

Syntax II – Questions from Class #19

1. Right Node Raising and ECM clauses (examples from Postal 1974, Phillips 1996)

- (1) a. * I find it easy to believe, but Joan finds it hard to believe—Tom to be a dishonest person.
b. * I wanted to prevent, but I couldn't prevent—Bob from meeting Sally.
c. * Tony hopes to stop, but only I can stop—the bomb from going off.
d. * I didn't expect to want, but I ended up wanting—Nixon to win.
- (2) I find it easy to believe, but Joan finds it hard to believe—that Tom is a dishonest person.
- (3) It is possible, but it would be unwise—for Bob to meet Sally.
- (4) I want, and Tom really needs—to be out of here by 6:30 to catch the last bus back to Boddington.

2. Antecedent Contained Deletion: correlation with pseudogapping? (numerous pseudogapping examples from Lasnik 1994)

Pseudogapping?

- (4) a. Mary hasn't dated Bill, but she has ~~dated~~ Harry.
b. John reviewed the play, and Mary did ~~review~~ the book.
c. Has he sold his collection yet? He has ~~sold~~ some of his paintings, but I'm not sure...
d. I rolled up a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~roll up~~ a magazine.
e. Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't ~~like~~ meteorology.
f. If you don't believe me, you will ~~believe~~ the weatherman.

Pseudogapping of raising verbs, stranding predicates, is impossible; same is largely true for ACD

- (5) a. * These leeks taste terrible, but your steak will ~~taste~~ better.
b. * Rona sounded annoyed, and Sue did ~~sound~~ frustrated.
c. * You probably just feel relieved, but I do ~~feel~~ jubilant.
- (6) a. ??? I was feeling everything that you were.
b. ?* Rona sounded everything that Sue did.
- Pseudogapping of V+IO sequence in double object construction is impossible; no problem for ACD
- (7) a. * John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary ~~gave Bill~~ some useful advice.
b. * John gave a lot of money to Bill, and Mary did ~~give a lot of money~~ to Sue.

- (8) a. John gave Bill everything that Mary did.
b. John gave a lot of money to everyone that Mary did.
- Pseudogapping of V+P sequences is typically ungrammatical; no problem for ACD
- (9) a. * John swam beside Bill and Mary did ~~swim beside~~ Susan.
b. * John stood near Bill, and Mary should ~~stand near~~ Susan.
- (10) a. John swam beside everyone that Mary did.
b. John stood near everybody that Mary did.
- Pseudogapping of V-to-V sequences is often marginal at best; no problem for ACD
- (11) a. ?I tried to buy a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~try to buy~~ a magazine.
b. ? I decided to buy a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~decide to buy~~ a magazine.
c. ?*I hoped to buy a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~hope to buy~~ a magazine.
- (12) a. I tried to buy everything that Lynn did.
b. I decided to buy everything that Lynn did.
c. I hoped to buy everything that Lynn did.
- Pseudogapping of V-NP-to-V sequences is impossible; marginal for ACD
- (13) a. * I wanted Bill to buy a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~want Bill to buy~~ a magazine.
b. * I told Bill to buy a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~tell Bill to buy~~ a magazine.
c. * I believed Bill to have bought a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~believe Bill to have bought~~ a magazine.
- (14) a. ?I wanted Bill to buy everything that Lynn did. (relevant reading: everything that Lynn wanted Bill to buy).
b. ? I told Bill to buy everything that Lynn did. (relevant reading: everything that Lynn told Bill to buy).
c. ?*I believed bill to have bought everything that Lynn did. (relevant reading: everything that Lynn believed Bill to have bought.)
- Pseudogapping of V-that-NP-V sequences is impossible; also impossible for ACD
- (15) a. * I realized that Bill had bought a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~realize that Bill had bought~~ a magazine.
b. * I knew that Bill would buy a newspaper, and Lynn did ~~know that Bill would buy~~ a magazine.
- (16) a. * I realized that Bill had bought everything that Lynn did. (relevant reading: everything that I realized Bill had bought.)

- b. * I knew that Bill would buy everything that Lynn did. (relevant reading: everything that I knew that Bill would buy.)

For recent discussion of analyses of ACD see

- (i) Norbert Hornstein. 1994. An argument for minimalism: the case of antecedent contained deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 455–480.
- (ii) Christopher Kennedy. 1997. Antecedent contained deletion and the syntax of quantification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 662–688.