Ellipsis in the Syntax of Rioplatense Spanish

Andrés Saab

IIF-SADAF-CONICET

Universidad de Buenos Aires

Table of Contents

Summary

Ellipsis is an operation of grammar that leaves part of a phrase unpronounced. Languages vary regarding the type of elliptical phrases they offer. Spanish presents a rich variety of ellipses in the sentential domain that are also attested in many other languages, even far typologically (sluicing, stripping, gapping, and fragment answers). In addition, the language also licenses elliptical constructions that are more restricted cross-linguistically. One of such constructions is TP-ellipsis with clitic-left dislocated remnants, a kind of ellipsis licensed through the polarity head in which the remnant (or remnants) is a contrastive clitic-left dislocated topic. The behavior of clitics within the ellipsis site is contrasted with doubling clitics in fragments answers and gapping in order to extract some conclusions regarding the nature of clitic doublings in Rioplatense Spanish. Unlike the great variety of TP-ellipses Spanish has, the language does not make use of lower sentential ellipses, in particular, the language lacks VP-ellipsis both with auxiliary and verb stranding. This absence of VP-ellipsis is correlated with the absence of VP-fronting. Other elliptical constructions in the sentential domain, modal ellipsis and PredP-ellipsis (i.e., the complement of copular verbs), correlate with the possibility of fronting the complement of the relevant modal or of the Predicate Phrase, although in the case of modal predicates the availability of ellipsis or fronting depends on that the modal predicates do not suffer restructuring. In the nominal domain, NP-ellipsis is the most productive ellipsis in Spanish. The construction shares all the properties of the so-called non-local anaphora (e.g., English VP-ellipsis or pseudo-gapping), i.e., it can occur long-distance, across the discourse and in a variety of embedded clauses, including syntactic islands. Nominal features like gender and number behave different under NP-ellipsis: whereas number features can mismatch with the number features in the antecedent, gender features must be identical in the ellipsis site and the

antecedent. Rioplatense Spanish presents new evidence that the case feature of the elided noun can vary with the case feature of the noun antecedent, providing support for the idea that nouns are born with genitive case.

1. Introduction

Ellipsis is an operation of grammar that leaves part of a phrase unpronounced. For a typical example like (1), the elliptical phrase *compró un libro de Borges* in the second conjunct is called the *E-site* (closed by angled brackets)[i], the polarity marker *también* is called *the licensor*, and the subject *Paula* is *the remnant*:

(1)   a.   Ana   compró   un   libro   de   Borges y   Paula también.

Ana   bought   a   book   of   Borges and   Paula too

'Ana bought a book by Borges and Paula did, too.'

b. [$_{YP}$ *Remnant*: Paula *Licensor*: también *E-site*: < [$_{XP}$ compró un libro de Borges] >]

Elliptical phrases must not be confused with other kinds of grammatical silences. In ellipsis, E-sites, as (1b) shows, have full articulated internal structure, and require linguistic antecedents, out of which the missing information is recovered. Other grammatical silences lack both properties. For instance, if in a bookstore, someone pointing out to a book by Borger says

(2)   Quiero   ese   de   Borges.

      want.1SG   that of   Borges

      'I want that one by Borges.'

the hearer will correctly understand that the nominal phrase is about certain Borges' book. In this

case, there is no linguistic antecedent and the missing information is recovered with an empty

indexical, without internal structure (or with less articulated structure). An empty indexical in

this case can be modeled as an empty proform, $\emptyset$ in (3), standing for a semantic property:

(3)   ese $\emptyset_N$ de   Borges

      that   of   Borges

Besides the superficial similarities, the analysis for the nominal phrase *ese de Borges* in (3) is

different from the analysis for a case of NP-ellipsis in examples like (4):

(4)   ese   libro   de   Cortázar   y   ese   <   libro   >   de   Borges

      that book   of   Cortázar   and   that   book   of   Borges

      'that book by Cortázar and that one by Borges'

In (4), the nominal gap is, strictly speaking, elliptical, which means that there is a full elided NP

(see §3). Ony in this case, we are in front of a case of ellipsis. To disambiguate between a true

case of ellipsis and a case of an empty indexical or, to use a more standard terminology, of deep

anaphora (Hankamer & Sag, 1976), the linguist has several diagnostic tools at her disposal. The

general strategy is to confirm or disconfirm if a given grammatical silence has internal structure, in which case we are in front of a true case of ellipsis. For instance, a remnant that survives an E-site and is syntactically connected to it is taken as strong evidence for ellipsis. In this respect, consider a case of TP-ellipsis with a clitic left dislocated topic as remnant (see §2):

(5)   Vi   a   Ana,   pero   a   Paula, no.

        saw.1SG   DOM Ana   but   DOM Paula not

        'I saw Ana, but Paula, I did not.'

        E-site: <   la   vi $t_{a\ Paula}$ >

                 CL.ACC.F.3SG saw.1SG

The remnant *a Paula* is generated within the E-site in the direct object position, position from which it receives the differential object marker *a* 'to' and its theta role. Compare with an overt deep anaphora like *hacerlo* 'do it', which has no internal structure (Saab, 2010a). The proform can be used as an answer to the question in (6A), whenever it replaces the entire verbal phrase.

(6)   A.   Criticaste   a   Ana?

             criticized.2SG DOM   Ana

             'Did you criticize Ana?'

        B: Sí,   lo   hice.

             yes   it   did.1SG

             'Yes, I did.'

However, unlike a true case of ellipsis like (5), extraction from the deep anaphora is banned:

(7) A. A   quién   criticaste?

         DOM   who   criticized.2SG

         'Who did you criticize?'

    B: * A   Ana   lo   hice.

         DOM   Ana   it   did.1SG

         Intended: 'Ana, I did.'

Providing a short answer as in (8) is, instead, perfectly licit, showing that short answers are a type of ellipsis with internal structure:

(8) B': A   ANA.

         DOM   Ana

         'ANA.'

    E-site: <   critiqué $t_{a\ Ana}$>

             criticized.1SG

In sum, the examples in (5) and (8) contain E-sites fully articulated as their non-elliptical counterparts. These elliptical phenomena are the focus of the present article, in which many of the most characteristic ellipses that the grammar of Spanish offers are reviewed, with special reference to Rioplatense Spanish, an Argentinian dialect. The language is spoken in the Buenos Aires province, the city of Buenos Aires, the provinces of Santa Fe, Entre Ríos, La Pampa,

colonized zones of la Patagonia by modern population coming from Buenos Aires, and, finally, important zones of Uruguay. Typologically speaking, the dialect does not present any particular difference with most Spanish dialects. It is essentially a Romance prodrop language with canonical SVO order. Yet, there are many microparametric particularities at each level of linguistic analysis: phonetic, phonological, morphological and syntactic. For instance, the pronominal system has its own characteristics, the most prominent being its own addressee system (the so-called *voseo* system, in which the extended Peninsular pronoun for the second person singular *tú* 'you' is replaced by *vos* 'you'), its accusative clitic system, which distinguishes gender and number in the third person slot (e.g., *lo* 'him', *los* 'them.M.3PL', *la* 'her', *las* 'them.F.3PL') without any form of *leísmo*, typical in other varieties, and, finally, its extended system of accusative clitic doubling, which applies not only to pronominal forms, as in most dialects, but also to non-pronominal direct objects, in particular, the differentially marked ones (e.g., <u>la vi</u> <u>a Ana</u> *lit.* 'CL.ACC.F.3SG saw.1SG DOM Ana'). In the nominal domain, there are many lexical innovations, as well, involving, for instance, the quantificational system of the nominal phrase. The way in which these dialectal properties interact with different kinds of ellipsis, both in the sentential and nominal domains, is extremely informative regarding the internal structure of the relevant innovative constructions. Put differently, ellipsis can be used as a powerful tool to inquiry into the underlying syntax of many grammatical "constructions". In this article, the nature of clitics and some aspects of the internal structure of nominals in Rioplatense Spanish are revisited under the light of ellipsis.

In §2, different ellipses available in the sentential domains are presented, namely, TP-ellipsis with clitic left dislocated remnants, modal ellipsis, and predicate ellipsis with copular verbs. The

nature of Rioplatense clitic doubling is also analyzed, in particular, its behavior under fragment answers and gapping, which shows a set of distinctive properties that distinguish these clitics from the behavior of pronominal clitics in other instances of TP-ellipsis. In §3, the syntactic distribution of Spanish NP-ellipsis is discussed together with the type of identity effects it triggers. Some instances of genitive NP-ellipsis licensed by certain quantificational modifiers in Rioplatense Spanish are introduced and briefly discussed, as well.

2. Ellipsis in the sentential domain

The structure of a sentence contains at least the following projections of lexical and functional categories:

(9) $[_{CP}$ C^0 $[_{TP}$ T^0 $[_{VP}$ V^0 $]$ $]$ $]$

Any of these categories can be further decomposed. For instance, the verbal layer contains at least a root (written as $\sqrt{}^0$), a verbal categorizer v^0 (under some assumptions), and a functional projection encoding voice features (the so-called VoiceP). In turn, the inflectional layer contains, in addition to the T(ense) projection represented in (9), other categories for encoding features like grammatical aspect or mood. Finally, the C layer connects grammar and discourse through heads like Topic, Focus or Σ (for polarity features). For the purposes of this article, new categories will be added and commented only when necessary.

Now, Spanish shows a rich variety of ellipsis in the sentential domain, whose differences among each other essentially reduce, among other factors, to (i) the size of the elided constituent, (ii) the

type of remnants that they license, (iii) their syntactic distribution in the sentence, (iv) their tolerance to different kind of identity mismatches with their corresponding linguistic antecedents, and (v) their semantic and discourse conditions. With respect to the size of the E-site, most Spanish ellipses are ellipsis of the inflectional layer, called here TP-ellipsis, essentially differentiated among them for the type of remnant they license. Sluicing (10), stripping (11) and fragment answers (12) are all different instances of TP-ellipsis. Simplified E-sites are provided below each example:

(10)   <u>Sluicing</u>:

Ana   vio   a   alguien,   pero   no   sé   a   quién.

Ana   saw.1SG   DOM   someone   but   not   know.1SG   DOM   who

'Ana saw someone, but I don't know who.'

E-site: [$_{CP}$ a quién <[$_{TP}$ vio $t_{a\ quién}$]>]

(11)   <u>Stripping</u>:

Vi   a   Ana,   pero   no   a   Paula.

saw.1SG   DOM   Ana   but   not   DOM   Paula

'I saw Ana, but not Paula.'

E-site: [$_{FocP}$ no a Paula <[$_{TP}$ vi $t_{a\ Paula}$]>]

(12)   <u>Fragment answers</u>:

A.   A   quién   viste?

       DOM   who   saw.2SG

'Who did you see?'

B: A   Ana.

       DOM   Ana

       'Ana'

E-site: [$_{FocP}$ A Ana <[$_{TP}$ vi $t_{a\ Ana}$]>]

In sluicing, the E-site corresponds to the TP and the remnant corresponds to a *wh*-element that is extracted from the E-site itself. The entire clause is interpreted as an indirect interrogative sentence. In stripping, there is also TP-ellipsis, but the remnant introduces some sort of contrast with its correlate in the antecedent. There is also polarity focus involved in the interpretation of the entire sentence. Fragments like (12B) introduce information focus, but depending on the discourse, they can also introduce corrective focus. There is evidence that the elided category is also a TP (Merchant, 2004). These ellipses are broadly attested in many languages, even distant from a typological point of view. Yet, Spanish, and related Romance languages, has a more distinctive type of TP-ellipsis, one in which the remnant is at least a clitic left dislocated topic followed by a polarity marker.

(13) a. Ana   vio   a   María, pero   a   Paula *no.*

          Ana   saw   DOM   María but   DOM   Paula not

          'Ana saw María, but Paula, she didn't.'

      b. Ana   vio   a   María, y   a   Paula *también.*

          Ana   saw   DOM   María and   DOM   Paula too

          'Ana saw María, and Paula, she did, too.'

	c.	Ana	no	vio	a	María, pero	a	Susana *sí.*
		Ana	not	saw	DOM	María but	DOM	Susana yes

'Ana saw María, but Susana, she does.'

	d.	Ana	no	vio	a	María, y	a	Paula *tampoco.*
		Ana	not	saw	DOM	María y	DOM	Paula neither

'Ana didn't see María and Paula, she didn't, either.'

This kind of ellipsis will be analyzed with some detail in §2.1 as a paradigmatic instance of TP-ellipsis in Spanish. The construction is briefly compared to a type of fragment answer only to show why Rioplatense clitic doubling must be distinguished from clitic left dislocated constructions. In §2.2, lower ellipses in the sentential domain are discussed. On the one hand, the absence of VP-ellipsis, attested in English but also in other Romance languages like Portuguese, is correlated with the absence of VP-fronting. Now, Rioplatense Spanish, as most Spanish dialects, does have modal ellipsis with certain modal auxiliaries and PredP-ellipsis with true copular predicates, a type of low verbal ellipsis, as well.

2.1. Spanish TP-ellipsis and Clitic Left Dislocation

2.1.1. The syntactic structure of Spanish TP-ellipsis with CLLD remnants

As already observed, all Spanish dialects make use of a type of sentential ellipsis that consists of (i) ellipsis of the TP projection, and (ii) clitic-left dislocated topics as remnants.[ii] For instance, given a non-elliptical sentence like (14a), the elliptical alternative in (14b) is perfectly licit:

(14)	a.	La	critiqué	a	Ana, pero	a	Paula	no

| | CL.ACC.F.3SG | criticized | DOM | Ana | but | DOM | Paula | not |

la   critiqué.

CL.ACC.F.3SG criticized

'I criticized Ana, but Paula, I didn't criticize her.'

b.   La   critiqué   a   Ana,   pero   a   Paula   no.

CL.ACC.F.3SG criticized   DOM   Ana   but   DOM   Paula   not

'I criticized Ana, but Paula, I didn't.'

According to an accepted analysis, the category affected by ellipsis is at least the entire TP, with the polarity head (negative in this case) as the licensor, and a contrastive topic as the remnant:

(15)   [ΣP a Paula [Σ' no *E-site*: <[TP la critiqué]>]]

The paradigm in (13) shows that any polarity marker licenses this type of ellipsis. As for the remnants, their distribution parallels the distribution of CLLD topics. On the one hand, multiple topic fronting is allowed in non-elliptical CLLD contexts:

(16)   A   Ana,   el   libro,   se   lo   di   ayer.

DOM   Ana   the   book   CL.DAT.3SG   CL.ACC.M.3SG   gave.1SG   yesterday

'Ana, this book, I gave it to her yesterday.'

And multiple fronting is perfectly licit in elliptical environments, as well (López, 1999):

(17) A   Ana,   el   libro,   se   lo   di   ayer,

DOM Ana   the   book   CL.DAT.3SG   CL.ACC.M.3SG   gave.1SG   yesterday

pero   a   Paula, la   revista,   no.

but   DOM   Paula   the   magazine   not

'Ana, this book, I gave it to her yesterday, but Paula, the magazine, I didn't.'

On the other hand, long-distance extraction is allowed both in elliptical and non-elliptical contexts, whenever well-known locality conditions are met. For instance, long extraction from a selected embedded clause is grammatical with and without ellipsis. Thus, the answer in (18B) is grammatical with and without angled brackets after the polarity item:

(18) A: Ana   dijo   que   no   leyó   el   libro   de   Borges?

Ana   said   that   not   read   the   book   of   Borges

'Did Ana say that she didn't read the book by Borges?'

B: Sí,   y   el   libro   de   Cortázar   también

yes   and   the   book   of   Cortázar   also

<   dijo   que   no   lo   leyó   >.

said   that   not   CL.ACC.M.3SG   read

'Yes, and the book by Cortazar, she did too (say that she did not read it).'

Yet, extraction out of an adjunct island is impossible both in elliptical and non-elliptical contexts:

(19) A: Ana   se   enojó   porque   no   leíste

          Ana   CL.REFL   got.angry   because   not   read.2SG

          el   libro   de   Borges?

          the   book   of   Borges

          'Did Ana get angry because you didn't read the book by Borges?'

      B: *Sí,   y   el   libro   de   Cortazar   también

          yes   and   the   book   of   Cortazar   also

          <   se   enojó   porque   no   lo

                 CL.REFL   got.angry   because   not   CL.ACC.M.3SG

          leí   >.

          read.1SG

      Intended: 'Yes, and the book by Cortazar, she got angry because I didn't read it, too.'

2.1.2. Identity effects

This type of TP-ellipsis gives rise to certain identity mismatches, but not to others. For instance, the E-site must be identical to its antecedent in tense features. In the example (20), the first conjunct in past tense cannot serve as a licit antecedent for the E-site in the future tense in the second conjunct:

(20) *Ana   estudió todo   el   día   ayer,   y   mañana   también.

      Ana   studied all   the   day   yesterday   and   tomorrow   too

      Intended: 'Ana studied the entire day yesterday and tomorrow she will, too.'

      E-site: <   va   a   estudiar   todo   el   día   >

		goes	to	study		all	the	day

Similarly, a clause in the future cannot serve as a licit antecedent for an E-site in the past:

(21)　A:　Ana　va　a　estudiar　todo　el　día　mañana.

Ana　goes　to　study.INF　all　the　day　tomorrow

'Ana will study the entire day tomorrow.'

　　　B:　*Ayer　también?

yesterday　too

E-site: <　estudió　todo　el　día　>

studied　all　the　day

Intended: 'Did she study the entire day yesterday, too?'

Unlike tense, certain mood mismatches are allowed. For instance, subjunctive clauses selected by epistemic predicates can be subject to TP-ellipsis of the relevant type:

(22)　Ana　no　viene　pero　es　posible　que　Paula　sí

Ana　not　comes.IND　but　is　possible　that　Paula　yes

'Ana does not come, but it is possible that Paula does.'

E-site: <　venga　>

comes.SUBJ

And the reverse pattern is also permitted:

(23) Es   posible   que   Paula venga   pero creo   que Ana no.

     is   possible   that Paula comes.SUBJ but   believe.1SG that Ana not

     'It is possible that Paula comes but I believe that Ana doesn't.'

     E-site: <   viene >

                    comes.IND

These Spanish facts cast doubts on the idea that *all* material above the VoiceP can trigger ellipsis

mismatches (Rudin, 2019).[iii] In principle, both well-known semantic and syntactic theories of

identity in ellipsis can capture the tense / mood mismatches. If as Merchant (2001) has claimed,

identity in ellipsis only requires mutual entailment between the E-site and its antecedent, the

tense mismatches follow as an entailment failure, since a past proposition does not entail a future

one and vice versa. This is not the case when grammatical mood is involved. If grammatical

mood is a pure morphosyntactic feature of the Spanish grammar required by morphological well-

formedness conditions, then mutual entailment is met at the semantic level regardless any mood

distinction at the PF component. As for syntactic approaches, identity in ellipsis requires identity

of syntactic-semantic features, consequently, tense mismatches are correctly ruled out when the

size of the E-site contains at least a TP. On this account, again, pure morphological features, as

grammatical mood, are irrelevant for the identity calculus.

Oral narratives might serve to distinguish both types of approaches (Saab, 2008, 2016). As is

well-known, in Spanish an oral narrative can be done in the so-called historical present tense, as

in (24), or in the formal past, as in (25). There is no semantic difference between both discourses,

in the sense that both are mutually entailed. The difference is stylistic and must be accounted for in pragmatic terms.

(24) ¡Adiviná   qué   me   pasó   ayer!
     guess   what   me   happened   yesterday

     Estoy   *tomando*   una   cervecita   en   el   bar   y
     am.1SG   drinking   a   beer   in   the   bar   and

     entonces   *veo*   a   mi   mujer   besándose   con
     then   see.1SG   DOM   my   wife   kissing   with

     mi   mejor   amigo.
     my   best   friend

'Guess what happened to me yesterday! I am drinking a beer in the bar and then I see my wife kissing my best friend.'

(25) ¡Adiviná   qué   me   pasó   ayer!
     guess   what   me   happened   yesterday

     Estaba   *tomando*   una   cervecita   en   el   bar   y
     was.1SG   drinking   a   beer   in   the   bar   and

     entonces   *vi*   a   mi   mujer   besándose   con
     then   saw.1SG   DOM   my   wife   kissing   with

     mi   mejor   amigo.
     my   best   friend

'Guess what happened to me yesterday! I was drinking a beer in the bar and then I saw my wife kissing my best friend.'

An understudied treat of oral narratives in the historical present is that they cannot be interrupted by another speaker with the historical present, only with the formal tense, as the example in (26) shows (Saab 2008, 2016):

(26)　A:　　¡Adiviná　　qué　me　pasó　　　ayer!

　　　　　　guess　　　　what　me　happened　yesterday

　　　　　Estoy　tomando　una　cervecita　en　el　bar...

　　　　　am.1SG　drinking　a　beer　　in　the　bar

　　　'Guess what happened to me yesterday. I am drinking a beer in the bar…'

　　　B:　　¡Qué　casualidad!　ayer　　　yo　también

　　　　　what　coincidence　yesterday　I　too

　　　　　estaba tomando　una　cervecita　en　el　bar

　　　　　was　drinking　a　beer　　in　the　bar.

　　　'What a coincidence! Yesterday, I was also drinking a beer in the bar.'

　　　B':　　#¡Qué casualidad!　ayer　　　yo　también

　　　　　what　coincidence　yesterday　I　too

　　　　　estoy　tomando　una　cervecita　en　el　bar.

　　　　　am　drinking　a　beer　　in　the　bar

　　　'#What a coincidence! Yesterday, I am also drinking a beer in the bar.'

Now, an instance of TP-ellipsis as a reply to (26A) does not give good results. This is because the use of the past tense in the E-site is forbidden for the identity condition on ellipsis and the use of the historical present is ruled out as pragmatically infelicitous.

(27) A: *¡Adiviná   qué   me   pasó   ayer!*

               guess   what   me   happened   yesterday

               Estoy   tomando   una   cervecita   en   el   bar…

               am.1SG   drinking   a   beer   in   the   bar

'Guess what happened to me yesterday. I am drinking a beer in the bar…'

    B: *¡Qué   casualidad!* #Yo   también.

          what   coincidence   I   too

    '#What a coincidence! Me too.'

E-site #1: *<*estaba   tomando   una   cervecita   en   el   bar* >

               was   drinking   a   beer   in   the   bar

E-site #2: #<*estoy   tomando   una   cervecita   en   el   bar* >

               am   drinking   a   beer   in   the   bar

Therefore, the historical present facts provide a crucial piece of evidence in favor of a theory of identity in ellipsis formulated in syntactic terms.

2.1.3. Clitic Doubling in Rioplatense Spanish: interactions with ellipsis

Another relevant identity mismatch concerns to inflectional differences between the clitics that duplicates the left dislocated topics in the antecedent and the E-site. The inflectional information

that clitics encode can vary between antecedent and E-site in any direction: gender, number or

person (only illustrated with first person plural):

(28) a. A   Juan, *lo*   desaprobé,   pero   a   Ana   no

DOM   Juan   CL.ACC.M.3SG failed.1SG   but   DOM   Ana   not

<[*la*   desaprobé]>.

CL.ACC.M.3SG failed.1SG

'Juan, I failed him, but Ana, I didn't.'

b. A   Ana, *la*   desaprobé,   pero   a   Juan   no

DOM   Ana   CL.ACC.F.3SG failed.1SG   but   DOM   Juan   not

<[*lo*   desaprobé]>.

CL.ACC.F.3SG failed.1SG

'Ana, I failed him, but Juan, I didn't.'

c. A   las   chicas, *las*   desaprobé,   pero

DOM   the   girls   CL.ACC.F.3PL failed.1SG   but

a   Juan   no   <[*lo*   desaprobé]>.

DOM   Juan   not   CL.ACC.M.3SG failed.1SG

'The girls, I failed them, but Juan, I didn't.'

d. A   Juan, *lo*   desaprobé,   pero

DOM   Juan   CL.ACC.M.3SG failed.1SG   but

a   las   chicas no   <[*las*   desaprobé]>.

DOM   the   girls   not   CL.ACC.F.3PL failed.1SG

'Juan, I failed him, but the girls, I didn't.'

e. A   nosotros   *nos*   desaprobaron, pero

DOM   we   CL.ACC.1PL   failed.3PL   but

a   Juan   no <[*lo*   desaprobaron]>.

DOM   Juan   not   CL.ACC.M.3SG failed.3PL

'Us, they failed us, but Juan, they didn't.'

f. A   Juan   *lo*   desaprobaron, pero

DOM   Juan   CL.ACC.M.3SG failed.3PL   but

a   nosotros   no <[*nos*   desaprobaron]>.

DOM   we   not   CL.ACC.1PL   failed.3PL

'Juan, they failed him, but us, they didn't.'

This is consistent with a well-known observation, namely that features of bound pronouns do not count for ellipsis resolution. But the differences between antecedents and E-sites can be even more extreme. The examples in (28) contain variables in the antecedents as correlates of the variables in the E-sites. Yet, non-variables can also serve as correlates. In the example in (29), the full direct object *a Juan* serves as correlates for the clitic *la*.

(29) Desaprobé   *a*   *Juan*   pero   a   Ana   no.

failed.1SG   DOM   Juan   but   DOM   Ana   not

'I failed Juan, but Ana, I did not.'

E-site: <   *la*   desaprobé   >

CL.ACC.F.3SG failed.1SG

In sum, clitics in CLLDs behave as pronominal variables, and as such, they can mismatch with other variables or non-variables whenever they are elided. This behavior resembles the behavior of traces of *wh*-movement in sluicing, which can also mismatch with variables and non-variables in the antecedent.

Now, Rioplatense Spanish is a language with productive clitic doubling (CD) of accusative direct objects. As all Spanish dialects, the dialect has mandatory clitic doubling of pronominal objects:[iv]

(30)   a.   Ana   me   vio   a   mí.

                 Ana   CL.ACC.1SG   saw   DOM   me

                 'Ana saw me.'

       b.   Ana   te   vio   a   vos.

                 Ana   CL.ACC.2SG   saw   DOM   you

                 'Ana saw you.'

       c.   Ana   lo/la   vio   a   él   /   ella.

                 Ana   CL.ACC.M.3SG / CL.ACC.F.3SG saw   DOM   he   /   she

                 'Ana saw him/her.'

       d.   Ana   nos   vio   a   nosotros/nosotras.

                 Ana   CL.ACC.1PL   saw   DOM   we.M/we.F

                 'Ana saw us.'

       f.   Ana los/las   vio   a   ustedes.

                 Ana   CL.ACC.M.3PL/CL.ACC.F.3PL   saw   DOM   you

'Ana saw you.'

g.   Ana los/las   vio   a   ellos/ellas.

Ana   CL.ACC.M.3PL/CL.ACC.F.3PL   saw   DOM   they.M/they.F

'Ana saw them.'

Now, unlike many other dialects, Rioplatense Spanish also permits optional doubling of non-pronominal direct objects whenever those objects are differentially marked through the marker *a* 'to':

(31)   a.   Ana   (la   )   vio   a   Paula.

Ana   CL.ACC.F.3SG saw   DOM Paula

'Ana saw Paula.'

b.   Ana   (lo   )   desaprobó   a   su

Ana   CL.ACC.M.3SG failed   DOM her

estudiante   preferido.

student   preferred

'Ana failed her preferred student.'

The nature of clitics in clitic doubling constructions is under debate, with two analytic options in the dispute: (i) they are pronominal variables or (ii) they are pure agreement markers. Ellipsis can help to distinguish both options. Under the first view, the expectation is that doubled clitics in CD behaves as clitics in CLLD in ellipsis environments. This is not the case, yet. While it is true that there are commonalities, there are also crucial differences that point out for an analysis

along the lines of option (ii), i.e., as pure agreement markers. The behavior of clitic doubling under ellipsis can be controlled for in fragment answers, a kind of TP-ellipsis with focused fronted remnants (Merchant, 2004).

(32) A. A   quién   viste?

DOM   who   saw.2SG

'Who did you see?'

B: A   Ana.

DOM   Ana

'Ana'

[cf. example (12)]

Now, in Rioplatense Spanish there are also two non-elliptical licit answers, one with CD and another one without.

(33) B': A   Ana   vi.

DOM   Ana   saw.1SG

B'': A   ANA   la   vi.

DOM   Ana   CL.ACC.F.3SG saw.1SG

'Ana, I saw her.'

Therefore, for a short answer like (32B), there are two E-sites in competition, one with CD and another one without:

(34)   a. *E-site #1*: [$_{FocP}$ A ANA <[$_{TP}$ vi $t_{a\ Ana}$]>]

        b. *E-site #2*: [$_{FocP}$ A ANA <[$_{TP}$ *la* vi $t_{a\ Ana}$]>]

Note now that, if an E-site like (34b) is licit, then there is *prima facie* the possibility of having clitic mismatches like those (28). This seems to be correct. Consider a corrective fragment answer like (35B):

(35)   A.   La   viste   a   ANA?

               CL.ACC.F.3SG   saw.2SG   DOM   Ana

               'Who did you see?'

      B: No,   a   CARLOS.

               not   DOM   Carlos

               'Not, CARLOS.'

Yet, unlike the examples in (28) in which the presence of the clitic is mandatory, in (35), there is a priori no reason to rule out any of the two possible E-sites in (36):

(36)   a. E-site #1: [$_{FocP}$ A CARLOS <[$_{TP}$ vi $t_{a\ Carlos}$]>]

        b. E-site #2: [$_{FocP}$ A CARLOS <[$_{TP}$ *lo* vi $t_{a\ Carlos}$]>]

Two different empirical considerations point out to the conclusion that the E-site #2 is illicit. Concretely, for all purposes, the E-site of a short answer behaves as if clitic doubling within it

were impossible. The first piece of evidence involves island repair under CD. For instance,

subject island can be repaired by CD under focus fronting. Consider in this respect the two non-

elliptical answers in (37):

(37) A: Crees   que   desaprobar(la)   a   Ana

           believe.2SG   that   fail.INF-(CL.ACC.F.SG) DOM   Ana

           va   a   causar   un escándalo?

           goes   to   cause.INF   a   scandal

           'Do you believe that to fail Ana will cause a scandal?'

      B: No,   A   PAULA   creo   que   [desaprobar*la*]

           not   DOM   Paula   believe.1SG   that   fail.INF-CL.ACC.F.3SG

           va   a   causar   un   escándalo.

           goes   to   cause.INF a   scandal

      B': * No,   A   PAULA   creo   que   [desaprobar   *t*]

           not   DOM   Paula   believe.1SG   that   fail.INF

           va   a   causar   un   escándalo.

           goes   to   cause.INF a   scandal

      Intended: 'No, I believe that failing PAULA will cause a scandal.'

As is clear, answering without clitic doubling, as in (37B'), triggers an island effect. In this

scenario, short answers behave exactly as the non-CD answer, showing that the clitic is not

present in the E-site:

(38) A: Crees   que   desaprobar(*la*)   a   Ana

          believe.2SG   that   fail.INF-(CL.ACC.F.3SG)   DOM   Ana

          va   a   causar   un   escándalo?

          goes   to   cause.INF   a   scandal

          'Do you believe that to fail Ana will cause a scandal?'

      B: *   No,   A   PAULA.

               not   DOM   Paula

          Intended: 'Not, PAULA'

This is not the case when clitics in CLLD are considered, which does not trigger any island effect in the same syntactic environment:

(39) A   Ana,   desaprobar*la*   va   a   causar   un

      DOM   ANA   fail.INF-CL.ACC.F.3SG   goes   to   cause.INF   a

      escándalo   y   a   Paula, también.

      scandal   and   DOM   Paula too

      'Ana, to fail her will cause a scandal and Paula, it will, too.'

The second piece of evidence has to do with Weak Crossover Effects (WCO). CD repairs WCO effects. Thus, in (40a), moving the direct object by focus movement and crossing a possessive pronoun does not block the possibility of having coreference between the possessive pronoun and the direct object. This contrasts with (40b), in which there is a clear WCO effect produced by the movement of the direct object across the possessive pronoun (Saab & Zdrojewski, 2012).

(40) a.   A   ANA$_i$ la$_i$ criticó   su$_i$ madre.

              DOM   Ana   CL.ACC.F.3SG criticized   her   mother

      b. ?* A   ANA$_i$ criticó   su$_i$ madre.

              DOM   Ana   criticized   her   mother

      'Her mother criticized ANA.'

Fragment answers behave again as if CD was not applied within the E-site:

(41) A: Su$_i$ madre la$_i$ criticó   A   ANA$_i$?

              her   mother CL.ACC.F.3SG criticized   DOM   Ana

              'Did her mother criticized ANA?'

      B: ?* No,   A   PAULA$_i$.

              not,   DOM   Paula

              'Not, PAULA.'

              E-site: <criticó t_i su$_i$ madre>

Clitic left dislocated topics, instead, behave the same with and without TP-ellipsis. In an example like (42), there is no WCO effect in the antecedent or the E-site.

(42) A   Ana$_i$ la$_i$ criticó   su$_i$ madre, pero a   Paula no.

      DOM   ANA   CL.ACC.F.3SG criticized   her   mother but   DOM   Paula not

      'Ana$_i$, her$_i$ mother criticized, but Paula$_i$, her$_i$ mother does not.'

E-site: <la criticó t_i su$_i$ madre>

The reasonable conclusion is, then, that CD does not apply within E-sites.

This analysis can be extended to clitic mismatches under gapping. Gapping is a sort of TP-ellipsis in which the remnants generated within the E-site must move to some left peripheral position, perhaps a focus position (Saab, 2008).[v] As Depiante (2004b) has shown, gapping with CD triggers clitic mismatches. Thus, in the examples in (43) all the ellipses are licit when the clitics mismatch in gender features in the antecedent and the E-site:[vi]

(43) a. Juan *la*   vio   a   Ana   y   Paula a   Carlos.

Juan CL.ACC.F.3SG saw   DOM Ana   and Paula DOM Carlos

'Juan saw Ana and Paula, Carlos.'

b. Juan *lo*   vio   a   Carlos y   Paula a   Ana.

Juan CL.ACC.M.3SG saw   DOM Carlos and Paula DOM Ana

'Juan saw Carlos and Paula, Ana.'

E-site: <t_{Paula} criticó t_{Ana} >

In sum, clitics in E-sites give rise to two different types of identity mismatches: (i) in TP-ellipsis with clitic left dislocated remnants, the clitics are pronominal variables and, as such, can trigger identity mismatches between antecedents and E-sites (cf. (28)), and (ii) in fragment answers or gapping, there is no doubling clitics in the E-sites, which gives rise to an illusory clitic mismatch with the clitic in the antecedent (cf. (35) for fragment answers and (43) for gapping).

2.2. (Im)possible verbal ellipses

2.2.1. No VP-ellipsis

As other Romance languages, Spanish lacks verbal ellipses of the auxiliary stranding type. English or Portuguese are languages in which this low ellipsis is particularly productive. Thus, the ungrammatical sentence in (44) has the perfectly grammatical English counterpart in (46) (Zagona, 1982, 1988, and Lobeck, 1995):

(44) *   Ana   había   trabajado   duro   y   Paula había, también.

           Ana   had   worked   hard   and   Paula had   too.

(45)   Anne had worked hard, and Pauline had, too.

And the same good result obtains in Portuguese, as the following Brazilian Portuguese example shows:

(46)   A   Ana   tinha   trabalhado   muito e   a   Paula tinha também.

         the   Ana   had   worked   a-lot and   the   Paula had   too

It is worth mentioning that the phenomenon is not restricted to coordinate structures. Thus, VP-ellipsis can operate across the discourse. In the English example in (47), the ellipsis in (47B) serves as a licit reply for speaker A's question:

(47)   A: Had Ana worked hard?

B: Yes, she had.

Methodologically, it is important to investigate whether a given type of ellipsis is allowed both in coordinate and relevant across-the-discourse environments or only one environment is allowed. For instance, some ellipses are facilitated as replies like (47B) in which there is polarity focus involved, but not in coordinate structures (see §2.2.3).

The impossibility of auxiliary stranding VP-ellipsis in Spanish is not a fortuitous lexical property of some auxiliaries; the ban generalizes to the entire set of true auxiliaries (e.g., *haber* 'to have', *ser* 'to be', *ir* 'to go', and so on). The examples in (48) and (49) contain illicit VP-ellipses both in coordinate structure and focus polarity replies for the passive auxiliary *ser* 'to be', and the examples in (50) and (51), for the future auxiliary *ir* 'to go':

(50) a. * Ana   fue   criticada   y   Paula fue   también.

             Ana   was   criticized   and   Paula was   too

      Intended: 'Ana was criticized and Paula was, too.'

(51) A: Ana   fue   criticada?

             Ana   was   criticized

      'Was Ana criticized?

      B: *   Sí,   FUE.

             yes   was

      Intended: 'Yes, she was.'

(52) Ana   va   a   ir   al   cine   y   Paula va,   también.

Ana goes to go to.the cinema and Paula goes too

Intended: 'Ana will go to the cinema and Paula will, too.'

(53)   A: Ana   va   a   ir   al   cine?

Ana goes to go to.the cinema

'Will Ana go to the cinema?

B: * Sí, VA.

yes goes

Intended: 'Yes, she will.'

Now, there is another syntactic environment to consider. An important common assumption in Romance syntax is that main verbs move to the T head. A piece of evidence in favor of such an approach is that some adverbs always follow the verb, a plausible argument in favor of the idea that the verb must vacate its original merge position within the VP:

(54)   Juan   trabaja [$_{VP}$ seguido   aquí *t*].

Juan works often here

'Juan often works here.'

As the English translation shows, in this language the relative order is Adv-V. Arguably, the distinction can be derived if in Spanish, but not in English, the verb moves outside the VP. Roughly, V to T movement is analyzed as in (55):

(55)   [$_{CP}$ C^0 [$_{TP}$ V^0+T^0 [$_{VP}$ … t_V …]]]

Now, a subtype of VP-ellipsis makes use of this output giving rise to a V-stranding VP-ellipsis configuration, in which the verb moves to T and the VP is elided (Goldberg, 2005). Obviously, English main verbs cannot give rise to this variety of ellipsis, since there is no main verb raising in the language. Yet, Portuguese does instantiate the construction. Consider the example (56B):

(56)   A: Você   deu   o   livro   pra   Ana?
            you   gave   the   book   to.the Ana
            'Did you give the book to Ana?'
       B: Dei,   sim.
            gave.1PL   yes
            'Yes, I did.'

A plausible E-site is provided in (57), with the verb located outside the elided VP:

(57) $[_{CP}$ C^0 $[_{TP}$ dei $<[_{VP} \ldots t_V \ldots]>$]]

As observed, Spanish lacks V-stranding VP-ellipsis:

(58)   A: Le   diste   el   libro   a   Ana?
            CL.DAT.2SG   gave   the   book   to   Ana
            'Did you give the book to Ana.'
       B: *(Le)   DI,   sí.
            CL.DAT.3SG   gave.1SG   yes

'Yes, I did.'

The configurations in (59a) and (59b) are, then, illicit outputs in the grammar of Spanish:

(59)   a. <u>No Aux-stranding VP-ellipsis</u>: * $[_{CP}$ C^0 $[_{TP}$ AUX+T^0 **<u>E-site</u>: < $[_{vP}$ ... V^0 ...] >**]]

       b. <u>No V-stranding VP-ellipsis</u>: * $[_{CP}$ C^0 $[_{TP}$ V^0+T^0 **<u>E-site</u>: < $[_{vP}$ ... t_V ...] >**]]

Putting together the empirical results so far, the generalization is that Spanish has a vast variety of TP-ellipses but lacks the two basic kinds of VP-ellipses attested in languages like Portuguese. There is no obvious reason why this is the situation in the two relevant Romance languages and beyond. Martins (1994) linked the availability of VP-ellipsis in European Portuguese to the formal properties of the polarity head. According to her, Romance languages in which the polarity is "strong" license VP-ellipsis.[vii] For instance, in affirmative sentences in European Portuguese, polarity is strong and requires that the verb moves from its base position to the polarity position through head movement, as illustrated in the simplified representation in (60) (Σ = polarity head).

(60) $[_{\Sigma P}$ $[_T$ V+T]+$\Sigma_{[strong]}$ $[_{TP}$ t_T $[_{VP}$ t_V]]]

The verbal movement to such a high position has two consequences: (i) enclisis, and (ii) the licensing of ellipsis.

(61)   *European Portuguese*:

a. *   Lhe   deste   o   libro?   *proclisis

     CL.DAT.3SG   gave.2SG   the   book

b.   Deste-lhe   o   libro?   enclisis

     gave.2SG- CL.DAT.3SG the   book

     'Did you give him/her the book?'

c.   Sim,   dei.   verbal ellipsis

     yes,   gave.1SG

     'Yes, I did.'

d.   Sim,   dei-lho.

     yes,   gave.1SG-CL.DAT.3SG.CL.ACC.3SG

     'Yes, I gave it to him/her.'

[Martins 1994: 174]

Enclisis, i.e., the ordering V-CL, is a direct consequence of the verb crossing the clitic in its way to Σ, the visible result of a Σ head with strong features. According to Martins, whenever this is the case, ellipsis is licensed. Yet, contra Martins' expectations, Spanish has enclisis in imperative sentences, but not ellipsis (Silva, 2023).

(62)   A: Quiero   comprarle   ese   libro   a   Ana.

         want.1SG   buy.INF.CL.DAT.3SG   that   book   to   Ana

  B: *   Comprá.

        buy.IMP

  B':   Compráselo.

buy.IMP-CL.DAT-CL.ACC.3SG

'Buy it to her.'

A more robust correlation is observed with respect to the availability of XP-movement. For instance, a VP-ellipsis language like English also has VP-fronting, an impossible construction in Spanish (Saab, 2022):

(63)   a. Anne had read the book and Pauline had, too.

       b. and read the book, Pauline had.

(64) a. *   Ana   había leído el   libro y   Paula también   había.

              Ana   had   read the   book and Paula also   had

     b. *   y   leído el   libro, Paula había.

              And   read   the   book, Paula had

For the two cases to look at in §2.2.2 and §2.2.3, this correlation between ellipsis and movement will be used to certificate whether ellipsis is, indeed, a licit option.[viii]

2.2.2. Modal ellipsis

Consider the case of the modal *poder* 'can'. As is well-known, this verb allows for the clitic to adjoin to the modal itself (as a proclitic) or to the infinitive verb (as an enclitic). The proclitic pattern arises as a process of restructuring in which the modal and the infinitival complement

form a sort of periphrastic structure. Modal ellipsis is possible only if restructuring does not apply.

(65) a.   Ana   puede comprarlo   y   yo   también   puedo.

            Ana   can   buy.INF.CL   and   I   also   can

     b. *   Ana   lo   puede comprar   y   yo   también   lo   puedo.

            Ana   CL   can   buy.INF   and   I   also   CL   can

            'Ana can buy it and I can too.'

Note now that the infinitival complement can be fronted whenever restructuring does not apply:

(66) a. *   Comprar,   lo   puedo.

            buy.INF   CL   can.1SG

     b.   Comprarlo,   puedo.

            buy.INF.CL   can.1SG

            '…buy it, I can.'

These facts show, then, that there is a strong correlation between XP-fronting and XP-ellipsis. The impossibility of modal ellipsis in restructuring contexts, illustrated in (65b), is taken by Depiante (2001) as an argument against the existence of modal ellipsis in Spanish. Her idea is that clitic extraction in (65b) is banned because of the deep anaphora nature of the complement of the modal in the second conjunct. However, Fernández Sánchez (2023) has presented several

arguments in favor of true modal ellipsis. One important observation is that phrasal extraction

out of the E-site is licit (Saab, 2008 and Fernández Sánchez, 2023).

(67) a. A   Ana,   puedo   desaprobarla,   pero

         DOM Ana   can.1SG   failed.INF-CL.ACC.F.3SG   but

         a   Paula no   puedo.

         DOM Paula not   can.1SG

         'Ana, I can fail her, but Paula, I can't.'

     b. Con   qué   herramienta   podés   arreglarlo   y

         with what tool   can.2SG   fix.INF-CL.ACC.M.3SG and

         con   cuál no   podés.

         with which not   can.2SG

         'With which tool can you fix it and with which one you cannot?'

With respect to the internal analysis of modal ellipsis, Fernández Sánchez (2023) proposes,

following Wurmbrand's (1998) theory of restructuring, that the elided complement of a modal

verb is of the TP-size, adding then another variety of TP-ellipses to the already varied typology

of this type of ellipsis in Spanish. His analysis for a case like (67b) is roughly as illustrated in

(68):

(68) [CP con cuál [ΣP no [TP podés [VP t_{poder} <[TP arreglarlo $t_{con\ cuál}$] >]]]]

A lower VP-analysis is not implausible, though.

2.2.3. PredP-ellipsis

Saab & Stigliano (2023) acknowledge a type of low ellipsis in Rioplatense Spanish, in which the complement of a copular verb gets deleted whenever there is some sort of focus involved in the sentence (polarity focus, in the general case).

(69)   A: Deberías   estar   feliz.

         should.COND.2SG   be.INF happy

         'You should be happy.'

       B.   ESTOY.

         am

         'I am indeed.'

The predicates that make this ellipsis licit are restricted to the set of true copular verbs (in Rioplatense Spanish, only *ser* 'to be$_{\text{individual level}}$', *estar* 'to be$_{\text{stage level}}$', and *parecer* 'to seem'). Thus, in addition examples like (69B), examples with *ser* and *parecer* are also grammatical:

(70)   a.   No   soy   feliz, pero   parezco.

         not   am   happy but   seem.1SG

         'I am not happy, but I look (happy).'

       b.   A: No   sos   feliz?

              not   are   happy

              'Aren't you happy?'

B: SOY, sí.

am, yes

'I AM.'

Other predicates that also take predicative complements, like *volverse* 'to become' and *ponerse* 'to become', do not license this kind of ellipsis:

(71) A: Te   volviste   loco?

CL.2SG   became.2SG   crazy

'Did you go mad?'

B: *Sí,   me   VOLVÍ.

yes   CL.1SG became.1SG

'Yes, I did.'

(72) A: Te   pusiste   colorado?

CL.2SG   became.2SG   red

'Did you blush?'

B: *Sí,   me   PUSE.

yes   CL.1SG became.1SG

'Yes, I did.'

This difference is not fortuitous, it coincides with another relevant distinction, namely, the availability of true copular predicates to take the neuter anaphora *lo* 'it' as complement. Contrast the minimal pairs in (73) and (74):

(73) A: Deberías   estar feliz.

          should.COND.2SG   be.INF happy

          'You should be happy.'

      B. Lo   ESTOY.

          CL.NEUTER   am

          'I am indeed.'

(74) A: Te   pusiste   colorado?

          CL.2SG   became.2SG   red

          'Did you blush?'

      B: *Sí,   me   lo   PUSE.

          yes   CL.1SG   CL.NEUTER   became.1SG

          Intended: 'Yes, I did.'

The anaphora *lo* is a proform standing for a lower predicative projection, called PredP by Saab &
Stigliano, who follow the spirit of Bowers (1993). This projection is headed by a Pred^0 that takes
predicates of different categories as complements (PPs, APs, NPs). In sum, copular verbs allow
deletion of this PredP, as illustrated in (75) for an example like (70B):

(75) $[_{CP} C^0 [_{TP} T^0 [_{VP} \text{SOY } \underline{\text{E-site}}: < [_{PredP} \ldots \text{Pred}^0 [_{AdjP} \text{feliz}]] >]]]$

On this account, the correlation between the occurrence of *lo* and the possibility of PredP-ellipsis
follows from the particular underlying syntax of copular verbs that take the relevant elidable

complements. In turn, pseudo-copular verbs do not take PredP complements, a fact that accounts both for the impossibility of *lo*-replacement and of PredP-ellipsis.

Importantly, PredP can be fronted, pointing out to the same conclusion that there is a correlation between XP-ellipsis and XP-fronting.

(76)   a.   Feliz, soy/estoy.

              happy am_{ser}/am_{estar}

              'Happy, I am.'

      b.   Feliz, parezco.

              happy look.1SG

              'Happy, I look.'

In syntactic environments involving analytical tenses, the behavior is as expected: the VP layer cannot be elided (78B); only the lower PredP can (77B):

(77)   A: No   hubiera   sido   lindo.

              not   had.SUBJ   been   nice

              'It wouldn't have been nice.'

      B: Sí   que   HUBIERA   SIDO.

              yes   that   had.SUBJ   been

              'Yes, it would have been.'

(78)   A: No   hubiera   sido   lindo.

not   had.SUBJ   been   nice

'It wouldn't have been nice.'

    B: Sí   que   HUBIERA.

yes   that   had.SUBJ

Intended: 'Yes, it would have.'

And the same with respect to fronting: only PredP can be fronted, not the VP:

(79)   a.   Lindo, hubiera   sido.

nice   had.SUBJ   been

'Nice, it would have been.'

    b. *   Sido   lindo, hubiera.

been   nice   had.SUBJ

Intended: 'Been nice, it would have.'

In summary, Spanish does not have VP-ellipsis of the auxiliary or verb-stranding type, although it allows for a lower type of predicative ellipsis under (polarity) focus. In Spanish and other languages, the availability of VP-ellipsis depends on the availability for the VP (or another lower category in the VP domain) to be fronted.

3. Ellipsis in the nominal domain

The structure of a nominal contains at least the following projections of lexical and functional categories:

(80) $[_{DP} D^0 [_{NumP} Num^0 [_{NP} N^0]]]$

For simplification, the symbol N^0 stands for the combination of a functional category, n^0, and a category-less root. The result of such a combination in the syntax is what is normally called a *noun*. The NP domain is the locus of argument structure relations, gender determination and other lower dependencies of the nominal type. The NumP domain adds semantic and morphosyntactic number and, in addition, provides structural space for some type of prenominal modifiers, quantifiers and numerals. Finally, in the DP domain, many semantic and morphosyntactic properties of nominals are determined: definiteness, deixis, some forms of quantification and so on. The examples (81)-(83) illustrate some common nominal phrases in Spanish:

(81)   a.   las   tres   comedias   musicales

                the.F.PL   three   comedies   musical.PL

                'the three musical comedies'

        b. $[_{DP}$ las $[_{NumP}$ tres $[_{NP}$ comedias $[_{AP}$ musicales$]]]$

(82)   a.   las   terribles   matanzas   de   los   leones

                the.F.PL   terrible.PL killings   of   the.M.PL   lions

                'the terrible killings of the lions'

        b. $[_{DP}$ las $[_{NumP}$ terribles $[_{NP}$ matanzas $[_{PP}$ de los leones$]_{THEME}]]$

(83)   a.   todos   los   estudiantes   de   física

                all.M.PL   the.M.PL   students   of   physics

‘all the students of physics’

b. [$_{DP}$ todos los [$_{NumP}$ Num$_{PL}$ [$_{NP}$ estudiantes [$_{PP}$ de física]$_{THEME}$]]]

Now, Spanish makes productive use of an ellipsis operation that elides the lower nominal projection, i.e., the NP. This operation is called NP-ellipsis, whose basic analysis represented in (84):

(84)   [$_{DP}$ D^0 [$_{NumP}$ Num^0 <u>E-site</u>: < [$_{NP}$ … N^0 …] >]]

Consider a simple example of nominal ellipsis with a numeral modifier as remnant and its associated analysis:

(85)   a.   Ana   desaprobó   a   dos   estudiantes   de   química

Ana   failed   DOM   two   students   of   chemistry

y   yo   desaprobé   a   tres.

and   I   failed   DOM   three

‘Ana failed two students of chemistry and I failed three.’

b. [$_{DP}$ D^0 [$_{NumP}$ *remnant*: tres <u>E-site</u>: < [$_{NP}$ estudiantes de química] >]]

According to this view, NP-ellipsis is almost the perfect nominal counterpart of the operation of VP-ellipsis in English and many other languages (see §2):

(86)   [$_{CP}$ C^0 [$_{TP}$ T^0 <u>E-site</u>: < [$_{VP}$ … V^0 …] >]]

However, some instances of NP-ellipsis look very similar to gapping at least in the surface string. Compare the two strings in (87):

(87) a.   Ana   compró   un   libro y   Paula una   revista.

              Ana   bought   a   book and Paula a   magazine

              'Ana bought a book and Paula, a magazine.'

      b.   el   estudiante de   física   y   el   de   química

              the   student   of   physics   and the   of   chemistry

              'the student of physics and the <student> of chemistry'

In both cases, the E-site seems to consist only of the verb *compró* or the noun *estudiante*, with the complements of the two heads serving as remnants. However, the syntactic distribution of the two constructions is clearly different.

3.1. Spanish NP-ellipsis

3.1.1. The syntactic distribution of NP-ellipsis in Spanish

Unlike gapping or stripping, NP-ellipsis behaves as the so-called non-local anaphora such as VP-ellipsis, TP-ellipsis and so on. An important property of non-local anaphora is that their distribution is syntactically unrestricted and unbounded, i.e., the E-site can occur in almost any type of syntactic environment: coordinate structures (88a), embedded structures (88b), and even syntactic islands (88c).

(88) a.

Ana	desaprobó	al	estudiante	de	física	y
Ana	failed	DOM.the	student	of	physics	and

Paula	desaprobó	al	<	estudiante	>	de	química.
Paula	failed	DOM.the		student		of	chemistry

'Ana failed the student of physics and Paula failed the (student) of chemistry.'

b.

Ana	desaprobó	al	estudiante	de	física	y
Ana	failed	DOM.the	student	of	physics	and

Pedro	dijo	que	Paula	desaprobó	al	<	estudiante	>	de
Pedro	said	that	Paula	failed	DOM.the		student		of

química.
chemistry

'Ana failed the student of physics and Pedro said that Paula failed the (student) of chemistry.'

c.

Ana	desaprobó	al	estudiante	de	física
Ana	failed	DOM.the	student	of	physics

porque		Paula	desaprobó	al	<	estudiante	>
because		Paula	failed	DOM.the		student	

de	química.
of	chemistry

'Ana failed the student of physics because Paula failed the (student) of chemistry.'

Gapping, instead, is strongly restricted to coordinate structures:

(89) a.   Ana   compró   un   libro   y   Ana   <   compró   >

Ana   bought   a   book   and   Paula   bought

una   revista.

a   magazine

'Ana bought a book and Paula, a magazine.'

b. ??   Ana   leyó   un   libro   y   Pedro   dijo   que

Ana   read   a   book   and   Pedro   said   that

Ana   <   leyó   >   una   revista.

Ana   read   a   magazine

Intended: 'Ana read a book and Pedro said that Pedro (read) a magazine.'

c. *   Ana   leyó   un   libro   porque   Paula   <   leyó   >

Ana   read   a   book   because   Paula   read

una   revista.

a   magazine

Intended: 'Ana read a book because Paula (read) a magazine.'

Now, an associated property of non-local anaphora is that the E-site must form a constituent. The surface string *el de química* seems to contradict this property, since only a part of the NP seems to be affected by ellipsis, like in typical instances of non-local anaphora (gapping or stripping):

(90)   [NP <estudiante> de química]

Yet, there is certain consensus that the complement of the noun first vacates the NP, which is, then, elided by NP-ellipsis, as shown in the analysis illustrated in (91):

(91)   [$_{DP}$ el [$_{XP}$ de química *E-site*: <[$_{NP}$ estudiante $t_{de\ química}$]>]]

On this approach, NP-ellipsis with nominal complements as remnants would be the nominal counterpart of the elliptical construction called *pseudo-gapping* in English, which, despite its superficial similarity with gapping, has all the properties of English VP-ellipsis, a non-local anaphora, as well.

(92)   I played the guitar, and she did the trumpet <[$_{VP}$ play $t_{the\ trumpet}$]>.

3.1.2. NP-ellipsis and nominal inflection

If NP-ellipsis is ellipsis of the NP, with exclusion of the NumP, then, the NP antecedent and the elliptical NP should allow mismatches in number features. This is correct: the nouns in antecedents and E-sites can vary in number features and in any direction:

(93)   a.   Ana   prefiere   a   su   perro   más   que

            Ana   prefers   DOM   POSS.3SG   dog   more   that

            a   los   <   perros >   de   Paula.

            DOM   the   dogs   of   Paula

            'Ana prefers his dog more than Ana's (dogs).'

        b.   Ana   prefiere   a   sus   perros   más   que

Ana	prefers	DOM	POSS.3PL	dogs	more	that

al < perros > de Paula.

DOM.the dogs of Paula

'Ana prefers her dogs more than Ana's (dog).'

c. Ana compró dos libros y Paula compró uno.

Ana bought two books and Paula bought one

'Ana bought two books and Paula bought one.'

d. Ana compró un libro y Paula compró dos < libros >.

Ana bought one book and Paula bought two books

'Ana bought one book and Paula bought two.'

Gender features, instead, cannot vary:

(94) a. * Ana prefiere a su perro más

Ana prefers DOM POSS.3SG dog.M.SG more

que a la < perra > de Paula.

that DOM the.F.SG dog.F.SG of Paula

Intended: 'Ana prefers her male dog more than Paula's (female dog).'

a. * Ana prefiere a su perra más

Ana prefers DOM POSS.3SG dog.F.SG more

que al < perro > de Paula.

that DOM.the.M.SG dog.M.SG of Paula

Intended: 'Ana prefers her female dog more than Paula's (male dog).'

c. * Ana   visitó   a   su   tía   y   Paula   visitó

Ana   visited DOM   POSS.3SG   aunt   and   Paula   visited

al   <   tío   >   suyo.

DOM.the.M.SG   uncle   POSS.M.3SG

Intended: 'Ana visited her aunt and Paula visited her (uncle).'

d. * Ana   visitó   a   su   tío   y   Paula   visitó

Ana   visited DOM   POSS   uncle   and   Paula   visited

a   la   <   tía   >   suya.

DOM   the.F.SG   aunt   POSS.F.3SG

Intended: 'Ana visited her uncle and Paula visited her (aunt).'

Depiante & Masullo (2001, 2004) explain this different behavior of gender and number by assuming that while gender is an inherent, lexical property of nouns, number features are introduced by an independent functional head that dominates the NP. Thus, gender features in the E-site must always be identical to the gender features of the antecedent noun. Yet, Saab (2004, 2008, 2010b) has shown that gender, at least for the vast majority of noun types, is not a lexical property. Like number, gender is also introduced through a functional head, namely, n^0. Now, since nominal ellipsis is of the nP size in Spanish, it follows that gender features within the E-site cannot mismatch the gender features in the antecedent. The analysis in (95) represents this approach in terms of ellipsis size:

(95) $[_{DP}$ D^0 $[_{NumP}$ Num$^0_{[\{sg/pl\}]}$ E-site: $< [_{nP} \dots n^0_{[\{masc./fem.\}]}$ $[_{\sqrt{P}}$ $\sqrt{}^0$ $]$ $]$ $>$ $]$ $]$

3.2. Ellipsis of genitive nouns in Rioplatense Spanish

A relevant pattern of nominal ellipsis involves ellipsis of genitive NPs with certain quantificational remnants. Some relatively young generation of Rioplatense Spanish speakers make productive use of nouns like *bocha* 'ball' or *banda* 'band':

(96) Este semestre hay   una bocha de estudiantes de física.

    this semester there.is a   ball of students   of physics

    'This semester there are many/a lot of students of physics.'

(97) Leí   una banda de libros de Borges.

    read.PST.1SG a   band of books of Borges

    'I read lot of Borges' books.'

These quantifiers take genitive NPs as complements headed by the preposition *de* 'of'. Pesetsky (2013) has proposed that genitive case is primeval on nouns, in the sense that the first categorizer head n^0 is always marked as genitive, a fact opaqued in the surface because in most cases this genitive is overwritten by other cases. Yet, there are situations in which this case survives overtly. Assume that this is what happens in (96) and (97). On this analysis, *libros* in (98a) is the nominal head of the relevant DP, although it is realized with genitive case, as illustrated in the simplified bracketing in (98b):

(98) a.   una banda de libros

       a   band of books

    b. [DP una [NumP banda [NPGEN *de*-libros]]]

Since the genitive noun heads the extended projection of the entire DP, NP-ellipsis should be grammatical. The example in (99) shows that the prediction is borne out:

(99)　A:　Hay　　　　muchos　　estudiantes　de　　física?

there.is　　many　　　students　　of　　physics

'Are there many students of physics?'

B:　No,　pero　de　química　　hay　　　　una　　bocha.

no　　but　　of　　chemistry　　there.is　　a　　　ball

'No, but there are many of/lot of chemistry.'

The example in (99B) demonstrates that there is indeed NP-ellipsis headed by a genitive noun. The remnant *de química* is extracted out of the elided NP$_{GEN}$, which constitutes the syntactic domain in which its theta-role is assigned by the elided noun. Put differently, extraction and semantic selection point out to the indubitable conclusion that there is NPGEN-ellipsis. In (100), there is a simplified analysis of the relevant NP-ellipsis:

(100)　de química … [$_{DP}$ una [$_{NumP}$ bocha <[$_{NPGEN}$ de estudiantes $t_{de \, química}$]>]] …

Note now that case mismatch between the antecedent NP and the elided NPGEN is perfectly licit. In (101), the surface case of the antecedent noun is accusative, whereas the case of the elided noun is genitive.

(101) Leí   algunos   libros de   Cortázar   y   banda de Borges.

read.PST.1SG some   books of   Cortázar   and   many of Borges

'I read many books by Cortazar and many by Borges.'

[$_{NumP}$ banda [E-site: < [$_{NPgen}$ de libros] >]]

This shows that, in addition to the very well-known inflectional number mismatches in (Rioplatense) Spanish discussed in §3.2.2, case mismatches are also active in the language. Now, if as Pesetsky has argued, all nouns are borne out as genitive, there is a point of the syntactic derivation in which both nouns are perfectly identical. Arguably, syntactic identity applies, then, at this derivational step and the realization of genitive case through the insertion of the preposition *de* 'of' only emerges late in the morphological derivation.

Pestesky (2013) himself conjectured that certain patterns of qualitative binominal phrases of the type attested in Romance could be analyzed in the same way. Thus, for a qualitative binominal construction like (102a) we would have the rough analysis in (102b) with the noun *libros* as the genitive head of the entire extended projection:

(102) a.   una   mierda de   departamento

a   shit   of   apartment

'a shit of an apartment'

b.   b. [$_{DP}$ una [$_{NumP}$ mierda [$_{NPGEN}$ *de*-libros]]]

However, unlike the examples of quantificational cases, there is no nominal ellipsis of the genitive NP. In an example like (103), a reading in which the genitive noun is missing but interpreted is impossible:

(103) una   mierda de   departamento en   San Telmo   y   una   mierda en

       a   shit of   apartment   in   San Telmo   and a   shit   in

       La   Boca

       La   Boca

       Impossible interpretation: 'a shit of an apartment in San Telmo and a shit (of apartment) in La Boca'

In sum, nominal ellipsis is also a powerful tool to diagnose the internal structure ad feature composition of nominal phrases.

4. Further readings

For other general overviews of ellipsis in Spanish, the reader can consult Brucart & MacDonald (2012) and Fábregas (2023). Brucart (1999) is an excellent overview on ellipsis phenomena in Spanish written in Spanish. Brucart (1987) is a classic on Spanish ellipsis both in the sentential and nominal domain from the perspective of Government and Binding. Saab (2008) is also a comprehensive study of Spanish ellipses in Spanish. On Spanish TP-ellipsis in particular, the reader can consult Depiante (2000), who discusses both stripping and pseudo-striping, and Saab (2010a), in which fragment answers and TP-ellipsis with clitic-left dislocated remnants are discussed. Zagona (1988) is one of the few attempts to account for the lack of VP-ellipsis in

Spanish. Modal ellipsis is particularly addressed in Depiante (2001) but for a completely different perspective, the reader should consult Fernández Sánchez (2023), which is the most recent approach to the problem. As for NP-ellipsis in Spanish and beyond, I refer to Ticio (2003) and Saab (2010b, 2019).

References

Arregi, Karlos (2003). Clitic left dislocation is contrastive topicalization. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 9(1): 31–44. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Authier, Jean-Marc. (2011). A movement analysis of French modal ellipsis. *Probus* 23: 175–216. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2011.005

Bowers, John (1993). The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4): 591-656. doi: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178835

Brucart, Josep M. (1987). *La elisión sintáctica en español*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.

Brucart, Josep M. (1999). La elipsis. In: Bosque, Ignacio & Violeta Demonte (dirs.) *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española (Vol. 1)*, 2787-2863. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Cecchetto, Carlo. 2000. Doubling structures and reconstruction. *Probus* 12(1): 93–126. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2000.12.1.93

Cinque, Guglielmo (1990). *Type of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Brucart, Josep M. & Jonathan E. MacDonald (2012). Empty categories and ellipsis. In: Hualde, José Ignacio, Antxon Olarrea & Erin O´Rourke *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*, 579-602. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Depiante, Marcela (2000). *The Syntax of Deep and Surface Anaphora: A study of Null Complement Anaphora and Stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Depiante, Marcela (2001). On Null Complement Anaphora in Spanish and Italian. *Probus* 13.2: 193-221. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2001.003

Depiante, Marcela (2004a). Dos casos de elipsis con partícula de polaridad en español. *RASAL* 1: 53-69.

Depiante, Marcela (2004b). Morphological *vs*. syntactic clitics: evidence from ellipsis. Talk given at the *Coloquio de Morfosintaxis*, Universidad de Buenos Aires, July 1-2.

Depiante, Marcela & Pascual Masullo (2001). Género y número en la elipsis nominal: consecuencias para la hipótesis lexicalista. Paper presented at the *I Encuentro de Gramática Generativa*, Universidad Nacional del Comahue.

Depiante, Marcela & Pascual Masullo. 2004. Gender is in the lexicon, number is in the syntax: evidence from nominal ellipsis in Spanish. Paper presented at GLOW 27, Aristotle University.

Di Tullio, Ángela, Andrés Saab & Pablo Zdrojewski (2019). *Clitic Doubling in a Doubling World. The Case of Argentinean Spanish Reconsidered*. In: Ángel Gallego (ed.) *The Syntactic Variation of Spanish Dialects*, 213-242. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fábregas, Antonio (2023). Ellipsis in Spanish. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 12 /(2): 1-134. doi: https://doi.org/10.7557/1.12.2.7228

Fernández-Sánchez, Javier (2023). Spanish modal ellipsis is not null complement anaphora. *Linguistics* 61(4): 885-913. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2021-0077

Goldberg, Lotus (2005). *Verb-stranding VP-ellipsis: a cross-linguistic study*. Ph.D. Dissertation, McGill University.

Hankamer, Jorge & Ivan Sag (1976). Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3): 391-426. doi: http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177933

Hurtado, Alfredo (1984). On the properties of LF. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 6:121–149.

Johnson, Kyle (2001). What VP-ellipsis can do, what it can't, but not why. In: Mark Baltin & Chris Collins (eds.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, 439-479. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Lobeck, Anne (1995). *Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing, and identification*. New York: Oxford University Press.

López, Luis (1999). VP-ellipsis in English and Spanish and the Features of Aux. *Probus* 11(2): 263–297. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1999.11.2.263

Merchant, Jason (2001). *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Merchant, Jason (2004). Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 661-738. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-005-7378-3

Pesetsky, David. 2013. Russian Case Morphology and the Syntactic Categories. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press. doi: https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262019729.001.0001

Ranero Echeverria, Rodrigo (2021). *Identity Conditions on Ellipsis*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Maryland.

Rudin, Deniz (2019). Head-Based Syntactic Identity in Sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50(2): 253-283. doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00308

Saab, Andrés (2004). *El dominio de la elipsis nominal en español. Identidad estricta e inserción tardía*. Master Thesis, Universidad Nacional del Comahue.

Saab, Andrés (2008). *Hacia una teoría de la identidad parcial en la elipsis*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Universidad de Buenos Aires.

Saab, Andres (2010a). Silent interactions: Spanish TP-ellipsis and the theory of island repair. *Probus* 22(1): 73-116. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2010.003

Saab, Andrés (2010b). (Im)possible deletions in the Spanish DP. *Iberia* 2(2): 45-83.

Saab, Andrés (2016). Ineffable Narratives in Spanish. Another Case of Overgeneration by *e*-GIVENess. *Probus* 28(2): 367-389. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2014-0014

Saab, Andrés (2019). Nominal ellipsis. In: Temmerman Tanja & Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*, 526-561. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saab, Andrés. (2022). Bleeding restructuring by ellipsis. New hopes for a motivated verbal ellipsis parameter. Ms., IIF-SADAF-CONICET and University of Buenos Aires.

Saab, Andrés & Laura Stigliano (2023). On an undocumented type of predicate ellipsis in Spanish and its consequences for the theory of ellipsis licensing. *Isogloss*.

Silva, María Florencia (2023). Imperatives and their interaction with VP-ellipsis in Spanish. *Isogloss* 9(1)/5: 1-16. doi: https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.262

Ticio, Emma (2003). On the Structure of DPs. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Wurmbrand, Susanne (1998). *Infinitives*. Ph.D. Dissertation,, MIT.

Zagona, Karen (1982). *Government and Proper Government of Verbal Projections*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington University.

Zagona, Karen (1988). Proper Government of Antecedentless VP in English and Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 95-128. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01791593

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa (1998). *Prosody, focus, and word order*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

---

[i] In this article, the angled brackets are used without any commitment regarding the nature of ellipsis (deletion, non-pronunciation, among other possibilities discussed in the literature).

[ii] On clitic left dislocation in Spanish and Romance, the reader can consult Hurtado (1984), Cinque (1990), Zubizarreta (1998), Cecchetto (2000), Arregi (2003), and Di Tullio et al. (2019).

[iii] The reader is referred to Ranero (2021), who uses tense identity mismatches as an argument against Rudin's (2019) idea that mismatches above the VoiceP are freely available.

[iv] The most salient differences of the Rioplatense pronominal pattern in (31), compared to standard Peninsular dialects, are (i) the well-known absence of a distinguished second person plural (e.g., as most American dialects, Rioplatense has lost the form *vosotros* 'you$_{2PL}$'), (ii) the absence of any form of *leísmo* (i.e., Rioplatense Spanish distinguishes masculine and feminine third person pronouns both in the singular and in the plural), and (iii) the use of *voseo* in the slot for the second person singular (i.e., Rioplatense use *vos* 'you.$_{2SG}$' instead of the more common *tú*).

[v] As shown in Di Tullio et al (2019), right dislocated topics cannot be remnants in gapping. For a case like (42b), the direct object in the E-site cannot be a right dislocated topic. Clitic right dislocated topics are absolutely banned as gapping remnants (Di Tullio et al, 2019). Thus, the sentence in (ia) with two clitic right dislocated topics cannot give rise to a gapping sentence like (ib).

(i)   a.   Ana   lo   compró, el   libro   y   Paula

                Ana   CL.ACC.M.3SG   bought   the   book   and   Paula

                la   compró, la   revista.

                CL.ACC.F.3SG   bought   the   magazine

                'Ana bought it, the book and Paula bought it, the magazine.'

b. *	Ana	lo	compró, el	libro	y	Paula,	la revista.
	Ana	CL.ACC.M.3SG	bought the	book	and	Paula	the magazine

Intended: 'Ana bought it, the book, and Paula, the magazine.'

[vi] The same type of mismatch is observed with person and number, not exemplified here for space reasons.

[vii] The notion of "strong feature" was particularly productive in the first minimalist models (Chomsky, 1995). The notion is quite vague, but it essentially refers to some special (perhaps, morphophonological) properties of functional heads that require for the relevant heads to be affected by particular morphosyntactic operations, such as movement to the relevant head position or overt filling of the relevant head position. The idea is that such operations are ways of deleting the otherwise illicit strong features.

[viii] Johnson (2001) also observes this connection between VP-fronting and VP-ellipsis. He explains the correlation claiming that elided VPs must be fronted to be elided. Authier (2011) notes the correlation, as well, and links the possibility of movement to the licensing of ellipsis. Saab (2022) derives the correlation from different morphological conditions that in some languages require the VPs to be frozen for ellipsis and movement.