

Verb-stranding VP-ellipsis (VVPE)

Phenomenon: The lexical verb heading the VP is still pronounced when the VP is elided, as in Portuguese, Hebrew, and Russian. This phenomenon is commonly referred to as verb-stranding VP-ellipsis (VVPE).

- (1) a. Eu dei um livro pra Maria e o Pedro também deu (um livro pra Maria).
I gave a book to.the Maria and the Pedro also gave
'I gave a book to Maria, and Pedro did, too.' (Portuguese, Santos 2009:28)
- b. A: Šalaxt etmol et ha-yeladim le-beit-ha-sefer?
send.PST.2SG.FEM yesterday ACC the-children to-house-the-book
'Did you send the children to school yesterday?'
B: Šalaxti (etmol et ha-yeladim le-beit-ha-sefer).
send.PST.1SG
'I did.' (Hebrew, Doron 1999:129)
- c. A: Ty položil ručku na stol, ili knigu na stul?
you put.PST.SG.M pen.ACC on table or book.ACC on chair
'Did you put the pen on the table or the book on the chair?'
B: Net, ne položil (ručku na stol, ili knigu na stul).
no NEG put.PST.SG.M
'No, I didn't (put the pen on the table or the book on the chair)' (Russian, Griбанова 2013:152)

Analysis: Independent V-to-T movement (Portuguese, Silva 2001; Hebrew, Doron 1983) or V-to-Asp movement (Russian, Bailyn 1995, Griбанова 2013) evacuates the verb prior to ellipsis (Goldberg 2005).

- (2) ... V ... [CP ... V+T/Asp ... ([VP V O]) ②]

Standard assumptions: HM is syntactic, E is post-syntactic, thus **HM counter-bleeds E**. If a language has VPE and verb-raising out of VP it is expected to show VVPE (Goldberg 2005).

The puzzle of Mainland Scandinavian VPE

MSc shows **no VVPE** (Sailor 2018; see Sailor 2009, Sect. 4.2.2 for Danish, Thoms 2012 for Norwegian, Thoms 2012, Ström Herold 2009:153 for Swedish) despite exhibiting **VPE** (Sailor 2009, Houser et al. 2011, Thoms 2012, Bentzen et al. 2013) and **V-raising to C** (at least in matrix clauses, Vikner 1995). Instead of the elided verb, a dummy replacement form of *gøre, gjøre, göra* 'do' is pronounced.

- (3) a. Mona og Jasper vaskede bilen, eller rettere Mona *vaskede/gjorde.
Mona and Jasper wash.PST car.DEF or rather Mona wash.PST/do.PST
'Mona and Jasper washed the car, or rather Mona did.' (Danish, Houser et al. 2011:249)
- b. Johan leste ikke *Lolita*, men Marie *leste/gjorde.
Johan read.PST not *Lolita* but Marie read.PST/do.PST
'Johan didn't read *Lolita*, but Marie did.' (Norwegian, Thoms 2012:7)
- c. Maria körde inte bilen, men Johan *körde/gjorde det.
Maria drive.PST not car.DEF but Johan drive.PST/do.PST det
'Maria didn't drive the car, but Johan did.' (Swedish, Sailor 2018:856)

In MSc **E bleeds HM** which is at odds with the standard view of syntactic HM and post-syntactic E.

Sailor (2018): Ellipsis and HM are syntactic

Background: The relevant head movement is **V-to-T/Asp** in VVPE languages and **V-to-C** in MSc. Merger of the licensor of ellipsis turns the ellipsis site into an opaque (phase) domain (Aelbrecht 2010, Baltin 2012). The licensor is T in MSc.

Analysis:

V-to-T/Asp

The verb leaves the ellipsis site before/at the same time when it turns opaque because the trigger of HM and the licensor of E are the same, namely T.

- (4) T merges: [TP V+T[V*,E] ([VP V O]) ①]

V-to-C

Verb movement is triggered by C and fails to take place from the ellipsis site, which is already rendered opaque by previous merger of T.

- (5) T merges: [TP T[E] ([VP V O]) ①]
C merges: [CP C[V*] ([TP T[E] ([VP V O]) ①)]

Issue: What about V-to-v movement? This should make V accessible for C (if ellipsis targets VP, not vP).
Prediction: Languages with **V-to-T/Asp** movement **show VVPE**. Languages with **V-to-C** movement **lack VVPE**.

Verb-doubling VP-topicalization (VVPT)

Phenomenon: A finite copy of the verb is pronounced in its canonical position when the VP is topicalized. This phenomenon I will refer to as verb-doubling VP-topicalization (VVPT).

- (6) a. [Temperar aquele peixe] o cozinheiro temperou aquele peixe (mas...)
season.INF that fish the cook seasoned (but...)
'As for seasoning that fish, the cook seasoned it (but...)' (Portuguese, Bastos-Gee 2009:162)
- b. [Liknot et ha-praxim] hi kanta et ha-praxim.
to.buy ACC the-flowers she bought
'As for buying the flowers, she bought.'
(Hebrew, Landau 2006:37)
- c. [Kupit' pomidory] ona kupila pomidory, (no salat ne sdelala).
buy.INF tomatoes.ACC she bought but salad not make.PERF
'As for buying the tomatoes, she bought (them), but she hasn't made a salad.'
(Russian, Verbuk 2006:397)

Analysis: Independent V-to-T or V-to-Asp movement evacuates the verb from the low VP copy prior to the application of copy deletion (CD) (Abels 2001, Landau 2006, Aboh & Dyakonova 2009, Hein 2017).

- (7) [CP [VP V O] ... V+T/Asp ... [VP V O] ②]

Standard assumptions: HM is syntactic, CD is post-syntactic, thus **HM counter-bleeds CD**, analogous to the VVPE case. If a language has VPT and verb-raising out of VP it is expected to show VVPT.

The puzzle of Mainland Scandinavian VPT

MSc shows **no VVPT** despite allowing **VPT** (see Lødrup 1990, Holmberg 1999, Ørsnes 2011, Houser et al. 2011) and **V-raising to C** (Vikner 1995). Paralleling the VVPE cases again, we find that instead of a verb doublet, there is a dummy verb *gøre, gjøre, göra* 'do' occurring in V2 position.

- (8) a. ...og [körde/køre bilen] *körde/gjorde han.
and drove/drive car.DEF drove/did he
'...and drive the car, he did.' (Danish, Platzack 2008:280)
- b. [(Å) lese bok-en] *leser/gjør hun i dag.
to read.INF book-DEF reads/does she in day
'As for reading the book, she does it today.' (Norwegian, Siri M. Gjersøe p.c.)
- c. [Läser boken] *läser/gör han nu.
reads book.DEF reads/does he now
'Reading the book he is now.' (Swedish, Källgren & Prince 1989:47)

In MSc **CD bleeds HM** which is at odds with the standard view of syntactic HM and post-syntactic CD.

Copy deletion in syntax?

Idea 1: A lower copy is deleted in syntax as soon as a higher copy in c-commanding position exists.
Problem: HM and CD should take place simultaneously. Only after VP has moved to SpecCP, after merger of C, can CD apply. But C also triggers V-raising. The triggers for CD and HM are the same, namely C (9).

- (9) [CP [VP V O] V+C[V*,VP*(CD)] ... [VP V O] ①] (compare with (4))

Idea 2: When C attracts V, V is located in an opaque phase domain (PIC, Chomsky 2000, 2001).

- Strong PIC:** (10) [TP T[V*] ([VP S [V' v [VP V O]])]] (11) [CP C[V*] ([TP T [VP S [V' v [VP V O]])]]]
- Weak PIC:** (12) [TP V+T[V*] ([VP S [V' v [VP V O]])]] (13) [CP C[V*] ([TP T [VP S [V' v [VP V O]])]]]

Problem: The strong PIC wrongly predicts a lack of VVPT in V-to-T/Asp languages. Weak PIC wrongly predicts lack of V-to-C movement in regular matrix clauses without VPT.

VVPT (and its absence in MSc) cannot be accounted for by CD being syntactic in the same way that Sailor (2018) accounts for VVPE by E being syntactic, despite the close similarity between VVPT and VVPE.

HM, CD, and E are ordered post-syntactic operations

Proposal

Post-syntactic HM: All three operations must take place in the same module. As CD cannot be syntactic, E and HM must apply in the post-syntax (E: Merchant 2001, 2004, Goldberg 2005, a.o.; HM: Chomsky 1995, Merchant 2002, Schoorlemmer & Temmerman 2012, Zwart 2017, a.o.)

Order: Each language has a fixed order of application between HM and E/CD (cf. Arregi & Nevins 2012, Schoorlemmer 2012). CD and E are non-pronunciation operations, therefore nothing is ever ordered between them. They might even be the same operation.

(14) Order	Interaction	VVPE	VVPT	Languages
HM < CD, E	counter-bleeding	yes	yes	Hebrew, Portuguese, Russian
CD, E < HM	bleeding	no	no	Danish, Norwegian, Swedish

Predictions

- Languages show the **same behaviour of the verb in VPE and VPT**.
- This behaviour is **independent of V-to-T/Asp vs. V-to-C**.

Afrikaans has **V-to-C** movement and behaves like MSc in VPT (15a) and VPE (15b).

- (15) a. [Die boek skryf] *skryf/doen hy die boek (maar hy wil dit nie publiseer nie).
the book write write/do he (but he will it not publish not)
'As for writing the book, he does write it, but he doesn't want to publish it.'
b. Jan skryf 'n boek en Marie *skryf/doen ook ('n boek).
Jan write a book and Marie write/do too
'Jan is writing a book and Marie is, too.' (Erin Pretorius, p.c.)

Welsh has **V-to-T** movement (Rouveret 1990, Roberts 2004) and behaves like MSc in VPT (16a) and VPE (16b).

- (16) a. [Cau y glwyd] y gwnaeth y ffermwr.
shut the gate c did the farmer
'Shut the gate, the farmer did.'
b. Prynodd Siôn y llyfr hwn a gwnaeth Mair hefyd.
bought S. the book this and did Mair too
'Siôn bought this book and Mair did too.' (Rouveret 2012:918, 916)

References

Abels, Klaus. 2001. The predicate cleft construction in Russian. In *FASL: The Bloomington Meeting*, 1–18. Michigan: Michigan Slavic Publications. • Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. *The syntactic licensing of ellipsis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2012. *Morphotactics: Basque Auxiliaries and the Structure of Spellout*. Dordrecht: Springer. • Bailyn, John. 1995. *A configurational account of Russian "free" word order*. PhD thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. • Baltin, Mark. 2012. Deletion versus pro-forms: An overly simple dichotomy? *NLLT* 30: 381–423. • Bastos-Gee, Ana Claudia. 2009. Topicalization of verbal projections in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Minimalist Essays on Brazilian Portuguese Syntax*, 161–189. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Doron, Edit. 1983. *Verbless Predicates in Hebrew*. PhD thesis, University of Texas Austin, Austin, TX. • Doron, Edit. 1999. V-movement and VP-ellipsis. In *Fragments: Studies in ellipsis and gapping*, 124–140. New York: OUP. • Goldberg, Lotu M. 2005. *Verb-stranding VP ellipsis: A cross-linguistic study*. PhD thesis, McGill University, Montreal. • Griбанова, Vera. 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. *NLLT* 31(1): 91–136. • Houser, Michael J., Line Mikkelsen, and Maziar Toosarvandani. 2011. A defective auxiliary in Danish. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 23(3): 245–298. • Källgren, Gunnel, and Ellen Prince. 1989. Swedish VP-topicalization and Yiddish verb topicalization. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 12: 47–58. • Landau, Idan. 2006. Chain Resolution in Hebrew VP-fronting. *Syntax* 9(1): 32–66. • Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: OUP. • Merchant, Jason. 2002. Swiping in Germanic. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax. Proceedings from the 15th CGSW*, 289–316. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 661–738. • Platzack, Christer. 2008. Cross-linguistic Variation in the realm of support verbs. Ms., Lund University; LingBuzz/000766. • Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In *The cartography of syntactic structures*, 297–327. New York/Oxford: OUP. • Rouveret, Alain. 1990. X-bar theory, minimality and barrierhood in Welsh. In *The syntax of the modern Celtic languages*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. • Rouveret, Alain. 2012. VP ellipsis, phases, and the syntax of morphology. *NLLT* 30:897–963. • Sailor, Craig. 2018. The typology of head movement and ellipsis: A reply to Lipták & Saab. *NLLT* 36: 851–875. • Santos, Ana Lucia. 2009. *Minimal answers. Ellipsis, syntax and discourse in the acquisition of European Portuguese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Schoorlemmer, Erik. 2012. Definiteness marking in German: Morphological variations on the same syntactic theme. *JCL* 15: 107–156. • Schoorlemmer, Erik, and Tanja Temmerman. 2012. Head Movement as a PF-Phenomenon: Evidence from Identity under Ellipsis. In *Proceedings of the WCCFL 29*, 232–240. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project. • Silva, Gláucia V. 2001. *Word order in Brazilian Portuguese*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter. • Ström Herold, Jenny. 2009. *Proformen and Ellipse: Zur Syntax und Diskurspragmatik prädikativer Anaphern im Deutschen und Schwedischen*. PhD thesis, Lund University, Lund. • Thoms, Gary. 2012. Ellipsis licensing and verb movement in Scandinavian. Ms., University of Glasgow. • Verbuk, Anna. 2006. Russian predicate clefts as 5-topic constructions. In *FASL: The Princeton Meeting 2005*, 394–408. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. • Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2017. An argument against the syntactic nature of verb movement. In *Order and structure in syntax 1: Word order and syntactic structure*, 29–47. Berlin: Language Science Press.