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THE WEEK IN A NUTSHELL

What can an in-depth discussion of an at first sight obscure construction attested in a number of Dutch dialects tell us about the theory of ellipsis?
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1 Setting the scene: the theory of ellipsis

1.1 PF-deletion vs. pro: is there syntactic structure inside an ellipsis site?

(1) Ed bought something, but I don’t know what [e].

(2) a. …

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{know} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{what} \\
\text{C}^* \\
\text{pro} \\
\text{C}^*
\end{array}\]

b. …

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{know} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{what} \\
\text{C}^* \\
\text{pro} \\
\text{C}^*
\end{array}\]

\[\implies\] PF-deletion

1.2 Argumentation: how do we know whether or not an ellipsis site contains syntactic structure?

sample argument #1: case matching & PF-deletion (Ross 1969; Merchant 2001:42-43)

(3) Er will jemandem schmeicheln, aber sie wissen nicht [wen / *wen] [e].

‘He wants to flatter someone, but they don’t know who.’

(4) Er will jemanden loben, aber sie wissen nicht [wen / *wen] [e].

‘He wants to praise someone, but they don’t know who.’


‘They don’t know the answer.”

sample argument #2: pragmatic control & pro (Hankamer & Sag 1976; Hardt 1993:34)

(6) [on receipt of a present]

You shouldn’t have [e]!

(7) [whilst listening to a male and a female singer performing a duet]

I like him, but not her.

1.3 Looking ahead: what will be the outcome of the discussion?

1. Both ellipsis strategies exist, though ellipsis-as-pro occurs in only a limited set of contexts.
2. Not all of the arguments traditionally offered in favour of one or the other approach are equally valid.
3. The approach outlined here leads to a possible unification of the two strategies.
THE DATA: ELIMINATING THE USUAL SUSPECTS

2.1 Short Do Replies (SDRs)
(8) A: Marie zie Pierre geim.
   Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: * Z'en duut.
   she.NEG does
   'A: Mary loves Pierre. B: No, she doesn't.' [Wambeek Dutch]
(9) A: Marie zie Pierre nie geim.
   Mary sees Pierre not gladly
B: Ze duut.
   she does
   'A: Mary doesn't love Pierre. B: Yes, she does.' [Wambeek Dutch]

2.2 Eliminating the usual suspects (1): VP-ellipsis

2.2.1 Distribution

VP-ELLISSPIS
   B: No, he doesn't.
   b. Ed loves Julia, and Freddy does too.
   c. Ed loves Julia more than Freddy does.
   d. Ed reads every book that Julia does.
   e. A: Ed loves Julia.
   B: I think he doesn't.
   f. A: Does Ed love Julia?
   B: No, he doesn't.
   g. A: Who loves Julia?
   B: Ed does.

SDRs
   Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: Z’en duut.
   she.NEG does
   'A: Mary loves Pierre. B: No, she doesn't.'
      Mary sees Pierre gladly and Jeff does too.
      Mary sees Pierre more gladly than that, - Jeff does
      Mary reads every book that Pierre does
   e. A: Marie zie Pierre geim.
      Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: * Ik paas da Z’en duut.
      I think that, - she.NEG does
   f. A: Zie Marie Pierre geim?
      sees Mary Pierre gladly
B: * Nieje, z’en duut.
      no she.NEG does
   g. A: Wou zie Pierre geim?
      who sees Pierre gladly
B: * Marie duut.
      Mary does

2.2.2 There-expletives

VP-ELLISSPIS
(12) A: There were many people at the party.
   B: a. No, there weren't.
      b. * No, there wasn't.
      c. * No, it wasn't.
      d. * No, it weren't.

SDRs
(13) A: Duin stojn drou inn of.
     there stands, three men
        there NEG does
     b. * Duin en duont.
        there NEG does
     c. * Y En duunt.
        it NEG does
     d. * Y En duunt.
        it NEG does
     'A: There are three men standing in the garden. B: No, there aren't.' [Wambeek Dutch]

2.2.3 Modals and auxiliaries

VP-ELLISSPIS
(14) a. A: Ed has't visited Julia.
   B: (i) Yes, he has.
      (ii) * Yes, he does.
   b. A: Ed is cooking.
   B: (i) No, he isn't.
      (ii) * No, he doesn't.
   c. A: Ed should come.
   B: (i) No, he shouldn't.
     (ii) * No, he doesn't.
   d. A: Ed will come.
   B: (i) No, he won't.
     (ii) * No, he doesn't.

SDRs
(15) a. A: Jef ei Marie nie geziem,
      Jeff has Mary not seen
   B: (i) * Ij eit.
     he has
     (ii) Ij duut.
     he does
     'A: Jeff hasn't seen Mary. B: Yes, he has.'
   b. A: Marie is uit keuken.
     Mary is in the kitchen
     B: (i) * Z'en is.
        she.NEG is
        (ii) Z’en duut.
        she does
     'A: Mary is cooking. B: No, she isn't.'
   c. A: Marie zou muunte kommen.
      Mary should must come
     B: (i) * Z’en zou.
        she.NEG should
(ii) Z'en duut.  
she.NEG does  
A: Mary should come.  B: No, she shouldn't.'  

A: Marie gu kommen.  
B: (i) * Z'en guit.  
II she.NEG does  
A: Mary will come.  B: No, she won't.' [Warshock Dutch]  

VP-ELLIPSIS  
(16) A:  
Ed loves Julia.  
B:  
a.  
No, he doesn't.'  
b.  
* No, he loves not.  
(17) A:  
Ar chuirt tí isteach áir?  
C:* phutbot you in on it  
B:  
Chuir.  
putbot  
'A: Did you apply for it?  B: 'Yes, I did.' [Dick, McCasky 1991:27]  

SDRs  
(18) A:  
Marie zie Pierre geim.  
Mary sees Pierre gladly  
B:  
a.  
Z'en duut.  
shenEG does  
b.  
* Z'en ziet.  
shenEG sees  
'A: Mary loves Pierre.  B: No, she doesn't.' [Warshock Dutch]  

2.2.4 Past tenses  

VP-ELLIPSIS  
(19) A:  
John loved Mary.  
B:  
a.  
No, he didn't.  

b.  
* No, he doesn't.'  

SDRs  
(20) A:  
Marie zag Pierre geim.  
Mary saw Pierre gladly  
B:  
a.  
* Z'en de.  
shenEG did  
b.  
Z'en duut.  
shenEG does  
'A: Mary loved Pierre.  B: No, she didn't.' [Warshock Dutch]  

2.2.5 Co-occurrence with 'yes' and 'no'  

VP-ELLIPSIS  
(21) A:  
Ed loves Julia.  
B:  
a.  
He doesn't.  

b.  
No, he doesn't.'  

SDRs  
(22) A:  
Marie zie Pierre geim.  
Mary sees Pierre gladly  
B:  
a.  
Z'en duut.  
shenEG does  
b.  
* Neéij, z'en duut.  
no shenEG does  
'A: Mary loves Pierre.  B: No, she doesn't.' [Warshock Dutch]  

VP-ELLIPSIS  
(23) A:  
Ed doesn't love Julia.  
B:  
a.  
He does.  

b.  
Yes, he does.  

SDRs  
(24) A:  
Marie zie Pierre nie geim.  
Mary sees Pierre not gladly  
B:  
a.  
Ze duut.  
shenEG does  
b.  
Jou ze duut.  
yes she does  
'A: Mary doesn't love Pierre.  B: Yes, she does.' [Warshock Dutch]  

Note: the status of jou 'yes' in SDRs  
(i)  
jou 'yes' in negative SDRs  
(25) A:  
Marie zie Pierre geim.  
Mary sees Pierre gladly  
B:  
Jou z'en duut.  
yes shenEG does  
'A: Mary loves Pierre.  B: No, she doesn't.' [Warshock Dutch]  

(26) A:  
Kom lef?  
comes left  
B:  
* Jou, hij kom nie.  
yes he comes not  
I  

D  

(ii) vowel lengthening in jou 'yes'  
(27) A:  
Marie gu nie nui de cinema.  
Mary goes not to the cinema  
B:  
Jou(+) nie nui de cinema.  
yes Mary goes ART to the cinema  
'A: Mary doesn't go to the cinema.  B: Yes, she does go to the cinema.' [Warshock Dutch]  

(28) A:  
Marie zie Pierre nie geim.  
Mary sees Pierre not gladly  
B:  
Jou(+) z'en duut.  
yes she does  
'A: Mary doesn't love Pierre.  B: Yes, she does.' [Warshock Dutch]  

(iii) replacement by toch wel  
(29) A:  
Marie gu nie nui de cinema.  
Mary goes not to the cinema  
B:  
Toch wel, Marie gu wel nui de cinema.  
ART ART Mary goes ART to the cinema.  
'A: Mary doesn't go to the cinema.  B: Yes, she does go to the cinema.' [Warshock Dutch]
(b) intonation break after yes 'yes'

(31) A: Kom Marie?
comes Mary
B: Jaa.
yes Marie comes

'A: Is Mary coming? B: Yes, she is.'

Mary sees Pierre not gladly
B: * Jaa.
yes she does

'A: Mary doesn't love Pierre. B: Yes, she does.'

(33) A: Kom ze morgen?
comes she tomorrow
yes she does
   b. Jaa, ze kom morgen.
yes she comes tomorrow

'A: Is she coming tomorrow? B: Yes, she is coming tomorrow.'

(34) A: Marie zie Pierre nie geim.
Mary sees Pierre not gladly
B: * Jaa.
yes she does

'A: Mary doesn't love Pierre. B: Yes, she does.'

(4) SDRs and discourse particles

(35) A: Magje kijk ook mee?
may-look-ERG also with
B: A ba Jou.
PRF PRF yes

'A: Can I also come? B: I guess so.'

(36) A: Magje kijk ook mee?
may-look-ERG also with
B: Mo ba jou.
PRF PRF yes

'A: Can I also come? B: Of course.'

(37) A: Magje kijk ook mee?
may-look-ERG also with
B: A mo ba jai-ch
PRF PRF PRF yes-you.NEG do

'A: Can I also come? B: Of course you can!'

(38) A: Ik muun ook mee.
I have to also with
B: a. ** A ba jou g'm doetj.
PRF PRF yes you.NEG do
b. ** Mo ba jou g'm doetj.
PRF PRF yes you.NEG do
c. A mo ba jou g'm doetj.
PRF PRF PRF yes you.NEG do

INTENDED READING: 'A: I have to come as well. B: No, you don't.'

(39) A: Ik muun ook mee.
I have to also with
B: a. A ba g'm doetj.
PRF PRF you.NEG do

2.2.6 Co-occurrence with adverbs

VP-ELLIPSIS

(40) A: Julia always pays back her debts.
B: She often doesn't, you know.

(41) A: Ed lives here.
B: He doesn't anymore.

(42) A: Julia will come tomorrow.
B: No, she probably won't.

(43) A: Julia thinks you have a lot of money.
B: I don't, however.

SDRs

(44) A: Marie/guid altaed nui de mes.
Mary goes to the mass
B: * Z'en duu geregeld.
she.NEG does often

(45) A: Pierre/woend ie.
Pierre lives here
B: * j en duu nie mieje.
he N EG does not anymore

(46) A: Marie kom morgen.
Mary comes tomorrow
B: * Z'en duu wurschaanlek.
she.NEG does probably

(47) A: Jef/zeit du gou veel geld etj.
Jeff' says that you much money have
B: 'k En duu pertang.
I NEG do however

'A: Jeff says you have a lot of money. B: I don't, however.'

2.2.7 Subject restrictions

VP-ELLIPSIS

(48) A: Ed loves woodcarving.
B: But Bill doesn't.

(49) A: Everybody loves Julia.
B: Ed doesn't.

SDRs

(50) A: Pierre zie Marie geim.
Pierre sees Mary gladly
2.2.9 Pseudogapping

**VP-ELLIPSIS**

(58) A: Gee, I've never seen you on campus before.
B: Yes! Neither have I you.

(Lassik 1999:142)

**SDRs**

(59) A: Pierre zie Marie gein.
B: * Mo i j en duu jula.
but he NEG does jula

intended reading: 'A: Pierre loves Mary. B: But he doesn't Julia.'

2.2.10 Data summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>SHORT DO REPLIES</th>
<th>VP-ELLIPSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>only in non-embedded contradictory replies</td>
<td></td>
<td>coordinations, comparatives, ACD, replies to declarative clauses, yes/no-questions and subject-wh-questions, embedded and main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there-expletive as subject</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement with elided associate DP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modals and auxiliaries</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past tenses</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can co-occur with 'yes' and 'no'</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurrence with adverbs</td>
<td>only very high adverbs</td>
<td>no restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject restrictions</td>
<td>only weak personal pronouns</td>
<td>no restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurrence with wh-movement</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudogapping</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Comparison of Short Do Repliess and VP-ellipsis

2.3 Eliminating the usual suspects (II): periphrastic *duu ‘do’* = topic drop

2.3.1 Introduction

periphrastic *duu ‘do’*

(60) A: Pierre spelj met de kinern.
B: Da duu n nie. that does he not

'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

[Waxhous Dutch]
topic drop
(61) A: Willje da veruil oeren?
     want you that story hear
B: * Da kannek al.
     that know I already
     'A: Do you want hear that story? B: I know it already.'

2.3.2 Inversion

PERIPHRASTIC DU\'N \"DO\"
(62.) A: Willje da veruil oeren?
     want you that story hear
B: a Da kannek al.
     that know I already
b. * Ik kan da al
     I know that already
     'A: Do you want hear that story? B: I know it already.'

SDRs
(63) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
     Pierre plays with the children
B: a Ij en duut.
     he NIEG does
b. * En duut i.j.
     NIEG does he
     'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

2.3.3 Negation and affirmation marking

PERIPHRASTIC DU\'N \"DO\"
(64.) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
     Pierre plays with the children
B: Da (en) duut n *(nie).
     that NIEG does he not
     'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

SDRs
(65) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
     Pierre plays with the children
B: Ij *(en) duut *(nie).
     he NIEG does not
     'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

2.3.4 Activities vs. states

PERIPHRASTIC DU\'N \"DO\"
(66) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
     Pierre plays with the children
B: Da duut n nie.
     that does he not
     'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

     Pierre knows very much
B: * Da duut n nie.
     that does he not
     INTENDED READING: 'A: Pierre knows a lot. B: No, he doesn't.'

SDRs
(68) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
     Pierre plays with the children
B: Ij en duut.
     he NIEG does
     'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

(69) A: Pierre wetj naaig veel.
     Pierre knows very much
B: Ij en duut.
     he NIEG does
     'A: Pierre knows a lot. B: No, he doesn't.'

2.3.5 Distribution

PERIPHRASTIC DU\'N \"DO\"
(70) a. Marie spelj veel met de kinjern, en Jef duut dad oek.
     Mary plays a lot with the children and Jeff does too.
    'Mary plays a lot with the children and Jeff does too.'

b. ? Marie spelj miej met de kinjern dan da Jef da duut.
     Mary plays more with the children than that, Jeff does that
     'Mary plays more with the children than Jeff does.'

c. A: Marie spelj veel met de kinjern.
     Mary plays a lot with the children
B: Ik paus da ze da nie duut.
     I think that, she that not does
     'A: Mary plays a lot with the children. B: I think she doesn't.'

d. A: Spelj Marie veel met de kinjern?
     plays Mary a lot with the children
B: Nieje, da duuk ze nie.
     no that does she not
     'A: Does Mary play with the children a lot? B: No, she doesn't.'

e. A: Wou spelj er etel met de kinjern?
     who plays always with the children
B: Da duuk Marie.
     who does Mary
     'A: Who always plays with the children? B: Mary does.'

2.3.6 There-expletives

PERIPHRASTIC DU\'N \"DO\"
(71) A: Dui werken drou mann inn of.
     there work, three men in the garden
B: a. * Da doenj er niet.
     that doen, there not
b. * Da duut er nie.
     that does there not
c. * Da doenj t nie.
     that doen, it not
d. * Da duut-n nie.
     that does it not
     INTENDED READING: 'A: There are three men working in the garden.
     B: No, there aren't.'
2.3.7 Modals and auxiliaries

**PERIPHRACTIC DUUN 'DO'**

(72) A: Marie eit den ont even gegeven. Mary has the dog food given.
     B: a. * Da duu ze nie. that does she not
     b. Dad ei ze nie geduim. that has she is not done
     'A: Mary has fed the dog. B: No, she hasn't.'

(73) A: Marie must den ont even geven. Mary must the dog food give
     B: a. * Da duu ze nie. that does she not
     b. Da muss ze nie duum. that must she is not do
     'A: Mary has to feed the dog. B: No, she doesn't.'

(74) A: Marie guit den ont even geven. Mary goes the dog food give
     B: a. * Da duu ze nie. that does she not
     b. Da guv ze nie duum. that goes she is not do
     'A: Mary is going to feed the dog. B: No, she isn't.'

2.3.8 Past tenses

**PERIPHRACTIC DUUN 'DO'**

(75) A: Marie spelj alled met de kinjern. Mary played always with the children
     B: a. * Da duu ze nie. that does she not
     b. Da dee ze nie. that did she not
     'A: Mary always used to play with the children. B: No, she didn't.'

2.3.9 Co-occurrence with 'yes' and 'no'

**PERIPHRACTIC DUUN 'DO'**

(76) A: Marie spelj met de kinjern. Mary plays with the children
     B: Nie, da duu ze nie. no that does she not
     'A: Mary plays with the children. B: No, she doesn't.'

(77) A: Marie spelj nie met de kinjern. Mary plays not with the children
     B: Jou, da duu zu wet. yes that does she AFF
     'A: Mary doesn't play with the children. B: Yes, she does.'

2.3.10 Co-occurrence with adverbs

**PERIPHRACTIC DUUN 'DO'**

(78) A: Marie zou muate beginne zwanmen. Mary should must start swim
     B: Da duu ze al. that does she already
     'A: Mary should start swimming. B: She already does.'

(79) A: Pierre spelj voetbal. Pierre plays soccer
     B: Nie, da duu-n nie mieje. no that does he not anymore
     'A: Pierre plays soccer. B: No, he doesn't anymore.'

(80) A: Ik eup da Marie gin sein gui muiken. I hope that Mary no scene goes make
     B: Da zal ze wuirschaanlekt nie duun. that will she probably not do
     'A: I hope Mary doesn't make a scene. B: She probably won't.'

(81) A: Jef zou da gou voetbal spelj. Jeff said that, you soccer play
     B: Da duum ek pertang nie. that do I however not
     'A: Jeff said you play soccer. B: I don't, however.'

2.3.11 Subject restrictions

**PERIPHRACTIC DUUN 'DO'**

(82) A: Pierre spelj voetbal. Pierre plays soccer
     B: Mo Jef duu da nie. but Jeff does that not
     'A: Pierre plays soccer. B: But Jeff doesn't.'

(83) A: Iederjijn geef geldj uin dermen. everybody gives money to the poor
     B: Pierre duu u da nie Pierre does that not
     'A: Everybody gives money to the poor. B: Pierre doesn't.'
### 2.3.12 Data summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting DDo replies</th>
<th>Dutch-paraphrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inversion required for ellipsis</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negation and affirmation marking</td>
<td>exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stative verb as antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution</td>
<td>only in non-embedded contradictory replies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antecedent clause can contain a there-expletive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modals and auxiliaries</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch ‘do’ can occur as participle/partitive</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past tenses</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can co-occur with ‘yes’ and ‘no’</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurrence with adverbs</td>
<td>only very high adverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject restrictions</td>
<td>only weak personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of Short Do Replies and Dutch-paraphrases

### 2.4 Setting the research agenda: the basic properties of SDRs

(84) Basic properties of dialect Dutch Short Do Replies

a. the subject:
- is a weak pronounal coreferential with the preceding subject
- if the antecedent clause contains a there-expletive, the SDR-subject is ‘it’
- some dialects allow the weak subject pronoun to be doubled

b. negation:
- is obligatorily marked by the (normally optional) preverbal clitic en
- the postverbal negator nie ‘not’ is obligatorily absent

b. emphatic affirmation:
- is marked by stress on the verb Dutch ‘do’
- the affirmative adverb wel is obligatorily absent

d. the verb:
- is always the verb Dutch ‘do’
- cannot be preceded by modals or auxiliaries
- cannot show up in participial or infinitival form
- can replace stative verbs
- only occurs in the present tense
- can be used to replace modals and auxiliaries

e. the gap:
- cannot host associates of there-expletives
- cannot host traces of wh-movement
- cannot host the trace of a pseudogapping-remnant

f. distribution:
- SDRs only occur productively in short contradictory replies to declarative statements

g. co-occurrence restrictions:
- SDRs cannot be combined with ‘yes’ and ‘no’
- SDRs cannot be combined with adverbs, except very high ones such as petraan ‘however’ or vrij geknet ‘frankly’
3 TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Clause structure: negation within the split IP-domain

3.1.1 The split IP-domain

\[ \phi C [ \phi P \phi G \phi r \phi T \phi r \phi [ \phi T \phi r \phi [ \phi T \phi r \phi T \phi T \phi P \phi V \phi n ] ] ] \]

3.1.2 Two positions for negation: Haegeman (2002b)

(a) Lewie ei gisteren [ daunen boek ], nie t gelezen.
   'Louis hasn't read that book yesterday.'
   (Welsh Dutch)

(b) Lewie eit gisteren [ daunen boek ], wel t gelezen.
   'Louis has yesterday that book read'
   (Welsh Dutch)

3.1.3 The position of the high NegP: evidence from Finnish (Holmberg 2003b)

(a) Minä ostaa-issi-n kahvia.
   'I buy-1SG coffee'
   (Finnish)

(b) Minä e-n ostaa-issi kahvia.
   'I Neg-1SG buy-CON coffee'
   (Finnish)

3.2 The syntax of contradiction

3.2.1 Contradictory sentential emphasis in Hungarian: Lipták (2003)

(a) A: Anna nem ment el moziba.
   Anna not went P cinema.to
   'A: Anna didn't go to the cinema. B: Yes, she did.'
   [Hungarian]

(b) A: Anna ment moziba.
   Anna P went cinema.to
   'A: Anna went to the cinema. B: No, she didn't.'
   [Hungarian]

3.2.2 Contradictory sentential emphasis in Dutch

(a) Mary goes to the cinema.
   'A: Mary goes to the cinema. B: Yes, she does.'
   [Welsh Dutch]

(b) Mary goes to the cinema.
   'A: Mary goes to the cinema. B: No, she doesn't.'
   [Welsh Dutch]

(c) Mary has yesterday that book not read.
   'A: Mary hasn't read that book yesterday. B: Yes, she has.'
   [Welsh Dutch]
4 THE ANALYSIS: PUTTING ALL THE PIECES TOGETHER

4.1 Three main ingredients

4.1.1 SDRs contain a null proform

4.1.1.1 Arguments for a PF-deletion analysis of English VP-ellipsis

- There-expletives (Ross 1969)

(103) a. Jim said there wouldn't be many people at the party, but there were [e].
   b. Jim said there wouldn't be a linguist at the party, but there was [e].

(104) a. ... there were more people at the party.
   b. * ... there were $prov_p$

- Wh-movement

(105) I know who Ed saw and who he didn't [e].

(106) a. ... who he didn't see...
   b. * ... who he didn't $prov_p$

- Pseudogapping

(107) Ed likes chisels more than he does [e] fruit flies.

(108) a. ... than he does $like_{1}$ fruit flies
   b. * ... than he does $prov_{1}$ fruit flies

- ACD

(109) Ed likes every chisel that Julia does [e].

(110) a. Ed likes every chisel that Julia does $like_{2}$
   b. * Ed $like_{1}$ every chisel that julia $prov_{2}$.
   c. * Ed likes [ the portrait of it ].

4.1.1.2 SDRs as the mirror image of VP-ellipsis

- There-expletives

(111) A: Dui stonj drou mann inn of.
   there stand$_3$ three men in the garden
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDRS</th>
<th>VP-ELLISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>there-expletive as subject</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement with elided associate DP</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurrence with wh-movement</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudogapping</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Arguments for a pro-analysis of SDRs

4.1.1.3 Summary and conclusion

4.1.2 The SDR-proform replaces more than just VP

4.1.2.1 Modals, auxiliaries, past tenses and adverbs revisited

4.1.2.2 Modals and auxiliaries disallowed in SDRs

4.1.2.3 Past tenses disallowed in SDRs

B: Z’en duut.
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a. * Z’en duut Pierre gladly sees

b. Z’en duut she.NEG does

A: Mary loves Pierre. B: No, she didn’t.' [Wambek Dutch]

A: Pierre loves Mary. B: But he doesn’t Julia.’

[Warbeck Dutch]

A: Mary is cooking. B: No, she isn’t.

c. A: Marie zou moe moet kommen.

B: (i) * Z’en zou.

(ii) Z’en duut.

she.NEG does

A: Mary should come. B: No, she shouldn’t.

d. A: Marie gu komen.

B: (i) * Z’en gu.

(ii) Z’en duut.

sh.NEG does

A: Mary will come. B: No, she won’t.’

[Warbeck Dutch]
• Only high adverbs allowed in SDRs

(121) A: Marie guid alted ni de mes.
Mary goes always to the mass
B: * Zen duu gergeld.
she.NEG does often

(122) A: Pierre woendj ie.
Pierre lives here
B: * Ij en duu nie mieje.
he NEG does not anymore

(123) A: Marie kom mergen.
Mary comes tomorrow
B: * Zen duu wuiwschaanleq.
she.NEG does probably

(124) A: Jef zeit da gos veel geld etj.
Jeff says that you much money have
B: k En duu perian.
I NEG do however

'A: Jeff says you have a lot of money. B: I don't, however.'

4.1.2.2 Conclusion: a TP-proform

(125) A: Marie zie Pierre gein.
Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: Zen duut.
she.NEG does

'A: Mary loves Pierre. B: No, she doesn't.'

(126) Zen duut prop
she.NEG does

4.1.3 The SDR-verb is an auxiliary

4.1.3.1 Reconsidering some properties of the SDR-verb

• Activities vs. states

PERIPHERASTIC DUEN 'DO'

(127) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
Pierre plays with the children
B: Da duut n nie.
that does he not

'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'

(128) A: Pierre wenj naaig veel.
Pierre knows very much
B: * Da duut n nie.
that does he not

INTENDED READING: 'A: Pierre knows a lot. B: No, he doesn't.'

SDRs

(129) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
Pierre plays with the children
B: Ij en duut.
he NEG does

'A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn't.'
4.1.3.2 Summary and conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT DO REPLEYS</th>
<th>DUEN-PARAPHRASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stative verb as antecedent</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duan ‘do’ can be preceded by modals and auxiliaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duan ‘do’ can occur as participle</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duan ‘do’ can occur as infinitive</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Arguments for the auxiliary-status of the SDR-verb

PERIPHRASTIC DUEN ‘DO’

(135) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
B: Da duan n nie.
   ‘A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn’t.’

SDRs

(136) A: Pierre spelj met de kinjern.
B: l'en duan he NEG does.
   ‘A: Pierre plays with the children. B: No, he doesn’t.’

4.2 The actual analysis: a step-by-step derivation of an SDR

(137) A: Marie zie Pierre geijn.
   Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: jou z'en duant.
   ‘A: Mary loves Pierre. B: No, she doesn’t.’

(140) Agr,P
    Agr' NegP
    Neg* en + duat
    pro\(\text{to}\)

(141) Agr,P
    Agr' NegP
    Neg* en + duat
    pro\(\text{to}\)

(142) CP
    ze
    C'
    Agr,P
    Agr'
    NegP
    neg
    Neg* pro\(\text{to}\)

(143) VFocP
    jau
    ze
    C'
    Agr,P
    Agr'
    NegP
    neg
    Neg* pro\(\text{to}\)
4.3 The basic properties of SDRs revisited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties of SDRs</th>
<th>Account in the present analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject is a weak pronominal</td>
<td>It is base-generated directly in SpecAgrP (underlying hypothesis: only very weak pronouns can be base-generated outside of the theta-domain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject cannot be a there-expletive</td>
<td>The ellipsis site has no internal structure and hence cannot contain an associate for there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subject can be doubled</td>
<td>The subject-DP undergoes movement from SpecAgrP to SpecCP; doubling is spelling out of the trace (Van Craenenbroeck &amp; Van Koppen 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation is obligatorily marked by the (normally optional) negative clitic</td>
<td>Spelling out the high Neg*-head is necessary to license pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The postverbal negator is absent</td>
<td>It is contained in the structure that is replaced by the proform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic affirmation is marked by stress on the verb daan ‘do’</td>
<td>Spelling out the high Neg*-head (here: suprasegmentally, i.e., as focal stress on the verb) is necessary to license pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affirmative adverb wel is optionally absent</td>
<td>It is contained in the structure that is replaced by the proform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb is always daan ‘do’</td>
<td>It is an auxiliary inserted as Last Resort (cp. do-support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb cannot be preceded by modals and auxiliaries</td>
<td>It is an auxiliary daan ‘do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb cannot show up in participial or infinitival form</td>
<td>It is an auxiliary daan ‘do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb can replace stative verbs</td>
<td>It is an auxiliary daan ‘do’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The verb only occurs in the present tense</td>
<td>This is a default tense (TP being contained in the structure that is pronominalized by pro, past tense is unavailable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The verb can be used to replace modals or auxiliaries | The base-generated position of modals and auxiliaries is contained in the structure that is replaced by pro; as a result, they cannot show up |
| The gap cannot host traces of wh-movement, associates of there expletives or the trace of a pseudogapping remnant | The gap is not a PF-deleted syntactic structure, but rather a null, structureless proform |
| SDRs only occur productively in short contradictory replies to declarative statements | Focus marking on the head of the high NegP is necessary to license the proform; that same focus marking induces a reading of contradictory sentential emphasis |
| SDRs cannot be combined with ‘yes’ and ‘no’ | SDRs involve movement into the CP-domain; given that ‘yes’ and ‘no’ are also base-generated there (cf. infra), the two are incompatible |
| SDRs can only be combined with high adverbs | The base-generated position of lower adverbs are contained in the structure that is replaced by the TP-proform |

Table 5: The analysis of SDRs vs. their basic properties

---
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5 THE BIGGER PICTURE: THE THEORY OF ELLIPSIS REVISITED

5.1 Back to the starting point

(144) Ed bought something, but I don't know what [e].

(145) a. …

know CP

what C

C pro

b. …

know CP

what C

C

→ PF-deletion

Conclusion
It is not a matter of either…or…: both the PF-deletion and the pro-theory of ellipsis are valid, albeit not for the same constructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP-ELLIPSIS</th>
<th>SDRs</th>
<th>pro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(147) a. ✓ She doesn’t know Pierre.  b. * She doesn’t pro.</td>
<td>(149) a. * Z’en duut Pierre geim. Marie has-him_glady she doesn’t does  b. ✓ Z’en duut pro Pierre gladly see, Marie has-him_glady she doesn’t does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 On the validity of the argumentation

5.2.1 Valid arguments in favour of PF-deletion

5.2.1.1 The ellipsis site as a host for movement traces

• Wh-movement

(150) I know who Ed saw and who he didn't [e].

(151) A: Ik weet lou Marie geim ziet. I know who that Mary gladly sees

B: * En wou en duu-se? and who NEG does she

INTENDED READING: ‘A: I know who Mary loves. B: And who doesn't she?’

• Pseudogapping

(152) Ed likes chisels more than he does [e] fruit flies.


B: * Mo ij en duu Julia. but he NEG does Julia

INTENDED READING: ‘A: Pierre loves Mary. B: But he doesn't Julia.’

• Obiect clitic movement

(154) a. Marie eit-<e> zai <*-e> wierschaaliek nie gezien. Mary has-him,daten she him,daten probably not seen ‘Mary probably didn't see him.’

b. Marie eit-<em> zai <-em> wierschaaliek nie gezien. Mary has-him,daten she him,daten probably not seen ‘Mary probably didn't see him.’

(155) A: Marie eit-n gezien. Mary has-him,daten seen

B: a. Z’en duut. sheneg does

b. * Z’en duut-n. sheneg does-him,daten

‘A: Mary saw him. B: No, she didn't.’

5.2.1.2 The ellipsis site as a source of agreement

(156) a. Jim said there wouldn’t be many people at the party, but there were [e].

b. Jim said there wouldn’t be a linguist at the party, but there was [e].

(157) A: Dui ston drou mann ini of. there stands, three men in the garden

B: a. * Dui en doen. there NEG does

b. * Dui en duut. there NEG does

c. * En duut. if NEG does

d. * En duut. if NEG does

‘A: There are three men standing in the garden. B: No, there aren’t.’

5.2.1.3 The ellipsis site as an antecedent-contained pronoun

(158) Ed likes every chisel that Julia does [e].

(159) *Marie leest elken boek da Pierre duut.

Mary reads every book that Pierre does
5.2.2 More dubious arguments in favour of ellipsis-as-pro

5.2.2.1 Pragmatic control (Haskemae & Sag 1976, Hardt 1993:34)

(160) [on receipt of a present]  
You shouldn’t have [e]!

(161) [whilst listening to a male and a female singer performing a duet]  
I like him, but not her.

(162) [context: a mother catches her thirteen-year-old son about to sneak off to a party in spite of the fact that he's not allowed to go out; the mother shouts:]  
#Gen: don’t!  
you NEG do  
INTENDED READING: ‘Oh no you don’t!’

5.2.2.2 Nominal antecedents (Hardt 1993:34)

(163) David Begelman is a great [laugh]er and when he does [e], his eyes crinkle at you the way Lady Brett's did in the The Sun Also Rises.

(164) A: Marie eit een goei zangeres gezien.  
Mary has a good singer seen
B: Z’en duut.  
sh e NEG does
‘A: Mary saw a good singer. B: No, she didn’t.’  
# ‘A: Mary saw a good singer. B: No, she doesn’t sing well.’

5.2.3 An important factor: semantic licensing of ellipsis

5.2.3.1 Syntactic isomorphism & ellipsis (cf. e.g. Fiengo & May 1994)

A VP α can only be elided if there is a syntactically isomorphic VP β in the preceding discourse.

(166) John doesn’t [love Julia ], but Ed does [love Julia ].

(167) I’ll fix the car if you tell me how [e].  
... how I’ll fix the car.  
= ... how to fix the car. (Merchant 2001:22)

5.2.3.2 Focus condition on ellipsis (Merchant 2001:31)

An IP α can only be elided if α is e-GIVEN

5.2.3.3 e-GIVENNESS (Merchant 2001:31)

An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo θ-type shifting,  
(i) E entails the F-closure of F, and  
(ii) E entails the F-closure of A.

5.2.3.4 F-closure (Merchant 2001:14)

The F-closure of α, written F-clo(α), is the result of replacing F-marked parts of α with θ-bound variables of the appropriate type (modulo θ-type shifting).

5.2.3.5 θ-type shifting (Merchant 2001:14a)

θ-type shifting is a type-shifting operation that raises expressions to type <θ> and existentially binds unfilled arguments.

5.3 Taking things one step further: towards a unification of pro and PF-deletion

5.3.1 pro vs. PF-deletion: the problem

VP-ELLIPSE

(170) A: Mary loves Pierre.  
B: She doesn’t.

(173) a. * She doesn’t [love Pierre]  
        b. * She doesn’t pro.

SDRs

(174) A: Marie zie Pierre gezien.  
Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: Z’en duut.  
sh e NEG does
‘A: Mary sees Pierre. B: No, she doesn’t.’

(175) a. * Z’en duut [love Pierre]  
        b. * Z’en duut pro  
        sh e NEG does  
        sh e NEG does

pro vs. PF-deletion:

• Why would UG allow for two (near-)equivalent mechanisms?
• What determines their distribution?
• Is one option Last Resort with respect to the other? If so, why?

5.3.2 A quick (and incomplete) bird’s eye view of elliptical constructions

5.3.2.1 Shlicing (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001)

(176) Er will jemandem schmeicheln, ...  
he wants someone, to flatter  
... aber sie wissen nicht [*wer / *wen / *wem] [e], but they know not who_sub, who_add, who_adum  
he wants to flatter someone, but they don’t know who.”

(177) Sie wissen nicht [*wer / *wen / *wem] er schmeicheln will.  
they know not who_sub, who_add, who_adum  
*he flatter wants  
‘They don’t know who he wants to flatter.’

5.3.2.2 VP-ellipsis (Johnson 2001)

(178) I know which book Max read, and which book Oscar didn’t [e].

5.3.2.3 Gapping (Vanden Wyngaard 1998)

(179) a. I tried to read Aspects, and John [e] LGB.  
        b. * John said that Harry would come and Sam [e] Sally.

5.3.2.4 Pseudogapping (Johnson 1996)

(180) a. While Truman doesn’t want to visit every city, he does [e] Paris.  
        b. * While Doc might claim that O.J. Berman had read his book, he wouldn’t [e] the paper.
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5.3.2.5 NP-ellipsis (Chisholm 2002, Haegeman 2002a)

(181) I believe no one's claim that he had ridden a camel.
  a.  It was of the two-humped variety.
  b.  We saw someone on it in the park.

(182) I believe no one's claim that he had ridden a camel, except for John's [e].
  a.  It was of the two-humped variety.
  b.  We saw someone on it in the park.

(183) a.  K' (en) een nie vele geen boeken.
    I NKG have not many no books
    'I don't have many books.'
  b.  Boeken (en) een-k nie vele (*geen) boeken
    NKG have-I not many no books
    'I don't have many books.'

(184) K' (en) een nie vele (*geen) [e].
    I NKG have not many no
    'I don't have many.'

5.3.2.6 Fragment answers (Merchant 2005)

(185) Q: Pijn idde i Maria?
    who=NP saw the Maria
        the Giannisout
    b.  Ton Gianni [e].
        the Gianniout
  'Q: Who did Maria see? A: Giannis.'

(186) Q: Pijn idde i Maria?
    who=NP saw the Maria
  A: a.  * I Maria idde o Giannis
        the Maria saw the Gianniout
    b.  I Maria idde ton Gianni.
        the Maria saw the Gianniout
  'Q: Who did Maria see? A: Maria saw Giannis.'

5.3.2.7 Stripping (Merchant 2003)

(187) I spoke with Sakis yesterday, and (with) Anna.

(188) Milisa me ton Saki xfhes, kai *(me) tin Anna.
    I spoke with the Sakis yesterday and with the Anna
    'I spoke with Sakis yesterday, and with Anna.'

(189) Milisa me ton Saki kai tin Anna xfhes.
    I spoke with the Sakis and the Anna yesterday
    'I spoke with Sakis and Anna today.'

5.3.2.8 Conjugated 'yes' and 'no' (Van Craenenbroeck 2004)

(190) Q: Een ze gewonnen?
    have they won
  A: Ja-n-s [e].
      yes-H.-they instantiated
  'Q: Have they won? A: Yes.'
5.3.2.13 Data summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>construction</th>
<th>syntactic structure inside the ellipsis site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sluicing plus demonstrative</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sluicing</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP-ellipsis</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gapping</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudogapping</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP-ellipsis</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fragment answers</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stripping</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjugated ‘yes’ and ‘no’</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduced conditionals</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specification pseudoeffects</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clausal comparative deletion</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null complement anaphors</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short do reply</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: A quick overview of elliptical constructions in terms of the presence or absence of syntactic structure in their ellipsis site

5.3.3 An apparent detour: null subject languages

5.3.3.1 The traditional theory of pro and its problems

(199) a. pro is governed by Xₜₜ

(200) pro ho parlato a tuo fratello haveᵥ₀ spoken to your brother 'I have spoken to your brother.' (Rizzi 1986:519-520)

(201) IP

\[
\begin{array}{c}
| \text{pro} \\
| \text{ho} \\
| \text{[sig]} \\
| \ldots
\end{array}
\]

AN AGREE-BASED APPROACH

(202)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
| \text{Fp} \\
| \text{VP} \\
| \text{pro} \\
| \ldots
\end{array}
\]

5.3.3.2 A possible way out: the deletion theory of pro (Holmberg 2003a, Roberts 2004)

argument 6.1: expletives in Finnish (Holmberg 2003a)

(203) (Minä) puhun ruotia. I speak_swedish 'I speak Swedish.'

(204) (Sinä) puhut tuotea. you speak_swedish 'You speak Swedish.'

(205) *(Sinä) sattui minulle omettomuus. expš happened_to_me accident 'I had an accident.'

(206) a. * Sinä puhun ruotia. expš speak_swedish

b. Olettekö (*sinä) käynyt haveᵥ₀-Ø expš visited Paris 'Have you been to Paris?'

(207) a. Sinä olen minäkin käynyt Parisissa. expš haveᵥ₀ I-too visited Paris 'I have been to Paris, too (actually).'

b. Minä sinä olen käynyt Parisissa. I expš haveᵥ₀ visited Paris 'I've been to Paris (would you believe it).'

'I'm the one who has been to Paris.'

(208) (1998) Elle-ž ont chanté faux que c'est pas possible. why_liason-haveᵥ₀ sang wrong that it.is not possible 'They sang incredibly bad.'

(209) Ž-ont chanté faux que c'est pas possible. liaison-haveᵥ₀ sang wrong that it.is not possible 'They sang incredibly bad.'

(210) Pourquoi Ž ont chanté? why liaison-haveᵥ₀ sang 'Why did they sing?'

5.3.4 Putting two and two together: towards a unified theory of ellipsis

New proposal:
- There exists only one ellipsis mechanism: PF-deletion
- There are two possible targets for ellipsis: a fully-fledged syntactic structure and a pronoun
VP-ELLIPSIS vs. SDRs

(211) A: Marie zie Pierre nie geirn.
     Mary sees Pierre not gladly
     she does that
     'A: Mary loves Pierre. B: No, she doesn't.'

(212) A: Mary doesn't love Pierre.
     B: She does love Pierre.

(213) a. SDRs CP
    DP C
    duut
    AgP l
    t
    AgP
    NegP
    Neg

b. VP-ELLIPSIS TP
    DP she
    T'
    does
    VP
    V'
    love
    DP Pierre
    V

5.3.5 New problems and questions

• (How) is case assigned to the pronoun in SDRs?
• What determines whether a pronoun can or must be PF-deleted?
• Why is deletion of a full syntactic structure Last Resort with respect to deletion of a pronoun?

6 IN PURSUIT OF THE TP-PROFORM (I): CONJUGATED 'YES' AND 'NO'

6.1 The basic data: conjugated 'yes' and 'no' (CYN)

(214) A: Kom Marie mergen?
     comes Mary tomorrow
     B: Ja-n-s.
     yes-sh_ex
     'A: Is Mary coming tomorrow? B: Yes.'

(215) A: Kom Marie mergen?
     comes Mary tomorrow
     B: Nie-p-s.
     no-sh_ex
     'A: Is Mary coming tomorrow? B: No.'

(216) Kpeize da-n ze gewonnen éé-n.
     I think that rt. they won have-rt.
     'I think they've won.'

(217) A: Éé-n ze gewonnen?
     have-rt. they won
     B: Ja-n-s.
     yes-sh_ex
     'A: Have they won? B: Yes.'

6.2 CYN vs. SDRs

6.2.1 Geographic distribution
6.2.2 Subject restrictions

**CYN**

(218) A: Ei Jef z' a gegeven?
B: a. Jo-n.
    yes-he_verb
b. * Jui-s.
    yes-they
    * Jui-k.
    yes-them

'A: Has Jeff given them to you? B: Yes.'

(219) A: Kom Marie mergen?
    comes Mary tomorrow
B: a. Jui-s.
    yes-she
b. * Jui-zzi.
    yes-she
    * Jui-Marie.
    yes-Mary

'A: Is Mary coming tomorrow? B: Yes.'

**SDRs**

(221) A: Pierre zie Marie gein.
    Pierre sees Mary gladly
B: * Mo Jef en duut.
    but Jeff NEG does

INTENDED READING: 'A: Pierre loves Mary. B: But Jeff doesn't.'

(222) A: Marie kom mergen.
    Mary comes tomorrow
    she_verb NEG does
b. * Zaa in en duut.
    she_verb NEG does
    * Marie en duut.
    Mary NEG does

'A: Mary is coming tomorrow. B: No, she isn't.'

(223) a. * Z'n doe zij.
    she_verb doing she
b. ? Z'en duu zai.
    [Warshook Dutch]
c. ?? Z'en doe zij.
    [Kloekhorst Dutch]
d. ?? Z'en doet zij.
    [Kloekhorst Dutch]
e. * Z'en doe zij.
    she_verb does she
    * Z'en doe zij.
    she_verb doing she

'No, she doesn't.'

6.2.3 There-expletives

**CYN**

(224) A: Kom er iemand mergen?
    comes there someone tomorrow
    yes-it
b. * Jii-r.
    yes-there

'A: Is someone coming tomorrow? B: Yes.'

(225) Kepeza da-n ter twee venten in den hof sta-n.
    I think that-there two men in the garden stand.
    I think that there are two men standing in the garden.'

(226) A: Staun ter twee venten in den hof?
    stand two men in the garden
    yes-it
b. * Jii-n.
    yes-there
    * Jii-n.
    yes-there
    Jii-n.
    yes-they

'A: Are there two men standing in the garden? B: Yes.'

**SDRs**

(227) A: Dui stonj drou mann inn of.
    there stand three men in the garden
    there NEG does
b. * Dui en duot.
    there NEG does
    * Ton duot.
    NEG does
d. * Ton duot.
    NEG does

'A: Are there three men standing in the garden. B: No, there aren't.'

6.2.4 Object clitics

(228) a. Marie ein-<o> zaai in-<o> wurtschaalnek nie gezien.
    Mary has-him<obj> she him<obj> probably not seen
    'Mary probably didn't see him.'

b. Marie ein-*<em> zaai nie wurtschaalnek nie gezien.
    Mary has-him<obj> she him<obj> probably not seen
    'Mary probably didn't see him.'

**CYN**

(229) A: Ei-s-n
    gezein?
    has-she<her><his> him<her><his> seen
    yes-she<her><his>
b. * Jui-s-n. yes-she,com,IMP-him,ACC-IV
   'A: Has she seen him? B: Yes.' [Watchout Dutch]

SDRs
(236) A: Marie eit-n gezien.
    Mary has.him,ACC-IV-IV seen
B: a. Z'en duent.
    she,NEG does
b. * Z'en duent-n.
    she,NEG does-him,ACC-IV-IV
   'A: Mary saw him. B: No, she didn't.' [Watchout Dutch]

6.2.5 Data summary and conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geographic distribution</th>
<th>CONJUGATED 'yes' / 'no'</th>
<th>SHORT DO REPLIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Flanders and East Flanders, with offshoots in Flemish Brabant and Antwerp</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject coreferential with preceding subject</th>
<th>obligatory</th>
<th>obligatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clitic as subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak pronoun as subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong pronoun as subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper name as subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject doubling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there-expletive as subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject used in reply to there-expletives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement with elided associate DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7: Comparison of conjugated 'yes' and 'no' and Short Do Replies

6.3 The analysis

6.3.1 The position occupied by 'yes' and 'no' in the clausal left periphery

(233) A: Kom Jef mergen?
    comes Jeff tomorrow
B: Jo-n.
    yes-he,com
   'A: Is Jeff coming tomorrow? B: Yes.' [Watchout Dutch]

(234) Ik paus dat-n mergen komt.
    I think that-he,com tomorrow comes
   'I think he is coming tomorrow.' [Watchout Dutch]

(235) A: Één Piet en Jan gewonnen?
    have Pete and John won
B: Ja-n-s.
    yes-Ps-they,com
   'A: Have Pete and John won? B: Yes.' [Wargena Dutch]

(236) Kpeize da-n Piet en Jan gewonnen één.
    I think that-Ps. Pete and John won have
   'I think Pete and John have won.' [Wargena Dutch]

6.3.2 The actual analysis

(237) CP

6.4 A bonus: conjugated 'yes' and 'no' vs. sluicing

6.4.1 A discrepancy

(238) A: Één ze gewonnen?
    have-Ps. they won
B: Ja-n-s.
    yes-Ps-they,com
   'A: Have they won? B: Yes.' [Wargena Dutch]

(239) Zèen iemand zien, ...
    they have someone seen, a. ... maar k'èn wees nie wie.
   but I,NEG know not who
6.4.2 An analysis built on two premises

6.4.2.1 The structural position occupied by subjects in sliced IPs (Marchant 2001:185-195)

(241) a. A biography of one of the Marx brothers will appear this year – guess which!
    b. * Which Marx brother did she say that [a biography of i] will appear this year?

(242) a. * which, [i a biography of] if [she will] appear this year
    b. which, [i a biography of] if [she will appear this year]

(243) a. * Which candidate were [posters of i] all over town?
    b. Which candidate were there [posters of i] all over town?

(244) a. * Which candidate did they say that [to get i to agree to a debate] was hard?
    b. Which candidate did they say that it was hard [to get i to agree to a debate]?

(245) a. * Wat waren [t voor mensen] op het feest?
    b. Wat waren er [t voor mensen] op het feest?

(246) *Guess* [which Marx brother], [p will [VP a biography of i] appear this year]?

6.4.2.2 Locality restrictions on COMP-agreement and subject clitic placement

COMP-AGREEMENT

(247) a. * darr-e wiej allichte de wedstrijd winne zółt.
    b. * darr-e allichte wiej de wedstrijd winne zółt.
    c. * dat allichte wiej de wedstrijd winne zółt.

SUBJECT CLITIC PLACEMENT

(248) Ik paus dat-n aai gui komen.
    I think that-hèw he’re gonna go come
    I think that he will come.

(249) a. Kem good da zaaln gisteren nie wisten wa duan.
    Kem good da zaaln gisteren nie wisten wa duan.
    I have heard that they’re gonna yesterday not knew what doyou
    I have heard that yesterday they’re gonna not knew what doyou
    I heard they were bored yesterday.

6.4.2.3 The actual analysis

(250) a. Kem goed da-se zaaln gisteren nie wisten wa duan.
    Kem goed da-se gisteren zaaln nie wisten wa duan.
    I have heard that they’re gonna yesterday not knew what doyou
    ‘I heard they were bored yesterday.’

(251) a. CONJUGATED "YES" AND "NO"
    b. SLURING
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7 IN PURSUIT OF THE TP-PROFORM (II): ANOTHER WAY TO DISAGREE

7.1 The basic data

(252) A: Marie gaa naar de film.
   Mary goes to the movie
B: Do's nie.
   that is not
'A: Mary goes to the movies. B: No, she doesn't.'

(253) A: Marie gaa nie naar de film.
   Mary goes not to the movie
B: Do's wel.
   that is AFF
   'A: Mary doesn't go to the movies. B: Yes, she does.'

(254) A: Marie gaa nie naar de film.
   Mary goes not to the movie
B: Da's jewel.
   that is YES.AFF
   'A: Mary doesn't go to the movies. B: Yes, she does.'

7.2 Da's nie/[ja]wel vs. SDRs

7.2.1 Distribution

DA'S NIE/[JAI]WEL

(255) A: Marie gaa nie naar de film.
   Mary goes not to the movie
B: * Ik denk dat da jewel is.
   I think that, that yes.AFF is
   [tentative reading] 'A: Mary doesn't go to the movies. B: I think she does.'

SDRs

(256) A: Marie zie Pierre geain.
   Mary sees Pierre gladly
B: * Ik puus da z'ën duut.
   I think that, she:Neg does
   [tentative reading] 'A: Mary loves Pierre. B: I think she doesn't.'

7.2.2 Modals and auxiliaries

DA'S NIE/[JAI]WEL

(257) A: Marie heef nen boek gekoelcht.
   Mary has a book bought
B: a. Da's nie.
   that is not
   b. * Da heef nie.
   that has not
   'A: Mary has bought a book. B: No, she hasn't.'

(258) A: Karel wil nie kommen.
   Carl wants not come
B: a. Da's wel.
   that is AFF
   b. * Da wil wel.
   that wants AFF
   'A: Carl doesn't want to come. B: Yes, he does.'

(259) A: Bart mag hier nie komen.
   Bart may here not come
B: a. Da's jewel.
   that is YES.AFF
   b. * Da mag jewel.
   that may YES.AFF
   'A: Bart is not allowed to come here. B: Yes, he is.'

SDRs

(260) a. A: Jef ei Marie nie gezeien.
   Jeff has Mary not seen
B: (i) * Ij eit.
   he has
   (ii) Ij duut.
   he does
   'A: Jeff hasn't seen Mary. B: Yes, he has.'

b. A: Marie is uit keeken.
   Mary is to it cooking
B: (i) * Z'en is.
   she:Neg is
   (ii) Z'en duut.
   she:Neg does
   'A: Mary is cooking. B: No, she isn't.'

c. A: Marie zou moeten komen.
   Mary should must come
B: (i) * Z'en zou.
   she:Neg should
   (ii) Z'en duut.
   she:Neg does
   'A: Mary should come. B: No, she shouldn't.'

d. A: Marie gai kommen.
   Mary goes come
B: (i) * Z'en gau.
   she:Neg goes
   (ii) Z'en duut.
   she:Neg does
   'A: Mary will come. B: No, she won't.'

7.2.3 Periphrastic tenses

DA'S NIE/[JAI]WEL

(261) A: Marie haar grootvader is gestaneveld in WOL.
   Mary her grandfather is died in World.War.One
B: a. Da's nie.
   that is not
   b. * Da's nie geweest.
   that is not been
   'A: Mary's grandfather died in World War I. B: No, he didn't.'

SDRs

(262) A: Marie eit den ont eten gepgeven.
   Mary has the dog food given
   she:Neg does
7.2.4 Past tenses

**DA'S NIE/TAJWEL**

(263) A: Mary zag Pierre graag.  
Mary saw Pierre gladly  
B: a. Da's nie.  
that is not  
b. ?? Da was nie.  
that was not  
'A: Mary loved Pierre.  B: No, she didn't.'

**SDRs**

(264) A: Marie zag Pierre geïn.  
Mary saw Pierre gladly  
she.NEG does  
b. Z'en duat.  
she.NEG does  
'A: Mary loved Pierre.  B: No, she didn't.'

7.2.5 Co-occurrence with adverbs

**DA'S NIE/TAJWEL**

(265) A: Karol kent de eerste 1000 cijfers van pi uit zijn hoofd.  
Mary knows the first 1000 digits of pi by heart.  
B: ?? Da's nie meer.  
that is not anymore  
***INTENDED READING***: 'A: Karol knows the first 1000 digits of pi by heart.  
B: He doesn't anymore.'

(266) A: Marie komt morgen.  
Mary comes tomorrow  
B: ?? Da's waarschijnlijk nie.  
that is probably not

**SDRs**

(267) A: Ik ben nie aansprakelijk voor die schade.  
I am not liable for that damage  
B: Da's wel, eerlijk gezegd.  
that is AFF honestly said  
'A: I am not liable for that damage.  B: Frankly, you are.'

7.2.6 Co-occurrence with *'yes' and 'no'*

**DA'S NIE/TAJWEL**

(272) A: Marie komt nie morgen.  
Mary comes not tomorrow  
B: ?? Ja, da's juwel.  
yes that is yes.AFF

**SDRs**

(273) A: Marie zie Pierre geïn.  
Mary sees Pierre gladly  
she.NEG does  
b. ?? Niege, z'en duat.  
that is not anymore  
'A: Mary loves Pierre.  B: No, she doesn't.'

7.2.7 Data summary and conclusion

**SHORT DO REPLIES**  
**DA'S NIE / DA'S (TAJWEL)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>only in non-embedded contradictory replies</th>
<th>only in non-embedded contradictory replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verb</td>
<td>daar ‘do’</td>
<td>zijn ‘be’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb can replace modals and auxiliaries</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb can be preceded by auxiliary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb can occur in the past tense</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurrence with adverbs</td>
<td>only very high adverbs</td>
<td>only very high adverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-occurrence with <em>'yes' and 'no'</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8: Comparison of SDRs and da’s nie / da’s (ja)wel**

7.3 The analysis: a step-by-step derivation of da’s nie/(ja)wel

(274) A: Marie gaut nie naar de film.  
Mary goes not to the movie  
B: Da's juwel.  
that is yes.AFF

'A: Mary doesn't go to the movies.  B: Yes, she does.'
(257) NegP
    Neg°  da

(258) NegP
    jawel
    Neg°  da

(259) Agr° P
    Agr°  Neg°
    jawel
    Neg°  da

(260) NegP
    da
    Agr°  Neg°
    jawel
    Neg°  t_o
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