University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 18
Issue 1 *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*

Article 2

5-1-2012

Ellipsis as Movement and Silence: Evidence from French

Marc Authier
The Pennsylvania State University, jma11@psu.edu

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol18/iss1/2
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Ellipsis as Movement and Silence: Evidence from French

Abstract
French allows ellipsis after a number of verbs that express priority or dynamic modality. This phenomenon is known as 'modal ellipsis' and, in the past ten years, its syntactic status has been hotly debated in the literature on Romance syntax in ways reminiscent of the controversy surrounding the proper syntactic treatment of English VP ellipsis and Sluicing that started with the early works of Ross (1967) and Sag (1976). What has been established so far with some degree of certainty is that unlike English VP-ellipsis, French modal ellipsis is ellipsis of a TP (Dagnac, 2010). Also established by Busquets and Denis (2001) is the fact that modal ellipsis allow syntactic extraction out of the elision site. This weighs heavily in favor of a PF-deletion approach because it suggests that the ellipsis site has inner structure and therefore provides an extraction site that would remain unavailable under a pro-form approach. In this paper, I explore a novel formulation of the licensing conditions on modal ellipsis that takes as a point of departure a suggestion by Johnson (2001) that English VP-Ellipsis should be derived by way of movement and that elided VPs stand in a topic position though they are not spelled out at PF. I argue that adopting a similar approach to French modal ellipsis correctly predicts (a) the class of French verbs that license modal ellipsis, (b) some novel grammaticality contrasts involving infinitival forms of these verbs, and (c) the fact that French does not have VP-Ellipsis and that English does not have modal ellipsis.

This working paper is available in University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics: http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol18/iss1/2

Ellipsis as Movement and Silence: Evidence from French

Marc Authier

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to discuss how ellipsis sentences like (1) are represented in syntax.

(1) a. *Il a réoccupé le Rhin alors qu' il aurait pas dû* [ ]. (Chu (2008:93))
he has reoccupied the Rhine although he would-have not had-to
'He has reoccupied the Rhine, although he shouldn't have.'
b. *Même si tu avais voulu [ ], tu aurais pas pu le voir.*
even if you had wanted you would-have not been-able him to-see
'Even if you had wanted to, you wouldn't have been able to see him.'

In the past ten years or so, the categorial status of the ellipsis site in (1) has been hotly debated in the literature on Romance syntax in ways reminiscent of the controversy surrounding the proper syntactic treatment of English VP ellipsis, Sluicing, and to some degree NP ellipsis, that started with the early works of Ross (1967) and Sag (1976). What has been established so far with some degree of certainty is that unlike English VP-ellipsis, French modal ellipsis is ellipsis of a TP. Dagnac (2010), for example, shows that the ellipsis site not only includes the VP but must encompass aspectual auxiliaries, negation and passive auxiliaries, as the ungrammaticality of the examples in (2) makes clear.

(2) a. **Cédric aurait pu avoir fini en octobre, et Alain aurait*
Cédric would-have been-able to-have finished in October and Alain would-have
pu aussi ***avoir*** *[~~fini en octobre~~].*
been-able also to-have
Cedric could have finished in October, and Alain could have also.'
b. **Cédric doit s'inscrire, mais Alain peut* ***ne pas*** *[~~s'inscrire~~].*
Cédric must to-register but Alain is-allowed not
'Cedric must register, but Alain is allowed not to.'
c. **Cédric veut être muté, et Alain veut aussi* ***être*** *[~~muté~~].*
Cédric wants to-be reassigned and Alain wants also to-be
'Cedric wants to be reassigned, and Alain wants to be also.'

Also established by Busquets and Denis (2001) and Dagnac (2010) is the fact that elliptical sentences like those in (1) allow syntactic extraction out of the elision site. They are found in Antecedent Contained Deletion configurations, as illustrated in (3a), free relative configurations, as illustrated in (3b), and wh-question configurations, as illustrated in (3c):

(3) a. *Ils m'ont envoyé tout l'argent qu'ils ont pu* [ ].
they me-have sent all the-money that-they have been-able
'They sent me all the money they could.'
b. *Elle joue avec qui elle peut* [ ].
she plays with who she can
'She plays with whoever she can.'
c. (*Speaker admiring a guitar collection*)
Je me demande lesquelles on peut toucher et lesquelles on peut pas [ ].
I wonder which-ones one can touch and which-ones one can not
'I wonder which ones you can touch, and which ones you can't.'

Data such as (3) weigh heavily in favor of a PF-deletion approach because they suggest that the ellipsis site has inner structure and therefore provides an extraction site that would remain unavailable under a pro-form approach. I will therefore assume that French modal ellipsis is PF-deletion

of a TP. Finally, based on this type of extraction test, one can establish that the verbs that license PF-deletion of TPs in French are the ones that appear in (4).

(4) *pouvoir* 'be able', *devoir* 'must/should', *vouloir* 'want', *falloir* 'be necessary', *avoir le droit* 'be allowed.'

Using the primary categories of sentential modality proposed by Portner (2009), we can characterize these verbs as expressing either priority or dynamic modality. Interestingly, however, the epistemic reading normally available with verbs like *pouvoir* and *devoir* becomes unavailable when these verbs license ellipsis, as illustrated in (5).

(5) a. *La police doit arriver dans cinq minutes et l'ambulance doit arriver dans*
the police must to-arrive in five minutes and the-ambulance must to-arrive in
cinq minutes aussi. (OK epistemic/OK deontic)
five minutes also
'The police should arrive in ten minutes and the ambulance should arrive in ten minutes also.'
b. *La police doit arriver dans cinq minutes et l'ambulance doit [ ] aussi.*
he police must to-arrive in five minutes and the-ambulance must also
(*epistemic/OK deontic)

This restriction is, in fact, shared by English VP ellipsis, as noted in McDowell (1987), as can be seen in (6).

(6) John must wash his car every day, and Peter must [ ] too. (*epistemic/OK deontic)

With this background in mind, I would now like to explore a novel formulation of the licensing conditions on modal ellipsis that takes as a point of departure a suggestion by Johnson (2001) that English VP-Ellipsis should be derived by way of movement and that elided VPs stand in a topic position. My goal is to show that extending this type of approach to French modal ellipsis appears to correctly predict (a) the class of French verbs that license modal ellipsis, (b) some novel grammaticality contrasts involving infinitival forms of these verbs, and (c) the fact that French does not have VP-Ellipsis and that English does not have modal ellipsis.

2 Modal Ellipsis as Movement and PF-deletion

2.1 English VP-ellipsis and the Syntax of Movement

Johnson (2001) points out a number of intriguing parallels between the positions in which traces of topicalized VPs are licensed and the positions in which VP ellipsis is licensed. He first observes that the trace of a topicalized VP in English must be governed by an Aux, as the contrast between (7) and (8) illustrates, and that this condition also applies to elided VPs as shown in (9) and (10).

(7) She claimed that ...
a. *eat grapefuit*, Sarah wouldn't [e].
b. *eaten grapefuit*, Sarah hasn't [e].
c. *eating grapefruit*, Sarah should be [e].
d. *eating grapefruit*, Sarah's not [e].
e. *eat grapefruit*, Sarah wants to [ ].

(8) She claimed that ...
a. **would eat grapefruit*, Sarah [e].
b. **hasn't eaten grapefruit*, Sarah [e].
(8) c. ?**eating grapefruit*, Sarah started [ ].
d. ?**eat grapefruit*, Sarah made her [ ].

(9) a. Rachel ate grapefruit, but Sarah wouldn't [e].
b. Rachel has eaten grapefruit, but Sarah hasn't [e].

c. Rachel should be eating grapefruit, and Sarah should be [ ] too.
d. Rachel is eating grapefruit, but Sarah isn't [ ].
e. Rachel won't eat grapefruit, but Sarah wants to [ ].

(10) a. *I can't believe Rachel eats grapefruit, and I can't believe Sarah [ ] either.
b. *I hear that Rachel hasn't eaten grapefruit and that Sarah [ ] either.
c. *Rachel started eating grapefruit, but only after Sarah started [ ].
d. *Sarah made Rachel eat grapefruit, and then Sophie made [ ].

Second, although an elided VP can sometimes include Aux material as illustrated in (11a), Sag (1976) points out that for many speakers, VPs headed by *have* resist ellipsis. So, for instance, (11b) does not easily allow an interpretation whereby the elided VP is understood to be *have eaten grapefruit*.

(11) a. Sarah will *be rewarded*, and Rachel will [ ] too.
b. Sarah might have eaten grapefruit, but Sarah shouldn't [ ].

Interestingly, as Johnson points out, this block on eliding VPs headed by *have* is also found in VP topicalization as shown in (12).

(12) *She claimed that *have eaten grapefruit*, Sarah should [ ].

Although this is not discussed in Johnson (2001), we can add to this that the matching pattern between VP ellipsis and VP topicalization appears to extend to the restriction on epistemic modals illustrated in (6) for VP ellipsis, since epistemic modal readings are also difficult to get when VPs are topicalized as (13) shows.

(13) Peter said that Max must work for the KGB and work for the KGB, Max must [ ].
(??epistemic/OK deontic)

Turning next to untensed contexts, Johnson (2001) notes that there too, VP ellipsis and VP topicalization behave in strikingly similar ways. As has been known since Zwicky (1981), the licensing conditions on VP ellipsis following infinitival *to* are much more restrictive than those in effect when the ellipsis site is preceded by a tensed auxiliary. The generalization seems to be that VP ellipsis cannot strand infinitival *to* when the infinitival clause is not in complement position. Roughly, VP ellipsis is barred from subject and adjunct infinitivals as well as infinitival clauses embedded within an NP. The paradigm in (14) illustrates this.

(14) a. You shouldn't play with rifles because it's dangerous to [ ].
b. *You shouldn't play with rifles because to [ ] is dangerous.
c. *Holly came to train with Fred and I also came to [ ].
d. *I investigated Bill's attempt to fire Joe while you investigated Fred's attempt to [ ].

As Sag (1976) observes, the restrictions illustrated in (14 b through d) are not found with VP ellipses in tensed clauses. Thus, (14b) contrasts with (15a), (14c) with (15b), and (14d) with (15c).

(15) a. That Joe and Pete and turned in their final paper late is not surprising, but that all of the other students in the class did [ ] too is quite unexpected.
b. Joe turned in his final paper late although Fred didn't [ ].
c. I investigated Bill's claim that he didn't attempt to fire Joe while you investigated Fred's claim that he did [ ].

Further, as Johnson points out, it is doubtful that the finite/non-finite contrast illustrated in (14) vs. (15) has to do with the defective nature of infinitival *to* because the same paradigm is found when the ellipses in infinitival clauses are preceded by auxiliaries other than *to*, as (16) illustrates.

(16) a. *You shouldn't have played with rifles because to have [ ] is dangerous.

(16) b. *Mag Wildwood came to be introduced by the barkeep and I also came to be [ ].
c. *Lulamae recounted a story to be remembered because Holly had recounted a story to be [ ].

Instead, Johnson argues, the finite/non-finite differences in (14)-(16) can be made to follow from the hypothesis that VP ellipsis is licensed by VP topicalization. Specifically, if one assumes that for a VP to be able to elide, it must first be able to topicalize, the differences between (14) and (15) are expected because topicalized VPs cannot land inside an infinitival clause in the way they can in tensed clauses, as (17) shows.

(17) a. *You shouldn't play with rifles because [*play with rifles* to [ ]] is dangerous.
b. *Holly came to train with Fred and I also came [*train with Fred* to [ ]].
c. *I investigated Bill's attempt to fire Joe while you investigated Fred's attempt [*fire Joe* to [ ]].

Regarding (17), two comments are in order. First, the topicalized VPs in italics cannot move up further than the infinitivals that contain them because the latter are islands to extraction. Second, it is, in fact, possible to topicalize a VP contained in an infinitival but only if it can move out of that infinitival to find a finite clause to land in. This latter property of topicalization, illustrated in (18a), strengthens Johnson's hypothesis since the same context also allows VP ellipsis, as (18b) shows.

(18) a. *Ride with him*, I don't want to [ ].
b. Bill will ride with him, but I don't want to [ ].

To sum up, Johnson's (2001) proposal regarding English VP ellipsis is that elided VPs are not in the position they are commonly thought to occupy, as this position is the tail position of a chain created by Move. Rather, elided VPs stand in a topic position, and therefore the licensing conditions on VP ellipsis reduce to the general conditions on syntactic movement as they apply to the type of movement embodied by VP topicalization.

2.2 French Modal Ellipsis as Movement

I will now argue for an analysis of French modal ellipsis along the same lines. That is, modal ellipsis will be shown to reduce to topicalization of an infinitival clause with both the head and the tail of the chain created by Move not being spelled out phonologically or with only part of the head of the chain being spelled out (what Busquets and Denis (2001) named French "Pseudo-Gapping").

Although French generally requires that dislocated phrases be "clitic-doubled" as in (19), infinitival clauses can appear in a left-dislocated position and be linked directly to a gap, provided that they are introduced in the complement position of those verbs that license modal ellipsis as (20)-(21) illustrate.

(19) a. *Je te dis que tes cartes, je *(les) ai envoyées hier.*
I you tell that your postcards I them have sent yesterday
'I'm telling you that your postcards, I sent them yesterday.'
b. *Je suis sûr que ton père, ils *(lui) ont déjà téléphoné.*
I am sure that your father they to-him have already phoned
'I'm sure that your father, they already called.'

(20) a. *J'aimerais bien faire des études de médecine, mais disséquer les cadavres, je peux pas [ ].*
I-would-like well to-do some studies of medicine but dissect the corpses I can not
I'd like to undertake medical studies, but dissect corpses, I just can't.'
b. *Elle m'a dit que fumer dans les couloirs, on a le droit [ ].*
she to-me-has said that to-smoke in the hallways one has the right
'She told me that smoke in the hallways, we can.'

(20) c. *Je veux pas laver tes chaussettes mais nettoyer l'évier, je veux bien [ ].*
I want not to-wash your socks but to-clean the-sink I want well
'I don't want to clean your socks, but clean the sink, I'm willing to.'

d. *Tu peux toucher les statues, mais toucher les peintures, il faut pas [ ].*
you can touch the statues but to-touch the paintings it is-necessary (to) not
'You can touch the statues, but touch the paintings, you can't.'

e. *Je comprends que tu lui en veuilles, mais insulter sa mère, tu*
I understand that you to-him be-mad but to-insult his mother you
aurais pas dû [ ].
would-have not must-PST
'I know you're mad at him, but insult his mother, you shouldn't have.'

(21) a. **On n'a pas disséqué de cadavres, mais disséquer des grenouilles,*
we NEG-have not dissected any corpses but to-dissect some frogs
on va [ ]
we are-going (to)
'We didn't dissect corpses, but dissect frogs, we're going to.'

b. ?**Je n'ai jamais attrapé de saumons, mais attraper une grosse truite,*
I NEG-have never caught any salmon but to-catch a big trout
j'ai failli [ ].
I-have almost
I didn't catch any salmons, but catch a big trout, I almost did.'

c. ??*Félix n'a pas osé demander à Marie, mais demander à Céline,*
Felix NEG-has not dared to-ask to Marie but to-ask to Celine
il a osé [ ].
he has dared
'Felix didn't dare ask Marie, but ask Celine, he did.'

d. **Anne ne croit pas avoir fermé les rideaux, mais avoir fermé*
Anne NEG believes not to-have shut the drapes but to-have shut
les fenêtres, elle croit [ ].
the windows she believes
'Anne doesn't think that she closed the drapes, but the windows, she thinks she did.'

e. **Eric dit ne pas aimer le caviar, mais aimer le champagne, il dit [ ].*
Eric says NEG not to-like the caviar but to-like the champagne he says
'Eric claims to not like caviar, but champagne, he claims to.'

Further, the phenomenon in (20) displays a now familiar characteristic of English VP topicalization, namely that topicalization of a phrase contained in an infinitival is possible only if that phrase can move out of the infinitival that contains it and find a finite clause to land in. Consider in this respect the ill-formed examples in (22).

(22) a. **Paul a téléphoné pour [obtenir son visa plus rapidement, pouvoir [ ]].*
Paul has phoned to to-obtain his visa more quickly to-be-able
'Paul called so that he could get his visa more quickly.'

b. **[Critiquer le gouvernement, avoir le droit [ ]] est nécessaire au bon*
to-criticize the government to-have the right is necessary to-the good
fonctionnement de toute démocratie.
functioning of every democracy
'To be able to legally criticize the government is a key feature of every democracy.'

c. **Son ardeur à [prendre sa revanche, vouloir [ ]] témoigne d'un caractère*
his fervor to to-take his revenge to-want attests to-a spirit
combatif.
fighting
'The fervor he exhibits in wanting to get even attests to his fighting spirit.'

The ungrammatical sentences in (22) offer an intriguing parallel with the ill-formed examples of English VP topicalization in (17) in that the topicalized infinitival clauses cannot move up further

than the infinitivals that contain them because the latter are islands to extraction. That is, in order to be grammatical, French topicalized infinitivals, like English topicalized VPs, must be able to find a finite clause to land in, as in (23).

(23) a. *Soulever ce sac de ciment tout seul, tu risques pas de pouvoir [ ]!*
to-lift this bag of cement all alone you are-likely not of to-be-able
'Lifting this cement bag on your own is not something you're likely to be able to do.'

b. *C'est une bonne offre dans l'ensemble, mais aller au Canada en janvier je ne*
this-is a good offer overall but to-go to-the Canada in january I NEG
suis pas sûr de vouloir [ ].
am not sure of to-want
'It's a good offer overall, but I'm not sure that going to Canada in January is something I want to do.'

c. *Il peut vous vendre sa récolte de pommes mais vendre sa récolte*
he can to-you sell his crop of apples but to-sell his crop
de tabac, il dit ne pas avoir le droit [ ].
of tobacco he says NEG not to-have the right
'He can sell you his apple crop, but selling his tobacco crop is something he says he can't legally do.'

With this in mind, let us now turn to some finite/non-finite contrasts displayed by French modal ellipsis that, to the best of my knowledge, have never been discussed until now. As illustrated in (24), modal ellipsis is barred from subject infinitivals (24c) and adjunct infinitivals (24d) as well as infinitives embedded within an NP (24e).

(24) a. *Je ne sais pas si Patrick peut soulever 150kg, mais il se vante de pouvoir [ ].*
I NEG know not if Patrick can to-lift 150kg but he brags of to-be-able
'I'm not sure if Patrick can lift 150kg, but he (certainly) boasts he can.'

b. *Il a les moyens d'aider ses enfants et il devrait avoir honte*
he has the means of-to-help his children and he should to-have shame
de ne pas vouloir [ ].
of NEG not to-want
'He has the means to help his children and he should be ashamed of not wanting to.'

c. ?**Je ne sais pas si je peux soulever 150kg, mais pouvoir [ ] impressionerait*
I NEG know not if I can lift 150kg but to-be-able would-impress
certainement mes amis.
certainly my friends
'I don't know if I can lift 150kg, but to have that ability certainly would impress my friends.'

d. **Arnold a blessé son petit frère sans vouloir [ ].*
Arnold has hurt his little brother without to-want
'Arnold hurt his little brother unintentionally.'

e. **Quand on parle de perdre son emploi, il faut être conscient que le*
when you speak of to-lose your job it is-necessary to-be aware that the
souci de ne pas vouloir [ ] grandit avec l'âge.
worry of NEG not to-want grows with the-age
'When it comes to losing one's job, one should be aware that the stress associated with hoping that this situation will not arise increases with age.'

Given that the restriction on modal ellipsis illustrated in (24) is in every respect similar to that governing the topicalization of infinitival clauses (cf. (22) vs. (23)), I would like to suggest that modal ellipsis is licensed by topicalization. This, of course, directly accounts for why the conditions on modal ellipsis and topicalization of infinitival clauses are so similar. So, elided infinitival clauses in modal ellipsis contexts can now be thought of as being silent copies of infinitival clauses standing in a topic position, the latter also being silent copies. Consequently, an elided sentence like (25a) should be thought of as having the syntactic representation in (25b), where the

strikethrough notation indicates material that fails to be spelled out at the syntax-phonology interface.

(25) a. *(Arrête de toucher aux peintures: tu sais bien qu') il faut pas [ ].*
stop of to-touch to-the paintings you know well that it is-necessary (to) not
'(Stop touching the paintings: you know full well that) you're not supposed to.'
b. [~~*Toucher aux peintures*~~ *[il faut pas [~~toucher aux peintures~~]]]*

This hypothesis immediately captures the fact, illustrated in (5) that modal ellipsis is impossible under epistemic modals. This is so because modal ellipsis involves the topicalization of an infinitival clause and this topicalization is incompatible with epistemic modals as (26) shows.

(26) a. *[Vous amener jusque là]$_i$, je peux t$_i$; mais pas plus loin* (deontic)
you to-take up-to there I can but not more far
'Drive you up to that point, I can; but no further.'
b. **[Arriver d'un moment à l'autre]$_i$, la police peut t$_i$; alors accélère.* (epistemic)
to-arrive of-a moment to the-other the police may so speed-up
'The police may arrive at any moment, so hurry up.'

This hypothesis can also be extended to what Busquets and Denis (2001) name French "Pseudo-Gapping". Examples of this phenomenon are given in (27).

(27) a. *Alice ne peut pas s'acheter de jouets, mais* ***des livres****, elle peut [ ].*
Alice NEG can not self-buy any toys but some books she can
'Alice can't buy herself toys, but she can books.'
b. *Je veux bien aller au ciné avec toi, mais* ***avec elle****, je veux pas [ ].*
I want well to-go to-the movies with you but with her I want not
'I could you to the movies with you, but with her, I couldn't.'
c. *Tu peux pêcher dans la Lauze, mais* ***dans l'Oriège****, tu as pas le droit [ ].*
you can fish in the Lauze but in the-Oriège you have not the right
'You can fish in the Lauze, but in the Oriege, you can't.'
d. *Tu peux faire de la musique, mais* ***après 22h00****, il faut pas [ ].*
you can make some the music but after 10:00 p.m. it is-necessary (to) not
'You can play music, but after 10:00 p.m., you're not allowed to.'
e. *Tu as eu raison de ne pas engueuler ta fille, mais* ***ton fils****,*
you have had reason of NEG not scold your daughter but your son
tu aurais dû [ ].
you would-have must-PST
'You were right not to scold your daughter, but your son, you should have.'

The phrases in bold in the examples in (27) encompass various categories as well as various grammatical functions (i.e. argument or adjunct) and appear to have been directly extracted out of the ellipsis site to a position peripheral to the TP dominating the modal that licenses the ellipsis. On my account, however, what has been extracted is a whole TP. Thus, the syntactic representation of the second conjunct in (27b) would be as in (28).

(28) *[*~~PRO *aller au ciné*~~ *avec elle], [je veux pas [*~~PRO *aller au ciné avec elle*~~ *]]*
to-go to-the movies with her I want not to-go to-the movies with her

The derivation in (28), however, has the conceptual disadvantage of making use of non-constituent deletion. That is, in (28), everything but the PP *avec elle* 'wit h her' is deleted in the displaced TP, so that the operation responsible for blocking the PF spell out of *PRO aller au ciné* 'to go the movies' does not target a constituent. For this reason, I propose to modify my analysis of French Pseudo-Gapping in a way reminiscent of Merchant's (2004) treatment of fragment answers as movement of the pronounced fragment to a clause-peripheral specifier, followed by ellipsis of the clause itself. Thus my proposal is that in French Pseudo-Gapping, the infinitival clause first moves

to the specifier position of a Topic projection, then the pronounced phrase undergoes further movement to a higher position in the clausal periphery (very likely Rizzi's (1997) FocusPhrase), and, finally, the entire clause in Spec, TopP is elided. In other words, I now assume the derivation of the second conjunct in (27b) to be not as in (28) but, rather, as in (29).

(29) [$_{FocP}$*Avec elle* [$_{TopP}$[~~PRO *aller au cinéma avec elle*~~], [*je veux pas* [~~PRO *aller au cinéma avec elle*~~]]]].
with her to-go to-the movies with her I want not to-go to-the movies with her

This analysis not only remedies the non-constituent deletion problem just discussed but also receives independent support from the existence of examples like (30).

(30) a. *En tous cas,* ***avec elle,*** PRO *aller au cinéma, je veux pas*
in all cases with her to-go to-the movies I want not
'In any event, with her, I don't want to go to the movies.
b. *Le problème c'est qu'****à Jules,*** PRO *dire la vérité, j'ai jamais pu.*
the problem it-is that-to Jules to-tell the truth I-have never been-able
'The problem is that to Jules, I was never able to tell the truth.'

The example in (30a) is the non-elliptical version of the second conjunct in (27b). Additionally, the phrases that appear in bold in (30) are clearly contrastively focused, which suggests that their landing site is indeed the specifier position of FocP. In fact, it is possible to construct examples like (31a), in which every layer hypothesized by Rizzi (1997) to make up the C system is represented and which, put side by side with similar kinds of positional evidence from Italian, indicate that *à Jules* 'to Jules' in (31a), and by extension in (30b), marks the Focus projection.

(31) a. *Le problème c'est que Marie, à Jules,* PRO *dire la vérité, elle a jamais pu.*
FORCE TOP FOC TOP
'The problem is that Marie, to Jules, to tell the truth, she never could.'
b. *Credo que ieri, QUESTO, a Gianni, i tuoi amici avrebbero dovuto dirgli.*
FORCE TOP FOC TOP
'I believe that yesterday, THIS, to Gianni, your friends should have said to him.'

I therefore conclude that so-called Pseudo-Gapping in French is movement of an infinitival to the first TopP above FinP followed by movement of a phrase contained in the infinitival to FocP with all of the links of the chains headed by the infinitival not being spelled out at PF.

3 Conclusion

Let me briefly conclude with a remark concerning the question of why French does not have VP ellipsis and why English does not have modal ellipsis. Simply put, the answer to these questions follows from the theory of VP ellipsis and French modal ellipsis as topicalization and PF-deletion advocated in this paper. French does not have VP ellipsis because the latter is parasitic on VP topicalization and VP topicalization is disallowed in French as (32) shows.

(32) a. **Anne voulait manger des moules et* [$_{VP}$ *mangé des moules*]$_i$, *elle a* t_i.
Anne wanted to-eat some mussels and eaten some mussels she has
'Anne wanted to eat mussels, and eat mussels, she did.'
(32) b. *[$_{VP}$ *Rencontré beaucoup de gens comme ça*]$_i$, *je dois admettre*
met a-lot of people like that I must confess
que je n'ai pas t_i.
that I NEG-have not
'Meet many people like that, I must admit that I haven't.'

Conversely, English does not license French-type modal ellipsis because it does not allow topical-

ization of an infinitival clause complement to a modal verb taking a clausal complement, as illustrated in (33).

(33) *[PRO to go to Spain] $_i$, Anne wants t $_i$.

Ultimately then, whatever theory of the clausal periphery of French and English accounts for the ungrammaticality of (32) and (33) will also account for the differences in PF-deletion ellipsis exhibited by these languages.

References

Busquets, Joan and Pascal Denis. 2001. L'ellipse modale en français: le cas de pouvoir et devoir. *Cahiers de grammaire* 26: 55-74.

Chu, Xiaoquan. 2008. *Les verbes modaux du français*. Paris: Ophrys.

Dagnac, Anne. 2010. Modal ellipsis in French, Spanish and Italian: Evidence for a TP-deletion analysis. In *Romance linguistics 2008: Interactions in Romance*, ed. K. Arregi, Z. Fagyal, S. Montrul and A. Tremblay, 157-170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Johnson, Kyle. 2001. What VP ellipsis can do, and what it can't, but not why. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory,* ed. M. Baltin and C. Collins, 439-479. Oxford: Blackwell.

McDowell, Joyce. 1987. Assertion and Modality. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:661-738.

Portner, Paul. 2009. *Modality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the fifth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. R. Binnick, A. Davison, G. Green, and J. Morgan, 252-286. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Sag, Ivan. 1976. Deletion and Logical Form. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Zwicky, Arnold. 1981. Stranded *to* and phonological phrasing. *Linguistics* 20:3-58.

Department of French & Francophone Studies and Linguistics Program
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802–6201
jma11@psu.edu