Recoverability and Identity are Dissociable in Double Ellipsis

Richard Stockwell
Ulster University
r.stockwell@ulster.ac.uk

Boundaries of Ellipsis Mismatch
Tsuda University
1-3 September 2023

1 Introduction

1.1 Ellipsis

(1)   a. John bought something, but I don't know what $<$he bought $t_{\text{what}}>$.   *TP ellipsis*

      b. John bought a book, and Mary did too $<$buy a book$>$.   *VP ellipsis*

      c. John bought one book, while Mary bought four $<$books$>$.   *NP ellipsis*

- $<$Ellipsis$>$ (1) might seem to undermine form-meaning mapping – missing form, understood meaning.

- But meaning is recovered from spoken form, subject to identity (Hankamer 1971, Sag 1976, Williams 1977).

1.2 Recoverability

- Recoverability – Fiengo & Lasnik (1972):

ON NONRECOVERABLE
DELETION IN SYNTAX
Robert Fiengo,
MIT
Howard Lasnik,
MIT

1.3 Identity

- Further to recoverability, ellipsis requires identity (though cf. 1).

- E.g. sluicing requires identity in voice (Merchant 2013) – match (2) vs. mismatch (3):

(2)   a.   <u>Someone saved Alex</u>, but we don't know who $<t_{who}$ saved Alex$>$.   *act. = act.*

        b.   <u>Alex was saved</u>, but we don't know by whom $<$Alex was saved$>$.   *pass. = pass.*

(3)   a.   * <u>Someone saved Alex</u>, but we don't know by whom $<$Alex was saved$>$.   *act. ≠ pass.*

        b.   * <u>Alex was saved</u>, but we don't know who $<t_{who}$ saved Alex$>$.   *pass. ≠ act.*

1.4   Recoverability $\sim$ identity?

- Assumption that recoverability and identity go hand-in-hand:

> ". . . the question of recoverability: To what extent and in what way is the abstract elliptical structure identical to the overt syntax of the ellipsis antecedent?"   (Craenenbroeck & Merchant 2013: 710)

- But must ellipsis be identical with the same material from which it is recoverable?[1]

---

[1]Insofar as active and passive are truth-conditionally equivalent, recoverability is satisfied in (3) just as much as in (2). The further requirement for identity – as met in (2) but failed in (3) – is thus already dissociated from recoverability in the sense of being additional. The dissociation argued for here is more radical: ellipsis sites do not need to establish identity with the same material from which their meaning is recovered.

1.5   Dissociation in double ellipsis

- Today: recoverability (⇑) and identity (=) are dissociable in cases of 'double ellipsis'.

- Survey cases where a lone ellipsis is bad for violating identity (4) . . .

(4)   Spoken material
                                          ⇑, *=
                                    bad ⟨ellipsis⟩

- . . . but the very same ellipsis becomes good after adding a second, intermediate ellipsis (5):

(5)   Spoken material
                                              ⇑
                           intermediate ⟨ellipsis⟩
                                              =
                     previously bad ⟨ellipsis⟩ becomes good

⇑ Recover from spoken material.   = Identity between the two ellipses.

1.6 Outline

2 Argument structure

- Merchant (2013): sluicing requires structural identity in voice; e.g. (6) = (3a):

(6)   * Someone saved Alex, but we don't know by whom <Alex was saved>.   *act. ≠ pass.*

2.1 Counterexamples

- However, Nakamura (2016) observes (7):

(7) a.   Not so much whether to teach the Bible in public schools, but how? And by whom?

(Corpus of Contemporary American English)

   b.   GE Capital and Xerox in Stamford responded to inquiries about their use of extended-stay hotels by saying that they use them from time to time, but they were not sure how much or by whom.

(The New York Times, Aug 9, 1998)

- The naturally occurring sluices in (7) look to be counterexamples to structural identity in voice.

- The final sluices are passive despite the preceding spoken material being active (8):[2]

(8) a.   Active: ... teach the Bible in public schools ...
            Passive: And by whom <the Bible should be taught>?

   b.   Active: ... they use them from time to time ...
            Passive: ... or by whom <they are used>.

- Nakamura (2016): faced with (7), abandon structural identity.

- Here: structural identity holds in (7), though dissociated from recoverability.

---

[2]See Anand et al. (2021) regarding the appearance of the modal in the ellipsis site in (8a).

2.2   Double ellipsis

- Notice first that both examples in (7) involve double ellipsis (9):[3]

(9)   a.   . . . , but how? And by whom?

       b.   . . . how much or by whom.

- Double ellipsis is in fact crucial to (7). With single ellipsis, the active-passive mismatches laid out in (8) are ungrammatical in (10):

(10)   a.   * Not so much whether to teach the Bible in public schools, but by whom?

        b.   * They use them from time to time, but they were not sure by whom.

---

[3]See Citko & Gračanin-Yuksek (2020) for robust argumentation that coordinated and disjoined sluices involve two separate instances of clausal ellipsis.

   Their paper, like this one, is limited to English. This provides one reason why double ellipsis might not ameliorate mismatches in other languages: in a language where coordinated and disjoined sluices do not involve two separate instances of clausal ellipsis, amelioration is not expected. Another reason why the capacity of double ellipsis may vary cross-linguistically could have to do with morphology: in languages with richer morphology it might be harder to conjure the syntax of an ellipsis site absent an overt, syntactically identical antecedent.

2.3   Analysis

- Proposal: dissociate recoverability (⇑) from identity (=)

  ⇑ recover meaning from the spoken active material

  – this meaning can be syntactically represented with passive structure

  = the two ellipses are identical with one another as passive; mutually licensing for identity

(11)   Applied to (7a):

$$\begin{array}{c}
\textit{teach(bible)}\\
\Uparrow\\
\text{how} <\text{the Bible should be taught}>\\
=\\
\text{by whom} <\text{the Bible should be taught}>
\end{array}$$

(12)   Applied to (7b):   ⇑ *use(hotels)(they)*   how much <they are used> = by whom <they are used>

2.4   Point of order

- Potential problem: order is crucial.

- Reversing the order from (7) to place the passive sluice first is unacceptable (13):

(13)   a.   * Not so much whether to teach the Bible in public schools, but by whom? And how?
     b.   * They use them from time to time, but they were not sure by whom or how much.

- This unacceptability can be attributed to local, intermediate ungrammaticality.

- In (13), the combination of active spoken material and passive first sluice is ungrammatical:

  - give up at *by whom*, unacceptable

- Whereas in (7), the combination of active spoken material and the first sluice is grammatical:

  - parse the first sluice initially as active → the passive second sluice forces reanalysis of the first to be passive → grammatical after reanalysis

- In support of this explanation, the acceptability of 'passive sluice first' (13) improves when local ungrammaticality doesn't have chance to arise.

- In backwards ellipsis (14), the active spoken material follows both ellipses:

(14)   While they weren't exactly sure by whom or how often, the company admitted to using extended stay hotels from time to time.

- And using *either* (15) presages the coming of a second clause which might satisfy identity:

(15)   ? They use them from time to time, but they were not sure either by whom or how much.

2.5   Constructed examples

- The empirical point does not depend on any peculiarities of the naturally occurring examples in (7) – intermediate sluices with *how*; PRO (a) and bound *they* (b) subjects.

- Constructed examples avoiding these features (16)-(18) pattern the same way:

(16) $^?$ The university appoints vice chancellors, but the regulations don't say *(when, or) by whom.
        ⇑ *appoint(VCs)(uni)*   when <VCs are appointed> = by whom <VCs are appointed>

(17)   [?] Somebody hacked our computer network, but we've no idea *(why, or) by whom.
⇑ $\exists x.hack(net)(x)$ why <our network was hacked> = by whom <our network was hacked>

- Voice mismatch in the other direction (18):

(18)   [?] Vice chancellors are appointed, but the regulations don't say *(when, or) which committee.
⇑ $\exists x.appt(VCs)(x)$ when <someone appoints VCs> = which committee <t appoints VCs>

2.6   Two arguments

- Adjunct intermediate sluices so far: *how*, *how much*, *when*, *why*, . . .

- Argumental intermediate sluice:

(19)   [?] The news was reporting that the exam board had inadvertently revealed the A-level questions to a certain school ahead of time, but they couldn't say *(to which school, or) by whom.
⇑ $reveal(q)(s)(b)$ to which school <the A-level questions had been revealed>
= by whom <the A-level questions had been revealed>

- As before, while the meaning is recovered from the preceding spoken material, identity is established between the two ellipses, which mutually license one another.

2.7   Ditransitives

- Further to voice, sluicing disallows ditransitive diathesis (20) (Merchant 2013).[4]

- Mismatch is much improved when bridged by an intermediate sluice:

(20)   [?] They served someone milk, but I don't know *(why, or) to whom.
          ⇑ $\exists x.serve(m.)(x)(they)$ why <they served milk to someone> = to whom <they served milk t>

- As with voice, dissociating identity from recoverability allows structural identity conditions on ellipsis to be maintained in the face of apparent argument structure mismatches.

---

[4]Alternations between null arguments and PPs (i) (Merchant 2013) seem worse (a), especially with adjectives (b):

(i)   a. ?(?) John was arguing, but I can't reveal *(when, or) who.
              ?(?)⇑ $argue(j)$ when <John was arguing with someone> = who <John was arguing with t>
       b. (?)* John was afraid, but I don't know (why, or) what.
              (?)*⇑ $argue(j)$ why <John was afraid of something> = what <John was afraid of t>

It may be that there is difficulty in adding the preposition to the ellipsis site without an overt clue that this is required (cf. 20). Cf. also note 3.

2.8   Interim conclusion

- Narrow conclusion regarding mismatch: structural identity conditions on ellipsis can be maintained in the face of apparent counterexamples.

- Broad conclusion regarding ellipsis: double ellipsis mediates mismatches that are impossible in single ellipsis, because recoverability and identity are dissociable.

3   Limits

⇑ Recover meaning from spoken material.   = Identity between mutually licensing ellipses.

- How far removed can the ellipses be from recovered material?

    – active vs. passive, ditransitive diathesis, . . .

- Truth-conditional equivalence?

- No – still a role for structural and lexical identity.

3.1   Structural identity

- Structural identity – (21) manipulates the *spray~load* alternation to place conflicting requirements on the elided structure; non-identity results in ungrammaticality:[5]

(21)   * Mary loaded some stuff onto some vehicle, but I don't know (onto which vehicle, or) with what stuff.
⇑ *load(stuff)(vehicle)(m)*
onto which vehicle <she loaded some stuff *t*> *≠ or with what stuff <she loaded the vehicle *t*>.

3.2   Lexical identity

- Relational opposites (cf. Hartman 2009) cannot be recovered (*⇑):

- *be beaten ~ lose to* (22); *lend ~ borrow* (23):

(22)   * Someone beat Roger at tennis, but I don't know (when, or) to whom.
*⇑ *lose(r)*   when <he lost at tennis> = to whom <he lost at tennis>

---

[5]See Appendix 2 for another potential example involving Left Branch Extraction.

(23)   * Someone lent John £100, but he won't tell me (on what terms, or) from whom.
   *⇑ $\exists x.lend(£100)(j)(x)$ on what terms <he borrowed £100 from someone>
                                                    = from whom <he borrowed £100 t>

3.3   Auxiliaries

- Downsizing to verb phrase ellipsis (VPE) and a particular case of lexical identity.

- Warner's (1985) Auxiliary Verb Generalization: In VPE headed by an auxiliary verb, the auxiliary must have the exact same morphological form as its antecedent.

(24)   * She was appointed to the board, even though it was unclear (for how long, or) whether she was eligible to.
   ⇑ $\exists x.appoint(b)(x)$ for how long <she **was** appointed to the board>
                                       *≠ whether she was eligible to <**be** appointed to the board>

3.4   Interim summary

- So far: double ellipsis mediates argument structure mismatches in sluicing that are impossible with single ellipsis – within the limits of structural identity and lexical recoverability.

- The rest: three further case studies where recoverability and identity come apart in double VPE.

4 Dahl's many clauses puzzle

4.1 Strict vs. sloppy

- Consider (25), fixing *he* to mean *John*. The single ellipsis has two readings:

(25) John realises that he$_{(John)}$ is a fool, though Sam doesn't $<\ >$.

    a.   Strict reading, referential ($\rightarrow$) pronoun:
            John realises that he$_{\rightarrow John}$ is a fool, though Sam doesn't $<$realise that <u>John</u> is a fool$>$.

    b.   Sloppy reading, bound (x) pronoun:
            John$_x$ realises that he$_x$ is a fool, though Sam$_x$ doesn't $<$realise that x=<u>Sam</u> is a fool$>$.

    c.   * Disjoint reference:
            * John realises that he$_{(John)}$ is a fool, though Sam doesn't $<$realise that <u>Bill</u> is a fool$>$.

- There is no third reading taking the pronoun to point to someone else, e.g. Bill:

- Yet double ellipsis supports such a third reading (Schiebe 1973, via Dahl 1973).

4.2   The mixed reading

- (26) adds an intermediate elliptical clause to (25).

- Now a third 'mixed' reading is available (c):

(26)   John realises that he$_{(John)}$ is a fool, and Bill does too $< >$, though Sam doesn't $< >$.

    a.   Both strict: John realises that he$_{\rightarrow John}$ is a fool,
    and Bill does too $<$realise that John is a fool$>$,
    though Sam doesn't $<$realise that John is a fool$>$.

    b.   Both sloppy: John$_x$ realises that he$_x$ is a fool,
    and Bill$_x$ does too $<$realise that x=Bill is a fool$>$,
    though Sam$_x$ doesn't $<$realise that x=Sam is a fool$>$.

    c.   Mixed reading: John$_x$ realises that he$_x$ is a fool,
    sloppy ↗ and Bill$_x$ does too $<$realise that x=Bill is a fool$>$,
    strict ↗ though Sam doesn't $<$realise that Bill is a fool$>$.

- Mixed reading: the pronoun seems to be sloppy for the first ellipsis, but strict for the second.

4.3   Puzzle

(26)   c. Mixed reading: $John_x$ realises that he_x is a fool,
                    sloppy ↗   and $Bill_x$ does too <realise that x=<u>Bill</u> is a fool>,
                    strict ↗   though Sam doesn't <realise that <u>Bill</u> is a fool>.

- The mixed reading is a problem to the extent that recoverability and identity are intertwined:
    – each ellipsis independently establishes identity with the recoverable spoken material
    – the structure of the recoverable spoken material must be fixed as either strict (a) or sloppy (b)
    – structure cannot oscillate between its ambiguities, as apparently needed for (c) (see Hardt 2021: 6)

4.4   Analysis

- The mixed reading is not a problem if recoverability is dissociated from identity:
    ⇑ the 'Bill meaning' can be recovered sloppily from the spoken material
    – this meaning can be syntactically represented with a referential pronoun rather than binding
    – i.e. $[\lambda x.\ x$ thinks x is a fool$](b) = b$ thinks b is a fool   (cf. Dalrymple et al. 1991: 424f.)
    = the representation with a referential pronoun allows for identity with a 'strict' second ellipsis

18

(26)   c. Mixed reading:[6]   John$_x$ realises that he$_x$ is a fool,
                   sloppy ↗   and Bill$_x$ does too ⟨realise that x=<u>Bill</u> is a fool⟩,
                   strict ↗   though Sam doesn't ⟨realise that <u>Bill</u> is a fool⟩.

(27)   [λx. x thinks x is a fool]
                                                    ⇑
                         and Bill does too ⟨realise that Bill is a fool⟩
                                                    =
                         though Sam doesn't ⟨realise that Bill is a fool⟩

---

[6]A mixed reading can also originate with an exceptionally case-marked reflexive (i):

(i)   John considers himself a genius,
      and Bill does too ⟨consider himself(=Bill) a genius⟩,
      though Sam doesn't ⟨consider him(=Bill) a genius⟩.

Syntactically, the reflexive in the first ellipsis has to Vehicle Change (Fiengo & May 1994) into a pronoun in the second ellipsis. This does not cause an identity problem in examples like (ii):

(ii)   Bill defended himself, and then his lawyer did ⟨defend him(=Bill)⟩.

(26)   c. Mixed reading: John$_x$ realises that he$_x$ is a fool,

            sloppy ↗ and Bill$_x$ does too <realise that x=Bill is a fool>,

            strict ↗ though Sam doesn't <realise that Bill is a fool>.

- A 'reverse mixed' reading (28) is correctly predicted to be unavailable, since John ≠ Sam:

(28)   *Reverse mixed: John realises that he$_{→John}$ is a fool,

            strict   and Bill does too <realise that John is a fool>,

            sloppy   though Sam$_x$ doesn't <realise that x=Sam is a fool>.

- In sum: double ellipsis supports mixed readings that are not available with single ellipsis.

- Mixed readings cease to be puzzling once recoverability and identity are dissociated.

5   Elliptical answers

- In answer to a polar (29) or subject (30) question, verb phrase ellipsis (VPE) (a) is good (vs. fully pronounced (b) controls, SMALL CAPS = focus):

(29)   Did John go shopping?   a. He DID <go shopping>.   b. He DID go shopping.

(30)   Who went shopping?   a. SAM did <go shopping>.   b. SAM went shopping.

- But in answer to an adjunct question (31), VPE (a) is bad:[7]

(31)   Where did John go shopping?
       a.   * He did <go shopping> in PARIS.   b.   He went shopping in PARIS

---

[7]I don't know why single ellipsis is bad in (31) – see Kuno (1975), Levin (1979), Stockwell (2020: sect. 5.7) for discussion.

- Yet VPE becomes good in answer to the same question when combined with another elliptical clause with contrasting polarity:[8]

(32)　Where did John go shopping?

  a. He DIDN'T <go shopping> in PARIS; but he DID b. He DIDN'T go shopping in PARIS, but he DID go
    <go shopping> in LONDON.   shopping in LONDON.

- Double ellipsis is good (32) where single ellipsis is bad (31) since recoverability and identity are dissociable (33):[9]

(33)　$\Uparrow \{shop'(j)$ in $x \in D_{loc}\}$　he DIDN'T <go shopping> in PARIS = he DID <go shopping> in LONDON

---

[8]The same goes for alternative questions (i):

(i)　Did John recommend Mary with a phone call or with a letter?

  a. * He did <recommend her> with a LETTER.   b. He recommended her with a LETTER.
  c. He DIDN'T <recommend her> with a PHONE CALL; d. He DIDN'T recommended her with a PHONE CALL;
    he DID <recommend her> with a LETTER.   he DID recommend her with a LETTER.

[9]The elliptical constituents are identical up to focus: DIDN'T vs. DID, PARIS vs. LONDON. In the terminology of Stockwell (2020, 2022), building on Rooth (1992a,b), the elliptical constituents are 'proper alternatives' to each other.

6 No (overt) linguistic antecedent

- Lesson from double ellipsis: elided material need not establish identity with *overt* linguistic material.

⇑ Recover meaning from spoken material.   = Identity between mutually licensing ellipses.

- Empirical payoff: one class of VPE apparently without linguistic antecedents (though see appendix 3).

6.1 Other antecedent-less VPE

- Lexicalised idioms (34) (Hankamer 1978):[10]

(34)   Don't! You didn't! You mustn't! I really shouldn't. Oh, you shouldn't have! Shall we? May I? Please do. How
       could you? Oh no you don't! You wouldn't! Must you? Should I? Not in my X, you don't!

- Split antecedents (35) (Webber 1978):

(35)   Wendy is eager to sail around the world and Bruce is eager to climb Kilimanjaro,
       but neither of them can < > because money is too tight.

---

[10]Compiled from Schachter (1977), Hankamer & Sag (1976: 409f., fn. 19), Hankamer (1978: 69) and Pullum (2000). Miller & Pullum (2013) argue that antecedent-less ellipsis is not limited to fixed idioms. They emphasise the role of p versus ¬p alternatives, whether explicitly stated or raised to salience by contexts of permission or direction. For further discussion, see Poppels (2022: sect. 3.2.1).

6.2 Double ellipsis

- Antecedent-less ellipsis is not usually possible (36) (Hankamer & Sag 1976: 392, ex. 6):

(36)   (Context: Sag produces a cleaver and prepares to hack off his left hand.)
     a.   Hankamer: #Don't be alarmed . . . he never actually does $<\ >$.   *'surface' ellipsis*
     b.   Hankamer: Don't be alarmed . . . he never actually does it.   *'deep' pro-form*

- Antecedent-less double ellipsis can be much better (37)-(39):
    - (a) example, (b) contrast with single ellipsis, (c) analysis here
    - ⇑ recoverability from non-linguistic context
    - = identity between non-overt linguistic material

(37)   (Context: same as (36).)
     a.   He wouldn't, would he?   (cf. Jacobson 2022: ex. 21)
     b.   # He wouldn't. / # Would he?
     c.   ⇑ *cut(hand)(s)*   he wouldn't $<$cut his hand off$>$ = would he $<$cut his hand off$>$

(38)   (Tagline of a Clariol hair dye advert.)   (Schachter 1977)

    a.   Does she or doesn't she?

    b.   # Does she?

    c.   ⇑ *colour(hair)(she)*   does she $<$colour her hair$>$ = doesn't she $<$colour her hair$>$

(39)   (Context: I see two people clearly thinking about whether to jump into a very cold pool of water at the bottom of a rock formation while hiking. I turn to you and say:)

    a.   You know what? I kind of think that he will if she does.   (Jacobson 2022: ex. 19)[11]

    b.   # You know what? I kind of think that he will.

    c.   ⇑ $\lambda x.$ *jump(x)*   he will $<$jump$>$ = she does $<$jump$>$

- Such ellipses are 'exophoric' (Miller & Pullum 2013) – pointing outside the linguistic discourse to the world – only with respect to recoverability.

- Double ellipsis provides sentence-internal, if non-overt, linguistic material for identity between the two ellipses.

---

[11]Cf. earlier examples involving *I* and *you*: *I will if you will* (Jacobson 2009: 86, ex. 4a); *If you can, so can I* (Schachter 1977: note 2, attrib. Susumu Kuno).

7   Conclusion

7.1   Summary

- Recoverability and identity are dissociable in double ellipsis.

- A lone ellipsis that fails identity can become possible with respect to the same preceding material if it is bridged by an intermediate ellipsis with which it establishes identity.

- In abstract, recall (4) vs. (5):

(4)
$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Spoken material} \\ \Uparrow, *= \\ \text{bad } <\text{ellipsis}> \end{array}$$

(5)
$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Spoken material} \\ \Uparrow \\ \text{intermediate } <\text{ellipsis}> \\ = \\ \text{previously bad } <\text{ellipsis}> \text{ becomes good} \end{array}$$

- Structural identity conditions on ellipsis can be maintained in the face of apparent counterexamples.

- Clausal ellipsis: voice and other argument structure mismatches, within limits.

- VPE: Dahl's puzzling mixed reading, elliptical answers to questions, 'missing' antecedents.

7.2   Status of <ellipsis>

- Broader conclusion: there is syntactic structure inside ellipsis sites.

- Opposing view (e.g. Dalrymple et al. 1991, Hardt 1993, Ginzburg & Sag 2000) could enforce identity as part of recoverability as long as the two are intertwined.

  - e.g., a pro-form embedded in passive structure must source its meaning from a passive antecedent

- But if identity can be satisfied with respect to ellipsis sites in double ellipsis, then there must be structure inside them to evaluate for identity.

8   Appendices

8.1   Acknowledgements

8.2   Left Branch Extraction

- Another potential limiting case on using double ellipsis to circumvent mismatches – further to §3

- Sluices whose *wh*-remnant has been extracted from a left branch, e.g. adjectives, necessitate 'short sources' (Barros et al. 2014, Abels 2018).

- Of the candidates in (40), only the copula predication structure in (d) is grammatical:

(40)   The government makes frequent use of outside consultants, but it won't say how frequent <???>.
   a.   * . . . [how frequent] <it makes *t* use of outside consultants>.   *active*
   b.   * . . . [how frequent <use of outside consultants] it makes *t*>.   *pied piping*
   c.   * . . . [how frequent] <*t* use of outside consultants is made>.   *passive*
   d.   . . . [how frequent] <it is *t*>.   *short source*

- Since LBE sluices do not contain 'full source' structure, they should not be able to bridge voice mismatch in double ellipsis.

- (41) is thus predicted to be ungrammatical due to the inequality of (a) and ungrammaticality of (b), in minimal contrast with an example like (42):

(41)   (*) The government makes frequent use of outside consultants, but it won't say how frequent,
        or by which departments.

   a.   how frequent <it is> *≠ by which departments <consultants are used>
   b.   * . . . by which departments <it was>.

(42)   The government makes use of outside consultants, but it won't say how frequently, or by which departments.

- Further empirical work required.

8.3   More on antecedent-less double ellipsis

- Another case of double ellipsis (43) – tag question (cf. 38):

(43)   (Context: I see my friend Chris, about to ski down Inferno on cross-country skis, and say:)
        He's not really going to <ski down there>, is he <going to ski down there>?   (cf. Jacobson 2009: 86, ex.4b)

- Double ellipsis (44):

(44)   (Context: I point to one batch of cookies and say:)
        These, you may $<$eat $t>$.
        (Pointing to a second batch I say:)
        Those, you can't $<$eat $t>$ (cf. Jacobson 2003: 79, ex. 32; 2008: 58, ex. 41a; 2022: ex. 24)
        – at least not until they cool down.

- But is the second ellipsis necessary in (44)? It's absent in (45):

(45)   (Context: I see you about to grab some cookies:)
        Not those, you don't $<$ $>$.   (Jacobson 2003: 79, ex. 31)

    – but is a second ellipsis present by strong implication? Cf. stopping at the semicolon in (32a): *Where did John go shopping? He DIDN'T in PARIS. . .*

    – or is (45) idiomatic, lexicalised? Akin to Hankamer & Sag's (409f., fn. 19): *Not in my wastebasket, you don't!*

- Double ellipsis across speakers (46)? – "not perfect, but not horrendous" (informant work needed here)" (Jacobson 2022: ex. 20):

(46)   (Scenario: I see my friend Chris at the top of a double diamond ski slope, and I know he is only a beginner skier. You are concerned and say:) Do you think he really might $< >$?
(I turn to you and say:) No don't worry. I don't think he really will $< >$.

- (47) is definitely a problem (Jacobson 2022: ex.25):

(47)   (Scenario: Dad is with two of his kids, Keela and Zack. Keela (the older) has been trying to tell Dad for quite some time that she is very independent and doesn't need help typing her shoes. But Dad is a creature of habit, so he reaches down to help Keela – who says:)

   a.   Keela: Dad. Please! Stop! I DON'T WANT you to!!!

(Dad then reaches down to help Zack. But Zack likes to copy his big sister and so says:)

   b.   Zack (after Dad tries to help him): And I don't want you to either!!!!

(Moreover, can elaborate to add in some more kids all of whom want to be independent. Leah – one of the younger kids – then says:

   c.   Leah: Yeah Dad, don't you get it? None of us want you to.

   – (a) is fine on it's own – other speakers' ellipses not necessary

   – (a) is also fine without *Stop!* – so regardless of any possible double ellipsis in there

- Potential double ellipsis in (48), though only "marginally possible" (Jacobson 2008: 58, ex. 41b):

(48)   (Context: Bill is at a dog park, and is trying to pet each dog. Most of the dogs are quite unsocialized, and don't
        like to be petted – with the exception of Kolya. So, as he tries to pet Mitka, I turn to him and say:)
        ?? Better not ($<\ >$) – I think Kolya is the only one who would actually like you to $<\ >$.

8.4   Identity glitches elsewhere

- Case matching in free relative clauses.

- Case conflicts are tolerated so long as they are not morphologically expressed.

- van Riemsdijk (2017: exx. 19, 20):

- The case of a free relative (FR) must match with the case of the *wh*-word that forms it; e.g. German (49):

  – (a) grammatical: the nominative *wh*-word is the subject of the FR, which is the subject of the sentence

  – (b) ungrammatical: the *wh*-word needs to be accusative inside the FR, but the FR as a whole needs to be nominative as the subject of the sentence

(49)   a.   [$_{DP_{NOM}}$ Wer$_{NOM}$ *t* nicht stark   ist] muss klug   sein.
                          who   not   strong is   must clever be.

       'Who is not strong must be clever.'

       b.   * [$_{DP_{NOM}}$ { $^{Wen_{ACC}}_{Wer_{NOM}}$ } Gott schwach *t* geschaffen hat] muss klug   sein.
                          who   God weak   created   has   must clever be.

       'Who God has created weak must be clever.'

- Syncretism supports mismatching case (50) – *was* is syncretic for nominative and accusative:

(50)   [$_{DP_{NOM}}$ Was$_{ACC}$ du   *t* gekocht hast] ist schimmlig.
                  What   you   cooked have   is moldy.
   'What you have cooked is moldy.'

- Satisfying identity by taking { case morphology $\sim$ ellipsis } in two ways.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2018. Movement and islands. In *The oxford handbook of ellipsis*, Oxford University Press.

Anand, Pranav, Daniel Hardt & James McCloskey. 2021. The domain of matching in sluicing. Ms., University of California, Santa Cruz and Copenhagen Business School: https://people.ucsc.edu/~mcclosk/PDF/ahm2.pdf.

Barros, Matthew, Patrick Elliot & Gary Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Ms., Rutgers, UCL, University of Edinburgh.

Citko, Barbara & Martina Gračanin-Yuksek. 2020. Conjunction saves multiple sluicing: How *(and) why? *Glossa* 5. 92.

Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van & Jason Merchant. 2013. Ellipsis phenomena. In Marcel den Dikken (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of generative syntax*, 701–745. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1973. On so-called 'sloppy identity'. *Synthese* 26. 81–112.

Dalrymple, Mary, Stuart Shieber & Fernando Pereira. 1991. Ellipsis and higher-order unification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14(4). 399–452.

Fiengo, Robert & Howard Lasnik. 1972. On nonrecoverable deletion in syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3. 528.

Fiengo, Robert & Robert May. 1994. *Indices and identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Hankamer, Jorge. 1971. *Constraints on deletion in syntax*. New Haven, CT: Yale University dissertation.

Hankamer, Jorge. 1978. On the nontransformational derivation of some null VP anaphors. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9. 66–74.

Hankamer, Jorge & Ivan A Sag. 1976. Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7. 391–426.

Hardt, Daniel. 1993. *Verb phrase ellipsis: Form, meaning, and processing*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.

Hardt, Daniel. 2021. Ellipsis and identity. In Daniel Gutzmann, Lisa Matthewson, Cécile Meier, Hotze Rullmann & Thomas Ede Zimmermann (eds.), *The wiley blackwell companion to semantics, first edition*, 1–15. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Hartman, Jeremy. 2009. When eGIVENness overpredicts identity. Paper presented at Brussels Conference in Generative Linguistics 4, Brussels.

Jacobson, Pauline. 2003. Binding without pronouns (and pronouns without binding). In G.-J. M. Kruijff & R. T. Oehrle (eds.), *Resource–sensitivity, binding and anaphora*, 57–96. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Jacobson, Pauline. 2008. Direct compositionality and variable–free semantics: The case of antecedent contained deletion. In Kyle Johnson (ed.), *Topics in ellipsis*, 30–68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobson, Pauline. 2009. Do representations matter or do meanings matter: The case of antecedent containment. In E. Hinrichs & J. Nerbonne (eds.), *Theory and evidence in semantics*, 81–107. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Jacobson, Polly. 2022. No I'm not on mute: I actually didn't say anything. You're on Mute Workshop, 6 May.

Kuno, Susumu. 1975. Conditions for verb phrase deletion. *Foundations of Language* 13. 161–175.

Levin, Nancy Sue. 1979. *Main-verb ellipsis in spoken English*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University dissertation.

Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(1). 77–108.

Miller, Philip & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2013. Exophoric VP ellipsis. In Philip Hofmeister & Elisabeth Norcliffe (eds.), *The core and the periphery: Data-driven perspectives on syntax inspired by Ivan A. Sag*, CSLI.

Nakamura, Masanori. 2016. On MaxElide. In *Humanities annual report 46*, 103–130. Senshu University.

Poppels, Till. 2022. Explaining ellipsis without identity. *The Linguistic Review* 39(3). 341–400.

Pullum, Geoffrey. 2000. Hankamer was! In Sandra Chung, James McCloskey & Nathan Sanders (eds.), *Jorge Hankamer WebFest*, https://babel.ucsc.edu/jorgewebfest/pullum.html.

van Riemsdijk, Henk. 2017. Free relatives. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The wiley blackwell companion to syntax*, John Wiley & Sons.

Rooth, Mats. 1992a. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1. 75–116.

Rooth, Mats. 1992b. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. In Berman & Hestvik (eds.), *The Stuttgart Ellipsis Workshop*, SFB 340.

Sag, Ivan. 1976. *Deletion and logical form*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Schachter, Paul. 1977. Does she or doesn't she? *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 763–767.

Schiebe, Traugott. 1973. Zum problem der grammatisch relevanten identität. In F. Kiefer & N. Ruwet (eds.), *Generative grammar in Europe*, 482–527. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Stockwell, Richard. 2020. *Contrast and verb phrase ellipsis: Triviality, symmetry, and competition*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California dissertation.

Stockwell, Richard. 2022. Contrast and verb phrase ellipsis: the case of tautologous conditionals. *Natural Language*

Semantics 30. 77–100.

Warner, Anthony R. 1985. *The structure of English auxiliaries: A phrase structure grammar*. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Webber, Bonnie L. 1978. *A formal approach to discourse anaphora*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University dissertation. Published 1979 by Garland Publishing, New York.

Williams, Edwin. 1977. Discourse and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 101–139.