Same form, but not the same construction: pseudostripping vs. stripping in Romanian

Gabriela Bîlbîie, University of Bucharest & LLF, gabriela.bilbiie@lls.unibuc.ro

In this presentation, we focus on two different constructions, namely pseudostripping (Depiante 2000) and stripping (Hankamer & Sag 1976), making use of the negation marker *nu* (1) in Romanian, *no* (2) in Spanish (cf. Depiante & Vicente 2009), *non* (3a) vs. *pas* (3b) in French (cf. Abeillé 2006, Morris 2008), or *no* (4a) vs. *non* (4b) in Italian (Servidio 2012).

(1)   a. Ion va veni la petrecere, dar Maria **nu$_1$**.
           'Ion will come to the party, but Maria no.'
           b. Ion va veni la petrecere, dar **nu$_2$** şi Maria.
           'Ion will come to the party, but not Maria.'

(2)   a. Juan vino, pero Pedro **no$_1$**.
           b. Vino Juan, pero **no$_2$** Pedro.

(3)   a. Jean aime le chocolat, mais Marie **non**.
           b. Jean aime le chocolat, mais **pas** Marie.

(4)   a. Gianni è venuto, ma Mario **no**.
           b. E venuto Gianni, ma **non** Mario.

The common aspect bringing these two constructions together is this idea that there is interpretation beyond what is said/written, something is literally missing, or is semantically much less contentful than what is actually understood, and what is understood is understood because of the presence of an antecedent in the context. Furthermore, a uniform analysis is usually assumed for describing their syntactic behaviour, i.e. both involve some elliptical process, in particular clausal ellipsis (Depiante 2000, 2004, Vicente 2006, Morris 2008, Depiante & Vicente 2009).

The main goal of the presentation is to show that pseudostripping (1a, 2a, 3a, 4a) and stripping (1b, 2b, 3b, 4b) are two distinct constructions. Based on empirical evidence from Romanian, we observe that there are two mechanisms at work: proform-analysis vs. ellipsis-analysis. First, we build on the classical distinction between deep vs. surface anaphora (cf. Hankamer & Sag 1976), in order to show that pseudostripping cases behave as deep anaphora, and stripping as surface anaphora. Moreover, pseudostripping and stripping typically display a complementary distribution of adverbials (despite the homophony of forms in some languages, e.g. Romanian): the polarity response proform *nu$_1$* follows the remnant in pseudostripping (XP-Adv), whereas the (focus-sensitive) associative adverb *nu$_2$* precedes the remnant in stripping cases (Adv-XP). The different position of adverbials is linked to a different informational status and interpretation (see also Vicente 2006 for Spanish, Winkler 2005 for German): in pseudostripping XP-Adv, the XP is a contrastive topic, whereas in stripping Adv-XP, the XP is a contrastive focus. These two different information structural articulations are correlated with two different intonation patterns and two different discourse relations.

Moreover, we adopt a proform analysis of pseudostripping (Krifka 2013), rather than an elliptical one (Depiante 2000, 2004, Vicente 2006, etc.). Polar response particles are not the remnants of ellipsis, but rather adverbial proforms, behaving as propositional anaphors: they partly receive their interpretation through a contextually given antecedent (like an anaphorical pronoun). Pseudostripping sequences are therefore clauses with a non-verbal predicative head and should be analyzed as polar verbless clauses. On the other hand, the stripped sequence is an elliptical clause; it has a propositional content, but it lacks the predicative verbal head. As it does not always allow a syntactic reconstruction mechanism, we analyze stripping as a clausal fragment (Ginzburg & Sag 2000), rather than postulating a PF-deletion mechanism.

Overall, our study shows that there are mechanisms to disambiguate between two homophonous forms occurring in two different constructions.

References

Abeillé, A. 2006. Stripping constructions in French. Paper presented at the *Coordination and Ellipsis* conference, Paris.

Depiante, M. 2000. *The syntax of deep and surface anaphora: A study of null complement anaphora and stripping/bare argument ellipsis.* PhD thesis, University of Connecticut at Storrs.

Depiante, M. & L. Vicente 2009. Deriving word order restrictions on remnants of ellipsis from information structure factors. Paper presented at the 2009 LSA Meeting.

Ginzburg, J. & I. A. Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning and use of English interrogatives.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Hankamer, J. & I. A. Sag. 1976. Deep and surface anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3): 391-428.

Krifka, M. 2013. Response particles as propositional anaphors. *Proceedings of SALT 23*: 1-18.

Morris, A. 2008. Polarity ellipsis and negative stripping. Manuscript.

Servidio, E. 2012. Polarity particles in Italian fragment answers. Internet celebration for Luigi Rizzi's 60th birthday, *CISCL*, Siena.

Vicente, L. 2006. Short negative replies in Spanish. In J. van de Weijer & B. Los (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2006*, 199-211. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Winkler, S. 2005. *Ellipsis and Focus in Generative Grammar*. Berlin: De Gruyter.