

If There's Anything Cleft Ellipsis Resembles, It's (Pseudo)gapping

Matthew Reeve
University College London

1. Introduction

Although there are various current views on how elliptical clauses are derived, perhaps the most widely-accepted view of such ellipsis types as sluicing and VP-ellipsis is that they involve a licensing relation between a functional head (bearing a particular feature) and the complement of that head, which is marked for non-pronunciation at PF. This is the so-called *PF-deletion* analysis illustrated in (1):

- (1) a. Barry insulted someone, but I don't know [_{CP} who_i C_[F] [_{TP} ~~Barry insulted t_i]].
b. Barry insulted someone, even though he said [_{TP} he [_[F] wouldn't] [_{VP} ~~insult someone~~]].~~

In order to analyse apparent 'non-constituent deletions' such as gapping and pseudogapping as involving PF-deletion, the non-deleted parts of the clause ('remnants') must undergo movement out of the ellipsis site prior to PF-deletion, as in (2) (Jayaseelan 1990, Lasnik 1999, Coppock 2001):

- (2) a. Barry has [_{VP} [_{VP} insulted Carlos] and [Diana_i [Esmeralda_j [_{VP} t_i ~~insulted~~ t_j]]]].
b. Although Barry didn't insult Archimedes, he did [Carlos_i [_{VP} ~~insult~~ t_i]].

While pseudogapping is fairly standardly treated as movement of the remnant followed by VP-ellipsis, a treatment of gapping in these terms is problematic, because gapping is highly restricted in its distribution in a way that the other ellipsis types are not. For example, gapping is generally restricted to coordinate structures. A number of authors have put this property of gapping at centre stage, arguing that gapping results from ATB-movement (Johnson 1996, 2009), the range of options for coordinating different types of constituents (Lin 2002), or the presence of 'bivalent' coordinators whose second member may be a null projection (Williams 1997, Ackema & Szendrői 2002).

In this paper, I argue against both VP-ellipsis and coordination-based analyses of gapping. The empirical evidence comes from a little-studied type of ellipsis which I will term 'cleft ellipsis', and which is illustrated in (3):¹

- (3) a. If there's anyone who can throw insults, it's Barry _{who can throw insults}.
b. If there's anything that Barry is, it's rude _{that Barry is}.
c. If there's anything that Barry can do, it's throw insults _{that he can (do)}.

The examples in (3) involve a 'reduced cleft' preceded by a conditional *if*-clause. Since full clefts are also possible in these examples, the question arises of whether reduced clefts involve a full cleft

* Thanks to Dirk Bury, David Potter, Craig Sailor, Gary Thoms, Elena Titov and Sasha Titov for useful discussion and judgments.

¹ The fullest description of such 'premodified reduced *it*-clefts' that I am aware of can be found in Declerck & Seki (1990). Here I use *subscripting* to indicate the non-pronounced but understood material in the ellipsis site, without prejudging the question of whether the ellipsis is derived by literal deletion.

structure plus ellipsis, or simply an anaphoric relation between *it* and a discourse antecedent, with no cleft clause and hence no ellipsis (e.g., Mikkelsen 2007). While I leave open the possibility that some reduced clefts do not involve ellipsis, I argue that there are two types of cleft ellipsis, one derived from a true full cleft by deletion of the cleft clause CP (Type A), and a second derived without movement by the same mechanism involved in gapping (Type B).² The reason for analysing Type B cleft ellipsis as a type of gapping is that it shares the distributional restrictions of gapping, apart from the coordination requirement. In order to give a unified account of gapping and Type B cleft ellipsis, therefore, we cannot appeal to a coordination-based analysis. On the other hand, reducing Type B cleft ellipsis and gapping to VP-ellipsis will fail to account for the distributional restrictions on gapping and cleft ellipsis, which are not shared by VP-ellipsis. Instead, I propose a modified version of Carrera Hernández's (2007) analysis of gapping, according to which the gapped clause is a TP whose head lacks a 'lexical address'. This TP projection therefore violates Inclusiveness unless it can be related to a TP in the same structure which can provide it with a lexical address. The underspecified TP thus forms a syntactic dependency (or chain) with the specified TP, a dependency which is subject to familiar conditions such as c-command and locality.

2. A unified analysis of gapping and cleft ellipsis

2.1. Two types of cleft ellipsis

In this section I will propose that the examples in (3) instantiate at least two ellipsis mechanisms: cleft clause deletion (a subtype of adjunct deletion) and embedded gapping. First, I will outline my assumptions about the structure of full *it*-clefts. In Reeve (2012), I argue that *it*-clefts may in principle involve either (i) base-generation of the clefted XP in postcopular position, or (ii) focus-movement of the clefted XP from inside the cleft clause. In fact, while strategy (ii) is available for all clefts (but imposes an obligatory contrastive interpretation on the clefted XP), strategy (i) is only available where the cleft clause may contain an overt relative operator (in other words, most DP- and certain PP-clefts). In addition, the cleft clause is extraposed to adjoin to the matrix VP so that it can be interpreted as a restrictive modifier of the subject *it*; that is, *it*-clefts are a type of specificational sentence with a definite subject. The structures for strategies (i) and (ii) (prior to extraposition) are illustrated in (4a,b) respectively:

- (4) a. [TP it's_j [VP t_j [DP [DP Barry] [CP who_i t_i can throw insults]]]]
 b. [TP it's_j [VP t_j [CP [AP rude]_i [CP that Barry is t_i]]]]

(4a) illustrates the base-generated structure for a DP-cleft, while (4b) illustrates the movement structure for an AP-cleft. Notice, however, that there is no full cleft equivalent of the reduced cleft in (3c), where the focus is a VP. This means that this reduced cleft must be derived in some way other than from a full cleft. Accordingly, I propose that while reduced DP- and AP-clefts may in principle be derived from full clefts by constituent deletion of the cleft clause CP ('Type A' cleft ellipsis), reduced VP-clefts must be derived by gapping into the cleft clause CP ('Type B' cleft ellipsis), resulting in the structure in (5), the reduced counterpart of (5b):

- (5) a. [TP it's_j [VP t_j [CP C DP T [VP throw insults]]]]
 b. It's that Barry can throw insults.

While the Type B strategy is the only possibility with reduced VP-clefts, it is also available in principle for other reduced clefts. I will argue below that this distinction between reduced VP-clefts (Type B only) and other clefts (Type A or Type B) captures important differences between reduced VP- and AP-clefts in particular. The main topic of this paper is the parallel between Type B ellipsis and gapping,

² Cleft ellipsis is superficially similar to pseudogapping in that the T node is pronounced (hence the title of this talk), but since cleft ellipsis patterns with gapping rather than with pseudogapping with respect to its locality properties, the two must be treated as distinct.

and I will therefore not have anything more to say about Type A ellipsis.³ Clearly, though, there are questions about whether such cases really do involve ellipsis, which must be left for future research. In the next section I show how Carrera Hernández's (2007) analysis of gapping can be extended to Type B ellipsis.

2.2. Type B ellipsis as a syntactic dependency

Carrera Hernández's (2007) main concern is to account for the peculiar locality properties of gapping: namely that it is restricted to coordinate structures, that there must be a sentence-internal antecedent, that this antecedent must precede the ellipsis site, and that neither the ellipsis site nor the antecedent may be embedded with respect to the other. These properties are illustrated in (6a-d) respectively:

- (6) a. *If Bill drank the vodka, then Mary ___ the scotch.
 b. *Bill ___ the vodka. (as a response to *Who drank what?*)
 c. *Bill ___ the vodka, and Mary drank the scotch.
 d. *Bill drank the vodka, and I hope that Mary ___ the scotch.
 *I think that Bill drank the vodka, and Mary ___ the scotch.

To capture these properties, she adopts the idea that deletion in coordinate structures involves underspecified projections rather than constituent deletion (Williams 1997, Ackema & Szendrői 2002). That null projections are arguably required is shown by examples such as (7), in which the matrix auxiliary shows plural agreement rather than the singular agreement that would be expected if the structure involved TP- rather than CP-coordination:

- (7) [_{CP} That the Earth revolves around the Sun] and [_{CP} 0 the Moon revolves around the Earth] are well-established facts.

Carrera Hernández argues that null projections (OPs) are underspecified in that their head lacks a 'lexical address' – a pointer to a lexical entry. This is a violation of Inclusiveness (Chomsky 1995, Neeleman & van de Koot 2002), and the OP must therefore enter a syntactic dependency with a categorially identical projection bearing a lexical address. That is, Carrera Hernández argues that OP must be related to an antecedent in the same way that a trace, an anaphor or an obligatorily-controlled PRO must. Her analysis of (2b) above can thus be represented in (8), where I indicate a null (i.e. lexically underspecified) node/projection with [₀]:

- (8) [&_P [_{TP} Barry has insulted Carlos] [&· and [_{TP}[₀] [_{DP} Diana] T [₀] [_{VP}[₀] V [₀] [_{DP} Esmeralda]]]]]

Here, the right-hand TP (marked [₀]) is dependent on the left-hand TP. Carrera Hernández's analysis captures the properties of gapping in (6): the requirement for an antecedent is due to the syntactically dependent nature of OP; the impossibility of embedding and the restriction to coordinate structures are due to Relativized Minimality (there must be no intervening [+V,-N] node); and the precedence requirement is due to the c-command condition on syntactic dependencies, along with the asymmetric

³ Evidence that Type A clefts involve obligatory ellipsis comes from NPI-licensing. A clefted NPI-headed DP cannot be licensed by negation in the cleft clause, as in (ia). In Reeve (2012) I attributed this to a c-command condition: an NPI cannot c-command its licenser (cf. Heycock & Kroch 2002). The equivalent reduced cleft is also ungrammatical, as shown in (ib). The grammatical pseudocleft example in (ic) shows that this cannot be reduced to something like 'semantic reconstruction'.

- (i) a. *It's any bread that I don't have.
 b. ?*If there's anything I don't have, it's any bread _{that I don't have}.
 c. What I don't have is any bread.

The ungrammaticality of (ib) suggests that the c-commanded negation is present in the structure just as it is in (ia), despite not being overt.

structure Carrera Hernández adopts for coordination (the first conjunct c-commands the second but not vice versa).⁴

An aspect of Carrera Hernández's analysis that will be crucial for our purposes is the possibility of 'dependent ellipsis': the idea that a 0(P) licensed by a syntactic dependency may itself license its dependents (specifiers, complements) as 0P. Thus, in (8) above the gapped T (marked _[0]) licenses its complement VP as null. Ackema & Szendrői (2002) use dependent ellipsis to account for 'determiner sharing' cases such as (b) (McCawley 1993): the gapped T may license a null D in the subject DP, which is not possible otherwise:

- (9) Too many Irish setters are named Kelly, _{too many} German shepherds are named Fritz, and _{too many} huskies are named Nanook.

Ackema & Szendrői argue that dependent ellipsis is not recursive, so the head of this VP may not license its complement as 0P (thus accounting for the impossibility of **Bob gave the magazines to Jessica and Harry gave the newspapers to Joanne*, for example). There are a number of problems with restricting dependent ellipsis in this way, however; such as the acceptability of examples such as (10):

- (10) a. Bob has read many newspapers, and Mary _{has read many} novels.
 b. John said that he can play backgammon, and Bill _{said that he can play} mahjong.

While there are undoubtedly restrictions on dependent ellipsis – the nature of which is mysterious to me – I will assume for the purposes of this paper that dependent ellipsis is transitive.

What I would like to propose, then, is that Type B cleft ellipsis involves a syntactic dependency between the cleft clause CP and the *if*-clause CP. Recall that I proposed the non-movement source in (11a) for reduced VP-clefts; this can now be revised as in (11b):

- (11) a. [_{TP} it's_j [_{VP} t_j [_{CP} C DP T [_{VP} throw insults]]]]
 b. [_{TP} [_{CP} if ...] [_{TP} it's_j [_{CP[0]} C_[0] [_{TP[0]} DP_[0] T_[0] [_{VP} throw insults]]]]]]

In (11b), I treat the cleft clause CP as a complement of the finite copula, which is merged directly in T.⁵ The cleft clause CP (marked _[0]) enters into a dependency with the *if*-clause CP. In turn, the head of this CP licenses its complement TP as null; the head of this TP licenses the head of the subject DP (its specifier) as null; and so on. This is made possible by the assumption that dependent ellipsis can reach down into embedded finite CPs and DPs contained within them, which examples such as (10) support.

3. Consequences of the analysis

In this section, I will show that this analysis can account for the shared locality properties of gapping and cleft ellipsis, as well as the fact that cleft ellipsis and gapping into finite CPs have a similar distribution of possible remnants.

⁴ Carrera Hernández also notes two further properties of gapping that follow from her analysis, in that they are characteristic of grammatical dependencies in general: a 0P can only be linked to a single antecedent, but a single antecedent may license multiple 0Ps (see Koster 1987, Neeleman & van de Koot 2002). The first also appears to be true of cleft ellipsis, but in the latter case there is the interfering factor of the exhaustive interpretation of clefts, which seems to prevent multiple 0Ps from being licensed by a single *if*-clause.

⁵ In Reeve (2012) I assumed that the copular verb undergoes V-to-T, and that the cleft clause is obligatorily extraposed to adjoin to VP (a process which is clearly visible in OV languages such as German). However, this structure would not be compatible with the analysis of cleft ellipsis proposed here, and hence I adopt a 'truncated' analysis of copular clauses (e.g., Cinque 2004) with extraposition targeting the clefted DP. I leave the problem of reconciling the arguments for the two distinct structures to future research.

3.1. Locality properties

We saw in section 2 that gapping has a number of distributional restrictions that are not shared with ellipsis types such as VP-ellipsis and sluicing, which we can refer to as coordination, obligatoriness, precedence and non-embedding. Under Carrera Hernández's analysis, the final three of these are due to the conditions on syntactic dependencies (obligatoriness, c-command, locality). The obligatoriness property is self-explanatory: a syntactic dependent needs an antecedent. The precedence requirement, for Carrera Hernández, follows from the c-command requirement and the asymmetric coordination structure she assumes. This explanation is not available to us if the *if*-clause is an adjunct and may be left- or right-adjoined to TP, as it will c-command OP in either case. However, there is independent evidence that 'backward' dependencies are not possible unless the dependent element is in a clause subordinate to the clause containing the antecedent (Williams' 1997 General Pattern of Anaphoric Dependence, or GPAD). Whatever is responsible for GPAD would therefore also prevent OP from being licensed by a following *if*-clause, since OP would not be in a clause subordinate to the *if*-clause. Finally, the non-embedding requirement follows from the locality restriction on syntactic dependencies (for Carrera Hernández, Relativized Minimality).

If Type B cleft ellipsis involves gapping, therefore, we should expect to see these three restrictions holding of Type B cleft ellipsis. Compare the examples in (12), involving reduced DP-clefts, and those in (13), involving reduced VP-clefts:

- (12) a. A: I know there's someone who can throw insults. Who is it? B: It's Barry.
 b. A: I know there's someone who can throw insults. Who is it? B: It's Barry, if anyone can throw insults.
 c. If there's anyone who can throw insults, I believe that it's Barry.
- (13) a. A: I know there's something Barry can do better than anyone. What is it? B: #It's throw insults.
 b. A: I know there's something Barry can do better than anyone. What is it? B: #It's throw insults, if there's anything that Barry can do.
 c. *If there's anything that Barry can do, I believe that it's throw insults.

The examples in (12a-c) show respectively that reduced DP-clefts may be standalone sentences, that the reduced cleft may precede the *if*-clause, and that the reduced cleft may be embedded with respect to the *if*-clause. That is, the obligatoriness, precedence and non-embedding restrictions do not hold of reduced DP-clefts. VP-clefts, on the other hand, show all of these restrictions, as shown in (13). This follows if VP-clefts must have a gapping structure of the type in (11b), while DP-clefts need not.

On the face of it, AP-clefts should pattern with DP-clefts, since they have full cleft equivalents from which the reduced clefts could be derived by CP-deletion, which is not subject to the locality restrictions on gapping. However, as noted above, I argued in Reeve (2012) that full AP-clefts, unlike DP-clefts, must be derived by focus-movement of the AP. This correspondingly imposes the same restriction that standard focus-movement imposes in English: a requirement for the moved focus to be contrastive; that is, for there to be a salient restricted set of alternatives to the focus in the discourse context (see also Heggie 1988). Thus, while DP-clefts may naturally be used to answer a *wh*-question (which merely requires new information focus), AP-clefts are somewhat unusual in such cases. However, they are felicitous in contrastive contexts as in (14c). (14b',c') show that the same is true of focus-movement:

- (14) a. A: Who wrote *War and Peace*? B: It was Tolstoy who wrote *War and Peace*.
 b. A: What is Barry above all? B: ?#It's arrogant.
 b'. A: What is Barry above all? B: ?#Arrogant Barry is.
 c. A: Barry is very confident. B: No, it's arrogant that Barry is rather than confident.
 c'. A: Barry is very confident. B: No, arrogant Barry is, not confident.

We therefore make specific predictions about reduced AP-clefts. Under a non-contrastive interpretation of the clefted AP, reduced AP-clefts should pattern with VP-clefts in terms of locality restrictions, since they must be derived from a non-movement source, and hence via gapping. However, a contrastive

interpretation of the AP should facilitate violation of the locality restrictions on gapping: the contrastive interpretation should license focus-movement of the AP, which in turn should permit CP-deletion. These predictions appear to be correct: compare (15), in which no contrastive context is given, with (16), which explicitly provides such a context:

- (15) a. A: What is Barry above all? B: #It's arrogant.
 b. A: What is Barry above all? B: ?#It's arrogant, if there's anything that Barry is.
 c. ??If there's anything that Barry is, I believe that it's arrogant.
- (16) a. A: Barry is very confident. B: No, it's arrogant rather than confident.
 b. A: Barry is very confident. B: No, it's arrogant rather than confident, if there's anything that Barry is.
 c. If there's anything that Barry is, I believe that it's arrogant rather than confident.

The present analysis of cleft ellipsis thus manages to account for restrictions that it shares with gapping, as well as the cases where it does not show these restrictions.

Finally, data from Russian provide additional support for the present analysis. Cleft constructions in Russian are syntactically distinct from English *it*-clefts in that they show no evidence of copular or relative clause structure, and hence appear to lack a CP layer. In Reeve (2012) I analysed Russian clefts as involving a recursive TP structure in which the initial pronoun (corresponding to *it*) is the subject of the higher TP, and the lower TP involves focus-movement of the 'clefted XP' to a position following this pronoun, as in (17b):⁶

- (17) a. Èto Ivana Maria ljubila.
 this Ivan-ACC Maria.NOM loved
 'It was Ivan that Maria loved.'
 b. [_{TP1} èto [_{TP2} Ivana_i [_{TP2} Maria ljubila *t_i*]]]

Crucially, full clefts such as (17) *always* involve focus-movement; there is no base-generated structure, unlike in English. Thus, although a reduced cleft could in principle be derived either by movement plus CP-deletion or by gapping without movement, the first strategy (permitting locality violations) would also force a contrastive interpretation of the focus. We thus expect that such reduced clefts will show the locality restrictions of gapping where a contrastive context is not provided, since in that case the gapping strategy will be forced:

- (18) a. Q: Kogo Maria ljubila? A: #Èto Ivana.
 who.ACC Maria.NOM loved this Ivan-ACC
 'Q: Who did Maria love? A: It was Ivan.'
 b. *Èto Ivana, esli Maria i ljubila kogo-to.
 this Ivan-ACC if Maria.NOM and loved someone.ACC
 'It was Ivan, if Maria loved anyone.'
 c. ?*Esli Maria i ljubila kogo-to, to ja dumaju, što èto Ivana.
 if Maria.NOM and loved someone.ACC then I think that this Ivan-ACC
 'If Maria loved anyone, then I think that it was Ivan.'

Unfortunately it is not yet clear to me to what extent a contrastive context facilitates these locality violations – more research is needed here. However, the fact that DP-clefts in Russian *do* show the locality restrictions in a non-contrastive context provides the expected contrast with English DP-clefts.

⁶ Note that the case-marking of the clefted DP as accusative shows that we are genuinely dealing with ellipsis here rather than with a simple copular sentence, since the default postcopular case in such examples is nominative. This is also particularly important here because Russian allows null copulas in the present tense, and we therefore want to avoid a confound with such cases.

3.2. A note on the coordination restriction

Unlike the other locality restrictions on gapping, the coordination restriction clearly does not hold of Type B cleft ellipsis: in all the examples given so far, the antecedent of the ellipsis is a clausal adjunct rather than a conjunct. According to Carrera Hernández, the coordination restriction follows from Relativized Minimality: if there is any intervening (in terms of *c-command*) [+V,-N] node between 0P and its antecedent, the dependency between the two will be blocked. Carrera Hernández proposes that the category & in English (though not in all languages) is underspecified with respect to syntactic category, and hence does not count as an intervener. In reduced clefts premodified by an *if*-clause, however, it seems as if the relation between the cleft clause 0P and the *if*-clause should be blocked by the intervening T node (hosting the copula), since all three of these elements are [+V,-N]. To resolve this problem, then, I would like to suggest that two properties hold of the syntactic dependency induced by the ‘0’ property: (i) 0 is satisfied only by a maximal category (so CP or TP but not C or T), and (ii) the relevant locality principle is not Relativized Minimality, but the Minimal Link Condition.⁷ That is, the relation is only blocked by a [+V,-N] XP that dominates 0P but not the antecedent. This ensures that copular T does not block the dependency between the cleft clause and the *if*-clause without sacrificing the account of the non-embedding restriction in terms of locality.⁸

3.3. Possible remnants

Under the present analysis, Type B cleft ellipsis involves gapping into an embedded CP, a process for which we have independent evidence. In this section I will show that this makes correct predictions about the possible remnants of cleft ellipsis, and about some crosslinguistic variation in this regard. All our examples of cleft ellipsis so far have involved a single remnant, but of course gapping permits multiple remnants (indeed, examples with single remnants are often not even referred to as ‘gapping’). However, gapping into embedded finite CPs is more restricted than gapping within a single CP. The examples in (19) show that an object and a prepositional dative, or an argument and adjunct PP, may be remnants under embedded gapping, but a subject and an object may not be:

- (19) a. Barry said that he gave books to Sarah, and Bill_{said} [CP that he gave [DP newspapers] [PP to Mary]].
 b. Barry said that he talked about chemistry on Tuesday, and Bill_{said} [CP that he talked [PP about physics] [PP on Wednesday]].
 c. *Barry said that Sarah bought fish, and Bill_{said} [CP that [DP Sue] bought [DP chips]].

Since Type B cleft ellipsis involves gapping into an embedded finite CP, we expect to see the same distribution of possible remnants. Indeed, (20) shows the same pattern as (19):

- (20) a. If there’s anything that Bill gave to anyone, it was [DP newspapers] [PP to Mary].
 b. If there’s anything that Bill talked about on some day, it was [PP about physics] [PP on Wednesday].
 c. *If there’s anyone that bought anything, it was [DP Sue] [DP chips].

⁷ See Müller (2011) for useful recent discussion of the status of these two principles. While recent work in the locality literature has moved towards the idea that it is classes of features rather than phrase-structural notions (A/A’/head) to which locality constraints refer, it is still often assumed that there is an irreducible distinction between heads and phrases (often tacitly, but see Rizzi 2004 for an explicit mention of this). For one thing, assuming movement involves a feature on the hosting head, the relation between a specifier of that head and the trace of the specifier would otherwise be blocked by the head itself.

⁸ This raises the further question of why we could not derive ungrammatical pseudogapping examples such as (i) through gapping, licensing deletion by an *if*-clause, for example:

- (i) ?*If there’s anyone Barry insulted, he did Carlos.

While I cannot go into this question in detail here, I assume that it is related to the semantic condition on gapping, which I take to be a form of ‘e-givenness’ in Merchant’s (2001) sense. More specifically, I would like to suggest that the ellipsis site and the antecedent must be in a mutual e-givenness relation (but without the existential type-shifting); this ensures that the ellipsis site and the antecedent are both mutually-entailing propositions, ruling out (i) but permitting cleft ellipsis.

While an explanation of this restriction on embedded gapping is lacking, the parallel between (19) and (20) supports the claim that the two involve the same ellipsis phenomenon. It is important to note, too, that the examples in (20) do not have a full *it*-cleft source.

Russian provides further support for the analysis. Recall that Russian clefts do not involve an embedded CP, and hence do not involve gapping into an embedded finite CP under the present analysis. What this means is that reduced clefts in Russian should pattern with *matrix* gapping rather than with embedded gapping. This seems to be correct: for example, Russian allows subject-object and subject-indirect object-direct object gapping in matrix clauses, but not in embedded clauses. It also allows these types of gapping in reduced clefts, as we expect:

- (21) c. ... a [TP Maria ljubila Ivana].
 and Maria-NOM loved Ivan-ACC
- d. ... a [TP Maria dala Ivanu knigu].
 and Maria-NOM gave Ivan-DAT book-ACC
- (22) a. Esli kto-to i ljubil kogo-to, to èto Maria Ivana.
 if someone.NOM and loved someone.ACC then this Maria-NOM Ivan-ACC
- b. Esli kto-to i dal komu-to èto-to,
 if someone.NOM and gave someone.DAT something.ACC
 to èto Maria Ivanu knigu.
 then this Maria-NOM Ivan-DAT book-ACC

Importantly, reduced clefts do *not* pattern with gapping into embedded CPs, which appears to be impossible:⁹

- (23)*... a [TP Maria skazala, èto ona ljubit Ivana].
 ... and Maria-NOM said that she loves Ivan-ACC

German is another language that provides support for the present analysis. In German, premodified reduced clefts do not actually involve a cleft structure, but simply feature the adverbial *dann* ‘then’ followed by the remnant:

- (24) a. Wenn er überhaupt irgendetwas gekauft hat, dann einen Apfel.
 if he at.all anything bought has then an.ACC apple.ACC
- b. [CP₁ [CP₁ wenn ...], [CP₁ dann [C' C [TP_[0]] [VP_[0]] [DP einen Apfel] V_[0]] T_[0]]]]

The analysis that suggests itself is that *dann* appears in SpecCP and the TP undergoes partial ellipsis, as in (24b).¹⁰ If the *wenn*-clause in (24) is adjoined to CP, as its position suggests, then this relation satisfies the locality condition on OP licensing. Furthermore, as in Russian but not as in English,

⁹ Apparently such gapping becomes possible if the complementiser is pronounced (Elena Titov, p.c.). This goes against a commonly-cited generalisation in the gapping literature according to which there can be no overt head in the middle of a gapping site (e.g., Lin’s 2002 Highest Head Condition); see Fitzgibbons (2013) for some similar cases involving retention of prepositions (what she calls ‘parasitic ellipsis’).

We also predict that reduced clefts in which the correlate of the clefted XP in the *if*-clause is further embedded will be ungrammatical, since the gapping could not go down into the embedded finite CP. This appears to be correct:

- (i) *Esli Maria i skazala, èto ona ljubit kogo-to, to èto Ivana.
 if Maria.NOM and said that she loves someone.ACC then this Ivan-ACC
 ‘If there’s anyone that Maria said that she loved, it was Ivan.’

However, this would also be ruled out by an analysis with movement of *Ivana* plus constituent deletion, since movement out of finite CPs is already degraded in Russian.

¹⁰ Given the verb-second nature of German, one question is why the tensed verb (*hat* in (24b)) does not raise to C in such cases. I assume that this is because the feature triggering head-movement may alternatively be satisfied by ellipsis, as proposed by Lasnik (1999) to explain why the verb does not raise in pseudogapping.

gapping in this case does not reach down into an embedded finite CP. We therefore correctly predict that both the subject and object may be retained in a German ‘reduced cleft’:

- (25) a. Wenn überhaupt irgendjemand irgendetwas gekauft hat,
 if at.all anyone anything bought has
 dann Dirk einen Apfel.
 then Dirk an.ACC apple.ACC
- b. [_{CP1} [_{CP1} wenn ...], [_{CP1} dann [_C C [_{TP[0]} [_{DP} Dirk] [_{VP[0]} [_{DP} einen Apfel] V_[0]] T_[0]]]]]]

In this section, we have seen that the present analysis of Type B cleft ellipsis correctly predicts that Type B cleft ellipsis patterns with gapping into embedded CPs in English, but with matrix gapping in Russian and German.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that cleft ellipsis provides support for the view that gapping involves a syntactic dependency between a lexically unspecified projection and a categorially identical, lexically specified projection. This dependency obeys the same conditions as other syntactic dependencies (such as movement, anaphoric binding and theta-marking): in particular, obligatoriness, c-command and locality. This accounts for the fact that gapping and a subset of cleft ellipsis cases show locality restrictions (obligatoriness, precedence, non-embedding) not characteristic of other types of ellipsis such as VP-ellipsis and sluicing. The fact that Type B cleft ellipsis does not obey the coordination requirement follows if the OP dependency is satisfied only by maximal projections, and is restricted by the Minimal Link Condition. The analysis also accounts for the possibility of ‘multiple remnants’ in English, as well as the wider range of such remnants available in German and Russian. In English, cleft ellipsis patterns with embedded finite CPs in terms of possible remnants; in German and Russian, cleft ellipsis patterns with matrix TPs.

To the extent that it has been shown that a unified treatment of (Type B) cleft ellipsis and gapping is desirable and possible, this paper also provides evidence against alternative treatments of gapping. VP-ellipsis analyses fail to capture the locality restrictions on gapping which are not shared with VP-ellipsis. Coordination-based analyses fail to capture the parallels between gapping and cleft ellipsis, the latter of which is not restricted to coordinate structures.

One remaining question is the status of cleft ellipsis with respect to island constraints. I have proposed that Type B ellipsis does not (necessarily) involve movement of the remnants out of the ellipsis site. The main evidence for this was that cleft ellipsis seems to obey locality constraints when the clefted XP does not receive a contrastive interpretation (and hence does not move), but may violate them if it does (and hence moves). It would be natural to look for evidence of (non-)movement from island constraints, especially as this has been a lively topic of discussion in the ellipsis literature in recent years (e.g., Merchant 2001, 2004). However, the behaviour of cleft ellipsis with respect to island constraints is not entirely clear to me; strangely, it seems to pattern with none of the other types of ellipsis. For example, it apparently may not violate Merchant’s (2001) ‘PF islands’ (e.g., the Subject Condition, the Left Branch Condition), but may violate his ‘propositional islands’ (e.g., the Complex NP Constraint, the Adjunct Condition):

- (26) a. *If a politician who is something in particular will succeed, it’s arrogant. (subject)
 b. *If they hired a good-looking linguist, it’s too good-looking. (left branch)
- (27) a. If they didn’t hire anyone who was something in particular, it was good-looking. (complex NP)
 b. If they arrested him because he was something in particular, it was good-looking. (adjunct)

By contrast, gapping appears to be subject to the propositional islands but not the PF-islands (Coppock 2001), while sluicing appears to be able to violate all or most of both types (see Lasnik 2001 and Merchant 2001 for differing views on this). I leave the interesting question of how to account for the pattern in (26)/(27) for future investigation.

References

- Ackema, Peter & Kriszta Szendrői. 2002. Determiner sharing as an instance of dependent ellipsis. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5:3–34.
- Carrera Hernández, Ana. 2007. Gapping as a syntactic dependency. *Lingua* 117:2106–2133.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. ‘Restructuring’ and functional structure. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol. 3, 192–212. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coppock, Elizabeth. 2001. Gapping: In defense of deletion. In: *Chicago Linguistic Society* 37, 133–148.
- Culicover, Peter W. & Michael S. Rochemont. 1990. Extraposition and the Complement Principle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 23–47.
- Declerck, Renaat & Shigeki Seki. 1990. Premodified reduced *it*-clefts. *Lingua* 82, 15–51.
- Fitzgibbons, Natalia. 2013. Parasitic ellipsis. Paper presented at WCCFL 31, Arizona State University.
- Heggie, Lorie. 1988. The syntax of copular structures. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Jayaseelan, K. A. 1990. Incomplete VP deletion and gapping. *Linguistic Analysis* 20, 64–81.
- Johnson, Kyle. 2009. Gapping is not (VP-)ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 289–328.
- Koster, Jan. 1987. *Domains and Dynasties*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. Pseudogapping puzzles. In Elabbas Benmamoun & Shalom Lappin (eds.), *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis in Gapping*, 141–174. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? *NELS* 31, Vol. 2, 301–320.
- Lin, Vivian. 2002. Coordination and sharing at the interfaces. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Functional Heads, Licensing and Identification*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCawley, James. 1993. Gapping with shared operators. *Proceedings of BLS* 19, 245–253.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661–738.
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2007. On so-called truncated clefts. In Ljudmila Geist & Björn Rothstein (eds.), *Kopulaverben und Kopulasätze: Intersprachliche und Intrasprachliche Aspekte*, 47–68. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Müller, Gereon. 2011. *Constraints on Displacement: A Phase-Based Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Neeleman, Ad & Hans van de Koot. 2002. The configurational matrix. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 529–574.
- Pinkham, Jessie and Jorge Hankamer. 1975. Deep and shallow clefts. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 11, 429–450.
- Reeve, Matthew. 2012. *Clefts and their Relatives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. Locality and left periphery. In Adriana Belletti (ed.), *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, 104–131. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1997. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 577–628.

Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Robert E. Santana-LaBarge

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2014

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2014 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-462-1 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Reeve, Matthew. 2014. If There's Anything Cleft Ellipsis Resembles, It's (Pseudo)gapping. In *Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Robert E. Santana-LaBarge, 351-360. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #3038.