure identity between the remnant and the correlate. Further support for a syntactic structure in ellipsis also comes from research in Hartman 2011 where it is argued that traces in ellipsis structures have well-defined semantic properties. Fanselow and Cavar 2002 argues that these traces are actually copies of movement that can be pronounced in their base thus allowing for elided strings to have syntax without the need for evacuation movement of the remnant. In contrast, Lobeck 1995, Napoli 1985, and López 2000 argue that the ellipsis site does not have structure but is a phonetically null pro-form that gets its meaning by being indexed with the antecedent. One of the arguments for a pro-form approach is the fact that if remnant movement out of an ellipsis site would have to ignore movement constraints that apply outside of ellipsis contexts. In the sluicing example, a wh-remnant can raise out of a relative clause island in language where such constructions block regular wh-movement. In Craenenbroeck 2010, based on data in Dutch, it is suggested that ellipsis requires both derivations. It has to be noted, however, that Baltin 2011 criticizes the pro-form approach by pointing out that it also requires some form of ellipsis and thus is not really an alternative to deletion approaches.

This paper argues that the distinction between in ellipsis pro-forms and deleted PF structure is untenable based on data from English *do* since pro-forms require deletion as well.


This paper argues that sluicing requires, in addition to semantic identity, abstract case and argument structure identity licensed in overt syntax.


Based on data from Dutch this book argues that we need both a pro-from form and PF deletion analysis of ellipsis.


The paper argues that a copy and deletion approach to movement in ellipsis allows us to capture the fact that the lower copy can be pronounced in elided structures.

The article discusses the properties of traces in ellipsis and argues that traces always receive at LF a bound interpretation.


The book argues that ellipsis is licensed by a null pro-form licensed under Head Government.


This paper argues that ellipsis is a pro-form based on the distribution of Sluicingsluicing, NP-ellipsis and VP-ellipsis English, Italian and Spanish which have not been discussed within the generative tradition until now.


This paper argues that a pro-form analysis of a vP ellipsis site has significant advantages over the analysis which posits a deletion process over syntactic structure.

**THE NATURE OF SYNTACTIC LICENSING OF THE ELLIPSIS SITE**

On the assumption that ellipsis does involve deletion of Phonetic Form (PF) information in an otherwise well-formed syntactic structure, the question arises: what What is the syntactic mechanism, if any, of ellipsis licensing?. Chung, et al. 1995 proposes that, in the case of sluicing, syntax of the elided string is not built via regular structure-building operations present in non-ellipsis environments. Instead, structure within the ellipsis site comes from a copying operation that takes structural information within the Logical Form (LF) of the antecedent and copies it into the anaphor. There is syntax in ellipsis but it is a reconstructed copy of the LF of the
anaphor. Syntactic identity in ellipsis is thus achieved at LF by an ellipsis-specific reconstruction mechanism. However, other works, such as Williams 1977, have proposed that structure within the ellipsis site is built in the same fashion as structure in overt expressions, but there are special lexical markers in the structure in the form of diacritics. Aelbrecht 2010, following Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*), develops the idea of a dedicated syntactic feature for ellipsis, whereas Thoms 2015 argues for an approach where the positions of variables in the antecedent are what licenses ellipsis. Johnson 2008 proposes that ellipsis is licensed via syntactic and lexical identity. In the case of vP ellipsis, he argues that the elided site has structure and additional licensing restrictions come from topicalization of the VP. Szczegielniak 2005 extends this approach to antecedent-contained deletion constructions and demonstrates that ellipsis is sensitive to relative clause structure, which furthers the argument for syntactic licensing. Finally, Gengel 2008 argues that ellipsis is phase licensed, where PF deletion applies to the complement of a phase head, and Bošković 2014 extends this analysis to include the phase head itself.


This book discusses ellipsis in English and Dutch and argues for a syntactic licensing of ellipsis in terms of Agree.

Bošković, Željko. 2014. Now I’m a phase, now I’m not a phase: On the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45.1: 27–89. [class:journalArticle]

The paper proposes that phase heads are context dependent and that they license and undergo ellipsis.
The paper argues that sluice consists of a displaced wh- constituent and an empty IP and that LF operations fill out the empty IP to provide it with an interpretable Logical Form.


This paper proposes that various instances of ellipsis can be explained and given a unified account with a phase-based theory of deletion.


The article argues that VP elided sites have syntactic structure, can host wh traces, and explores the generalization that VP ellipsis seems to be subject to a licensing condition, which recalls conditions on traces.


This work argues that VP ellipsis is deletion of a topocalized VP and that it interacts with relative clause formation in ACD type contexts.

This article argues that identity in ellipsis is syntactic and sensitive to the position of variables in
the antecedent, rather than the feature content of syntactic heads.


This article examines several properties of the rule of VP Deletion and shows that these
properties follow from a narrow specification of the organization of the components of grammar.

**SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF THE ELLIPSIS SITE**

The ellipsis site not only is argued to have syntactic structure, but also specific semantic
properties. For example, Elbourne 2008 argues that the elided structure has the semantics of a
definite description based on the presence of sloppy readings of pronouns that cannot be bound,
and he proposes a type shifting operation that elevates elided constituents to a type where
binding into is possible. Hardt 1999 uses such examples to argue for a dDynamic sSemantics
approach to ellipsis licensing, where there is no syntax in the elided structure. Elbourne 2008
assumes a PF deletion approach, but can be understood as agnostic as to how much syntax there
is in an ellipsis site. Similar claims that ellipsis is interpreted directly via semantics have been
made in Dalrymple, et al. 1991, where the authors claim their approach has overcome arguments
against a direct semantic interpretation of ellipsis made, for example, in Hankamer 1973. It has
to be noted that presence of sloppy and strict identity in ellipsis has been used and as argument
for a purely semantic structure of the ellipsis site in Dahl 1973 based on the now so- called
Dahl’s puzzle where not every combination of sloppy and strict readings is available. However, it
has to be noted that Bach, et al. 1974 points out that the presence of sloppy and strict readings is
not a telltale sign of ellipsis.

[Class:JournalArticle]

Conclusion: sloppy identity is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for determining whether a rule is a deletion rule.


This paper introduces what is now known as Dahl’s puzzle. It argues that referential-non-referential ambiguities have to be resolved in semantic terms, i.e., in terms of the properties, propositions, etc.


The paper argues for a semantic analysis of ellipsis where the elided anaphor is not interpretatively or structurally ambiguous.


[Class:JournalArticle]

This article proposes that an ellipsis anaphor can be turned into a higher-order definite description that can be bound into.


[Class:JournalArticle]

This paper investigates recoverability in ellipsis.

The paper proposes a Dynamic Semantics analysis of ellipsis based on VP ellipsis.

**ELLIPSIS AND DISCOURSE LICENSING**

The question of parallelism between the antecedent and anaphor in ellipsis not only involves issues concerning the nature of the syntactic and semantic representation of elided structures, it also touches on our understanding of the way discourse plays a role in ellipsis licensing. Hardt and Romero 2004 argue that ellipsis parallelism is a requirement that uniquely holds at the level of discourse, whereas Kehler 2000 assumes there is syntactic structure in elided gaps, but proposes that discourse constraints such as coherence play a fundamental role in ellipsis licensing. A slightly different approach is taken in Asher, et al. 2001 which argues for a recovery mechanism that requires an identity of logical structure between the anaphor and antecedent which are then both interpreted in their respective contexts, subject only to the general discourse constraints on parallelism.


The paper argues for a recovery mechanism for ellipsis within a discourse account of parallelism.


The paper argues that the parallelism requirement generated by ellipsis is enforced in accordance with discourse structure.

The paper discusses the importance of coherence relations between the antecedent and elided clauses.

**ELLIPSIS AND ISLANDS**

The assumption that ellipsis deletes constituents that have syntactic structure raises the issue of how are remnants are licensed when they originate inside the ellipsis site. Merchant 2001’s The proposal in Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*) that sluicing involves wh-movement of the remnant out of the deletion site captures connectivity effects, but it also predicts the presence of regular wh-movement constraints in ellipsis. This is not the case, as sluicing appears to be insensitive to wh-remnant movement out of relative clause islands, adjunct islands, coordinate islands, and others. To address this Fox and Lasnik 2003 proposes that sluicing allows non-cyclic movement, whereas Merchant 2008 suggests that, when controlled for MaxElide, island alleviation is best analyzed as deletion of offending traces. Both approaches utilize the difference in the size of ellipsis to account for the contrast between vP ellipsis and sluicing, where the former is island sensitive and the latter is not. A different approach is developed in Wang 2008, which proposes that pronominal resumptive type elements occupy the trace position in island alleviating sluices. However, the analysis is challenged in Rottman and Yoshida 2013. A different approach is proposed in Szczegielniak 2008 and Van Craenenbroeck 2010, which develops the idea that there is more than one possible underlying structure for the ellipsis site in sluicing. For example, cleft constructions might be used as a Last Resort repair strategy. Crucially, VP ellipsis does not allow clefts, hence its island sensitivity. Other movement constraints have also been examined, thus Lasnik and Park 2003 and van Craenenbroeck and den Dikken 2006 debate the status of the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) in sluicing, and
Grebenyova 2005 discusses the status of multiple left branch extraction in multiple sluicing. Griffiths and Lipták 2014 proposes an alternative approach to island alleviation where they distinguish sluicing with wh-remants from sluicing with contrastive remnants and show that only the former alleviates islands.


The paper proposes that remnant movement is non-cyclic which requires the deletion of all island barriers in the ellipsis site.


This paper argues that sluicing cannot repair minimality violations hence its sensitivity to Left Branch Extraction constraints.


This paper argues that restrictions on correlate scope, or the lack thereof, translate into island (in)sensitivity in ellipsis.


This squib examines PP-extraction from the subject in English sluicing.

This chapter argues that island alleviation in sluicing is a reflex of trace deletion and that vP ellipsis does not alleviate islands because the deletion site does not cover all offending traces.


The paper uses data from idiom reconstruction to argue against a resumptive strategy in accounting for island alleviation in sluicing.


This paper argues that sluicing does not alleviate islands, instead the ellipsis site can be assigned alternative structures to the wh-question one proposed in Merchant 2001, such as for example clefts.

Van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010. Invisible last resort: A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. Lingua 120.7: 1714–1726. [class:journalArticle]

This paper argues that we can overcome Merchant 2001’s the arguments in Merchant 2001 against a cleft underlying sluicing structures and proposes that clefts can be used as a Last Resort in cases of island alleviation.

This paper presents three new arguments that the EPP is indeed suspended under ellipsis.


The paper proposes that island repair in sluicing is possible because wh-movement can leave a pronominal in trace position.

**P-STRANDING AND LF-ISLANDS IN ELLIPSIS**

Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*) proposes that P-stranding is a different kind of island and cannot be alleviated via ellipsis (LF Island) hence languages that do not allow P-stranding in wh-movement will not allow P-omission in sluicing. However, Almeida and Yoshida 2007 shows that there are exceptions to this correlation. For example, in Polish and Spanish P-omission is possible provided the wh-phrase is D-linked. This has led Szczegielniak 2008 (cited under *Ellipsis and Islands*) and Rodrigues, et al. 2009 to argue that clefts that allow P-stranding license P-omission. However, Stjepanović 2008, Sato 2011, and Nykiel 2013 discuss structures where clefts are impossible and yet P-omission is fine. Instead, they adopt various implementations of a PF licensing approach.


This paper discusses P-omission in Brazilian Portuguese, which is a non P-stranding language.

This work argues against analyzing the possibility of preposition omission under sluicing as categorically dependent on the availability of preposition stranding under wh-movement.


This paper claims that Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese do not constitute counterexamples to the generalization in Merchant 2001 that preposition stranding under sluicing is allowed only in those languages that also allow P-stranding in regular wh-questions.


This paper shows that P-omission in Indonesian contradicts Merchant 2001’s the generalization of Merchant 2001 that P-omission is possible only in those languages that allow P-stranding in wh-movement and proposes a PF licensing mechanism for P-omission.


This paper shows argues that Serbo-Croatian only appears to allow P-stranding under sluicing, unlike under wh-movement, because there is evidence that the loss of the P under sluicing may not be due to P-stranding.
TYPES OF ELLIPSIS

It is useful to look at ellipsis through the lens of what constituents and structures are elided. Such an approach gives us insight into how ellipsis interacts with different levels of the grammar, and allows for cross-linguistic comparisons. Structural distinctions have become standard in ellipsis literature since Ross 1967 (cited under *Ellipsis as Anaphora*) and have become independent of the theoretical claims they were initially based on. It has to be noted that such a taxonomy tacitly assumes that ellipsis targets constituents. However, this assumption is far from a forgone conclusion, especially if one takes into account research on Non- Constituent Coordination. That is why it is useful to think of these distinctions as labels whose precise meaning depends on the theoretical assumptions made in each respective publication.

Verb Phrase Ellipsis

VP ellipsis involves the omission of a verb phrase. It can be introduced in a coordinate clause or a subordinate clause. In both cases we can get both sloppy and strict readings. Sloppy and strict readings are not limited to pronouns. The availability of both readings with reflexives highlights the difference between VP ellipsis involving subordination and coordination as discussed in Hestvik 1995, where subordination of the elided clause relative to the antecedent clause facilitates strict interpretation, whereas coordination disfavors it. There is a debate as to how VP ellipsis identity is licensed. Williams 1977 (cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*) has argued that identity between the anaphor and antecedent can be established at a more abstract level than overt syntax; nowadays this level is assumed to be the level of logical form. However, Johnson 2008 (cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*) argues that identity licensing ellipsis can be syntactic. He notices that the
distribution of VP ellipsis is similar to the distribution of VP traces involved in VP topicalization. VP topicalization licensing ellipsis provides the necessary isomorphism at the level of syntax. This view has been empirically challenged by Aelbrecht and Haegeman 2012, which discusses constructions which that cannot undergo VP topicalization but can undergo VP ellipsis. However, there is more than one way to tie VP ellipsis with movement; for example, Thoms 2010 argues that movement that spells out lower copies can license VP ellipsis. There is also debate how VP ellipsis is licensed structurally and how much structure is deleted, so as to account for differences of ellipsis with different auxiliaries and modals, and the asymmetries between passive and active antecedents. The research is exemplified by work in Merchant 2013 and Nakamura 2013 which discuss on how much argument structure is elided in VP ellipsis. A similar discussion is present in Rouveret 2011 within a phase- based theory of syntactic derivation that attempts to tie in also morphological constraints on VP ellipsis outlined, among others, in Potsdam 1997.


The paper argues that VP -ellipsis and VP -topicalization are not distributionally equivalent.


This paper discusses sloppy and strict reading in reflexives and argues that their distribution depends on whether the clause containing ellipsis is coordinated or subordinated.

The article argues that elided VPs and their antecedent VPs can mismatch in voice, with passive VPs being elided under apparent identity with active antecedent VPs, and vice versa because the head that determines voice is external to the phrase being elided (vP).


This squib argues against the analysis in Merchant 2013 of voice mismatches in VP-deletion and pseudo-gapping based on sentences in which more than one VP-deletion operation applies.


This paper investigates the influences of verbal morphology on the (im)possibility of VP ellipsis (VPE) in English.


The main goal of this paper is to propose a derivational account of the salient syntactic properties of VP ellipsis constructions, both in languages like English and in “V-stranding VPE languages.”


This paper proposes that ellipsis is licensed by overt A’-movement.

**Verb Stranding Verb Phrase Ellipsis**

In standard cases VP ellipsis has the external argument as its remnant. However, it has been argued that the verb itself can also be a remnant which gives rise to constructions that resemble null internal arguments as argued in Otani and Whitman 1991. Similar claims have been made
for a variety of languages in Goldberg 2005, and for Farsi in Toosarvandani 2009, and for Russian in Gribanova 2012. However, the latter claim for Russian has been challenged in Bailyn 2014.


This paper argues against an across the board application of verb stranding to account for argument ellipsis in Russian.


This thesis presents a study of Verb-Stranding VP Ellipsis and proposes a Verbal Identity Requirement on VP Ellipsis, a novel generalization involving strict identity in root and derivational morphology between the antecedent and target clause main Vs of the construction.


This paper argues that Russian has Verb-Stranding Verb Phrase Ellipsis.


This paper discusses the properties of argument ellipsis in Chinese and argues for a verb stranding VPE account.

This paper discusses a novel ellipsis construction from Farsi, v-stranding VPE, in which part of a complex predicate goes missing, leaving behind the light verb and argues that this phenomenon patterns with English verb phrase ellipsis.

**Sluicing**

Typical sluicing constructions involve ellipsis of the Tense Phrase TP and a wh-expression remnant that is contrasted with an indefinite correlate. Chung, et al. 1995 (cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*) suggests that the LF of the antecedent, modulo the indefinite, which is treated as a variable, is the source of the structure in the elided string. The LF structure is “‘pasted’” onto a truncated CP structure containing the remnant wh-expression but nothing else. After that, the wh-expression is associated with the indefinite/variable as it would be with its own trace. Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*) proposes, based on connectivity effects, that sluicing is derived via independently motivated remnant wh-movement to Spec-C, and the ellipsis site has a regular wh-question structure. This approach has been extremely successful and extended to wh in-situ languages such as Farsi in Toosarvandani 2008 and Japanese in Takahashi 1994, where authors propose to extend the movement trigger to include wh-focus movement. Van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, based on Hungarian data, further extends the proposal to include focus movement of non-wh expressions. Part of the proposal of Merchant 2001 is that the anaphor and antecedent are isomorphic in that they mutually entail each other. However, AnderBois 2014 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*), based on the observation that doubly-negated indefinites and implicit passive agents do not license sluicing despite exhibiting truth-conditional equivalence to overt indefinites, argues that a relevant semantic condition on the antecedent and
anaphor being isomorphic needs to involve symmetric entailment over the Semantics of Issues in addition to truth-conditional information isomorphism. Semantic identity needs to be supplanted with syntactic identity since Chung 2013 (cited under *Does Ellipsis Have Syntactic Structure?*) provides examples where sluicing requires case and theta role isomorphism that can only be encoded in the syntax. Sluicing constructions appear to involve regular cyclic wh-movement according to Agüero-Bautista 2007, and they license parasitic gaps according to Yoshida, et al. 2015. Furthermore, as Lasnik 2014 argues, multiple sluicing appears to require rightward movement of the second remnant in languages such as English where multiple wh-movement is not usually possible. Some of the above issues, plus apparent island insensitivity of some sluicing structures have led researchers such as Sag and Nykiel 2011 to propose an account of sluicing where there is no wh-movement.


This article discusses how the remnant wh-phrase in a sluicing structure ends up in the position where it is pronounced.


This paper explores the properties of multiple sluicing in English and argues for a rightward movement account of the second wh-expression.


The paper reassesses the motivation for a deletion analysis of Sluicingsluicing.
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This paper discusses the syntax of sluicing with single and multiple wh-remnants in Japanese where there is no overt wh-movement to Spec-C.


This paper extends movement-plus-deletion analysis to Farsi, a wh-in situ language.


This paper deals with antecedent contained sluicing with non wh-remnants remnants in Hungarian.

 class:journalArticle

This study claims Parasitic Gaps (PG) are licensed in sluicing contexts suggesting overt wh-movement leaves a real gap in the ellipsis site.

**Sluicing Cross-Linguistically**

Cross-linguistic studies have mostly aimed to test the proposals in Merchant 2001 (cited under *Ellipsis and Information Structure*). Thus Grebenyova 2007 argues that the movement trigger should be extended to focus feature checking movement. Hiraiwa and Ishihara 2012 and Kim 2015 discuss sluicing in Japanese and Korean, languages that have cleft like constructions and focus movement, but no leftward wh-movement. Gribanova and Manetta 2016 compares Hindi-urdu Urdu to Uzbek to show that Hindi-urdu Urdu has wh-movement driven sluicing, whereas
Uzbek sluicing is derived via reduced copular clauses. Martín-González 2011 suggests that a reduced copula underlies some Spanish and English sluicing constructions, whereas Saab 2010 argues that Spanish sluicing is sensitive to adjunct islands and thus similar to clitic-left dislocation. Van Craenenbroeck 2012 proposes that the size of the deleted string in sluicing varies cross-linguistically, thus Hungarian can have deletion of the lower CP in multi-layered CP structure. Finally, Martín-González 2016 based on Spanish data shows that sluicing exhibits sensitivity to morphosyntactic information present both in the antecedent and remnant.


This paper argues that a +focus feature that is responsible for licensing sluicing in Slavic and the availability of multiple sluicing wrt. superiority effects.


This paper argues that only Hindi-Urdu has genuine sluicing, whereas Uzbek sluicing is derived from reduced copular clauses.


This article proposes that Japanese clefts, in-situ focus, and sluicing/stripping share a common underlying structure and are can be derived from one another.

The paper discusses sluicing and sprouting in Korean within the framework of construction-based HPSG and an independently motivated theory of dialogue context.


Based on passive-active mismatches in Spanish sluicing, this paper argues for copular constructions as sources of sluiced clauses.


The author argues based on Spanish data that sluicing exhibits sensitivity to morphosyntactic information present both in the antecedent and remnant.


This paper argues that sluicing in Spanish behaves as clitic left dislocation.


This paper shows that when there is more than one CP based on variation as to which part of the clausal structure is deleted by sluicing.

**Swiping**

Merchant 2002 proposes that swiping involves regular sluicing with Prepositional Phrase (PP) movement to Complementizer Phrase (CP), and ellipsis, but that in swiping the wh-expression incorporates with the preposition. However, Craenenbroeck 2010 (cited under *Does Ellipsis Have Syntactic Structure?*) and Radford and Iwasaki 2015 argue for an approach where the wh-
expression is not incorporated but undergoes XP movement to a projection higher than the PP.

Another approach is advocated in Larson 2014 where the structure is derived via Extraposition of the PP, wh-movement with P-stranding, followed by ellipsis of the Inflectional Phrase (IP).


This paper argues that swiping is an instantiation of a generalizable possibility for inverted word orders under ellipsis.


The paper argues that swiping must instantiate a kind of head-movement of a wh-word to a preposition.


The paper argues Swiping swiping is not constrained by the ECP.


The paper modifies the CP shell analysis of Swiping swiping developed by Craenenbroeck 2010 with a more richly articulated cartographic structure.
**Fragments**

Fragment answers have been argued to be derived via evacuation movement of the remnant and ellipsis in Merchant 2005, as well as in Ince 2012 for Turkish, in Temmerman 2012 for Dutch, in Thoms 2016 for Scottish Gaelic, and in Park 2005 for Korean. A different approach is taken in Abe 2016 which argues on the basis of Japanese that fragment answers involve an in-situ remnant.


The article based on Japanese data argues that in short answers the remnant phrase does not undergo focus movement to a peripheral position but rather simply stays in its original position.


The article shows that fragment answers in Turkish are elliptical structures, where CP (Complementizer Phrase) is targeted for ellipsis after a fragment answer moves to FP (Focus Phrase) above CP.


The paper proposes that in “short” answers ellipsis is preceded by A′-movement of the remnant to a clause-peripheral position.

The paper discusses Island insensitive answer fragments in Korean.


This paper argues for Merchant 2008’s (cited under *Ellipsis and Islands*) and the author’s PF-theory of islands based on two types of Dutch embedded fragment answers, where one type is island-sensitive, and the other one is not.


This article discusses Scottish Gaelic Verb-Answers, which differs from standard fragment answers in allowing us to directly observe some of the clausal structure in which it is embedded.

**Gapping**

Gapping involves structures where the main verb or the main verb and the auxiliary are elided. Hankamer 1979 shows that gapped structures cannot be embedded, and Toosarvandani 2016 argues that the antecedent of gapped structures also cannot be embedded. The obvious issue is how does one generate such structures but still preserve the notion that ellipsis affects constituents. Invariably, most articles propose either a PF deletion approach where the verb plus auxiliary is targeted as a prosodic unit. This is the case in Hartmann 2000. The other strategy is to propose some form of movement out of the ellipsis site followed by deletion, as is argued in Jayaseelan 1990, Jackendoff 1971 and Johnson 2009 argue that gapping is distinct from VP deletion, with the latter proposing that it involves coordination at the vP level combined with Across the Board movement (ATB) of the verb. It has to be noted that, in complex cases, ATB
can involve pied piping a predicate, a phenomenon discussed in more detail in Vicente 2010.

Finally, Repp 2009, based on data involving negation in gapping, discusses the degree of meaning overlap that is required between the elided anaphor and its antecedent.


The book discusses gapping as coordinate deletion.


This book investigates Right Node Raising and Gapping in German. Ellipsis in both constructions is claimed to be the result of a phonological process conditioned by prosodic and focus semantic constraints.


The paper argues that VP-Deletion is clearly distinct from gGapping.


This paper explores the relationship between gGapping and Extraposition, Right dislocation.


This paper argues that Pseudopseudo-gapping is a special instance of VP-ellipsis, while Gapping gapping is a special instance of ATB movement.

This book presents a cross-linguistic investigation of the behavior of negation in gapping sentences. It focuses on German and English with reference to Dutch, Japanese, Polish, Russian, and Slovak.


This paper proposes a No Correlate Embedding Generalization, which determines what can be embedded inside the first coordinate.


This squib focuses on cases where the gapping site contains more elements than just a verb.

**Pseudo-Gapping**

Pseudo-gapping involves ellipsis in a comparative, coordinate, and subordinate structure. It differs from vP ellipsis in that some parts of the verbal domain, but not the main verb, can be remnants. Pseudo-gapping has been argued in some form or other by Jayaseelan 2001, Gengel 2013, and Lasnik 1995 to involve movement of the remnant out of the elided VP via focus movement, or heavy NP shift or object shift. Boeckx and Stjepanović 2001 claims that the verb has to be stranded since head movement is a PF operation and cannot feed ellipsis, also a PF operation. Thoms 2016 suggests that pseudo-gapping is similar to Strippingstripping, but differing in the scope of the correlates. Merchant 2008 also assumes that Pseudopseudo-gapping is similar to VP ellipsis, but differs as to which verbal node is elided, which allows us to capture
asymmetries in voice mismatches between vP ellipsis and Pseudopseudo-gapping. Finally, Kubota and Levine 2017 argues within the framework of categorial grammar that pseudogapping is pseudo-VP ellipsis.


This paper discusses pseudo-gapping and vP ellipsis in Serbo-Croatian and argues that head movement and ellipsis are competing operations at phonetic form.


This book aims to provide a uniform account of Pseudopseudo-gapping and various Ellipsis ellipsis structures in generative grammar based on new empirical data from the Scandinavian languages and English.


The paper argues that a Focus Phrase above VP can provide a coherent account of English and Malayalam clefts and Pseudopseudo-gapping structures.


The authors propose a Categorial Grammar analysis of pseudo-gapping as a reflex of pseudo- VP ellipsis.

The paper argues for an Object shift account of pseudo-gapping.


This paper argues that the target of deletion in VP-ellipsis is a node lower than voice, while in Pseudopseudo-gapping a node containing voice is deleted and that is why VP-ellipsis allows mismatches in voice between the elided VP and its antecedent, and Pseudopseudo-gapping does not.


This paper argues that restrictions in gapping and stripping can be formulated in terms of Parallelism, arguing that the difference is keyed to the different ways in which their correlates may take scope.

**Comparative Ellipsis**

Comparative constructions allow most forms of ellipsis discussed here. However, comparatives differ from other subordinate types of ellipsis in that ellipsis is obligatory in comparatives, and that these constructions carry a comparative denotation that is often associated with a specific syntax as initially argued in Bresnan 1973. There is a debate as to whether comparatives involve deletion of any syntactic structure. Napoli 1983 proposes is that there is no deletion, and a direct analysis of the structure is adequate. However, Hazout 1995 and Pancheva 2006, among others, provide evidence that, at least in some languages, different types of comparatives have different properties with respect to their missing structures, which leads them to assume that there are cases of deletion in comparative ellipsis in at least a subset of comparative constructions.
Comparative deletion with attributive adjectives is argued in Kennedy and Merchant 2000 to involve ellipsis. Lechner 2008 proposes that comparative deletion always involves Gapping, and that unique properties of comparatives stem from independently required movement operations. Movement operations are also key in Kennedy 2002s, an analysis of Comparative Sub-deletion where the author appeals to the LF vs. versus overt movement distinction between comparative deletion and sub-deletion to capture the difference between the two types of comparative ellipsis.


The article provides a syntax of comparative structures that involves obligatory deletion.


This paper concentrating concentrates on Comparative Ellipsis constructions in Modern Hebrew containing the morpheme -Ser and argues for an analysis of these constructions as sentential structures undergoing ellipsis.


This paper investigates the syntax of Comparative Deletion and comparative sub-deletion in English and argues that comparative deletion involves overt movement plus deletion of a compared phrase, while comparative sub-deletion involves covert movement of the compared phrase.

This paper shows that attributive comparatives, unlike other comparatives, are well-formed only if some type of ellipsis operation applies within the comparative clause.


Drawing from a wide array of new data, the monograph develops a novel, directly semantically interpretable analysis of comparatives, which does not require reference to designated deletion processes. On the one hand, Comparative Deletion is reinterpreted in terms of overt movement of the degree predicate. On the other hand, it is argued that Comparative Ellipsis can entirely be subsumed under standardly sanctioned ellipsis operations such as Gapping, Right Node Raising, and Across-the-Board-movement movement.


This article presents a base-generated analysis of so-called Comparative Ellipsis sentences in English that accounts for the connection between their form and their interpretation.

This paper argues based on Slavic data that comparatives can be descriptively divided into two types: clausal and phrasal, depending on the category of the phrase following the comparative marker “‘than’.”

**Non-constituent Coordination**

Coordination of what appears to be non-constituents (NCC) has been analyzed by Williams 1978 as coordination of non-constituents, or as coordination of CP’s plus ellipsis in Wilder 1994 and Beavers and Sag 2004. The latter approach raises the question, how are the remnants licensed? Based on sensitivity to island effects in NCC, Sailor and Thoms 2013 proposes that remnants undergo movement followed by subsequent ellipsis of the extraction site. However, based on counterexamples where NCC does not show island sensitivity, Bruening 2015 argues that NCC requires non-constituent ellipsis based on prosodic structure. This analysis is similar to Wilder 1994, Beavers and Sag 2004, and Hofmeister 2010 where Left Edge Ellipsis deletes the surrounding non-constituent structure leaving the remnants in-situ. Gazdar 1981 proposes that cases of NCC are coordination of VPs combined with Gappinggapping. However, this approach is critiqued in Hudson 1982, who which defends Hudson 1976s, a proposal that NCC can be derived via three independent mechanisms: Conjunction Reduction when structure is factored to the left, Right Node Raising when structure is factored to the right, and finally Conjunct Postposing that turns coordination within a clause into clause coordination.


The paper argues that NCC be analyzed as coordination plus ellipsis.
This paper argues that ellipsis can target syntactic or prosodic constituents, the latter resulting in cases of NCC.


This article argues that certain cases of Non- Constituent Coordination involve gapping.


The paper discusses either. . .conjunction in terms of non-constituent ellipsis.


The paper argues that conjunction reduction, gapping, and right-node raising are three separate phenomena in English that do not involve deletion just raising.


This paper argues that cases of non-constituent coordination are not instances of gapping.


The paper proposes that NCC is derived via ellipsis and evacuation movement of remnants.

This paper discusses non-constituent coordination as Across-the-Board movement and ellipsis.


The paper discusses the operation of conjunction reduction in non-constituent coordination.

**Stripping**

The term “‘stripping’,” sometimes called bare argument ellipsis, is ellipsis that spares just one remnant that cannot be the initial conjunct in coordinated structures. Stripping is limited to coordination structures and cannot occur in embedded contexts. Weir 2014 argues that examples of stripping involve coordination at the vP level, whereas Busquets 2006 and Wurmbrand 2017 argue that stripping is ellipsis at the TP level with the remnant being licensed by movement to a focus projection. Fukaya 2003 shows that Island sensitivity in Japanese restricts possible readings in stripping and argues that Stripping stripping involves an LF copying derivation (following Chung, et al. 1995, cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*) and LF movement of the remnant. Examples of stripping with wh-expressions have been divided into two categories: Yoshida, et al. 2015 proposes that Wwhy-Sstripping involves base generation, whereas stripping where a wh-remnant is accompanied by a non-wh remnant are argued by Ortega-Santos, et al. 2014 to be an instance of rightward movement of the non-wh remnant, plus wh-movement of the wh-remnant, followed by IP ellipsis.

This paper discusses Stripping stripping as TP-Ellipsis in Catalan.


This paper demonstrates that complex NP island effects are detectable in sluicing and stripping in Japanese.


The paper examines elliptical construction where a wh-phrase and a non-wh-phrase appear fragmentally.


This paper argues in stripping the Focus phrase to which the remnant moves does not merge as high as TP, but rather selects VoiceP.


This article argues that stripping is ellipsis of declarative TPs and is not only possible in coordinate structures, but also in embedded clauses.
This paper argues that Why-Why-Stripping exhibits movement properties such as connectivity effects in the same way as Sluicing.

**Nominal Ellipsis**

Nominal ellipsis targets constituents within the DP projection, even the nominal itself, provided it is not initial. Corver and van Koppen 2011, Merchant 2014, and Ruda 2016 claim that availability and scope of nominal ellipsis is attributed to the morphological/feature composition of the elements in the DP phrase, which correlates with the availability to have DP internal focus, as argued in Cinque 2012. However, Alexiadou and Gengel 2012 proposes that instead of focus within the DP, it is classifiers that play a central role in nominal ellipsis. Furthermore, Giannakidou and Stavrou 1999 argues it also differs from pronominalization contra Corver and van Koppen 2011. Finally, in Yoshida, et al. 2012, gapping in the nominal domain is argued to have different properties from gapping in the VP domain.


This paper proposes that NPE in a number of languages is licensed by the presence of classifiers in the nominal structure and argues against accounts of ellipsis in terms of focus.

This article argues that ellipsis can target a nominal modifier only if all constituents below it are also elided.


This article proposes that there are languages where morphological agreement licenses nNominal eEllipsis via pronominalization.


The paper discusses two DP ellipsis in Greek as two processes: nominal sub-deletion is analyzed as a genuine case of nominal ellipsis, and substantivization as nominalization.


The paper discusses gender mismatches in Greek elliptical constructions.


This paper offers an analysis of NP ellipsis with adjectival remnants based on the properties of the feature composition of heads contained within the extended projections of adjectives and nominals, and the interaction with operations such as Agree and the Principle of Chain Reduction.

The paper argues that the Gappinggapping-like constructions in the nominal domain and Gapping gapping constructions in the verbal domain show quite different properties.

**Argument Ellipsis**

In Argument/object ellipsis the inner argument that denotes an individual is elided. Erteschik-Shir, et al. 2013 and assume Argument Ellipsis (AE) is derived via Topic Drop of the Inner Argument, where deletion is a radical form of topicalization. A pro analysis, where the missing argument is a null pronoun is advocated in Hoji 1998. Otani and Whitman 1991 (cited under *Verb Stranding Verb Phrase Ellipsis*) argues AE to be a result of Verb stranding ellipsis. However, Saito 2007 rejects such an approach based on availability of sloppy and strict readings, and instead analyzes AE within an LF copying approach along the lines of Chung, et al. 1995 (cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*). Finally, Saito 2007 and Takahashi 2008 propose that AE is licensed via Anti-agreement, the generalization being that only arguments that do not trigger agreement on the verb can be elided.


This paper argues that missing objects are to be analyzed as Topic Drop.


This paper argues that AE in Japanese cannot be analyzed on a par with VP-ellipsis (VPE).

This paper discusses argument ellipsis in East Asian languages, and argues for an LF copying analysis.


This article provides a new argument for the analysis of null arguments in terms of ellipsis by considering null objects that behave like quantifiers.

**Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD)**

Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) involves ellipsis of a structure, which has the antecedent contain the ellipsis site. ACD is not limited to vP ellipsis, Yoshida 2010 shows examples involving ACD sluicing. Merchant 2000a shows ACD is also possible in comparatives, as well as negative polarity items. The structures are problematic since their semantic resolution triggers infinite regress because the ellipsis site is part of the antecedent. ACD primarily occurs with VP ellipsis in relative clauses that modify arguments. May 1985 proposes that ACD resolution takes place at the level of Logical Form (LF) via an operation of Quantifier Raising (QR) of the head noun plus relative clause to a position above vP. Such movement creates a VP antecedent that does not contain the ellipsis site, instead the antecedent contains a trace of the DP argument, which prevents infinite regress. However, Lappin 1999 argues that a HPSG analysis of ACD allows us to resolve this regress without resorting to movement, and Merchant 2000b shows that there is no need for infinite regress resolution movement for at least those cases of ACD where the relative clause is headed by an adjunct. But not all cases of ACD can be accounted in such a way. According to Kennedy 2008, who discusses a broader range of examples he calls argument contained ellipsis, ACD in vPs requires identity of inner arguments to be at a more abstract level
than lexical or syntactic. Bruening 2001 shows that QR in ACD constructions observes
superiority, a condition on movement, which further supports an LF movement analysis of ACD
resolution, but Wilder 2003 provides arguments that a similar restriction must hold at PF calling
into question the exact nature of QR in ACD.

Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys superiority: Frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry*

The paper examines “frozen scope” in double object and spray-load constructions.


This paper discusses how namely dependence licenses argument contained ellipsis.

in Ellipsis and Gapping*. Paper presented at the SOAS Ellipsis Workshop held at
the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London in September 1996. Edited by
9780195123029] [class:conference-paper]

The paper proposes an in-situ ellipsis resolution procedure of ACD that is formulated within
the framework of head-driven phrase structure grammar.


The monograph proposes an analysis of ACD resolution via QR at LF.

Merchant, Jason. 2000a. Antecedents-contained deletion in negative polarity items. *Syntax* 3.2:
144–150. [class:journalArticle]
This squib investigates antecedent-contained deletion and the licensing of negative polarity items.


This squib investigates ACD differences with complements and adjuncts.


This article argues for a condition prohibiting PF containment of the ellipsis site by its antecedent, in addition to one operating at LF.


This paper discusses cases of Antecedent Contained Sluicing.

*ACD and QR*

Baltin 1987 questions whether ACD even exists, and argues that apparent cases of ACD involve a deleted VP being within a phrase that has been moved out of the antecedent VP. However, Larson and May 1990 provides arguments against Baltin’s analysis by showing that his vacuous movement analysis gives incorrect predictions. Hornstein 1994 suggests that ACD is resolved not via QR but via object raising triggered by case licensing. However, Kennedy 1997 argues against such an analysis based on examples of ACD with PP arguments, which are assumed not to need to undergo case driven movement. Fox 2002 addresses the issue where a QR analysis assumes that a trace is not a copy of the moved element and proposes a trace conversion
mechanism that turns a quantifier copy into a DP trace. Hackl, et al. 2012 presents experimental evidence that supports the idea that QR licenses ADC. This evidence is challenged experimentally by Gibson, et al. 2015. The notion that we need QR at all is further questioned in Jacobson 2008, which advocates a direct compositionality approach that does away with the need for a QR mechanism to resolve type mismatch.


This article proposes that antecedent-contained deletion never takes place


This article proposes a resolution of a conflict between Quantifier Raising and the copy theory of movement.


The paper presents five experiments that provide evidence that the QR hypothesis of Hackl, et al. 2012 should be rejected in favor of a pragmatic account.


The paper argues that the integration of a quantifier in object position and the resolution of antecedent-contained deletion (ACD) is related.

This article proposes that antecedent-contained deletion structures are resolved via A-movement to a Case-marking specifier position at LF.


The article argues that ACD is compatible with the view that quantified NPs are interpreted “in situ,” where the meaning of verb directly combines with the meaning of the quantifier.


This article argues against the proposal in Hornstein 1994 and concludes that the argument for QR remains.


This paper argues for a QR analysis of ACD by critically examining Baltin 1987 who which proposes antecedent-contained deletions do not exist as such at surface form.

**Ellipsis Analysis of ATB and RNR**

Right Node Raising (RNR) can be exemplified by constructions where two conjuncts share the same inner argument pronounced at the right edge of both conjuncts. Giannakidou and Merchant 1998 and Abels 2004 propose an analysis that involves ellipsis of the shared arguments, which can account for the fact that RNR seems island insensitive. Sabbagh 2008 proposes an Across-
the Board (ATB) movement account, where the shared XP has undergone extraction to a position above both conjuncts. ATB accounts provide a clear analysis of the movement properties of RNR, whereas ellipsis accounts account for RNR properties that do not correlate with movement. Grosz 2015 proposes that RNR involves multi-dominance, which provides account for across the board agreement properties in RNR constructions. In attempt to reconcile multi-dominance with ellipsis, Barros and Vicente 2011 proposes that RNR constructions either involve multi-dominance or ellipsis. However, Larson 2012 argues that such models cannot account for the properties of RNR structures that simultaneously exhibit both properties of ellipsis and multi-dominance and thus force us to allow for both ellipsis and multi-dominance to occur simultaneously.


GSLA. [class:book]

The paper argues for an ellipsis analysis of Right Node Raisinge paper argues for an ellipsis analysis of Right Node Raising.


[class:journalArticle]

The paper argues that English RNR can be divided into two distinct subtypes, one derived via ellipsis and the other via multi-dominance.

This article discusses reverse sluicing in Greek. Reverse sluicing follows from an extension of the analysis of sluicing proposed in Chung, et al. 1995 (cited under *The Nature of Syntactic Licensing of the Ellipsis Site*).


The paper argues for multi-dominance approach to RNR constructions.


The paper argues that neither a movement, or multi-dominance analysis can account for the range of RNR data.


Based on data from Tagalog, the paper argues for a movement analysis of RNRR.