On Subjects in ACD in Dutch and German

Lobke Aelbrecht & Uli Sauerland
U. Ghent & ZAS

GGS 2010, FU Berlin – May 6–10, 2010

1 Introduction

1.1 Modal Complement Ellipsis (MCE) in Dutch and German

MCE: ellipsis of the infinitival complement of a non-epistemic modal (Aelbrecht, 2009):

(1)   Ik wil   wel   helpen, maar ik kan niet ~~helpen~~. (DUTCH)
       I wue   schau hoefn, oba   i kau net ~~hoefn~~ (AUSTRIAN GERMAN)
       I want prt   help   but   I can not help

       'I want to help, but I can't.'

(see also Aelbrecht 2007; Zobel 2007)

1.2 Extraction from MCE

Generally no object extraction from MCE (Aelbrecht, 2009):

(2)   *Ik weet niet welk   boek ze moet lezen, maar ik weet welk   (boek) ze   niet moet
        I know not which book she must read   but   I know which book   she not   must
        ~~lezen t~~$_{\text{welk}}$ ~~(boek)~~. (DUTCH)
        read

       'I don't know which book she has to read, but I know which she doesn't have to.'

1.3 ACD (Antecedent Condition Deletion)

Object extraction in ACD is possible, but only with coreferential subjects:

(3)   Da Jim$_j$ hot jeds Buach glesn, des$_i$ a$_j$ ~~t$_j$ lesn t$_i$~~ miassn hot. (AG)
      the Jim has every book   read   that he read   must   had

      'Jim read every book that he had to.'

(4)   *Da Jim$_j$ hot jeds Buach glesn, des$_i$ de Jana$_k$ ~~t$_k$ lesn t$_i$~~ miassn hot. (AG)
      the Jim has every book   read   that the Jana   read   must   had

      'Jim read every book that Jana had to.'

1.4 Plot

- Why object extraction from MCE only in ACD?
  Aelbrecht's (2009) freezing at LF + special trace identity in ACD (Sauerland, 2004)

- Why subject coreference in Dutch/German but not English?
  related to scope over the subject (Frey, 1993)

2 Two Extraction Puzzles

2.1 Objects vs Subjects

MCE in D/AG does not allow object extraction out of the ellipsis site, but subject extraction is fine:

(5)   a. *Ik weet niet welk boek ze moet lezen, maar ik weet welk (boek) ze   niet
          I   know not which book she must read   but   I know which book   she not
          moet ~~lezen t$_{\text{welk}}$ (boek)~~. (DUTCH)
          must read
          'I don't know which book she has to read, but I know which she doesn't have to.'
      b. Die rok   moet niet gewassen worden, maar hij mag   wel
          that skirt must not washed   become but   he is.allowed prt
          ~~gewassen worden t$_{\text{hij}}$~~. (DUTCH)
          washed become
          'That skirt doesn't have to be washed, but it can be.'

Aelbrecht's (2009) account:

- MCE is licensed by Agree with ellipsis licensor, here: root modal

- ellipsis is frozen when the licensor enters the derivation

- subject occupy a phase edge, objects don't

2.2 ACD and Coreferential Subjects

In ACD, extraction of objects is sometimes possible – a problem for Aelbrecht's (2009) account:

(6) a. Jim$_j$ heeft elk   boek gelezen dat$_i$ hij$_j$ moest ~~t$_j$ lezen t$_i$~~. (DUTCH)
         Jim has   every book read   that he had to read
     b. Da Jim$_j$ hot jeds Buach glesn, des$_i$ a$_j$ ~~t$_j$ lesn t$_i$~~ miassn hot. (AG)
         the Jim has every book   read   that he read   must   had
         'Jim read every book that he had to.'

But, when the subjects are not coreferential ACD is ruled out: Aelbrecht (2009) predicts this

(7) a. *Jim$_j$ heeft elk   boek gelezen dat$_i$ Jana$_k$ moest ~~t$_k$ lezen t$_i$~~. (DUTCH)
         Jim has   every book read   that Jana had to read
     b. *Da Jim$_j$ hot jeds Buach glesn, des$_i$ de Jana$_k$ ~~t$_k$ lesn t$_i$~~ miassn hot. (AG)
         the Jim has every book   read   that the Jana read   must   had
         'Jim read every book that Jana had to.'

Pilot Test on Standard German

Free relative clauses, 8 items each, different auxiliaries/modals, grammaticality with magnitude estimation. Two sample items each:

(8) free relative, subject coreference:

     a. Jana hat angerufen, wen$_j$ sie$_i$ ~~t$_i$ t$_j$ anrufen~~ wollte.
         Jana has phoned   who she phone   wanted
     b. Toby hat schon   getroffen, wen$_j$ er$_i$ ~~t$_i$ t$_j$ treffen~~ musste.
         Toby has already met,   who he meet   must

(9) free-relative, subject contra-reference:

a. Pascal hat schon erledigt, was Martin noch ~~t_i t_j erledigen~~ muss.
   Pascal has already finished, what Martin still must

b. Pius hat oft eingeladen, wen_j Tanja_i schon ~~t_i t_j eingeladen~~ hatte.
   Pius has often invited, who Tanja already invited has.

Preliminary result from 4 subjects (co vs contra-ref: Welch Two Sample t-test, $t = 1.3432$, $df = 61.08$, p-value $= 0.18$):

extraction	subject	sample	mean normalized judgment
no	coref.	(10)	0.2148
ACD, headed	coref.	(11)	0.1245
ACD, free	coref.	(8)	-0.1866
	contraref.	(9)	-0.5178

Sample control items:

(10) no extraction:

Die Ärzt-in musste den Fall nicht übernehmen, aber sie durfte.
the doctor-FEM must the case not take over, but she was allowed

(11) extraction: headed relative, subject coreference:

Connie hat eine Schulkameradin eingeladen, die sie durfte.
Connie has a schoolmate-FEM invited who she was allowed

3 A Binding Solution for the Puzzles

3.1 Sloppy Ellipsis in English

(12) Mary bribed him_i, and SOMEbody else DIdn't ~~bribe him_j~~

(13) John_i admitted that Mary had bribed him_i. Bill_j didn't admit that MAry had ~~bribed him_j~~, but he admitted that SOMEbody had ~~bribed him_j~~. (Hardt, 1992, (31))

Rooth (1992) account:

- ellipsis licensing phrase (LP) independent of elided constituent

- bound trace indices are irrelevant for ellipsis licensing

4

- identical trace indices are irrelevant for ellipsis

(14)   John $\underbrace{\lambda x \ x \text{ admitted that Mary had bribed } x}_{\text{antecedent}}$

    $\underbrace{\text{Bill } \lambda y \ y \text{ admitted that Mary had } \underbrace{\text{bribed } y}_{\text{elided VP}}}_{\text{licensing phrase (LP)}}$

(see also Heim 1997; Sauerland 2004; Takahashi and Fox 2005 and others)

(15)   Antecedent: ... YP ... t_{YP} ...

    a. OK: t_{XP} is bound within LP:
        $[_{LP} \text{ L } [\ldots \text{XP } [_{\text{ellipsis site}} \ldots \ t_{XP} \ldots]]]$
    b. *: t_{XP} isn't bound within LP and not identical to t_{YP} in the antecedent
        $[_{LP} \text{ L } [\ldots \text{XP } [_{\text{ellipsis site}} \ldots \ t_{XP} \ldots]]]$

Trace identity effect in English ACD:

(16) a. Polly visited every town$_i$ Opi Eric did [visit t_i].
     b. *Polly visited every town$_j$ in every country$_i$ Opi Eric did [visit t_i].

3.2 Objects vs Subjects

Our Proposal: The ellipsis licensing domain in Dutch/German cannot include more overt material than modal and its complement.

Object extraction:

(17) *Ik weet niet welk boek ze moet lezen, maar ik weet welk (boek) ze niet moet
      I know not which book she must read but I know which book she not must
      ~~lezen t~~$_{\overline{welk}}$ ~~(boek)~~.
      read

      'I don't know which book she has to read, but I know which she doesn't have to.'

Unbound trace of *welk*:

(18) welk (boek) ze niet $\underbrace{\text{moet } \sout{\text{lezen } t_{welk} \text{ (boek)}}}_{\text{LP}}$

Subject extraction:

(19)   (Aelbrecht, 2009, p. 63)

Erik is al   langsgekomen, maar Jenneke moet nog ~~$t_{Jenneke}$ langskomen~~
Erik is already passed by,   but   Jenneke must still pass by

'Erik has already passed by, but Jenneke still has to pass by.'

Bound trace of *Jenneke*:

(20)   ..., maar Jenneke $\underbrace{\lambda_{Jenneke} \text{ moet nog } \text{~~}t_{Jenneke}\text{ langskomen~~}}_{\text{LP}}$

3.3   ACD and Coreferential Subjects

- extraction allowed: trace identity

- subject coreference requirement:
  contra-reference would require scope over the subject (trace)

Further evidence for trace identity involvement in Dutch ACD:

(21)   *Jim_k heeft elk   boek$_i$ gelezen [dat$_i$ bovenop een tijdschrift$_j$ lag [dat$_j$ hij$_k$ moest
        Jim has   every book read   that on top of a   journal   laid that he   had.to
        ~~t_k lezen t_j~~
        read

ACD resolution in English: Scope over the subject:

(22)   a.   Polly visited every town *Op* ERIC did ~~visit $t_{\overline{Op}}$~~
        b.   every town $\underbrace{\text{ERIC}_F \text{ did } \text{~~visit }t_{\overline{Op}}\text{~~}}_{\text{LP}}$ Polly visited t_{QR}

AG and D like Standard German don't allow object-subject scope (Frey 1993 and others):

(23)   a. Jim_j λ_j [$_{DP}$ elk boek dat$_i$ hij$_j$ λ_j moest ~~t_j lezen t_i~~]$_i$ $\underbrace{t_j \text{ heeft gelezen } t_{DPi}}_{\text{antecedent}}$.

        b. Jim_j λ_j [$_{DP}$ elk boek dat$_i$ Jana$_k$ λ_k moest ~~t_k lezen t_i~~]$_i$ heeft $\underbrace{t_j \text{ gelezen } t_{DP_i}}_{\text{poss. antecedent}}$.

4 Conclusions

- ellipsis in German/Dutch with modal complements

- no ACD: subject extraction OK, object extraction not

- ACD: object extraction OK when subject coreferent

- freezing of ellipsis result of semantic condition

References

Aelbrecht, L., 2007. Modal complement ellipsis in Dutch. Bilbao-Deusto Student Conference in Linguistics.

Aelbrecht, L., 2009. You have the right to remain silent: The syntactic licensing of ellipsis. Ph.D. thesis, Katholieke Universitet Brussels, Brussels, Belgium.

Frey, W., 1993. Syntaktische Bedingungen für die semantische Interpretation: Über Bindung, implizite Argumente und Skopus. Akademie, Berlin, Germany.

Hardt, D., 1992. VP ellipsis and semantic identity. In: Barker, C., Dowty, D. (Eds.), Proceedings of SALT II. Ohio State University, Working Papers in Linguistics, Columbus.

Heim, I., 1997. Predicates or formulas? Evidence from ellipsis. In: Lawson, A., Cho, E. (Eds.), Proceedings of SALT VII. CLC Publications, Ithaca, New York, pp. 197–221.

Rooth, M., 1992. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. In: Berman, S., Hestvik, A. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Stuttgart Ellipsis Workshop. Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340, Bericht Nr. 29, IBM Germany, Heidelberg.

Sauerland, U., 2004. The interpretation of traces. Natural Language Semantics 12, 63–127.

Takahashi, S., Fox, D., 2005. MaxElide and the re-binding problem. In: Georgala, E., Howell, J. (Eds.), Proceedings of SALT 15. CLC Publications, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Zobel, S., 2007. Grundlagen der VP-Ellipse und VP-Ellipse im oberösterreichischen Deutsch. University of Vienna.