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1 Syntactic Identity?

(1) VP Deletion Transformation

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
X & - & VP & - & Y & - & VP & - & Z \\
SD: & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
SC: & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]
Condition: 2=4

(2) a. Sandy went to the store, though she said she didn’t go to the store.
   b. Kim understands Korean and Lee should understand Korean, too.
   c. They’re complaining about the noise, but I won’t complain about the noise.
   d. Many people are questioning your motives, but the FBI hasn’t questioned your motives.
   e. A: Did she interrogate them?    
      B: She is interrogating them at this very moment.

(3) a. *Paul denied the charge, but the charge wasn’t denied by his friends.  
       [Quirk et al. 1985]
   b. *The charge was denied by Bo, Lee wouldn’t deny the charge.
   c. *First Germany invaded Sudetenland, then the rest of Czechoslovakia was invaded.
   d. *France was afraid of being attacked by Germany, but then they did attack France.
2 LF-Based Approaches (Sag 1976; Williams 1977)

(4) VP Deletion (Sag 1976, 105):

VPD can delete any VP in S whose representation at the level of LF is a \( \lambda \)-expression that is an alphabetic variant of another \( \lambda \)-expression present in the logical form of S or in the logical form of some other sentence S’ not subsequent to S in discourse.

(5)a. &Someone hit everyone, but Pat didn’t hit everyone.

b. \( \neg \) &Someone hit everyone, but Pat didn’t hit everyone.

(6) a. A. Who did Sandy visit? B. Who did Bo visit?

b. *A. Who did Sandy visit? B. Who did Bo visit?

(7) Who did Sandy say we’d visit _ but Bo say we wouldn’t visit _?

(8) a. Sandy greeted everyone when Leslie greeted everyone.

b. Sandy greeted everyone when Leslie did greet everyone.

(9) a. What Sandy carried _ was the glove; what Chris carried _ was the bat.

b. *What, Sandy carried _ was the glove; what, Chris did carry _ was the bat.

c. What, Sandy tried to carry _ but couldn’t carry _ was the team trophy.

(10)a. &The chicken is ready to eat and the duck is ready to eat, too.

b. &The chicken is ready to eat and the duck is ready to eat, too.

c. \( \neg \) &The chicken is ready to eat and the duck is ready to eat, too.

(11)a. &George loves his mother and Dick does _ , too.

George, loves his, mother and Dick, loves his, mother, too.

George, loves his, mother and Dick, loves his, mother, too.
b. LF: $\lambda x[\text{love}(x,y\text{'s-mother})](\text{George}_y)$
c. LF: $\lambda x[\text{love}(x,x\text{'s-mother})](\text{George}_y)$

(12) a. These blankets have holes in them. Your shirt does have holes in it, too.
b. My uncles are bachelors, but I don’t think Lee’s uncle is a bachelor.
c. This coke machine never has anything in it, but that one always does have something in it.
d. Sandy bought herself a new scarf, so that her partner wouldn’t have to buy her a new scarf.

(13) “VP Deletion” Transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>[AUX+]</th>
<th>XP</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD: 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Condition: 3 is LF-redundant

3 Semantic Approaches (Sag and Hankamer 1984, Merchant 2001)

(14) a. A: Do you think they’ll like him$_C$?
   B: Of course they will __. [__ = $\lambda x[\text{like}(x,C)]$]
b. A: Do you think they’ll like me?
   B: Of course they will __. [__ = $\lambda x[\text{like}(x,A)]; \neq \lambda x[\text{like}(x,B)]$]

(15) Sag and Hankamer (1984: 332):
Delete VP$_e$ in $S_e$ only if:
   a. $c_e$ is the Kaplan-context of $S_e$,
   b. $c_a$ is the Kaplan-context of some sentence $S_a$ not subsequent to $S_e$ in discourse, and
   c. there is some VP$_a$ in $S_a$ s.t. for all assignments $f$,
   $$[[\text{VP}_e]]_{c_e}^f = [[\text{VP}_a]]_{c_a}^f.$$
(S&H were following Sag (1976) in assuming ‘no rebinding of traces’)

3
Merchant (2001):

(16) a. An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo $\exists$-type shifting,
   1. A entails F-clo(E), and
   2. E entails F-clo(A)

b. F-closure:
   The F-CLOSURE of $\alpha$, written F-clo($\alpha$), is the result of replacing F-marked parts of
   $\alpha$ with $\exists$-bound variables of the appropriate type (modulo $\exists$-type shifting) [Merchant
   2001:14]

c. **Focus condition on VP-ellipsis:**
   VP$_{e}$ can be deleted only if VP$_{e}$ is e-GIVEN.

The Relational Opposites Puzzle (Hartman 2009):

(17)*John will beat someone at chess, and then Mary will lose to someone at chess.

- $\exists$-clo(VP$_{a}$) = F-clo(VP$_{a}$)
  = $\exists$x.x will beat someone at chess.

- $\exists$-clo(VP$_{e}$) = F-clo(VP$_{e}$)
  = $\exists$x.x will lose to someone at chess.

- VP$_{a}$ and VP$_{e}$ satisfy mutual entailment modulo $\exists$-type shifting. (If someone will beat some-
  one at chess, then someone will lose to someone at chess, and vice versa.)

- Thus VP$_{e}$ is e-GIVEN, but ellipsis is impossible.

Comparison:

- The Relational Opposites Puzzle is problematic for Merchant’s (2001) semantic theory of
  VP-Ellipsis (Hartman 2009).

- Sag & Hankamer’s (1984)’s semantic theory of VP-Ellipsis solves the Relational Opposites
  Puzzle straightforwardly:

  The actual VP meaning is what determines the possibility of deletion, not the entailment
  properties of propositions formed by existential closure and/or f-closure.
4 Further Issues of Identity

Variable Rebinding?

(18) A Canadian flag hung in front of each embassy, and an American flag did hang in front of each embassy, too. [Hirschbühl 1982]

\[ \forall > \exists \]

(19) If Tom was having trouble in school, I would help him. On the other hand, if Harry was having trouble, I doubt that I would help Harry. [Hardt 93]

Split Antecedents

(20) I can walk and I can chew gum. Kim and Sandy said that they can walk and chew gum, too. [Webber 1978, Hardt 1993]

(21) Martha and Irv wanted to dance with each other, but Martha couldn’t dance with Irv, because her husband was here. [Webber, 1978]

(22) Wendy is eager to sail around the world and Bruce is eager to climb Kilimanjaro, and they will do what they’re eager to do? if they have enough money.

Anaphoric ‘Islands’ (or Anaphoric ‘Peninsulas’)

(23) David Begelman is a great laugher, and when he does, his eyes crinkle at you the way Lady Bretts did in The Sun Also Rises. [p. 90, Youll Never Eat Lunch in This Town Again, Julia Philips, cited by Hardt (1993), p. 34.]

(24) Harry used to be a great speaker, but he can’t anymore, because he has lost his voice.

(25) Today there is little or no OFFICIAL harassment of lesbians and gays by the national government, although autonomous governments might. [b-board msg; attributed to Ellen Prince by Hardt (1993)]

(26) ...the problem of ellipsis interpretation is just to recover a property (or relation over) the parallel element (respectively, elements) in the target that the missing or vestigial material stands proxy for. [Dalrymple et al. 1991, p. 3]
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