Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Multidominance, ellipsis, and quantifier scope

Temmerman, T.M.H.

Citation

Temmerman, T. M. H. (2012, June 28). *Multidominance, ellipsis, and quantifier scope*. *LOT dissertation series*. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19158

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/19158

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19158 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Temmerman, Tanja Maria Hugo
Title: Multidominance, ellipsis, and quantifier scope
Date: 2012-06-28

Multidominance, ellipsis, and quantifier scope

Published by
LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6006

e-mail: lot@uu.nl
http://www.lotschool.nl

Cover illustration: *Volts no10* by Olivier Du Tré

ISBN: 978-94-6093-086-7
NUR 616

Copyright © 2012: Tanja Temmerman. All rights reserved.

Multidominance, ellipsis, and quantifier scope

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. P.F. van der Heijden,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 28 juni 2012
klokke 11.15 uur

door

Tanja Maria Hugo Temmerman

geboren te Aalst, België
in 1985

Promotiecommissie

Promotores:	Prof.dr. J.E.C.V. Rooryck
	Prof.dr. J. van Craenenbroeck (Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel)
Commissieleden:	Prof.dr. K. Johnson (University of Massachusetts, Amherst)
	Dr. A.K. Lipták
	Dr. A.L. Saab

You can't win until you're not afraid to lose.
– Jon Bon Jovi

voor mijn grootouders

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments xiii

1 Introduction **1**
1 Empirical domain and theoretical scope 1
2 Outline of the dissertation 4

2 The framework **7**
1 Introduction 7
2 Merge, remerge, and multidominance 8
3 Linearization and Order Preservation 11
3.1 Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom 12
3.2 Johnson (2007): A modified LCA and multidominance 17
3.3 Cyclic linearization and Order Preservation 24
3.3.1 Phases and multiple Spell-Out 24
3.3.2 Cyclic linearization and Order Preservation 29
3.4 Multidominance, modified LCA, cyclicity: illustration 30
4 Ellipsis 37
4.1 Three approaches to ellipsis 38
4.2 The timing of ellipsis 42
4.2.1 Background: Licensing of ellipsis 42
4.2.2 Derivational ellipsis (Aelbrecht 2009) 43

3 Negative indefinites and ellipsis **47**
1 Introduction 47
2 Negative indefinites and ellipsis: the data 51
2.1 The Clausal/Verbal-Generalization 51
2.1.1 Background: polarity switches under ellipsis 51
2.1.2 *Any*/*no* interchangeability under ellipsis 56
2.2 The VPE/NI-Generalization 63
2.3 Support for the VPE/NI-Generalization: deontic modals 66
2.3.1 Introduction: deontics and negation 66
2.3.1 Deontic modals and negative indefinites in verbal ellipsis 69

2.4 Summary . . . 74
3 A cyclic, multidominant analysis of negative indefinites . . . 75
3.1 Introduction . . . 75
3.1.1 Modals are base generated in T . . . 76
3.1.2 Negation in the clause structure . . . 77
3.1.3 English *not* and *n't*: specifier and head . . . 80
3.2 Deriving negative indefinites . . . 83
3.2.1 The derivation of a modal-less sentence with *no* . . . 84
3.2.2 The derivation of a sentence with *no* and modal *can* . . . 98
3.3 Summary and discussion . . . 108
4 Negative indefinites and ellipsis: the analysis . . . 110
4.1 Deriving the VPE/NI-Generalization . . . 111
4.1.1 VP-ellipsis is ellipsis of T's complement . . . 112
4.1.2 The VPE/NI-Generalization: two sample derivations . . . 114
4.2 Deriving the Clausal/Verbal-Generalization . . . 128
4.3 Summary . . . 133
5 Extending the proposal: A cyclic, multidominant analysis of *not…a(ny)* 134
6 Previous analyses of negative indefinites . . . 138
6.1 Morphological analyses: amalgamation / incorporation . . . 139
6.1.1 Amalgamation / incorporation . . . 139
6.1.2 DM operations do not provide the required locality . . . 142
6.2 Syntactic analyses I: Agree / feature checking . . . 144
6.3 Syntactic analyses II: Quantifier Raising . . . 146
6.4 Johnson (2010a, 2010b, 2011a) . . . 150
6.4.1 Background: a multidominant analysis for WH-movement . . . 151
6.4.2 Johnson's (2010b) multidominant analysis of negative indefinites . . . 154
7 Conclusion . . . 159

4 Epistemic/dynamic modals, negative indefinites, and ellipsis 161

1 Introduction . . . 161
2 Epistemic modals and negative indefinites in ellipsis . . . 163
2.1 Background . . . 163
2.2 The data . . . 165
2.2.1 Three epistemic modals licensing VPE . . . 166
2.2.2 Aspectual auxiliaries . . . 169
2.3 The analysis . . . 173
2.3.1 Gergel (2009) on epistemic and deontic modals and VPE . . . 173
2.3.2 The analysis . . . 176
3 Dynamic modals and negative indefinites in ellipsis . . . 185
3.1 The data . . . 185
3.2 The analysis . . . 188
4 Conclusion . . . 193

5 Quantifier Raising and ellipsis **195**
1 Introduction . . . 195
1.1 Scope-shifting operations . . . 195
1.2 Overview of this chapter . . . 198
2 QR can escape a verbal ellipsis site: The data . . . 199
2.1 Scope Economy . . . 199
2.2 Two QPs in verbal ellipsis . . . 201
2.3 An object QP and sentential negation *n't* in verbal ellipsis . . . 205
2.4 An object QP and a modal in verbal ellipsis . . . 209
2.5 Summary . . . 211
3 Analyzing QR out of ellipsis . . . 212
3.1 QR as remerge + fusion (Johnson 2010a, 2011a) . . . 212
3.2 Obligatory short QR . . . 217
3.2.1 Obligatory QR and Shortest Move . . . 218
3.2.2 QR targets vP: the PIC and feature checking . . . 222
3.2.3 Conclusion . . . 223
3.3 QR targets vP: empirical support . . . 224
3.3.1 Introduction . . . 224
3.3.2 QR in Antecedent-Contained Deletion . . . 225
3.3.3 Conclusion . . . 230
3.4 QR and verbal ellipsis: two sample derivations . . . 231
3.4.1 QR across a modal in a non-elliptical sentence . . . 231
3.4.2 QR across a modal in verbal ellipsis . . . 243
4 QR in Johnson (2010a, 2011a): discussion . . . 249
4.1 The driving force of cyclic linearization . . . 250
4.2 QR and verbal ellipsis . . . 254
5 Conclusion . . . 257

6 Conclusions and future prospects **259**
1 Summary and conclusions . . . 259
2 Future prospects . . . 261
2.1 Negative concord . . . 261
2.2 Overt QR and NEG-shift . . . 263
2.3 Dutch negative indefinites . . . 264
2.4 Subject QPs and negative indefinites . . . 267
2.5 Remaining issues . . . 269

References . . . 271

Samenvatting in het Nederlands . . . 297

Curriculum vitae . . . 303

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No duty is more urgent than that of returning thanks.
– J. Allen

I feel very lucky to have had the opportunity to spend more than four years learning, teaching, and travelling. Being a PhD candidate has enriched me both academically and personally. I am grateful to everyone who played a part in making this experience a truly memorable one.

First and foremost, I warmly thank the two people that deserve my gratitude most. Although I cannot mention their names here according to the Leiden tradition, I want to make sure they know how much I appreciate their encouragement, advice, guidance, and support. They have been my teachers, my highly critical reviewers, my mentors. It has been a pleasure and privilege working with them. I am certain that I would not be where I am today if it wasn't for them.

I would like to thank Kyle Johnson, Anikó Lipták, and Andrés Saab for reading and approving the manuscript, and for the valuable comments and suggestions they provided. I am also grateful to them for taking the time to discuss my work (whether it made it into this dissertation or not) or linguistics in general at several occasions during the past years. In the same respect, I would like to thank Lobke Aelbrecht, Sjef Barbiers, Eefje Boef, Hans Broekhuis, Leston Buell, Lisa Cheng, Guglielmo Cinque, Norbert Corver, Roberta D'Alessandro, Marijke De Belder, Karen De Clercq, Marcel den Dikken, Jenny Doetjes, James Griffiths, Kleanthes Grohmann, Bettina Gruber, Liliane Haegeman, Dany Jaspers, Marjo van Koppen, Richard Larson, Jason Merchant, Martin Salzmann, Erik Schoorlemmer, Balázs Surányi, Peter Svenonius, Gary Thoms, Heimir Freyr Vidarsson, Guido Vanden Wyngaerd, and Jan-Wouter Zwart. This dissertation and my work in general have benefited

greatly from the input of the aforementioned people. Parts of this dissertation were presented at NELS 41 at the University of Pennsylvania in October 2010, the Syntax Circle at Leiden University in June 2011 and the Quirky Ellipsis Workshop at the University of Groningen in November 2011. I am thankful to the audiences of these conferences and workshops for their useful comments and critical questions.

This dissertation could not have been written without the help of native speakers of English. I owe a great debt to Leston Buell, James Griffiths, Jeremy Hartman, Will Harwood, Kyle Johnson, Allison Kirk, Jason Merchant, Rachel Nye, Gary Thoms, and Reiko Vermeulen. I would like to thank them for their patience in filling out numerous lengthy questionnaires and answering all my questions.

During my time as a PhD candidate, I have had the privilege to work in several departments at various universities. Spending time in these different environments and with the wonderful colleagues I met there contributed immensely to my development as a linguist, researcher, and teacher.

My first and last home was LUCL. Thanks to Gea Hakker, Alice Middag, Merel van Wijk, and Simone Heidt for helping me out quickly and efficiently with many practical issues. I would like to thank my (former) fellow LUCL PhD candidates for making me feel at home in the Netherlands, for the nice coffee breaks and lunches, especially at the early stages of my PhD: Enrico Boone, Camelia Constantinescu, Stella Gryllia, Margarita Gulian, Sita ter Haar, Annemiek Hammer, Pepijn Hendriks, Allison Kirk, Kathrin Linke, Hilke Reckman, Káča Součková, Marijn van 't Veer, Annemie Verbist, Rebecca Voll, Jenneke van der Wal, and Jurriaan Witteman. Thanks to Maarten van Leeuwen and Suzanne Fagel for always having their office door open for me and especially for the great evening in San Francisco in the summer of 2009. Special thanks go to Erik Schoorlemmer and Nana Kusuma for being dear colleagues and friends: I hope we will continue our visits across the Dutch-Belgian border for many years to come.

I was given the opportunity to gain teaching experience at the English department of Leiden University and later on at the Dutch department of the Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis in Brussels. I am grateful to my colleagues there for the excellent cooperation: Bert Botma, Marion Elenbaas, Colin Ewen, Martina Noteboom, and Thijs Porck in Leiden and Sabine De Knop and Julien Perrez at FUSL.

Last but not least, my deepest thanks to CRISSP (the Center for Research in Syntax, Semantics, and Phonology) at the University-College Brussels for providing a splendid, stimulating working environment. Marijke De Belder, Adrienn Jánosi,

Dany Jaspers, Koen Roelandt, Mansour Shabani, Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd: it was a real pleasure to work with you and to share many social occasions. I also want to thank the CERES-members Elke Brems, Brecht de Groote, Tom Toremans, and Walter Verschueren for the enjoyable moments I had with them in the office.

I profoundly appreciate the opportunities I've been given in the course of my PhD to attend LOT schools, OWLi '08 in Barcelona, and numerous interesting conferences and workshops. Travelling, discovering new cities, and meeting interesting and talented people is without any doubt one of the best parts of being a linguist. It is impossible to mention everyone, but I feel lucky to have shared these moments with Lobke Aelbrecht, Eefje Boef, Guro Busterud, Lieven Danckaert, Karen De Clercq, Bettina Gruber, Will Harwood, Herman Heringa, Huib Kranendonk, Marlies Kluck, Marika Lekakou, Jason Merchant, Rachel Nye, Mari Nygård, Dennis Ott, Radek Šimík, Gary Thoms, Barbara Tomaszewicz, and Heimir Freyr Vidarsson. I am sincerely grateful to Amélie Rocquet for always being there with kind words of support and advise. A very special thanks to Marijke De Belder, Ankelien Schippers, and Martin Salzmann, my linguistic partners in crime with whom I spent many hours discussing life in restaurants and bars around the world (and even on a ferris wheel). I am delighted that Marijke and Ankelien have accepted to be my *paranimfen* at the defense. In addition, I hereby also would like to thank *anyone* whom I might have forgotten to mention in the previous paragraphs.

A special mention goes to my two co-authors. I have learned tremendously from brainstorming, discussing, and disagreeing before agreeing with them. Although they are very different people, I truly appreciated working together with both of them and I am thankful for the very fruitful cooperation. I enjoyed their company in the office, on skype, and at the conferences we attended together. I can only hope we will collaborate again at some point in the future.

I would like to thank the non-linguists in my life, who help me see that being a linguist is only one part of me. Most of them I have known since childhood or for at least ten years, so I feel safe to say they are keepers.

First of all, thanks to my fellow *Oilsjteneers/Iendrachtsupporters/carnavalisten* (you know who you are) for all the fun moments we have shared throughout the years in our hometown. Always remember: *weir doeng voesj!*

Thanks to Guy and *De legen bokal* for reminding me that one never knows enough, for the competitive yet amusing evenings and for lengthy conversations at unpredictable moments. Raf, *bedankt voor de muziek*. You have always believed in me,

and that means a lot to me. Iwein, thanks for being there at the important moments, for being upfront and critical with me, and for your support and confidence.

I am thankful to the friends with whom I spent many hours at the dinner table (‘*komen eten’* & *gaan eten*), who took me on weekend getaways, and who let me rediscover board games. Therefore, thanks to Vos (Koen) & Vanessa, Jeroen & Marijke, Lies & Thomas, and Lore & Mike. I am especially grateful for the close friendship and the tremendous support of *de duifjes* throughout the years. It is a real pleasure and blessing when someone takes you for who you are and you never have to worry about what you can or cannot say. Finally, many many thanks go to Joachim and Kelly, probably my ‘oldest’ friends. I am very happy that our friendship has proven strong throughout the years. I want to thank you guys for your company at all kinds of occasions, for the laughter and the long conversations.

Koen, thank you for your support, encouragement, and patience, for taking care of me, for putting things in perspective, and for making sure I got out of the house once in a while in the last months. It is wonderful sharing our love for concerts, wining and dining, and travel. For being at my side and much more, thank you.

My family has always encouraged me to work hard and has been supportive of my PhD-dreams, even if that meant that I had to move relatively far away from my hometown. I want to thank them for being understanding and for their unconditional love. Thanks to my brother Hans and aunties Nelly and Natie for the many fun moments we had at several gigs. A special thanks to my parents, Frank and Sandra, not only for all of the aforementioned, but also for being friends rather than parents. We have shared numerous hours in front of a television screen – watching cycling races – and in restaurants and bars all over Europe. I hope we will continue our regular visits and travels in the future.

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandparents and therefore, my final words – in Dutch – go to them. *Oma Maria, het doet me veel pijn dat je er niet meer bent om het einde van mijn reis met me te delen. Ik mis je. Oma’s Maria en Lisette, pepe Hugo en opa Alex, bedankt voor jullie begrip en steun. Het kleine meisje van toen is geworden wie ze nu is dankzij jullie aandacht en onvoorwaardelijke liefde. Daarom is dit boek voor jullie.*