Return to Vehicle Change

Jan-Wouter Zwart
CLCG/Linguistics, University of Groningen

Presented at the *Quirky Ellipsis Workshop*, Groningen, November 15 2011
in connection with Marlies Kluck's dissertation defense

1. Vehicle Change

(1)   Definition (cf. Fiengo and May 1994:218)
        Vehicle Change is the selection of a different morphological guise for a noun
        phrase contained in a reconstructed elliptical constituent ('pronominal correlate')

(2)   Mary loves <u>John</u> and <u>he</u> thinks Susan does ⟨*sc* love <u>John > him</u> ⟩ too

        > trigger: looming Condition C violation
        > condition: invariance of indices

in Kluck 2011:243
(3)   <u>Bob</u> kissed <u>he</u> said it was only one other woman ⟨that <u>Bob > he</u> kissed ⟩

Question: do we really need it?

Some history of the discussion
i.   Some variation in reconstructed ellipsis must be allowed (Bouton 1970)
(4)   Mary stops to look at every pretty flower she stumbles onto, and so does Bob

ii.   Vehicle change may (even) introduce variables (Vanden Wyngaerd & Zwart
        1991, Fiengo & May 1994:219)
(5)   John kissed Mary, but I wonder who Harry did ⟨*sc* kiss [e]⟩

        > obviates the need for Quantifier Raising in Antecedent Contained Deletion

(6)   *Antecedent Contained Deletion*
a.   Dulles suspected everyone Angleton did
b.   *with QR*
        [everyone Angleton *did*] Dulles *suspected [e]*
c.   *without QR*
        Dulles suspected <u>everyone *OP* Angleton did</u> ⟨suspect <u>everyone etc. > *[e]*</u>⟩

iii   Minimalism (bottom up Merge, ellipsis = spellout): no need for reconstruction
        ('Antecedent-contained deletion as deletion', VandenWyngaerd & Zwart 1999),
        hence no Vehicle Change

        > varied ellipsis constituent is base-generated as such (focus-related topic)

iv   But: in the context of a top-down split-merge model (Zwart 2011), reconstruction (and Vehicle Change) might make a come-back

> WYSIWYG-approach: ellipsis site is unstructured empty category (Williams 1977)

(7)   John loves Mary and Bill does too
       Numeration: { [John loves Mary], and, Bill, does, [e], too } (hypothetical)

2. Scope of Vehicle Change

Fiengo & May 1994
(8)   a. Vehicle Change
           i   introduction of a variable for an R-expression (cf. (5))
           ii   introduction of a pronominal correlate (cf. (2))
           iii variation of pronominal features under invariance of indices (9)
       b. variation, but no Vehicle Change
           iv   alternations of the *him/himself* type (10)

(9)   I turned in <u>my</u> assignment, but most of the other students didn't ⟨... <u>my > their</u> ...⟩

(10)   *strict reflexives*
       John loves <u>himself</u> more than Mary does ⟨ love <u>himself > him</u> ⟩
       > α-occurrence of the index, i.e. identical with but not bound by the antecedent
           (cf. Rooryck & Vanden Wyngaerd 2011 'the self as other' idea)
       > β-occurrence: only sloppy reading (reflexive bound by local antecedent)

(11)   *'himself' is basically 'him' with a syntactic marker ('self')*
       [him]-self

NB, sometimes strict reflexives do require type (8iii) vehicle change (Fiengo & May 1994:101)
(12)   If every student revises <u>his</u> paper, then I won't have to ⟨... <u>his > their</u> ...⟩

3. Introducing a variable under ellipsis

(12)   *top-down approach*
       a. there is no movement > variables are not traces
       b. solution: wh-words are 'double atoms' with parts merged at different stages
       c. condition: only within a single derivation layer > locality effects

(13)   Who did you see [e] ?
       a. Numeration = { (who,[e]), did, you, see }
       b. Split Merge: ⟨who, { [e], did, you, see } ⟩, ⟨ who, ⟨ did, {[e], you, see} ⟩⟩, etc.
           until: ⟨who ⟨did ⟨you ⟨see, {[e]} ⟩⟩⟩⟩ and then the variable is merged last.

(14)   John kissed Mary, but I wonder who Harry did   (=(5))
        > WYSIWYG Numeration: { ..., (who,[e]), Harry, did }
        > output: ⟨who, ⟨Harry, ⟨did, ⟨[e]⟩⟩⟩⟩

Non-island sensitivity of sluicing (cf. Merchant 2001) follows
(15)   They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know
        which
        > in the absence of further overt material, the variable is merged rightaway.

Carries over to Andrews amalgams under Kluck's (2011) analysis
(16)   They want to hire someone who speaks you'll never guess which language

Conclusion: type (8i) vehicle change not needed in a top-down derivation

4. Introducing a pronominal correlate to avoid a binding theory violation

(17)   Mary loves <u>John</u> and <u>he</u> thinks Susan does ⟨*sc* love <u>John > him</u> ⟩ too   (=(2))

Principle C waived
(18)   non-*de se* contexts (Evans 1980)
        If everyone hates John, then surely John must hate John
        > John is not a self-hater but a John-hater

Demirdache (2000): R-expressions not used to express self-oriented dependency
(19)   *   <u>He</u> thinks <u>John</u> is an idiot (*de se*)
        > [John is an idiot] is the content of the subject's thinking ('owned' by *he*)

(20)   Everyone thinks <u>John</u> is an idiot and so in fact does <u>he</u> (*de dicto*)
        > [John is an idiot] is 'owned' by *everyone*, not by *he*

Carries over to Kluck's (2011:243) example
(21)   <u>Bob</u> kissed <u>he</u> said it was only one other woman ⟨that <u>Bob > he</u> kissed ⟩
        > Bob said: 'I kissed only one other woman'
        > elliptical part outside the scope of what Bob said (*de re*)

What about Principle C in a top-down approach?
(22)   a. Binding as a function of merge:
                i   antecedent marks its sister as dependent
                ii   dependency must be spelled out
                iii R-expressions not suitable (at least in English, Dutch, etc.)
                     ((19) will not occur under the reflexive reading)

            b. WYSIWYG-ellipsis: unclear what happens at the CI-interface, but if
                reconstruction, then the above (Principle C waiver) applies

5. Variation of pronominal features

(23) I turned in <u>my</u> assignment, but most of the other students didn't ⟨... <u>my > their</u> ...⟩

Contextually determined features of pronouns
(24) Starting point: Numeration has only PRON (a single semi-referential N/D-element)
        > Vehicle Change not needed for the spell-out variation of pronominal features

Vehicle change with strict reflexives is perhaps more complicated
(25) Every student thinks <u>he</u> is a genius, but the professor doesn't ⟨think <u>they</u> are⟩
        > vehicle change SG>PL, but also
        > bound variable pronoun > E-type pronoun (Fiengo & May 1994:101)

Elbourne type analysis with quantification over situations (cf. Elbourne 2005)
(26) In every situation s.t. there is a student
            that student thinks that **he** is a genius
            but the professor doesn't ⟨think that **he** is a genius⟩
        > in fact no variation needed at all

6. Reconstructing reconstruction

Conclusion
(27) in a top-down WYSIWYG-approach to ellipsis, Vehicle Change may not be needed

How is the ellipsis interpreted?
(28) Starting from the Numeration in (7) { [John loves Mary], and, Bill, does, [e], too }
        > there is a (derivationally determined) partitioning in the antecedent clause
           between **focus** and a **focus-related topic** (Tancredi 1992)
        > the parallelism in ellipsis constructions between the **foci** turns the ellipsis site
           (or its place-holder *do*) into a counterpart to the **focus-related topic**
        > ideally, that means it is the same focus-related topic (which, in Tancredi's
           proposal, is a predicate with open positions)

References
Demirdache 2000 Condition C. In *Atomism and binding*, Foris. ● Elbourne 2005 *Situations and individuals*. MIT Press. ● Evans 1980. On pronouns. *LI*. ● Fiengo and May 1994 *Indices and Identity*. MIT Press. ● Kluck 2011 *Sentence amalgamation*. Diss Groningen. ● Merchant 2001 *The syntax of silence*. OUP. ● Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 2011. *Dissolving binding theory*. OUP. ● Tancredi 1992. *Deletion, deaccenting and presupposition*. MIT Diss. ● Vanden Wyngaerd and Zwart 1991 Reconstruction and Vehicle Change. *LIN 1991* ○ 1999 Antecedent Contained Deletion as deletion. *LIN 1999* ● Williams 1977 Discourse and logical form. *LI*. ● Zwart 2011. Prospects for top-down derivation. *CatJL*.

c.j.w.zwart [AT] rug.nl ● let.rug.nl/zwart
Faculty of Arts, PO Box 716, NL9700 AS, Groningen, The Netherlands