

# Indivisible portmanteaux and the timing of ellipsis

Neil Banerjee  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
neilb@mit.edu

WCCFL 39

# A mystery with stripping copulas

- (1) Pisti otthon volt, de Ildi nem  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PST, but Ildi NEG ~~be.3SG.PST-AT.HOME~~  
'Pisti was at home, but not Ildi.'
- (2) Pisti otthon van, de én nem  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PRS, but 1SG NEG ~~be.1SG.PRS-AT.HOME~~  
'Pisti is at home, but not me.'
- (3) \* Pisti otthon van, de Ildi nem  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PRS, but Ildi NEG ~~be.3SG.PRS-AT.HOME~~  
Int: 'Pisti is at home, but not Ildi.'

► Why can't we elide 3rd person present copulas?

# The copular paradigms

Table: Affirmative singular copulas

	PRS.IND	PST.IND	SJV
1SG	vagyok	voltam	legyek
2SG	vagy	voltál	legy(él)
3SG	van	volt	legyen

Table: Negative singular copulas

	PRS.IND	PST.IND	SJV
1SG	nem vagyok	nem voltam	ne legyek
2SG	nem vagy	nem voltál	ne legy(él)
3SG	<b>nincs</b> , *nem van	nem volt	ne legyen

# Subjunctives

- ▶ Subjunctive → No portmanteau: *ne legyen* → ✓ellipsis

(4) Megkövetelem, hogy a Dóri itthon legyen, de  
require.1SG.PRS C DEF Dóri at.home be.SJV.3SG, but  
megengedem, hogy a Peti ne  
allow.1SG.PRS, C DEF Peti NEG.SJV

'I require that Dóri be at home, but I allow that Peti not be.'

# Ellipsis and copulas

- (5) Pisti otthon volt, de Ildi nem (volt)  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PST, but Ildi NEG be.3SG.PST  
'Pisti was at home, but not Ildi.'
- (6) Pisti otthon van, de én nem (vagyok)  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PRS, but 1SG NEG be.1SG.PRS  
'Pisti is at home, but not me.'
- (7) Pisti otthon van, de Ildi nincs/\*nem  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PRS, but Ildi NEG.be.3SG.PRS/\*NEG  
Int: 'Pisti is at home, but not Ildi.'

- ▶ For the portmanteau, stripping is not possible
- ▶ *nincs* can't be split into *nem* ~~cop.PRS.3SG~~

# Data summary

- ▶ Hungarian stripping can (usually) elide the complement of negation
- ▶ But a portmanteau across the ellipsis boundary blocks ellipsis
  - ▶ Not 3rd person → no portmanteau → ✓ellipsis
  - ▶ Not present tense → no portmanteau → ✓ellipsis
  - ▶ Not indicative → no portmanteau → ✓ellipsis
  - ▶ 3, PRS, IND → portmanteau → ✗ellipsis

# Timing of portmanteaux

- ▶ The possibility of a portmanteau across the boundary blocks ellipsis
- ▶ So, ellipsis sites must be accessible until we know if a portmanteau will form
- ▶ This raises the question of when the pieces of the portmanteau are brought together
- ▶ Possibilities:
  - ▶ Pre-syntactically, through listed bundles
  - ▶ Syntactically, through movement
  - ▶ Post-syntactically

# Do portmanteaux form pre-syntactically?

- ▶ Not if we assume *Late Insertion* and *No Bundling*
- ▶ Why *No Bundling*?
  - ▶ We have to list NEG,COP,PRS,3SG at least once in the Lexicon/Encyclopedia
  - ▶ A pre-syntactic bundle of the same features would duplicate this listing
  - ▶ So let's try to do with just listing special feature bundles just once
- ▶ So portmanteaux do not form pre-syntactically, by assumption
- ▶ But ask me about Cypriot Greek-internal reasons to assume *No Bundling* too!

## Do portmanteaux form syntactically?

- (8) a. Ildi otthon van/volt  
Ildi at.home COP.3SG.PRS/COP.3SG.PST  
'Ildi is/was at home.'
- b. Ildi nincs otthon  
Ildi NEG.COP.3SG.PRS at.home  
'Ildi is not at home.'
- c. Ildi nem volt otthon  
Ildi NEG COP.3SG.PST at.home  
'Ildi was not at home.'

- ▶ All verbs appear adjacent to negation (É. Kiss, 2002)
- ▶ No evidence of difference in syntactic positions of NEG and COP based on portmanteau status
- ▶ So portmanteau do not form syntactically

# Post-syntactic portmanteaux

- ▶ Options:
  - ▶ Fusion (Halle & Marantz, 1993; Halle, 1997)
  - ▶ Non-terminal insertion (Caha, 2009; Svenonius, 2016)
  - ▶ Contextual allomorphy (Trommer, 1999)
- ▶ I will present an analysis with non-terminal insertion
- ▶ Fusion can probably also be made to work, but contextual allomorphy will not work

# Negation in Hungarian

- ▶ The positions of negation and the verb are contentious
- ▶ Following É. Kiss (2002) and Surányi (2002), I assume the verb moves to the edge of the sister of NEG

(9) NEG [ [COP TNS AGR] ... [... AT.HOME ...t ...] ]

- ▶ The exact position is not important, so I won't pick a side
- ▶ This will allow the ellipsis site to be a constituent

# Prelude to the analysis

- ▶ So far, you're probably expecting portmanteau formation to precede ellipsis wholesale
- ▶ I'm actually going to propose that they're interleaved in a specific way
- ▶ This is necessary to capture post-syntactic interactions of ellipsis and allomorphy

# Capturing indivisible portmanteaux

- ▶ Portmanteaux spell out sequences of structurally adjacent heads (spanning, Svenonius, 2016)
- ▶ Ellipsis is the post-syntactic effect of an E feature (Merchant, 2001)
- ▶ Insertion algorithm operates as follows:
  1. Find the lowest terminal unassociated with an exponent
  2. If it is [E], delete its complement
  3. Associate an exponent to the biggest span anchored by the active target such that a single VI is at least as good at exposing the features of the span as multiple separate VIs (c.f. Haugen & Siddiqi, 2016:369)
  4. Repeat from start until no unassociated terminals remain



# Ellipsis of a non-portmanteau

(13) a. NEG E [ [COP PST 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ]

⋮  
otthon

b. NEG E [ [COP PST 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ]

⋮  
volt  
otthon

c. NEG E [ [COP PST 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ]

⋮  
volt  
otthon

d. NEG E [ [COP PST 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ]

⋮  
nem  
volt  
otthon

# Elliptically indivisible portmanteau

(14) a.

√ILDI [ NEG E [ [COP PRS 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ] ]

otthon

b.

√ILDI [ NEG E [ [COP] PRS 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ] ]

nincs

otthon

c.

√ILDI [ NEG E [ [COP PRS 3SG] ... [... AT.HOME ...] ] ]

lidi

nincs

otthon

# Discussion

- ▶ E gets associated with an exponent when COP is the target
- ▶ Insertion never targets E when it's exponed by a portmanteau VI
- ▶ So E does not trigger deletion of its complement in this case
- ▶ E is in the middle of a portmanteau → it will not be targeted → no ellipsis

# Why are ellipsis and portmanteaux interleaved?

- ▶ Sailor (forthcoming) and Ronai & Stigliano (2020) have observed that ellipsis bleeds allomorphy

(15) A [B C]

(16) a. ✗A ↔ *mimsy* / \_ B

b. ✓A ↔ *brillig*

- ▶ If insertion preceded ellipsis deletion wholesale, we could not capture this

# How ellipsis bleeds allomorphy

- ▶ At the point of insertion of anything at or above  $\epsilon$ , the ellipsis site has been obliterated
- ▶ This means contextual allomorphy should be bleeded by ellipsis of the trigger

(17) A E [ B  $\epsilon$  ]  
          ⋮          ⋮  
          tove slithy

- (18) a. ✗A  $\leftrightarrow$  *mimsy* / \_ B  
      b. ✓A  $\leftrightarrow$  *brillig*

# Why *nincs* is not the result of allomorphy

- ▶ Trommer (1999) proposes that portmanteaux are two cases of allomorphy
- ▶ *nincs* cannot be the result of allomorphy because ellipsis interacts with it differently
  - ▶ With portmanteau formation in Hungarian, ellipsis is blocked
  - ▶ But with allomorphy, ellipsis blocks it

# The timing of ellipsis

- ▶ Various proposals have been put forth about what happens to features inside ellipsis sites
  - ▶ Deleted in the syntax (Baltin, 2012)
  - ▶ Segregated Transfer (Aelbrecht, 2010; Sailor, forthcoming)
  - ▶ Deleted in the post-syntax (Murphy, 2016)
  - ▶ Non-insertion (Park, 2017; Saab, forthcoming)
- ▶ Hungarian portmanteaux show that the early deletion/isolation approaches cannot be right for this case

# Why early deletion/isolation doesn't work

- ▶ Suppose ellipsis = syntactic deletion or Segregated Transfer
- ▶ The PF cycle with NEG would see this:

(19) BUT [  $\sqrt{\text{ILDI}}$  [ NEG E ✕ ] ]

- ▶ ✕ is either nothing, or was interpreted in the previous cycle
- ▶ So PF operations cannot cross ellipsis boundaries
- ▶ But Indivisibility requires PF access across an ellipsis boundary

# Conclusion

- ▶ NEG+COP portmanteau blocks stripping in Hungarian
- ▶ Contents of ellipsis site cannot be deleted before we decide whether a portmanteau is possible
- ▶ Post-syntactic portmanteau-formation means the ellipsis site is PF-accessible
  - ▶ No syntactic deletion or Segregated Transfer
- ▶ A possible implementation involves ellipsis by post-syntactic deletion and portmanteau by spanning

# Things I ran out of time for

- ▶ You can ask me about these in the Q& A!
  1. Why Total Impoverishment (Murphy, 2016) doesn't work
  2. The pattern of elliptical indivisibility in Cypriot Greek
  3. Why Cypriot Greek may be a problem for a Fusion analysis
  4. How Cypriot Greek may provide another reason to adopt *No Bundling*
  5. How a non-Insertion approach (Park, 2017; Saab, forthcoming) might work

# Acknowledgements

Thanks to Adam Albright, Sabine Iatridou, and Norvin Richards for discussion and to Dóra Kata Takács, Amy Csete, Christos Christopoulos, Renos Georgiou, and Natalia Pavlou for judgements. This work was partially supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada's Doctoral Fellowship 767-2017-0069.

# References I

- Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. *The Syntactic Licensing of Ellipsis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi:10.1075/la.149.
- Baltin, Mark. 2012. Deletion versus pro-forms: An overly simple dichotomy? *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 30(2). 381–423. doi:10.1007/s11049-011-9157-x.
- Caha, Pavel. 2009. *The nanosyntax of case*: University of Tromsø Doctoral dissertation.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge University Press 1st edn. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511755088.
- Halle, Morris. 1997. Distributed morphology: Impoverishment and fission. In *Papers at the Interface*, vol. 30 (MITWPL), 425–449. MITWPL.
- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In Kenneth Hale & Jay Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20*, 111–176. Cambridge, US: MIT Press.
- Haugen, Jason D. & Daniel Siddiqi. 2016. Towards a Restricted Realization Theory: Multimorphemic monolistemicity, portmanteaux, and post-linearization spanning. In Daniel Siddiqi & Heidi Harley (eds.), *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*, vol. 229, 343–386. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:10.1075/la.229.12hau.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 1). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

# References II

- Merchant, Jason & Natalia Pavlou. 2017. The morphosyntax of the periphrastic future under negation in Cypriot Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17(2). 233–262. doi:10.1163/15699846-01702005.
- Murphy, Andrew. 2016. Subset relations in ellipsis licensing. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 1(1). 44. doi:10.5334/gjgl.61.
- Park, Dongwoo. 2017. *When does ellipsis occur and what is elided?* College Park, MD: University of Maryland, College Park Doctoral dissertation.
- Ronai, Eszter & Laura Stigliano. 2020. NP ellipsis bleeds allomorphy in Hungarian. *Snippets* (39). 10–12. doi:10.7358/snip-2020-039-rost.
- Saab, Andrés. forthcoming. Ellipsis: Its way from syntax to morphology. In Anikó Lipták & Güliz Güneş (eds.), *The derivational timing of ellipsis*, Oxford University Press.
- Sailor, Craig. forthcoming. The morphophonology of ellipsis: Evidence for Segregated Transfer. In Anikó Lipták & Güliz Güneş (eds.), *The derivational timing of ellipsis*, Oxford University Press.
- Surányi, Balázs. 2002. Negation and the negativity of n-words in Hungarian. *Approaches to Hungarian* 8. 107–132.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2016. Spans and Words. In Heidi Harley & Daniel Siddiqi (eds.), *Morphological Metatheory*, 199–220. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Trommer, Jochen. 1999. Morphology consuming Syntax' Resources.

# Elliptical divisibility in Cypriot Greek I

Table: Cypriot Greek periphrastic future constructions

	is going to	was going to
AFF	en na	itan na
NEG	tha	itan na

- ▶ Merchant & Pavlou (2017) argue *tha* in Cypriot Greek is a portmanteau of the present tense copula *en* and the subordinator *na* in the presence of matrix negation

## Elliptical divisibility in Cypriot Greek II

- ▶ Same pattern of elliptical indivisibility:

- (20) O Yannis itan na pai ekso  
the Yannis be.PST.3 C go.PFV.NPST.3SG out  
extes, ala i Maria en itan  
yesterday, but the Maria NEG be.PST.3  
'Yannis was going to go out yesterday, but Maria was  
not.' (Merchant & Pavlou, 2017:243), ex. 23a
- (21) \* O Yannis en na pai ekso  
the Yannis be.NPST.3 C go.PFV.NPST.3SG out  
avrio, ala i Maria en en  
tomorrow, but the Maria NEG be.NPST.3  
Int: 'Yannis is going to go out tomorrow, but Maria is  
not.'

# Elliptical divisibility in Cypriot Greek III

- ▶ Nothing wrong with *en en* sequence in general though:

(22) Ta mora en en arosta  
the children NEG be.NPST.3 sick

‘The children are not sick.’ (Merchant & Pavlou,  
2017:239), ex. 15a

- ▶ So it seems Cypriot Greek shows the same thing as Hungarian: when a portmanteau crosses an ellipsis boundary, it cannot be split

# A problem for Fusion?

- (23) En tha mairepso                      che na kathariso  
NEG THA    COOK.PFV.NPST.1SG AND C    clean.PFV.NPST.1SG  
avrio  
TOMORROW  
'I will not [cook and clean] tomorrow'                      (*Merchant & Pavlou, 2017:245*), ex. 26a

- ▶ Fusion operates on sister terminals, so would require head movement of C to COP
- ▶ But *tha* can form out of *cop* and the first C in a co-ordination
- ▶ So we would need CSC-violating head-movement out one conjunct only...

## Why No Bundling?

- ▶ Modelling indivisibility with pre-syntactic bundling requires ruling out the unbundled option
  - ▶ e.g. Economical to use the fewest number of feature bundles
- ▶ But in Cypriot Greek, this would fail because adjacency is required for *tha*
- ▶ So Bundling is not an option in Cypriot Greek

(24) En en            ute        na mairepso            supa ute na  
NEG be.NPST.3 neither C cook.PFV.NPST.1SG soup nor C  
kathariso            to        domatio avrio  
clean.PFV.NPST.1SG the room        tomorrow  
'I will neither cook soup nor clean the room tomorrow.'  
(Merchant & Pavlou, 2017:248), ex. 33

# Total Impoverishment Murphy (2016)

(25) For any  $F$ ,  $F$  a feature on  $L$ ,  $F \rightarrow \emptyset$  iff there is an  $L'$  such that  $F$  is on  $L'$  and  $L_F \subseteq L'_F$

- ▶ The features on a terminal are deleted if they are all contained on some terminal in the antecedent
- ▶ Relax the identity requirement to subsets instead of proper subsets (c.f. Murphy, 2016:9, fn. 4)
- ▶ Modelling elliptical indivisibility:  
Fusion  $\prec$  Impoverishment  $\prec$  Insertion

## Total Impoverishment Murphy (2016) (cont.)

- ▶ After Fusion [NEG,COP,PRS,3SG] will not be a subset of the antecedent [COP,PRS,3SG]
- ▶ With any non-portmanteau, the ellipsis site will contain identical terminals to the antecedent
- ▶ So, as long as Fusion  $\prec$  Impoverishment, we can capture elliptical indivisibility
- ▶ But Fusion only applies to 3rd person copulas, so agreement features must already be present before Fusion

## Total Impoverishment Murphy (2016) (cont.)

- ▶ Total Impoverishment needs feature identity, but a 1st person copula can be deleted under identity with a 3rd person one

(26) Pisti otthon van, de én nem  
Pisti at.home be.3SG.PRS, but 1SG NEG  
'Pisti is at home, but not me.'

- ▶ So agreement features must not yet be present at the time of Impoverishment
- ▶ Timing contradiction:
  - ▶ Agreement features are present before Fusion but not before Impoverishment
  - ▶ Yet Fusion precedes Impoverishment

# Non-Insertion approaches

- ▶ Park (2017); Saab (forthcoming) propose that ellipsis is just non-Insertion
  - ▶ For Park (2017), it is deleting the phonological feature matrices that exponents would be inserted into
  - ▶ For Saab (forthcoming), it is deleting the trigger for Insertion
- ▶ These approaches can also capture elliptical indivisibility
- ▶ As long as one terminal in a span having a PFM/Insertion trigger is enough to associate with the whole span
- ▶ These approaches predict that both stripping and predicate ellipsis produce the same output when a portmanteau is involved