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ellipsis is generally thought to target XPs.

Whenever a subconstituent of XP survives XP-deletion, evacuation movement is postulated.
Topic and claims

- Ellipsis is generally thought to target XPs.
- Whenever a subconstituent of XP survives XP-deletion, evacuation movement is postulated.
- We provide evidence from NP-ellipsis against evacuation movement:
  - It wrongly predicts freezing effects for subextraction from PP-remnants in English.
  - It is incompatible with genitive remnants of NP-ellipsis in German, which cannot undergo the movement required to escape ellipsis.
**Topic and claims**

- Ellipsis is generally thought to target XPs when a subconstituent of XP survives XP-deletion, evacuation movement is postulated.
- We provide evidence from NP-ellipsis against evacuation movement:
  - It wrongly predicts freezing effects for subextraction from PP-remnants in English.
  - It is incompatible with genitive remnants of NP-ellipsis in German, which cannot undergo the movement required to escape ellipsis.

**Alternative analysis**

XPs can survive ellipsis without evacuation movement when they are contrastive/focused (cf. Stigliano 2022).
Table of Contents

1 The logic of evacuation movement

2 Against evacuation movement
   • Absence of freezing effects
   • Survival of immobile constituents
   • Against exceptional movement under ellipsis

3 Proposal
Logic of Evacuation Movement

- consider ellipsis in the nominal domain:
- subconstituents of NP can survive "NP"-ellipsis

(1) a. I like these books about Chomsky and you like those \[ NP \text{ books about Chomsky} \].
   b. I like these books about Chomsky and you like those books about Churchill.
The logic of evacuation movement

Logic of Evacuation Movement

- consider ellipsis in the nominal domain:
- subconstituents of NP can survive "NP"-ellipsis

(1) a. I like these books about Chomsky and you like those \([_{NP}books\ about\ Chomsky]\).
   b. I like these books about Chomsky and you like those books \textbf{about Churchill}.

- typical account: examples like (1b) are derived by NP ellipsis, just like (1a), with the PP \textbf{evacuating the NP prior to deletion}

(2) ... and you those \([_{NP}_{NP}\underbrace{books}_{PP}][_{PP} about Churchill]]\)
Advantages of Evacuation Movement

- advantage 1: no non-constituent deletion needed
- advantage 2: explains why omission of the preposition is impossible if movement is rightward:

(3)  

a. *I like these books about Chomsky and you like those books about *t Churchill.
  
No P-omission under Evacuation Movement

because rightward movement, including extraposition but also reordering in DP, requires pied-piping

(4) a. I read those books __ yesterday \([PP \text{ about your favorite actor}]\)
   b. *I read those books \([PP \text{ about __}]\) yesterday \([DP \text{ your favorite actor}]\)

(5) a. [Those books by John about Chomsky] impress me.
   b. [Those books __ about Chomsky [by John]] impress me.
   c. *[Those books by __ about Chomsky [John]] impress me.
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3. Proposal
Subextraction from PP-remnants

- Saab (2019): possible to extract from PP-remnants of NP-ellipsis:

(6) I know who you bought two pictures of, but I don’t know \(\text{who}_1\) you bought three \([\text{NP pictures of } \_1]\)
Position of PP-remnants

- PP-remnants can be shown to be DP-internal as they front together with other parts of DP:

(7) I like these books about Chomsky, but [those books about Churchill], I really dislike.

- 2 possibilities for evacuation movement within DP:
  - leftward movement
  - rightward movement
Putative evacuation movement

Saab (2019) suggests leftward evacuation movement, but implausible given that PPs cannot occur pre-nominally (outside of ellipsis):

(8) a. *I like these two [about Churchill]₁ [NPbooks __₁]
   b. *I like these two [about Churchill]₁ [NPbooks __₁]
Putative evacuation movement

- Saab (2019) suggests leftward evacuation movement, but implausible given that PPs cannot occur pre-nominally (outside of ellipsis):

(8)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{*I like these two [about Churchill]_1 [NP books } \_1 ] \\
\text{b. } & \text{*I like these two [about Churchill]_1 [NP books } \_1 ] 
\end{align*}

- An alternative is evacuation movement to the right, leading to adjunction to NP/NumP, see Yoshida et al. (2012)

(9)  
\begin{align*}
\text{I like these two [NP[NP books } \_1 ] [about Churchill]_1 ]
\end{align*}

- Advantage: DP-internal modifiers can independently reorder to some extent:
Reordering within DPs

- with certain nouns, reordering of NP-modifiers is possible, though marked

(10) a. a letter from John to Mary
    b. a letter __1 to Mary [from John]₁

(11) a. a book about linguistics from the 19th century
    b. a book __₁ from the 19th century [about linguistics]₁
Reordering within DPs II

- while extraction from base order is possible (12), extraction from reordered structure is degraded (13):

  (12) a. Who$_1$ did you see a letter from ___$_1$ to Mary?  
b. Who$_1$ do you like books about ___$_1$ from the 20th century?

  (13) a.??Who$_2$ did you see a letter ___$_1$ to Mary [from ___$_2$]$_1$  
b.??Who$_2$ did you like books ___$_1$ from the 20th century [about ___$_2$]$_1$?

- unsurprising given the CED/the freezing principle
Against evacuation movement

Consequences for evacuation movement

- however, examples like (14) (repeated from above) would require exactly this kind of derivation

(14) I know who you bought two pictures of, but I don’t know who you bought [three [pictures ___1] [of ___2]1]

→ the grammaticality of (14) is completely unexpected under evacuation movement as it should violate the CED/the freezing principle
Consequences for evacuation movement 2

- making matters worse, the example in (14) is based on *of*-PPs
- *of*-PPs are known to be less mobile than other PPs, see Takami (1992, 53)

(15) a. students of physics with long hair  
    b. *students __1 with long hair [of physics]1

(16) a. a review of a book on the desk  

→ With *of*-PPs, the putative source structure underlying subextraction is ungrammatical.
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Extraction of genitives

- DP-internal genitives cannot be extracted from DP, see Lindauer (1995, 118), Müller (1995, 46)
- the ban on extraction also holds if the DP is indefinite and extraction takes place from a postnominal position

(17) a. Ich habe [geheime Berichte des Professors] gelesen
   I have secret reports the.GEN professor.GEN read
Extraction of genitives

- DP-internal genitives cannot be extracted from DP, see Lindauer (1995, 118), Müller (1995, 46)
- the ban on extraction also holds if the DP is indefinite and extraction takes place from a postnominal position

(17) a. Ich habe [geheime Berichte des Professors] gelesen
   I have secret reports the.GEN professor.GEN read

      the.GEN professor.GEN have I secret reports read

   c. *Ich habe [geheime Berichte ___₁] gelesen [des Professors]₁
      I have secret reports read the.GEN professor.GEN
Reordering: genitives

- crucially, genitives also cannot be reordered within NP by right-adjoining them:

(18) a. Die Angst der Erstklässler vor Monstern
    the fear the.\text{GEN} first.graders of monsters
    ‘the first graders’ fear of monsters’

b. *Die Angst ___\text{1} vor Monstern [der Erstklässler]_\text{1}
    the fear of monsters the.\text{GEN} first.graders
DP-internal genitives under NP-ellipsis

- crucially: genitives can survive NP-ellipsis where both N and the PP-complement are deleted (and recovered):

(19) Die Angst der Erstklässler vor Monstern ist gross, aber [die Angst der Zweitklässler vor Monstern] ist viel größer.  

‘The first graders’ fear of monsters is big, but that of the second graders is much bigger.’
DP-internal genitives under NP-ellipsis

- crucially: genitives can survive NP-ellipsis where both N and the PP-complement are deleted (and recovered):

  (19) Die Angst der Erstklässler vor Monstern ist gross, aber [die Angst der Zweitklässler vor Monstern] ist viel grösser.
  ‘The first graders’ fear of monsters is big, but that of the second graders is much bigger.’

  (19) shows that genitive remnant is part of the DP (precedes verb in V2) → survival of NP-ellipsis is not due to extraction from DP

  (19) would thus require reordering/rightward movement within DP, which was shown to be impossible in (18):

  (20) die [NP [NP Angst vor Monstern] [der Zweitklässler] ]
Leftward movement?

Leftward evacuation movement within DP is not an option either:
Leftward movement?

- Leftward evacuation movement within DP is not an option either:

- while genitives can occur in prenominal position, they can do so only if D is silent (irrespective of the position of D):

\[(21)\]  
\[\begin{align*}
(\text{a}) & \quad (*\text{Die}) \quad \text{Peters}_1 & / & [\text{der} \quad \text{Erstklässler}]_1 \\
& \quad \text{the.NOM} \quad \text{Peter.GEN} & \quad \text{the.GEN} \quad \text{first.graders} \\
& \quad [\text{NP} \quad \text{Angst} \quad \text{vor} \quad \text{Monstern}] \\
& \quad \text{fear} & \quad \text{before} & \quad \text{monsters} \\
\end{align*}\]  

\[\begin{align*}
(\text{b}) & \quad \text{Peters}_1 & / & [\text{der} \quad \text{Erstklässler}]_1 (*\text{die}) \\
& \quad \text{Peter.GEN} & \quad \text{the.GEN} \quad \text{first.graders} & \quad \text{the.NOM} \\
& \quad [\text{NP} \quad \text{Angst} \quad \text{vor} \quad \text{Monstern}] \\
& \quad \text{fear} & \quad \text{before} & \quad \text{monsters} \\
\end{align*}\]
Leftward movement?

- Leftward evacuation movement within DP is not an option either:
- while genitives can occur in prenominal position, they can do so only if D is silent (irrespective of the position of D):

(21) a. (*Die) Peters₁ / [der Erstklässler]₁
    the.NOM Peter.GEN the.GEN first.graders
    [NP Angst __₁ vor Monstern]
    fear before monsters

b. Peters₁ / [der Erstklässler]₁ (*die)
    Peter.GEN the.GEN first.graders the.NOM
    [NP Angst __₁ vor Monstern]
    fear before monsters

- but in the relevant ellipsis examples in (19)/(20), the determiner is overt
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3 Proposal
It is often claimed that ellipsis can allow certain otherwise illicit (viz., island-violating) movements (Ross 1969, Chomsky 1972, Perlmutter 1971, Lasnik 2001, Merchant 2001, Mendes 2020, Mendes and Kandybowicz 2021, Drummond 2021, ...)

(22) She kissed a man [\textsubscript{island} \textsubscript{who} bit one of my friends], but ...
   a. ... *Tom doesn’t realize \textit{which one of my friends}\textsubscript{1} she kissed a man [\textsubscript{island} \textsubscript{who} bit \_\textsubscript{1}]
   b. ... Tom doesn’t realize \textit{which one of my friends}\textsubscript{1} she kissed a man [\textsubscript{island} \textsubscript{who} bit \_\textsubscript{1}]
Islandhood is not at stake

- PP complements can move rightwards, in contrast with genitive complements

(23) a. Die Angst der Erstklässler vor Monstern
   the fear the.\textit{GEN} first.graders of monsters
   ‘the first graders’ fear of monsters’
   b. *Die Angst \textit{1} vor Monstern [DP der Erstklässler]\textit{1}
      the fear of monsters the.\textit{GEN} first.graders

(24) a. die Angst von Erstklässlern vor Monstern
   the fear of first.graderes before monsters
   b. ?die Angst \textit{1} vor Monstern [PP von Erstklässlern]\textit{1}
      the fear before monsters of first.graders
      ‘the first graders’ fear of monsters’

→ the logic of salvation by deletion cannot be used here to motivate exceptional movement since the movement as such is possible
Islandhood is not at stake

- Also, genitive complements can move to left, but only in the absence of an overt determiner:

(25) (*Die) Peters₁ (*die) Angst₁ vor Monstern
the.NOM Peter.GEN the.NOM fear before monsters
Islandhood is not at stake

- Also, genitive complements can move to left, but only in the absence of an overt determiner:

\[(25) \quad (*\text{Die} \; \text{Peters}_{1} \quad (*\text{die} \; \text{Angst} \_1 \; \text{vor} \; \text{Monstern}) \]

- crucially, the genitive can survive ellipsis in the presence of the determiner, suggesting it hasn’t moved to the left:

\[(26) \quad \text{Die Angst der Erstklässler vor Monstern ist größer als die Angst der Zweitklässler vor Monstern.} \]

‘The first graders’ fear of monsters is bigger than that of the second graders.’
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3. Proposal
Ellipsis and focus in the nominal domain

- as in much of the literature, we assume that the entire NP is marked for ellipsis
- but we make the claim that focus-marked constituents can in fact be retained (Hirai 2018, Stigliano 2022)

→ Result: Evacuation movement is not necessary.
The idea that portions of constituents marked for ellipsis can actually survive ellipsis has been around for a long time (though often frowned upon) (e.g. Morgan 1973, Hankamer 1979, Kimura 2010, Abe 2015, Ott and Struckmeier 2018, Griffiths 2019, Stigliano 2022)
Ellipses and focus in the nominal domain

(27) a. $[_{DP} D [_{NP} N X_{PF} ]]$
    b. $[_{DP} D [_{NP} N_{F} X_{P} ]]$

The idea that portions of constituents marked for ellipsis can actually survive ellipsis has been around for a long time (though often frowned upon)

(e.g. Morgan 1973, Hankamer 1979, Kimura 2010, Abe 2015, Ott and Struckmeier 2018, Griffiths 2019, Stigliano 2022)

One possible implementation

- for instance, ellipsis can seen as an instruction to forgo vocabulary insertion targeting head by head within the ellipsis domain (Wasow 1972, Bartos 2000, Saab 2008, ...)

- Crucially, this instruction is bled by a focus feature
Ellipsis of N

(28) Die Angst der Erstklässler ist größer als [DP die [NP the fear the.GEN first.graders is bigger than that Angst der Zweitklässler ]].

‘The first graders’ fear is bigger than that of the second graders.’

(29) [DP D [NP N GenP[F]]] domain of ellipsis
Ellipsis of post-nominal modifiers

(30) Im Flugzeug habe ich einen Artikel über Churchill gelesen und du einen Roman über Churchill. ‘On the plane I read an article about Churchill and you a novel about Churchill’

(31) \[[DP \ D \ [NP \ N[F] \ GenP]]\] domain of ellipsis
Conclusion

We have provided two arguments against evacuation movement in NP-ellipsis based on

- extraction from PP-remnants of ellipsis: evacuation movement would predict freezing effects
- ellipsis surviving genitives in German: genitives cannot undergo the type of movement necessary to escape NP-ellipsis
We have provided two arguments against evacuation movement in NP-ellipsis based on

- extraction from PP-remnants of ellipsis: evacuation movement would predict freezing effects
- ellipsis surviving genitives in German: genitives cannot undergo the type of movement necessary to escape NP-ellipsis

Proposal

- we adhere to NP-ellipsis as involving deletion of a maximal projection, viz., nP
- material within nP can survive ellipsis if it is contrastive/focus-marked
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Ellipsis of pre-nominal modifiers

(32) *Ich habe das schönste Auto und du [DP das [NP schönste [NP Motorrad ]]].
I have the prettiest car and you the prettiest motorbike
‘I have the prettiest car and you the motor bike.’

(33) *DP D[Q] [NP AP[Q]] [NP N[F,Q] PP[F,Q]]
[domain of ellipsis]

- The prenominal modifier is typically not properly included in the domain of ellipsis (though there are complications here)
- (possessors are no longer an issue as they are outside of NP)
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(34) *I like these books about Chomsky and you like those books about *Churchill.
(34)*I like these books about Chomsky and you like those books about t Churchill.

- The current approach has little to say about the fact that the preposition must also survive deletion even though
  - it is not contrastive and
  - should be recoverable from the antecedent
issue is more general: also affects Ds in German genitival DPs or parts of surviving RCs that are non-contrastive and should be recoverable from the antecedent
issue is more general: also affects Ds in German genitival DPs or parts of surviving RCs that are non-contrastive and should be recoverable from the antecedent

(35) .. als die Angst [*der Zweitklässler] than that fear the. GEN second.graders
issue is more general: also affects Ds in German genitival DPs or parts of surviving RCs that are non-contrastive and should be recoverable from the antecedent

(35) .. als die Ängst [*der Zweitklässler]
    than that fear the GEN second graders

(36) Ich habe zwei Bücher, die im Mittelalter spielen, und
    I have two books which in the Middle Age play and
    du hast drei Bücher, [*die in der Antike *spielen].
    you have three books which in the antiquity play
‘I have two books that are situated in the Middle Ages, and you have three that are situated in antiquity.’
pre-nominal modifiers can actually be elided, as long as other NP internal material also is.

the present analysis doesn’t capture this fact

(37) Ich habe zwei neue Bücher über Chomsky gelesen und du drei neue Bücher über Chomsky

‘I read two new books about Chomsky and you read three.’
Licensing of NP-ellipsis

another advantage of the present account is that ellipsis licensing is always by D and targets D’s complement, even in cases where it seems that the complement of a lower head, viz., Num or A, is deleted:
Licensing of NP-ellipsis

- another advantage of the present account is that ellipsis licensing is always by D and targets D’s complement, even in cases where it seems that the complement of a lower head, viz., Num or A, is deleted:

(38) a. I read two books about Chomsky and you three books about Chomsky

b. Ich kaufte die gelbe Tasche und du kauftest l bought.1sg the yellow bag and you bought.2sg die grüne Tasche the green bag ‘I bought the yellow bag and you bought the green (one).’
the fact that numerals and adjectives survive can be related to their contrastivity, which prevents them from being deleted
Licensing of NP-ellipsis 2

- The fact that numerals and adjectives survive can be related to their contrastivity, which prevents them from being deleted.
- The fact that there is no NP ellipsis after adjectives in English will have to be related to other factors (e.g., realization of some morphology necessary, which triggers *one*-insertion).
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Subextraction from PP-remnants

Once we combine PP-subextraction with visible extraposition, the result is ungrammatical:

(39) a. I know who you bought two pictures of today, but I don’t know who\textsubscript{1} you bought three pictures of \_	extsubscript{1} yesterday.

b. *I know who you bought two pictures of today, but I don’t know who\textsubscript{2} you bought three pictures \_	extsubscript{1} yesterday [of \_	extsubscript{2}]\textsubscript{1}.
Alternative 1: NP-modifiers = adjuncts

- It is frequently argued that PP-modifiers within NP are adjuncts (to NP/nP), cf. Donati and Cecchetto (2011), Bruening and Al Khalaf (2019)
  - this would render evacuation movement unnecessary
Alternative 1: NP-modifiers = adjuncts 2

possible counterarguments

▶ given the CED, one would expect subextraction to be generally blocked if they were adjuncts
▶ one would expect *about/of*-PPs to behave like bona fide adjuncts within DP, but they behave differently w.r.t. pied-piping extraction, see Bošković (2016, 23), (40), and subextraction, see Takami (1992, 56f.), (41):

(40) a. [About which city]₁ did Peter read [books ⎯₁]?  
   b. *[From which city]₁ did Peter meet [girls ⎯₁]?

(41) a. *Who₁ does Phineas know [a girl [behind ⎯₁]]?  
   b. *[What color eyes]₁ did you meet [a man [with ⎯₁]]?

→ makes evacuation movement even less plausible
Alternative 2: PP-modifiers as vP-constituents 1

- it is sometimes disputed that the PPs under consideration are part of NP
- rather, they are treated as constituents of VP, resulting from some reanalysis process
Alternative 2: PP-modifiers as vP-constituents 1

- it is sometimes disputed that the PPs under consideration are part of NP
- rather, they are treated as constituents of VP, resulting from some reanalysis process
- For some PP-modifiers, this may be correct given that (i) the noun can be omitted/(ii) can be replaced by a pronoun:

  (42) a. Who did he write his first book about?
  b. He wrote it about Nixon.

→ in such cases, no subextraction would be necessary
Alternative 2: PP-modifiers as vP-constituents 2

- however, this does not solve the puzzle because
  - this kind of reanalysis is not possible in all cases, cf.

  (43)  
  a. He found *(a/the book) about Chomsky.
  b. *He found it about Chomsky

- the PP fronts together with other parts of the noun phrase (recall from above):

  (44) but [that book about John], I really dislike
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Agents/themes/possessors in the German DP 1

- agents, themes and possessors in the German DP can be realized as genitives or *von-*‘of’-PPs

(45) a. Marias Bericht
    Mary’s report

   b. ein Bericht der Maria
      a report the.GEN Mary.GEN

   c. ein Bericht von (der) Maria
      a report of the Mary

- with proper names and kinship terms, an -s genitive is used, which, unlike in English, is limited to heads
Agents/themes/possessors in the German DP 2

- all can occur in postnominal position

(46) Die Entdeckung Amerikas / von Amerika / der Langsamkeit
the discover America.\textsc{gen} / of America / the.\textsc{gen}
slowness
‘the discovery of America/slowness’
Agents/themes/possessors in the German DP 3

PP-arguments and phrasal genitives are marked prenominally, either colloquial/dialectal (PPs) or archaic (phrasal genitives)

(47) a. von Hans die Frau
    of John the wife
    ‘John’s wife’

b. des Kaisers neue Kleider
    the. GEN emperor. GEN new clothes
    ‘the emperor’s new clothes’
Agents/themes/possessors in the German DP 4

- they are usually thought to (optionally) undergo movement within DP, viz., from within NP to Spec,DP
- agents are projected above themes: minimality effects: only the agent can front, cf. Lindauer (1995)

(48) a. Kolumbus’ Entdeckung Amerikas
   Columbus’ discovery America GEN

b. *Amerikas Entdeckung Kolumbus’
   America’s discovery Columbus’
Extraction 1

- DP-internal genitives cannot be extracted from DP, see Lindauer (1995, 118), Müller (1995, 46)

(49) a. Ich habe [Caesars Eroberung von Gallien] gesehen.
I have Caesar's conquest of Gaul seen
‘I saw Caesar’s conquest of Gaul.’
Extraction 1

- DP-internal genitives cannot be extracted from DP, see Lindauer (1995, 118), Müller (1995, 46)

(49)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Ich habe [Caesars Eroberung von Gallien] gesehen.
      \begin{align*}
      &\text{I have Caesar.}\text{GEN conquest of Gaul seen} \\
      &\text{‘I saw Caesar’s conquest of Gaul.’}
      \\
  \item b. *Caesars}_{1} habe ich [\underline{1} Eroberung von Gallien] gesehen.
      \begin{align*}
      &\text{Ceasar.}\text{GEN have I conquest of Gaul seen} \\
  \item c. *Ich habe [\underline{1} Eroberung von Gallien] gesehen Caesars}_{1}.
      \begin{align*}
      &\text{I have conquest of Gaul seen Caesar.}\text{GEN}
\end{itemize}
Extraction 1

- DP-internal genitives cannot be extracted from DP, see Lindauer (1995, 118), Müller (1995, 46)

(49) a. Ich habe [Caesars GEN Eroberung von Gallien] gesehen.  
    I have Caesar.GEN conquest of Gaul seen  
    ‘I saw Caesar’s conquest of Gaul.’

   Caesar.GEN have I conquest of Gaul seen

   I have conquest of Gaul seen Caesar.GEN

- confound: the DPs in the above examples are definite, extraction may be blocked for independent reasons
Extraction of PP-complements

but *von*-'of'-PPs bearing the same thematic role can be extracted

(50) a. Ich habe [geheime Berichte von Peter gelesen]
   I have secret reports of Peter read

   of Peter have I secret reports read

   I have secret reports read of Peter

→ the extraction restriction only affects genitives
Reordering 2: PPs

reordering of PP-modifiers, however, is possible to some extent, and, in nominalizations, seems to be most acceptable if the preposition is identical to the one selected by the underlying predicate, cf. Lindauer (1995, 109-11)

(51) a. die Angst von Erstklässlern vor Monstern
    the fear of first.graders before monsters

   b. ?die Angst ___1 vor Monstern [von Erstklässlern]1
   the fear ___ before monsters of first.graders
     ‘the first graders’ fear of monsters’
Relevance of surviving genitives

- DP-internal genitives are the most argument-like DP-internal constituents
- they must occur closer to the noun than ‘about’-PPs
Relevance of surviving genitives

- DP-internal genitives are the most argument-like DP-internal constituents
- they must occur closer to the noun than ‘about’-PPs
- → they are thus most likely to be generated within NP
- → their survival under NP-ellipsis thus cannot be explained away by treating them as adjuncts to NP (like other NP-modifiers)
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Looking the other side of the coin

- We’ve been looking at elements that can survive NP-ellipsis,
- We will consider now elements that can be elided in the nominal domain
- **Hypothesis (to be considered and rejected):** syntactic objects within the nominal domain can be independently elided
- Looking at the data in this way will put us on the right track: *NP ellipsis exists, but it is more flexible than previously thought*
(52) Die Angst der Erstklässler ist größer als [DP die [NP the fear the. GEN first.graders is bigger than that Angst der Zweitklässler ]].

‘The first graders’ fear is bigger than that of the second graders.’
(53) Im Flugzeug habe ich einen Artikel über Churchill gelesen und du [DP einen [NP Roman [PP über Churchill]]].
In the plane I read an article about Churchill and you a novel (about Churchill).

‘On the plane I read an article about Churchill and you a novel (about Churchill)’
but deletion of individual constituents is not always possible, see prenominal adjectives and possessors (same with numerals):

(54) *Ich habe das schönste Auto und du [DP das [NP schönste [NP Motorrad ]]].
I have the prettiest car and you the prettiest motorbike
‘I have the prettiest car and you the motor bike.’

(55) *Ich schätze Peters Bücher und du schätzt Peters Bilder
I appreciate Peter.GEN books and you appreciate his paintings
‘I appreciate Peter’s books and you appreciate his paintings.’
Takeaways

Generalizations

1. nouns and post-nominal modifiers can be independently elided,
2. pre-nominal modifiers cannot be independently elided
Takeaways

1. ellipsis of postnominal modifiers is unlikely to be reduced to pragmatic recovery alone, otherwise the asymmetry between prenominal and postnominal modifiers is unexpected. In other words: ellipsis is mediated by the grammar.

2. Deletion of individual constituents is too powerful and hence must be constrained
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Ellipsis in the grammar


(56) Peter will see Mary.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{NP} \\
[\text{Peter, } O] \\
\text{T} \\
[\text{FUT, } O] \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
[\text{see, } O] \\
\text{NP} \\
[\text{Mary, } O]
\end{array}
\]
Ellipsis in the grammar

(57) Peter will see Mary.

```
TP
  NP [Peter, /piːtəɬ/]
  T [FUT, /wɪt/]
  VP
    V [see, /siː/]
    NP [Mary, /meɪri/]
```
Ellipsis in the grammar

- Ellipsis as Q-deletion (Saab 2022)

(58) A: Mary won’t see Mary.
B: Peter will.
Ellipsis in the grammar

- Ellipsis as Q-deletion (Saab 2022)

(59) A: Mary won’t see Mary.
B: Peter will.
Ellipsis in the grammar

- Ellipsis as Q-deletion (Saab 2022)

(60) A: Mary won’t see Mary.
B: Peter will.