

2001

## Ellipsis in Spanish and the Stranded Affix Filter

Marcela A. Depiante  
*Universidad Nacional del Comahue*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Depiante, Marcela A. (2001) "Ellipsis in Spanish and the Stranded Affix Filter," *North East Linguistics Society*. Vol. 31 : Iss. 1 , Article 15.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/nels/vol31/iss1/15>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Linguistics Students Association (GLSA) at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in North East Linguistics Society by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@library.umass.edu](mailto:scholarworks@library.umass.edu).

## Ellipsis in Spanish and the Stranded Affix Filter

Marcela A. Depiante

Universidad Nacional del Comahue\*

### 1 Introduction

In this paper, we investigate elliptical constructions in Spanish such as the ones in (1)-(3). We propose that these constructions do not involve VP-ellipsis as argued for in Bosque (1984), Brucart (1987), Brucart (1999), López (1994), López (1999). We argue for an IP-ellipsis analysis of these constructions, as proposed by Zagona (1988). The constructions below are derived via PF-deletion of IP, prior overt movement of the remnant, followed by what we term Sigma-support. This proposal is based on an extension to Spanish of the account of negation in Italian presented in Bošković (forthcoming), providing evidence that Sigma in Spanish is a PF affix, as well as further support for the Stranded Affix Filter of Lasnik (1981). In addition, we provide a principled explanation for why this type of ellipsis is not possible in English as shown in the example in (4).

- (1) a. Ana leyó El Quijote pero María no  
Ana read El Quijote but María no  
'Ana read El Quijote but María didn't
- b. Ana no leyó El Quijote pero María sí  
Ana not read El Quijote but María yes  
'Ana didn't read El Quijote but María did'

---

\* The research reported in this paper was done while I was a student at the University of Connecticut, and is also reported partly in Depiante (2000). I would like to thank Sigrid Beck, Zeljko Bošković, Jairo Nunes and specially Howard Lasnik for comments and suggestions. In addition, I would like to thank the audiences at the University of Connecticut, the NELS 31 audience at Georgetown University, and the audience at the Universidad Nacional del Comahue in Argentina where this paper was presented. I would also like to thank Pascual Masullo and Roberto Aranovich for comments, suggestions and encouragement.

Marcela A. Depiante

216

- (2) a. Ana leyó El Quijote pero Hamlet no  
 Ana read El Quijote but Hamlet no  
 'Ana read El Quijote but she didn't read Hamlet'
- b. Ana no leyó El Quijote pero Hamlet sí  
 Ana not read El Quijote but Hamlet yes  
 'Ana didn't read El Quijote but she did read Hamlet'
- (3) a. Ana ha estado en Colorado pero en California no  
 Ana has been to Colorado but to California not  
 'Ana has been to Colorado but she hasn't been to California'
- b. Ana no ha estado en Colorado pero en California sí  
 Ana has not been to Colorado but to California yes  
 'Ana hasn't been to Colorado but she has been to California'
- (4) \*John read El Quijote but Peter not  
 (c.f. John read El Quijote but Peter didn't)

## 2 Previous Accounts

### 2.1 López's (1994, 1999) account of ellipsis in Spanish

López proposes that the constructions in (1)-(3) involve VP ellipsis. This VP ellipsis is licensed, according to him, by the head of  $\Sigma P$  (*no/sí*). The remnant is adjoined to Sigma Phrase as a left-dislocated constituent. Examples such as (1) have the structure given in (5). López takes  $\Sigma P$  to be located between IP and VP in Spanish contra Laka (1990) and Martins (1994) who assume that in Spanish  $\Sigma P$  is above IP.

- (5) a. Ana leyó El Quijote pero [<sub>IP</sub> [ <sub>$\Sigma P$</sub>  María [ <sub>$\Sigma P$</sub>  no [<sub>VP</sub> e]]]]
- b. Ana no leyó El Quijote pero [<sub>IP</sub> [ <sub>$\Sigma P$</sub>  María [ <sub>$\Sigma P$</sub>  sí [<sub>VP</sub> e]]]]

In order to account for the differences between English and Spanish, López further proposes that English auxiliaries but not Spanish auxiliaries may have  $\Sigma$ -features and therefore English auxiliaries may raise to  $\Sigma$  and license VP ellipsis as shown in the contrast in (6) below.

- (6) a. Ana hasn't read El Quijote but Mary has
- b. \*Ana no había leído El Quijote pero María había  
 Ana hadn't read El Quijote but María had

To account for the ungrammaticality of (4) in English, López proposes that in English, as opposed to Spanish (where *no* and *sí* may head  $\Sigma P$  and can license VP-

ellipsis) *not* occupies the Spec of  $\Sigma P^1$ , and furthermore he assumes that phonological empty heads are unable to license ellipsis, in this way accounting for the ungrammaticality of the English example.

- (7) a. \*John read El Quijote but Peter not  
 b. \*John read El Quijote but [<sub>DP</sub> Peter [<sub>ΣP</sub> not Σ [<sub>VP</sub> e ] ] ]

The assumption that phonological empty heads cannot license ellipsis is problematic and this is shown by the analysis of sluicing (IP Ellipsis) in English, as shown in (8) where a phonologically empty C that agrees with a *wh*-element in its Spec licenses ellipsis; as argued by Saito and Murasugi (1990) Lobeck (1990) and Lobeck (1995). In this paper, we present an account for the unavailability of Spanish-style ellipsis in English that does not need these stipulations.

- (8) Ana has hired someone but I don't know [<sub>CP</sub> who C [<sub>IP</sub> e ] ]  
 (c.f. \* Ana hired someone but I didn't know whether)

### 3 The Proposal

#### 3.1 Accounting for the Spanish ellipsis <sup>2</sup> data

In this section, I argue against a VP ellipsis analysis for the Spanish examples given in (1)-(3) proposed in López (1994) and López (1999). Based on an extension of Bošković's (forthcoming) analysis of negation in Italian to Spanish, I propose that the Spanish ellipsis cases under discussion can be analyzed in terms of IP-deletion and "Σ-support".

<sup>1</sup> Negation in English can sometimes function as a licenser of ellipsis, as in subjunctive contexts as noted by Baltin (1993) and discussed in Lasnik (in press) (fn. 9).

(i) I desire that John leave and that Bill not

<sup>2</sup> In Depiante (2000) I term this type of ellipsis "pseudostripping" because I compare it with a similar construction, that is known by the name of stripping (or bare-argument ellipsis) such as the one in (ia), which English also exhibits, as shown in (ib). However, this construction is different. For one thing, it cannot occur in embedded clauses as shown in (ii). In this paper I will use the more general term ellipsis to refer to it, since it is the only case I will be discussing. See Depiante (2000) for an analysis of stripping/bare-argument ellipsis in Spanish and English.

(i) a. Juan leyó El Quijote pero no María  
       Juan read El Quijote but not María  
       b. John read El Quijote but not Mary  
 (ii) a. \*Juan leyó El Quijote pero Susana dijo que no María  
        Juan read El Quijote but Susana said that not María  
       b. \*Juan read El Quijote but Susana said that not María

### 3.1.1 Negation in Spanish

Bošković (forthcoming) takes Negation (Neg) in Italian to be a PF affix that needs an overt negative element as a host, either *non* or a negative polarity item such as *nessuno* (*nobody*). This approach provides an explanation for the well-known contrast in Italian illustrated in (9) below.

- (9) a.      \*(Non) ha telefonato nessuno  
              Not has called nobody
- b.      Nessuno (\*non) ha telefonato  
              Nobody (\*not) has called.

When the negative element appears pre-verbally, Neg has its affixal properties satisfied and insertion of *no* is not required; if the negative element appears post verbally, *no* must be inserted in order for Neg not to be left stranded. The same facts hold for Spanish as shown in (10). Bošković's (forthcoming) analysis of Italian can therefore be extended to Spanish.

- (10) a.      \*(No) ha llamado nadie/nunca  
              Not has called nobody/never
- b.      Nadie/nunca (\*no) ha llamado  
              Nobody/never has called

We propose that the Spanish ellipsis examples in (1)-(3) are derived in the following way: a) the remnant in the second conjunct moves leftwards to a higher functional head F, encoding contrastive focus above IP and Sigma Phrase; b) there is deletion of IP not of VP; c) if Sigma is left stranded, the element *no/sí* must be inserted to support it to prevent a violation of the stranded affix filter of Lasnik (1981)<sup>3</sup>. I assume following Laka (1990) and Martins (1994), that  $\Sigma$ P is above IP in Spanish, but below it in English. The sentences in (1) where the remnant is the subject, have the representations in (11).

<sup>3</sup> In Italian, the equivalent of (1a) is given in (i) below, and not the example in (i). The examples are taken from López (2000).

- (i)      Carlo e venuto ma Pietro no  
              Carlo has come but Pietro hasn't
- (ii)     \*Carlo e venuto ma Pietro non  
              Carlo has come but Pietro (has) not

Italian, thus uses the negative form *no* and not the form *non* in these elliptical constructions. The form *no* is the one used to answer questions. To account for this contrast, I will follow the spirit of López's (2000) account. The difference, I speculate, has to do with the licensing properties of *no* versus *non* in Italian. We do not understand too much about licensing conditions on ellipsis. In any case, the story given here for the Spanish cases can be transferred to Italian, since *no* is still a negative element, that can support the Negation affix. The question of course is why *non* is not able to support it in (ii), while it is able to do so in cases such as (9)a. Further work on the nature of negation in Italian is needed to account for this difference.

- (11) a. Ana leyó El Quijote pero [<sub>FP</sub> María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>SP</sub> no [<sub>IP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> leyó el Quijote]]]



- b. Ana no leyó El Quijote pero [<sub>FP</sub> María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>SP</sub> sí [<sub>IP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> leyó el Quijote]]]



The derivation of examples where the remnant is an NP object or a PP object as in (2) and (3), repeated below as (12)a and (12)b, is given in (13)a and (13)b respectively.

- (12) a. Ana leyó El Quijote pero Hamlet no  
Ana read El Quijote but Hamlet not  
'Ana read El Quijote but she didn't read Hamlet'
- b. Ana ha estado en California, pero en Colorado no  
Ana has been to California but to Colorado not  
'Ana has been to California but she hasn't been to Colorado'

- (13) a. Ana leyó El Quijote pero [<sub>FP</sub> Hamlet<sub>i</sub> [<sub>SP</sub> no [<sub>IP</sub> ~~Ana leyó t<sub>i</sub>~~ ]]]



- b. Ana ha estado en California pero [<sub>FP</sub> [en Colorado]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>SP</sub> no [<sub>IP</sub> ~~Ana ha estado t<sub>i</sub>~~ ]]]



The account put forth here is reminiscent of the PF deletion account of VP ellipsis in English. The structure of (14)a is that given in (14)b. The past tense affix is supported by *do*, to avoid a violation of the stranded affix filter of Lasnik (1981) after deletion of the VP.

- (14) a. John read El Quijote and Mary did too
- b. John read El Quijote and [<sub>IP</sub> Mary<sub>i</sub> *do*+ *past affix* [<sub>VP</sub> t<sub>i</sub> read El Quijote] *too*]

### 3.1.2 Predictions

The account put forth here predicts that it should be possible to have ellipsis in Spanish with the negative elements *nunca*, *nadie* since these elements would be able to support

*Ellipsis in Spanish and the Stranded Affix Filter*

220

negative phrase behaves like other negative elements with respect to its distribution, and in (19) we observe that it can support the negative affix in elliptical constructions. The representation of (19) (the relevant part of it) is given in (20), giving evidence that Neg is a phrasal affix.

- (18) a.      \*(No) respeta a ninguno de ellos  
               \*(not) s/he-respects none of them
- b.      Ninguno de ellos (\*no) ha llamado todavía  
                     None of them (\*not) has called yet
- (19) Juan respeta a todos los estudiantes, pero Pedro a **ninguno de ellos**  
        Juan respects every student but Pedro none of them  
        ‘Juan respects every student but Pedro respects none of them’
- (20) .....pero [<sub>FP</sub> Pedro[ <sub>XP</sub> [**a ninguno de ellos**]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> Pedro-respeta-~~t~~ ]]]



To summarize, we have claimed that the Spanish elliptical cases under discussion constitute IP ellipsis, prior leftward movement of the remnant, and not VP ellipsis as López (1994) and López (1999) claims. The analysis is based on an extension of Bošković’s (forthcoming) analysis of negation in Italian to Spanish. In the next section we present evidence for the movement of the remnant in Spanish and in the following section we account for the lack of this type of ellipsis in English.

### 3.1.3 Evidence for movement of the remnant

We have proposed that the ellipsis examples given in (1)-(3) are derived by moving the remnant leftward overtly, to a higher functional projection, and then, PF-deleting the IP left behind, followed by Sigma support. We have assumed the standard view put forth in Laka (1990) and Martins (1994) that Sigma Phrase is above IP in Spanish. In this section, we present evidence that the remnant has actually moved overtly to a position higher than Sigma Phrase.

Note that a sentence such as (21) has two readings, one of them can be paraphrased as in (22)a and the other reading can be paraphrased as in (22)b. The account put forth in this paper can readily account for the two readings. For each reading we have a different representation as shown in (23), depending on the position from where we extract the remnant.

- (21) Juan dijo que Ana leyó El Quijote pero María no  
        Juan said that Ana read El Quijote but María not  
        ‘Juan said that Ana read El Quijote but Maria didn’t’
- (22) a.      ... but María didn’t say that Ana read El Quijote

b. ... but Juan said that María didn't read El Quijote

(23) a. ....pero [<sub>FP</sub>María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ΣP</sub>no [<sub>IP</sub>t<sub>i</sub>~~—dijo—que Ana leyó El Quijote~~ ]]]

^

|

b. ....pero [<sub>FP</sub>María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ΣP</sub>no [<sub>IP</sub>Ana~~—dijo—que t<sub>i</sub> leyó El Quijote~~ ]]]

^

|

Further evidence that the remnant has moved comes from island effects. Observe that in (24) only one reading is possible, that in which María didn't hear the rumor that Ana read El Quijote (and not the reading in which Juan heard the rumor that Ana read El Quijote but that María didn't read El Quijote) The possible reading is derived without any violation of subjacency, as shown by the derivation in (25)a, while the impossible reading is ruled out as a subjacency violation as shown by its derivation in (25)b<sup>5</sup>.

(24) Juan escuchó el rumor de que Ana leyó El Quijote pero María no  
 Juan heard the rumor that Ana read El Quijote but María no  
 'Juan heard the rumor that Ana read El Quijote but María didn't'

(25) a. ...pero [<sub>FP</sub>María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ΣP</sub>no [<sub>IP</sub>t<sub>i</sub>~~—escuchó~~ [<sub>NP</sub>el rumor [<sub>CP</sub>de que [<sub>IP</sub>Ana leyó EQ]]]]

^

|

b. \*...pero [<sub>FP</sub>María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ΣP</sub>no [<sub>IP</sub>Juan~~—escuchó~~ [<sub>NP</sub>el rumor [<sub>CP</sub>de que [<sub>IP</sub>t<sub>i</sub> leyó EQ]]]]

^

|

\*

### 3.2 Accounting for the English data

Recall that examples such as those in (26) are ungrammatical in English, and that López's (1995, 1999) explanation needed the stipulation that *not* was in the specifier of Sigma Phrase and furthermore that null heads could not license ellipsis, which as we have

<sup>5</sup> A member of the audience at NELS 31 proposes another possible derivation for the unavailable reading, which doesn't violate subjacency, that is the one given in (i) below. However, notice that in Spanish, in order to convey the constituent structure suggested in (i), in a non-elliptical sentence for example, we would have to have (ii), and in the elliptical one, we would have (iii). The sentence in (i) with the representation suggested will be ruled out independently.

- (i) Juan escuchó el rumor de que [Ana leyó el Quijote pero [<sub>FP</sub>María<sub>i</sub> [<sub>ΣP</sub>no [<sub>IP</sub>t<sub>i</sub> leyó ~~el Quijote~~]]]]
- (ii) Juan escuchó el rumor de que Ana leyó El Quijote pero de que María no leyó el Quijote
- (iii) Juan escuchó el rumor de que Ana leyó El Quijote pero de que María no.



*Ellipsis in Spanish and the Stranded Affix Filter*

222

already discussed, cannot be correct given the analysis of sluicing proposed in Saito and Murasugi (1990) and Lobeck (1990, 1995).

- (26) a. \*Ann read El Quijote but Mary not  
 b. \*Ann read El Quijote but Hamlet not  
 c. \*Ann has been to California but to Colorado not

The representation of (26)a that we propose is that given in (27) under the following assumptions a) English Sigma Phrase is located between IP and VP (as opposed to Spanish Sigma Phrase which is above IP following Laka (1990)); b) Tense is a PF affix in English, c) *not* is not a PF affix in English.

- (27) \*John read the newspaper but [<sub>IP</sub> Mary Past Affix [<sub>VP</sub> not [<sub>VP</sub> read-the newspaper]]]

After deletion of VP in (27), the past tense affix is left stranded. The sentence is ruled out as a violation of the stranded affix filter (Lasnik (1981)).<sup>6</sup> The account put forth here does away with the stipulations in López's account: a) we do not need the stipulation that *not* has to be a specifier in English but a head in Spanish; b) we do not need to stipulate that phonologically null heads are unable to license ellipsis, which as we saw earlier, is a very problematic assumption, given the standard analysis of sluicing.

#### 4 Conclusions

In this paper, we have analyzed elliptical constructions in Spanish such as the ones shown in (1)-(3). We have argued that these instances of ellipsis do not constitute instances of VP ellipsis in Spanish as argued by Bosque (1984), Brucart (1987), Brucart (1999), López (1994), López (1999), but are instances of IP ellipsis as proposed by Zagana (1988).

In order to derive these examples we have proposed that the remnant moves overtly to a higher functional projection above Sigma Phrase in Spanish and after PF deletion of IP, we do Sigma-support. We assume a clausal structure for Spanish where Sigma Phrase is above IP, and following Bošković (forthcoming) analysis of Negation

<sup>6</sup> Irrespective of the presence or absence of the *not* the representation in (27) will be ruled out as long as nothing is there to support the tense affix, as we can see from the ungrammaticality of (i).

(i) \*John reads the newspaper but Mary

in Italian, we propose that Sigma in Spanish is a PF affix that must be supported by an overt negative (or emphatic) element.

This paper also gives further support for the Stranded Affix Filter of Lasnik (1981). And finally, we have provided an explanation for why this type of ellipsis is unavailable in English, without appealing to the stipulations put forth in López (1994), and López (1999) analyses.

### References

- Baltin, Mark. 1993. Negation and clause structure. *ms.*
- Bošković, Željko. forthcoming. *On the nature of the syntax phonology interface: cliticization and related issues.* Elseiver.
- Bosque, Ignacio. 1984. Negación y Elipsis. *Estudios de linguística* 2: 171-199.
- Brucart, José María. 1987. *La elisión sintáctica en español.* Barcelona: Bellaterra.
- Brucart, José María. 1999. La elipsis. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. Ignacio Bosque, and Violeta Demonte. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Depiante, Marcela A. 2000. *The syntax of deep and surface anaphora: A study of null complement anaphora and stripping/bare argument ellipsis.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1981. Restricting the theory of transformations: A case study. In *Explanations in linguistics*, ed. Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot, 152-173. London: Longmans.
- Lasnik, Howard. in press. Feature movement or agreement at a distance? In *Remnant Movement, F-movement and the T-model*, ed. A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, S. Barbiers, and H.-M. Gaertner. : John Benjamins.
- Lobeck, Anne. 1990. Functional heads as proper governors. In *Proceedings of North Eastern Linguistic Society* 20, 348-362. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing and identification.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- López, Luis. 1994. The syntactic licensing of VP-ellipsis: a comparative study of Spanish and English. In *Issues and theory in Romance linguistics: Selected papers from the linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XXIII*, ed. Michael Mazzola, L, 333-354. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- López, Luis. 1999. VP-ellipsis in Spanish and English and the features of Aux. *Probus* 11: 263-297.
- López, Luis. 2000. Ellipsis and discourse-linking. *Lingua* 110: 183-213.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 1994. Enclisis, VP-deletion and the nature of Sigma. *Probus* 6: 173-205.
- Saito, Mamoru, and Keiko Murasugi. 1990. N'-deletion in Japanese. In *University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, ed. Javier Ormazabal and Carol Tenny, 87-107. University of Connecticut, Storrs.

*Ellipsis in Spanish and the Stranded Affix Filter*

- Tran, Tri Chan. 1999. *Gapping in Spanish: A Minimalist Account*. Doctoral Dissertation, UCLA.
- Zagona, Karen. 1988. *Verb phrase syntax. A parametric study of English and Spanish*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Universidad Nacional del Comahue  
Escuela Superior de Idiomas  
Mendoza esq. Perú  
(8332) General Roca  
Río Negro  
Argentina

depiantem@yahoo.com