
1 VP-Deletion, Parasitic Gaps, and Islands

Kim and Lyle (1995, 1996) discuss a very interesting set of facts involving parasitic gaps and VP-deletion (see also Rooth 1981 and Kehler 1993). They observe that apparent parasitic gap constructions do not show island effects when the gap is contained in a deleted VP, as demonstrated by the contrast between the (a) and (b) examples in (1)–(4) (in which the extraction islands are enclosed in brackets). In each set, the (a) example illustrates the well-known fact that parasitic gaps are sensitive to islands, and the (b) example shows that when the gap is contained in a deleted VP, the island effect disappears. (1)–(3) make this point for wh-islands, extraction from an adjunct, and complex NPs, respectively, and (4) shows that deletion even saves violations of the Coordinate Structure Constraint.¹

An earlier version of this squib was presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in San Diego, California, January 1996, and I am grateful to audiences there and at the University of California, Santa Cruz, for useful comments. In addition, I would like to thank Dan Hardt and Sandy Chung for helpful discussion of these issues, and two LI referees for detailed comments on an earlier draft. Any inconsistencies, errors, or omissions that remain in the current version are my responsibility.

¹ Similar examples are also discussed by Lappin (1992, 1996), who presents sentences like (i)–(ii) in support of the position that VP-deletion does not ameliorate island effects in parasitic gaps (though Lappin (1996:fn. 6) observes that not all speakers find these sentences unacceptable). The judgments shown here are those given in Lappin 1996.

(i) ??This is the book which Max read before hearing the claim that Lucy did.
(ii) *This is the play which John saw before Bill went because he wanted to.

Although these examples are clearly degraded, there are at least two reasons to believe that their awkwardness is due to factors independent of the parasitic gap issue. First, (iii)–(iv), although not ungrammatical, are only marginally
Wh-islands
(1) a. *Which article, did you read t, after Jim asked [who would be willing to summarize e,]? 
   b. Which article, did you read t, after Jim asked [who would be willing to ____]? 

Adjuncts
(2) a. *Which movie, did you see t, because Polly was so excited [after going to e,]? 
   b. Which movie, did you see t, because Polly was so excited [after she did ____]? 

Complex NPs
(3) a. *Dick Dale, who we attempt to emulate t, despite the admonitions of [many people who say we shouldn’t try to sound like e,], is performing tonight at the Catalyst. 
   b. Dick Dale, who we attempt to emulate t, despite the admonitions of [many people who say we shouldn’t ____], is performing tonight at the Catalyst. 

Coordinate structures
(4) a. *Which books, did you read t, after learning that Erik [read e, and found them, interesting]? 
   b. Which books, did you read t, after learning that Erik [did ____ and found them, interesting]? 

Kim and Lyle conclude from these facts that at least some parasitic gaps must be licensed at LF. This analysis is very important, because the traditional analysis of parasitic gaps—that they are licensed at S-Structure (Chomsky 1986; see also Engdahl 1983, 1984, Chomsky 1982)—constitutes a significant challenge to the hypothesis put forth in Chomsky 1993, 1995 that all grammatical constraints are enforced at the interface levels LF and PF. If Kim and Lyle’s analysis is correct, however, the status of parasitic gaps as an argument against Chomsky’s recent proposals must be called into question.

Kim and Lyle’s argument runs as follows. Assume first that Sub-

better than (i)–(ii). Neither of these examples involves extraction out of either the antecedent or deleted VP, however. 

(iii) Max read this book before hearing the claim that Lucy did. 
(iv) John saw this play before Bill went because he wanted to. 

Second, (v)–(vi), in which the deleted VPs are in positions structurally identical to those in (i)–(ii), are significantly more acceptable (see also (2b) and (3b)). 

(v) This is the book that Max reviewed before hearing the news that Lucy already had. 
(vi) This is the play that John decided to see only after we criticized him because he hadn’t. 

These facts, along with the clear contrasts between the (a) and (b) sentences in (1)–(4), suggest that the awkwardness of (i)–(ii) stems from a difficulty in identifying the antecedent VP in these particular examples, not from illicit parasitic gap configurations.
Subjacency is a constraint on movement, and second that a deleted VP is devoid of structure prior to LF, at which point its structure is built in by a copying operation of some sort (see May 1985, Haïk 1987, Kitagawa 1991, Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995). If a deleted VP has no structure prior to LF, then there is no parasitic gap chain in examples like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) at S-Structure. The chain cannot be created until after the antecedent VP has been copied into the position of the elided one, introducing an empty category. Kim and Lyle suggest that a null operator is then inserted into the structure, creating the parasitic gap chain (cf. Contreras 1984). Because this operation does not involve actual movement, sentences of this type do not show Subjacency effects. Moreover, since the parasitic gap chain is not instantiated until after the deleted VP has been rebuilt, it must be the case that some parasitic gap chains are licensed at LF.

My intention in this squib is to present an alternative explanation of the grammaticality of the (b) examples in (1)–(4). Specifically, I will argue that sentences like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) do not show Subjacency effects because they do not contain parasitic gap chains at all. Instead, I will claim that the “gap” in the deleted VP is actually a pronoun, which is interpreted as a variable bound by the overt wh-operator. That is, I will argue that the actual LF representations of the (b) examples of (1)–(4) are (5)–(8) (in which the content of the deleted VP is shown in boldface). Like their counterparts that do not involve VP-deletion, these LF representations are perfectly well formed.

(5) which article, did you read t_i after Jim asked who would be willing to read it_i

(6) which movie, did you see t_i because Polly was so excited after she saw it_i

(7) Dick Dale, who, we attempt to emulate t_i despite the admonitions of many people who say we shouldn’t attempt to emulate him_i, is performing tonight at the Catalyst

(8) which books, did you read t_i after learning that Erik read them_i, and found them_i interesting

I will support this proposal by showing that the “gap” in the deleted VP in sentences like these is not sensitive to strong crossover (Condition C), which should be the case if it were a true parasitic gap, but is instead sensitive to Condition B, as expected if it is a pronoun. A result of this analysis is that “nonparasitic” gap structures like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) provide additional empirical evidence for the operation of vehicle change proposed by Fiengo and May (1994), which (among other things) establishes identity between a coindexed pronoun and A-trace in the context of VP-deletion.

2 Vehicle Change

Since at least the appearance of Sag 1976 and Williams 1977, it has been accepted that VP-deletion is licensed by some kind of identity

A number of facts indicate that reconstruction cannot require strict syntactic identity. Those of relevance here are exemplified by sentences like (9) and (10), discussed by Fiengo and May (1994) (sentences like (10) were originally discussed by Webber (1978)).

(9) Achtenberg supports Brown, and he, thinks Alioto does, too.

(10) Albert named a country that he wants to visit, and given the amount of traveling he does, I’m sure that he will.

(9) shows that VP-deletion eliminates Condition C effects. If (11) were the LF representation of (9), as we would expect if deletion required strict identity, then (9) would violate Condition C.

(11) *Achtenberg supports Brown, and he, thinks Alioto supports Brown, too

Similarly, (10) indicates that VP-deletion can eliminate at least some Empty Category Principle (ECP) effects. If the LF representation of (10) were (12), then this sentence would violate the ECP, because the trace in the elided VP is not antecedent-governed.

(12) *Albert named a country Opi that he wants to visit ti, and given the amount of traveling he does, I’m sure that he will visit ti.

To explain facts like these, Fiengo and May (1994) propose an operation of vehicle change, which in effect states that certain features are nondistinct with respect to reconstruction. The aspect of vehicle change that is relevant to the current discussion is that it establishes identity between coindexed elements with different values of the pronominal feature, as stated in (13) (cf. Fiengo and May 1994:218).²

(13) Vehicle change
X[i+proj] is a reconstruction of Y[i–proj].

With vehicle change, the LF representation (14), in which the name Brown is replaced by a coindexed pronoun, licenses deletion in (9), because the LF representation of the deleted VP is a reconstruction of the VP in the first conjunct.

² Vehicle change is also involved in establishing identity between featurally distinct but referentially identical indexical expressions, licensing deletion in examples like (i) (from Sag and Hankamer 1984; see the discussion of this point in Fiengo and May 1994:218).

(i) A: Do you think they’ll like me?
    B: Yes, I’m sure they will. (like you)
(14) Achtenberg supports Brown, and he, thinks Alioto supports him, too

Likewise, in (15) vehicle change establishes identity between the pronoun \( i_1 \) and the trace \( t_i \) in the antecedent VP, licensing deletion in (10).\(^3\)

(15) \textit{Albert} named a country \( Op_i \) that he wants to visit \( t_i \), and given the amount of traveling he does, I’m sure that he will \underline{visit it}.

Although vehicle change bleeds Condition C in the context of VP-deletion, because it establishes identity between a referring expression or \( \overline{A} \)-trace and a pronoun, it licenses deletions that are sensitive to Condition B (see the discussion of this point in Fiengo and May 1991, 1994). This is illustrated by the contrast between (16) and (17).

(16) Rachel nominated Geoff, because he, asked her to.
(17) *Rachel nominated Geoff, because he, couldn’t.

With vehicle change, the LF representation of (16) is (18), which is well formed with respect to both Conditions B and C.

(18) Rachel nominated Geoff, because he, asked her to \underline{nominate him},

The LF representation of (17), however, is (19), which satisfies Condition C, but violates Condition B because the pronoun in the elided VP is bound in its minimal governing category.

(19) *Rachel nominated Geoff, because he, couldn’t \underline{nominate him},

The importance of these facts is that they show that Condition B effects can be used as a test to determine whether a particular deletion involves vehicle change. Before applying this test to the sentences

\(^3\)See Hardt 1993 for an alternative, semantic approach to examples like (10). Observing the ill-formedness of LF representations like (12), Hardt argues that “deleted” VPs are actually proforms and that the interpretation of VP-deletion involves recovering a VP meaning dynamically from context, rather than establishing syntactic identity at LF. Sentences like (10) are acceptable because the expression in the recovered VP meaning that corresponds to the trace in the antecedent is a free variable whose interpretation is contextually determined. An important difference between this type of approach to VP-deletion and the one I have adopted here, which relies on establishing identity between LF representations, is that it does not provide a direct explanation for the sensitivity of a deleted VP to syntactic constraints. As I will show, the gaps in the deleted VPs in examples like the (a) cases of (1)–(4) are sensitive to Condition B. If Condition B is a constraint on syntactic representations, as traditionally assumed, then cases such as these raise questions for a purely semantic account of ellipsis such as the one developed by Hardt (as well as those discussed in, e.g., Rooth 1981, Dalrymple, Shieber, and Pereira 1991, and Jacobson 1992).
under investigation here, I should note that if vehicle change is a
general component of the grammar of ellipsis, as claimed by Fiengo
and May, its effects should be apparent in a variety of contexts. In
particular, vehicle change entails that (5)–(8) are possible LF represen-
tations of the (b) cases of (1)–(4). If it can also be shown that (5)–(8)
are the actual LF representations of these sentences, the analysis that
I have proposed here will be confirmed: namely, that sentences of this
type do not show Subjacency effects because they do not contain
parasitic gaps.

3 (Non)parasitic Gaps, Strong Crossover, and Condition B

In order to present the argument, I must establish a fact about parasitic
gaps. Like other types of constructions involving A-movement, par-
sitic gap constructions show strong crossover effects. This is illustrated
by the contrast between (20) and (21) (see Cinque 1990:150, Postal

(20) *This is the guy who, they arrested before he, realized they
suspected.

(21) This is the guy who they arrested before anyone realized
they suspected.

The ungrammaticality of (20) is expected: like other A-bound empty
categories, a parasitic gap must not be bound by an expression in an
argument position. In this sentence, however, it is A-bound by the
pronoun he, as shown in (22).

(22) *this is the guy [who, they arrested t, [Op, before he, realized
they suspected e]]

Because parasitic gaps are sensitive to strong crossover, and assum-
ing that strong crossover is calculated at LF (with respect to Condi-
tion C, which Chomsky (1993, 1995) has argued applies only at LF),
the analysis of the (b) cases of (1)–(4) presented by Kim and Lyle
and the one I have proposed here make very different predictions. If
the deleted VPs in these examples contain true parasitic gaps, then
sentences of this type should show strong crossover effects. If the
deleted VPs contain pronouns licensed by vehicle change, however,
then sentences of this type should not show strong crossover effects,
but they should be sensitive to Condition B. Two sets of facts support
the vehicle change analysis.

First, (23)–(25) show that sentences of this type are not sensitive
to strong crossover.

(23) Which candidate, did Maureen vote for because he, asked
her to?

(24) Who, did you nominate without him, knowing that you did?

(25) Who, did Marcus recommend after she, asked him to?

Each sentence is grammatical on the reading indicated by the coindex-
ing, which is expected if their LF representations are (26)–(28), in which the elided VPs contain a pronoun instead of a parasitic gap.

(26) which candidate, did Maureen vote for ti because he, asked her to vote for him,

(27) who, did you nominate ti without him, knowing that you did nominate him,

(28) who, did Marcus recommend ti after she, asked him to recommend her,

True parasitic gap constructions in the same contexts are not grammatical.

(29) *Which candidate, did Maureen vote for because he, asked her to support?

(30) *Who, did you nominate without him, knowing that you backed?

(31) *Who, did Marcus recommend after she, said he owed a favor?

(29)–(31) contrast with examples in which the offending pronoun is replaced with an expression that is not bound by the wh-operator, which are acceptable.4

(32) Which candidate did Maureen vote for because the mayor asked her to support?

(33) Who did you nominate without anyone knowing that you backed?

(34) Who did Marcus recommend after remembering he owed a favor?

Second, (35)–(37) demonstrate that sentences like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) are sensitive to Condition B.

(35) *Which candidate, did Maureen vote for because he, wouldn’t?

(36) *Who, did you nominate at the same time that he, did?

(37) *Who, did Marcus recommend without realizing that she, already had?

4 An LI referee questions the strength of the contrast between (29)–(31) and their counterparts in (32)–(34), claiming that the two sets of examples are equally unacceptable. Although my own research has indicated that speakers consistently detect a contrast between these examples (and, crucially, (29)–(31) are invariably rejected), it is not surprising that some speakers may find (32)–(34) degraded: constructions in which parasitic gaps are contained in tensed adjuncts are generally considered marked in comparison with constructions in which parasitic gaps occur in nonfinite adjuncts. This fact actually provides another argument against analyzing sentences like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) as parasitic gap structures. The “gaps” in these examples are contained in tensed adjuncts, yet the sentences do not show the same degree of markedness as (32)–(34).
Each of these examples is ungrammatical on the intended reading, in which the overt pronoun in the adjunct is coindexed with the wh- phrase. This is expected if their LF representations are as shown in (38)–(40), which violate Condition B.

(38) *which candidate$_i$ did Maureen vote for t$_i$ because he$_i$ wouldn’t **vote for him$_i$**

(39) *who$_i$ did you nominate t$_i$ at the same time that he$_i$ did **nominate him$_i$**

(40) *who$_i$ did Marcus recommend t$_i$ without realizing that she$_i$ already had **recommended her$_i$**

If the pronoun is replaced by an expression that is not interpreted as coreferential with the object of the deleted VP, then the examples become perfectly acceptable, as expected.

(41) Which candidate did Maureen vote for because Louis wouldn’t?

(42) Who did you nominate at the same time that Willie did?

(43) Who did Marcus recommend without realizing that Charles already had?

The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that the “gap” in sentences like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) is not a gap at all, but rather a pronoun, licensed by vehicle change. An important potential objection to this analysis is raised by Kim and Lyle (1995). They point out that changing the featural content of an Æ-trace from [−pro] to [+pro] generates a [ +pro] empty category—that is, pro—yet pro is otherwise unattested in English. Even allowing for the possibility of pro in English (see Cinque 1990), this would be an undesirable result. Pro is a syntactic variable; therefore, we would incorrectly predict that non-parasitic gaps should show strong crossover effects (Cinque 1990, McCloskey 1990).

In fact, within the set of assumptions I have adopted here, the vehicle change analysis does not require the introduction of pro into the LF representations of these constructions. This is because reconstruction—the relation that licenses VP-deletion—is a formal identity relation between phrase markers, not a derivational, structure-building procedure (see Fiengo and May 1994:288). Vehicle change should be understood not as a type of coercion operation that transforms a [−pro] empty category into a [ +pro] empty category, but rather as a relation that establishes identity between two expressions in a syntactic representation that differ in featural content but agree in indexical value. Within this framework, the reconstructed pronouns in LF representations like (5)–(8) are lexically nondistinct from their overt counterparts and, as verified by the data discussed in this section, are subject to exactly the same distributional constraints.

4 Conclusion

Supporting my claims with evidence from strong crossover and Condition B effects, I have argued that the absence of Subjacency violations...
in the (b) cases of (1)–(4) indicates that the deleted VPs in sentences of this type do not contain parasitic gaps, but rather pronouns that are interpreted as bound variables. These are not variables in the syntax (i.e., resumptive pronouns, as suggested in Fiengo and May 1994); if they were, they would exhibit strong crossover effects, as shown by McCloskey’s (1990) work on Irish. The pronouns in the LF representations of the (b) cases of (1)–(4) are ordinary English pronouns, equivalent in all relevant respects to the pronouns in their nonelided counterparts.

If sentences like the (b) cases of (1)–(4) do not contain parasitic gaps, however, then they do not support the conclusion that some parasitic gap chains must be licensed at LF, and so do not remove the challenge presented by parasitic gaps to the hypothesis that grammatical constraints are imposed only at the interface levels. Although there might be arguments in favor of LF licensing of parasitic gaps (see, e.g., Kim and Lyle’s (1995, 1996) discussion of multiple wh-questions), nonparasitic gaps do not provide one of them.

Finally, nonparasitic gaps provide additional empirical support for an operation of vehicle change. The fact that these sentences do not exhibit strong crossover effects, but are sensitive to Condition B, shows that a pronoun and a coindexed A-trace must count as identical with respect to licensing VP-deletion, as argued by Fiengo and May (1991, 1994). More generally, if Condition B is a constraint on the distribution of pronominal expressions in an LF representation, then nonparasitic gaps provide additional support for the position that an elided VP is fully syntactically represented at LF.
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This work was begun while I was a postdoctoral research fellow at the Moss Rehabilitation Research Institute, Philadelphia, and was continued during my stay at the Sonderforschungsbereich 282 Theorie des Lexikons, funded by the German Science Foundation (DFG), at Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Germany. An earlier version was presented as part of the poster session of the SFB 282 at the 19th annual meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft in Düsseldorf, Germany. I gratefully acknowledge Bill Idsardi for encouragement and discussion and the following people for useful comments related to this squib: Ted Fernald, Sebastian Löbner, Barbara Meek, Ralf Naumann, and two anonymous reviewers for Linguistic Inquiry. All remaining errors are my responsibility.