

## Antecedent Contained Deletion and Movement Reconsidered

Analyses of Antecedent Contained Deletion (ACD) generally rely on movement for the resolution of infinite regress (Sag 1976), and to enforce the boundedness effects of Baltin (1987). Fox (2002) observes that this coupling of movement and ACD leads to a conflict with the copy theory of movement: if there are copies, then there can be no parallelism between the antecedent and ellipsis site, but if there are only traces, then there is no account of certain binding and reconstruction effects. Furthermore, Lasnik (2003) argues that A-movement must not leave behind a trace, an immediate problem for the copy theory of movement, movement theories of binding and control (Hornstein 2001), and A-movement theories of ACD (Hornstein 1995). In this talk, I present several new observations that lead to an analysis of ACD in which: (i) infinite regress is resolved through semantic parallelism not movement, (ii) boundedness still derives from movement, but (iii) movement only arises when parallelism requires a variable within the antecedent. This analysis not only accounts for the new data, but also leads to a resolution of three-way conflict above, and several interesting consequences for the architecture of movement.

The claim that movement is not responsible for the resolution of infinite regress derives from an observation of Yoshida 2003, namely that ACD is possible in IP ellipsis constructions (sluicing ACD) (1). Movement theories of infinite regress should predict (1) to be unacceptable. For one, there is no apparent movement of the PP adjunct. And more importantly, even if the PP adjunct did undergo some sort of Case movement or QR, the resulting logical form would contain more variables than binders (2). Given the impossibility of movement, it follows that something other than movement is resolving the infinite regress. Furthermore, passive movement (A-movement) destroys otherwise resolvable ACD (3). In (3a), the object containing a relative clause is a canonical instance of ACD. After standard passive movement of the object, the ACD becomes unacceptable (3b). If movement were simply to resolve infinite regress, it seems illogical that further (or prior) movement would cause a problem. This suggests that whatever the function movement serves in (3a), it can be disrupted by overt A-movement, and even suggests that A-movement accounts of ACD are incorrect (contra Hornstein 1995).

I propose that infinite regress is resolved by the antecedent selection operation inherent in Merchant's (2002) analysis of certain cases of sluicing (see also Chung et al. 1995). Through the adoption of Merchant's (2001) semantic parallelism requirement, non-constituent subparts of the VP may serve as antecedent, in some cases resolving infinite regress. Certain cases of ACD, however, require more than infinite regress resolution: when a variable is required within the ellipsis site, movement is necessary to create a variable within the antecedent that is parallel to the variable required within the ellipsis site. Following Lasnik's proposal that A-movement does not leave behind a trace, the lack of ACD resolution under overt A-movement then becomes a failure of parallelism, not infinite regress. Because passive movement moves the ACD site out of the antecedent VP without leaving a trace, the antecedent is no longer parallel to the ellipsis site, which contains the variable bound by the relative clause operator. Thus overt A-movement can bleed the covert A'-movement necessary to license the parallelism required for ACD. This also predicts that ACD ellipsis sites that do not require a variable, such as PP adjuncts, will not require A'-movement, but simply antecedent selection. Assuming that the constraints on A'-movement underlie the boundedness of ACD (as in Kennedy 1997), this predicts that PP adjunct ACD will not display boundedness effects. This prediction seems to be borne out (compare (4) to (5)).

More than simply accounting for the new observations, this analysis leads to a novel resolution to the conflict that arises between ACD, the copy theory of movement, and Lasnik's traceless A-movement. Under the analysis proposed here, it can be argued that the formal mechanism of movement is identical for both A-movement and A'-movement in that both leave behind a copy, while the difference lies at the level in which parallelism holds, namely semantic interpretation: A'-copies are interpreted as variables (perhaps through Fox's Trace Conversion), while A-copies are not interpreted at all. Furthermore, this suggests that not only are A-movement analyses of ACD incorrect, but also that ACD can no longer be used as a diagnostic for movement without caveat (as in Pesetsky 2000, and Soh 2005). This is a welcomed result for movement theories of construal, which do not resolve ACD as in (6) and (7), and any other analysis that relies on A-movement copies.

- (1) [IP John was kissing someone [PP without knowing who [IP e]]].
- (2) [IP [DP someone] [IP John [PP without knowing who [VP was kissing t<sub>DP</sub> t<sub>PP</sub>] [VP was kissing t<sub>DP</sub> t<sub>PP</sub>]]]]
- (3) a. Caroline ate every entrée that Diogo did  
b. \*Every entrée that Diogo did was eaten by Caroline
- (4) *The relative clause ACD in (a) can only have the meaning paraphrased in (c):*  
a. Larson thought that Kollberg questioned the suspects Beck did.  
b. #Larson thought that Kollberg questioned the suspects Beck thought that Kollberg questioned.  
c. Larson thought that Kollberg questioned the suspects Beck questioned.
- (5) *The variable-less PP-adjunct ACD in (a) can have the meanings paraphrased in both (b) and (c):*  
a. Larson thought that Kollberg questioned the suspects as fervently as Beck did.  
b. Larson thought that Kollberg questioned the suspects as fervently as Beck thought that Kollberg questioned the subjects.  
c. Larson thought that Kollberg questioned the suspects as fervently as Beck questioned the suspects.
- (6) *Binding and ACD*  
a. \*Everyone that Bill does likes himself (Anaphor)  
b. \*Everyone that you do thinks that I like him (Pronoun)
- (7) *Control and ACD*  
a. \*I persuaded everyone that should to leave his wife (Object Control)  
b. \*Everyone that should promised to leave early (Subject Control)

### Selected References

- Baltin, M. 1987. Do Antecedent-Contained Deletions Exist?. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18:279–295
- Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:239-282.
- Fox, Danny. 2002. Antecedent Contained Deletion and the Copy Theory of Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 63-96.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. *Logical Form: From GB to Minimalism*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Kennedy, Christopher. 1997. Antecedent-contained deletion and the syntax of quantification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 662-688.
- Larson, Richard and Robert May. 1990. Antecedent Containment or Vacuous Movement: Reply to Baltin. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:103-122.
- Lasnik, H. 2003. *Minimalist Investigations in Linguistic Theory*. Routledge Ltd.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Merchant, Jason. 2002. Swiping in Germanic. In J.-W. Zwart and W. Abraham (eds.), *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Pesetsky, David. 2000. *Phrasal Movement and its Kin*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Sag, Ivan. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. Doctoral Dissertation. MIT.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 2005. Wh-in-situ in Mandarin Chinese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36: 143-155.
- Yoshida, Masaya. 2003. *Adjunct Sluicing and ACD*. UMD Syntax Lunch.