1. Overview

- The Empirical Domain. Temporal Adverbal Constructions (TACs) have full clausal forms (1) and phrasal forms (2):
  (1) Sue left [after Joe left].
  (2) Sue left [after Joe].
- TAC-Stripping. At least some phrasal TACs have a clausal source involving movement of the remnant and ellipsis of a vP:
  (3) Kim met Sue [after Joe Tom].
- Embedding Constraints. Along with an articulated syntax-semantics for TACs, this provides an account for a surprising but familiar puzzle:
  (4) No Asymmetric Embedding. A phrasal TAC and its antecedent must be at the same level of embedding.

2. TAC-Stripping

- Basic Ingredients. TAC-Stripping is:
  - Low-adjunction of a TAC with an extended vP (e.g., Panchena 2008).
  - Movement of a single remnant and subsequent vP-ellipsis.
- Operator Movement. Gettig (1970) proposed movement of temporal operators (t) in TACs:
  (5) I saw Kim [after OoP, she said t1; she would leave t2].
  a. ‘I saw Kim after the time of saying that she would leave.’
  b. ‘I saw Kim after the reported time of leaving.’
- Temporal Re-binding. The resulting re-binding in ellipses is re-solved via Quantifier-Raising of the TAC (AC; Takahashi 2008):
  (6) Sue left after Joe did [ leave t1 ]; Sue [s left t2].
- Ellipsis Parallelism. Ellipsis is licensed according to Rooth 1992b:
  (7) FocP afterP Tom met Sue at t.
  a. [AC] = left [AC].
  b. [PD] = [left [AC]].
  c. [AC] ∈ {PD} for any t, ellipsis is licensed.

3. Movement and Ellipsis

- Focus Parallelism. Pitch accent in the matrix clause disambiguates the remnant (Rooth 1992a):
  (9) [AC] Kim met Sue [after PD Tom].
  • Focus Parallelism (26).
  a. Kim [heard that Sue had left].
  b. Kim [heard that Sue had left after Joe heard that she had left].
  ‘Kim heard that, after Joe heard Sue had left, Sue had left.’
- Binding Connectivity. The remnant shows binding connectivity effects (Lechner 2004, Bhatt & Takahashi 2011):
  (11) I took him to Sue before a. Joe’s boss 2 [he took him to Sue].
  b. ‘Sue’s boss 2 [he took him to Sue].
  (12) I took Joe to Sue before a. his boss 2 [he took him to Sue].
  b. ‘Sue’s boss 2 [he took him to Sue].
- Islands. The remnant’s sensitivity to islands is consistent with movement (Merchant 2004):
  (13) Complex-NP Constraint. I met [someone who knows Dutch] before:
  a. [someone who knows Russian].
  b. * [someone who knows Russian].
  (14) Left-Branch Extraction. Tom read Kim’s book after:
  a. [AC Ann’s book].
  b. * [AC Ann’s book].

4. Restructuring and Low-Adjunction

- Restructured Complements. Phrasal TACs permit restructured complements:
  (15) You should cook the dumplings before eating them.
  (16) The dumplings were eaten after being cooked.
- Scope of Negation. Negation cannot be interpreted inside a phrasal TAC (e.g., Oehrle 1987):
  (17) Tom didn’t leave after his boss.
  a. * ‘Tom left, but not after his boss didn’t leave.’
  b. ‘Tom left, but not after his boss’.
  And phrasal TACs necessarily take scope below root negation:
  (18) Tom didn’t leave after his boss.
  a. ‘Tom left, but not after his boss didn’t leave.’
  b. * ‘After his boss left, Tom didn’t leave.’
- Scope of Modals. Epistemic modals resist being interpreted inside a phrasal TAC (cf. Siegel 1987):
  (19) ‘Kim might leave after Joe (might leave).’
- Quantifier-Variable Binding. A quantificalional DP in subject position can bind a pronoun in a phrasal TAC (e.g., McCawley 1993):
  (20) No employees; left [after his boss].

5. The Eliminative Puzzle of Phrasal TACs

- Embedding Constraints. Phrasal TACs show the constraints against embedding the ellipsis site and antecedent observed with Gapping (Hankamer 1979) and other bare argument ellipses (e.g., Rooth 1992), but not necessarily with VP-Ellipsis (VPE):
  (21) Embedded Adjunction; Matrix Antecedent.
  a. Kim [heard that Sue had left after Joe heard that she had left].
  b. * Kim [heard that Sue had left after Joe (did) hear that Sue had left].
  ‘Kim heard that, after Joe heard Sue had left, Sue had left.’
- Matrix Adjunction; Embedded Antecedent.
  a. Kim [heard that Sue had left after Joe had left].
  b. Kim [heard that (that) Sue had left after Joe ‘had’ left].
  ‘After Joe left, Kim heard that Sue had left.’
- Not i-P-Parallelism (Toosarvandani 2016). Weakening i-P-Parallelism to include TACs weakens it beyond utility.
- Not Complementizers (Wurmbrand 2017). The presence of a complementizer (i) does not affect the status of an embedded ellipsis site and (ii) is not relevant for an embedded antecedent site.

6. Re-binding and Parallelism

- Blocking TAC-Stripping. Embedding results in irreparable Antecedent-Containment (23) or non-Parallel binding (25).
  (23) IP Tom read Kim’s book after a. his boss.

Why Is VPE Not Eliminative?

Why Can VPE Not Target Phrasal TACs? Focus movement induces re-binding that triggers a MAxELIDS-type effect (e.g., Merchant 2008).
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