Chapter 30: French

Anne Dagnac

Part IV: Typological case studies
Chapter 35: French
Anne Dagnac

Elliptical phenomena have received, by far, much less attention in French than in English or even Spanish within formal frameworks, in spite of the initial attempt by Zribi-Hertz (1986) to provide a comprehensive analysis of them in terms of null proforms. This is all the more regrettable as French displays constructions that resemble the main types of ellipses reported in the literature but with sometimes diverging properties. It also has proforms in contexts where other languages have ellipsis: it then appears as a large fallow field to investigate cross-linguistic accounts of ellipsis and its much debated relationships with anaphora. Today, one of the central issues, in particular for predicate and clausal ellipses, is whether ellipses, as opposed to pronouns, involve abstract syntactic structure: this question will be the central theme of this chapter. I will first examine whether the existence of ellipses following modal verbs challenges the consensus view that French lacks VP-ellipsis, and show that it does not (section 1). I will then turn to constructions that have been argued to display clausal ellipsis: in section 2, I will examine sluicing – and to a lesser degree, fragment answers –, in section 3 coordinate ellipses, and show that French calls for a non-uniform analysis of clausal ellipses. In the last two sections, I will very briefly point to a few questions raised by French Comparative ellipsis and NP-ellipsis.

1. Predicate ellipsis and anaphora in French
English-type predicate ellipses are ruled out in present-day French (for Old French, see Miller 1997), in particular after auxiliaries. In VP-ellipsis, an auxiliary can be followed by a gap: (1) shows that French auxiliaries, unlike their English counterparts in the translation, cannot. Instead, French uses substitutive proforms, cf. (2): roughly, agentive vPs are anaphorized by *le faire* 'do it', as in (2a); adjectival and passive predicates by *le* 'it', as in (2b-c). Clausal complements can be represented by various pronouns (*le* 'it', *en* 'of it', *y* 'to it', *ça* 'that') according to the verb and the context (cf. Zribi-Hertz 1986 and Roussarie & Amsili 2007).

(1)   * Jean   a acheté   du vin   mais   Luc   n'a   pas.   *VPE*
     Jean   has bought   of.the wine   but   Luc   SM[1]=has   not
     'John has bought wine, but Luke has not.'

(2)   a. Jean   a acheté   du vin   mais   Luc   ne l'a   pas fait.   *VP-anaphor*
     Jean   has bought   of.the wine   but   Luc   SM=it=has   not done
     'Jean bought wine but Luc didn't do it.'
     b. Jean est content mais Luc ne l'est pas / * n'est pas.
      Jean is happy but Luke SM=it=is not/ SM=is not
     'John is happy but Luke is not.'
     c. Le garage sera   démoli   dès que   la maison le sera.
      The garage be.FUT   destroyed   as soon as   the house it=be.FUT

---

[1] In all examples, the preverbal part of the discontinuous negation, *ne*, which does not carry semantic negation *per se,* is glossed as SM (scope marker), after Kayne (1984). Other abbreviations are FUT (future), PFT (perfect), PPFT (past perfect), PST (present), FEM (feminine), MASC (masculine), SG (singular), PL (plural). Cliticization is indicated by =.

'The garage will be destroyed   as soon as   the house will (be).'

In English pseudo-gapping (PG), some contrastive remnant is present next to the auxiliary, cf. (3b). In French, PG also has an anaphoric equivalent, as shown in (3a). As (3c) shows, it allows adjuncts, but not arguments, to be stranded.

(3) a. Jean offrira   du vin   à Marie lundi   et Luc   le fera   demain.   *PG-anaphor*
         Jean offer.FUT of.the.wine to Mary Monday and Luc   it=do.FUT tomorrow
      'Jean will offer wine to Mary on Monday and Luc will do it tomorrow.'

     b. Jean will offer wine to Mary on Monday and Luc will tomorrow.   *Pseudogapping*

     c. Jean a offert   du vin   à Marie et Luc   l'a fait   *du whisky/ *à Bill.
         Jean has offered of.the.wine to Mary and Luc it=has done of.the.whisky/to Bill
      'Jean offered wine to Mary and Luc did whisky/ to Bill.'

French then seems more suited for the study of competition between different proforms than to the investigation of predicate ellipsis. However, there are two contexts where a verbal form can be followed by a gap, as in English: after some lexical verbs, as in (4), and after (non-epistemic) modal semi-auxiliaries such as *pouvoir* 'can', *devoir* 'must', and, as shown by Authier (2011), *vouloir* 'want', *falloir* 'have to' and *avoir le droit* 'have the right', cf. (5).

(4) a. Jean   voulait participer,   mais il n'a   pas   osé.
         John   wanted participate,   but   he=SM=has   not   dared
      'John wanted to participate, but he didn't dare.'
     b. John wanted to participate, but he didn't dare.

(5) a. Jean   voulait participer,   mais   il ne peut pas/ il n'a pas le droit.
         John   wanted participate,   but   he=SM=can   not/ he=SM=have not the right
      'John wanted to participate, but he can't/ he is not allowed to.'
     b. John wanted to participate, but he can't.

In English, (4b) and (5b) are argued to involve different structures, a null proform devoid of inner structure in (4b), known as Null Complement Anaphora (NCA), and VP-ellipsis in (5b), where a fully articulated syntactic structure is generally argued to be present but unpronounced.[2] At first sight, (4a) resembles English NCA, while (4b), named French Modal Ellipsis (FME) by Busquets and Denis (2001), could resemble Verb-phrase ellipsis (VPE) or Null Complement Anaphora (NCA), or another structure found in Dutch named Modal Complement Ellipsis (MCE) – see Aelbrecht (2010) and Aelbrecht and Harwood this volume. I will argue that FME actually differs from all of them. One crucial test to diagnose the presence/absence of inner structure is extraction: if some item can be extracted from a position that would lie inside the gap, it seems reasonable to consider that this gap is syntactically structured though unpronounced. If nothing can be extracted from it, on the contrary, the gap can be seen as an opaque null pronoun. On this basis, Authier (2011) concludes that French NCA-cases such as (4) involve an opaque null complement. French modal ellipses, on the other hand, differ from NCA in that they pass all the usual tests diagnosing the presence of internal structure (cf. Authier 2011, Busquets and Denis 2001, and Dagnac 2010). In particular, they pass all extraction tests, including, unlike MCE (cf. (7c, from Aelbrecht 2010: 63), A'-movement tests:[3] they can enter Antecedent-Contained Deletion (ACD) constructions, where an elliptical restrictive relative modifies a quantified

---

[2] Zribi-Hertz (1986) considers all ellipses as empty categories. On the basis of their distribution, she considers French NCA and English VPE as allowing the same type of proforms, and leaves the question open for English NCA.

[3] Authier (2011) further shows that they pass the Missing Antecedent test and the Quantifier Scope test introduced by Hankamer and Sag (1976).

antecedent and then appears to be contained inside its anteceden, cf. (6), but also free relatives and WH-questions, cf. (7), and A-movement extraction, cf. (8).

(6)   Léa lit tous les livres qu'elle peut <lire t>.
       'Lea reads all the books that she can'[4]

(7)   a. Il embrasse [_WH qui_i] il peut <embrasser t_i>.
          He kisses [_WH who(ever)_i] he can <kiss t_i>
          'He kisses who(ever) he can.'
       b. Je sais quels livres LEA peut lire et je sais aussi quels livres_i BEN ne peut pas <lire t_i>. *FME*
          I know which books LEA can read and I know also which books_i BEN SM=can not <read t_i>.
          'I know which books LEA can read and I also know which books BEN can't.'
       c.?*Ik weet niet wie Kaat WOU uitnodigen, maar ik weet wel wie ze MOEST.   *MCE*
             I know not who Kaat wanted invite   but I know AFF who she must.PST
          'I don't know who Kaat WANTED to invite, but I do know who she HAD to.'   *VPE*

(8)   La fenêtre   peut être réparée mais la porte_i ne peut pas< t_i être réparée t_i>.
       The window can be   repaired but the door SM can not <   be repaired >
       'The window can be repaired but the door cannot < be repaired>.'

FME thus patterns with VPE in this respect and qualifies as ellipsis via deletion. FME shares another property with VPE: what can be elided matches what can be topicalized (Johnson 2001). As Authier (2011) shows, the modal verbs found in FME also allow their complement to topicalize, cf. (9), unlike French auxiliaries, NCA taking verbs, and epistemic modals, cf. (10):

(9)   J'aimerais bien faire des études de médecine, mais disséquer les cadavres, je peux pas.
       I would-like well to-do some studies of medicine but dissect the corpses I can not
       'I'd like to undertake medical studies, but dissect corpses, I just can't.'

(10)   a. *Anne voulait manger des moules et [_VP mangé des moules]_i, elle a t_i.
             Anne wanted to-eat some mussels and eaten some mussels she has
          'Anne wanted to eat mussels, and eat mussels, she did.'
       b. *Anne ne croit pas avoir fermé les rideaux, mais avoir fermé les fenêtres, elle croit.
          Anne SM=believes not to-have shut the drapes but to-have shut the windows she believes
          'Anne doesn't think that she closed the drapes, but the windows, she thinks she did.'
       c. *[Arriver d'un moment à l'autre]_i, la police peut t_i; alors accélère.   (*epistemic*)
             to-arrive of a moment to the other the police may so speed-up
          'The police may arrive at any moment, so hurry up.'

Authier (2011) then argues that both English-type VPE (cf. Johnson 2001) and FME are licensed by movement, and that the possibility for a tensed or auxiliary verb to have its predicate topicalized predicts the possibility of a corresponding predicate ellipsis. What remains to be explained is why the higher copy of a topicalized predicate can be unpronounced and why topicalization (and then potential ellipsis) of the VP is allowed after English auxiliaries but not after French ones.

       The answer to the latter question may correlate with the size of the elided material. While Zribi-Hertz (1986) and Busquets and Denis (2001) consider that FME *is* an instance of VPE, Dagnac (2010) argues that FME does not delete an infinitival VP but a full clause. This is straightforward with constructions involving *vouloir* 'want', where the elided material is a tensed clause, as in (11):[5]

---

[4] I don't give the English VPE equivalents to the French examples independently when the translation provides them.

[5] Dagnac's (2010) initial proposal, based on *pouvoir* and *devoir* is that FME deletes the TP complement selected by the modal. 'Clausal' must be qualified as either TP or CP for the other modals argued by Authier (2011) to license FME, since they can select both tensed CPs and

(11)   Je lirai   tous les livres$_i$ que tu voudras   <[$_{CP}$ que je lise t$_i$]>.
         I read.FUT   all the books   that you want.FUT   that I read.SBJV
         'I'll read every book that you [will] want me to read.'

Pouvoir 'can' and *devoir* 'must', on the other hand, are subject-raising verbs selecting an infinitival TP (Ruwet 1972: 48-85).[6] The hypothesis that FME elides the whole CP/TP accounts for various differences between FME and English VPE. First, in French, if the infinitive predicate has a tense, aspect or voice auxiliary, as in (12a), it cannot be stranded, nor can any constituent situated higher than vP inside the infinitive, such as negation, cf (12b).

(12) a. Tom peut avoir fini   en juin, et Léa peut aussi (*avoir).
       Tom can have finished   in June   and Lea can also have
       'Tom can have finished in June, and Lea can have, too.'

    b. *Paul peut aller   à Madrid mais Léa   peut   ne pas.
       Paul can go   to Madrid but Lea   can   not
       'Paul is allowed to go to Madrid but Lea is allowed not to.'

These differences are expected if English modal auxiliaries select an (elidable) predicate VP, while French modal verbs like *pouvoir* and *devoir* select an (elidable) clause, as sketched in (13):

(13) a.   Modal < *[TP... [(NegP) [T...[Asp [passive BE [[$_{vP}$ [VP ....]]]]]]>*   (French)
     b.   Modal (NegP) [Asp [passive BE [$_{vP}$ *<[VP ....]>*]]]   (English)

---

infinitives. The nature of their infinitival complements is debated: I will assume here that they are

control verbs selecting a CP, too.

[6] Monoclausal analyses of *pouvoir* + infinitive exist. To my knowledge, however, none of them

accounts for the full range of Ruwet's arguments, in particular the initial observation that

complements of the subject can cliticize on the infinitive, as in (i), where *en* 'of it' stands for *du*

problème; this is impossible with monoclausal complex predicates, cf. (ii):

(i)   La solution peut en être publiée.

        The solution can of.it be published

        'The solution (of the problem) can be published.'

(ii)   a. La solution [en a été publiée].

         The solution of.it has been published

       b. *La solution a [$_{VP}$ en été publiée].

          The solution has of.it been published

       c. *La solution a été [$_{VP}$ en publiée].

        The solution has been of.it published

        'The solution (of the problem) has been published.'

Second, Merchant (2007, 2008) argues that clausal ellipses disallow voice mismatches between the ellipsis site and the antecedent, while smaller ellipses tolerate them: unlike VPE, FME disallows voice mismatches, cf. (14); this is expected if the latter, but not the former, elides a clause:

(14)   a.*Il faut remplacer l'ampoule$_i$ de l'escalier , mais elle$_i$ ne peut pas– elle$_i$ est coincée.
          It needs replace the bulb of the staircase, but it SM=can not, it is jammed
          'Someone should replace the bulb in the staircase but it can't be– it's jammed.'

The topicalization/ellipsis parallelism pointed at by Authier (2011) can be reformulated in this way: English can topicalize and then delete VPs, French can only topicalize and then delete clauses.

(15)   a. *Anne voulait manger des moules et [$_{VP}$ mangé des moules]$_i$, elle a t$_i$.
          b. Anne wanted to eat mussels, and [$_{VP}$ eat mussels]$_i$, she did $_i$.

(16)   a. Anne voulait manger des moules mais [$_{TP}$ manger des moules]$_i$, elle n'a pas pu t$_i$.
          b. Anne wanted to eat mussels, but [$_{VP}$ eat mussels]$_i$, she couldn't t$_i$.

         To sum up, French *does* display a type of ellipsis produced by deletion after (non-epistemic) modals. However, it is not a predicate ellipsis, but a clausal ellipsis – a consequence, if Authier (2011) is right, of the ability of French to allow clauses, but not VPs, to be topicalized. The particular properties of FME, which differ both from those of English VPE and Dutch MCE, provide comparative material for further investigations into ellipsis licensing. Whether other clausal ellipses in French also involve deletion, though, is an open question.

2. Sluicing and related cases

French displays sluicing, cf. (17)-(18), as well as sprouting, cf. (19). In sluicing, a constituent question is missing, except for the WH-phrase. Sluices can be embedded, cf. (17), (19), or appear as dialogue fragments, cf. (18): I will refer to them as 'embedded sluices' and 'root sluices', respectively. Sprouting is a particular instance of sluicing, in which the WH-phrase has no overt correlate in the antecedent clause.

(17)   Paul a reconnu   quelqu'un   mais j'ai   oublié   qui __.   *Embedded sluice*
          'Paul has recognized   someone   but I have   forgotten   who.'

(18)A: Je dois parler   avec quelqu'un.   B: Avec qui __?   *Root sluice*
          'I must talk   with someone.   B: With whom?'

(19)   Elle a rencontré   Paul à Berlin   mais j'ai oublié   quand__.   *Sprouting*
          She has met   Paul in Berlin   but I have forgotten   when
          'She met Paul in Berlin, but I forgot when.'

French also has a construction similar to dialectal Dutch spading (cf. (20b), from Van Craenenbroeck 2010: 16), where the WH-word is followed by a demonstrative, cf. (20). Unlike Germanic languages, though, it lacks swiping altogether, cf. (21): when a WH-PP is sluiced, the WH-word cannot be followed by its preposition, as in the English translation.

(20)   a. A: J'ai parlé   à un journaliste.   B: Qui ça?   *Spading (French)*
             I talked   to a journalist.   Who that?
          'A: I talked to a journalist. B: Who?'

          b. A.   Jef ei gisteren iemand gezien.   B. Wou da ?   *Spading (Wambeek Dutch)*
             Jeff has yesterday someone seen.   Who that
          'A. Jeff saw someone yesterday. B. Who?'

(21)   *Il a rendez-vous   avec quelqu'un,   mais j'ai oublié   qui avec.   *Swiping*
          He has appointment with someone,   but I have forgotten who with
          'He has an appointment with someone, but I forgot who with.'

         French sluicing has been poorly studied so far, and seems to share most of the properties of its English counterpart (cf. chapter III-21). Three cases, however, need closer attention: bare sluices (22), sluices involving the direct object *quoi* (23) and degree *comment* sluices (24). In standard French, they

can be found both in spontaneous sloppy conversation and in careful writing, and can constitute the main utterance, as in the (a) examples, or be embedded, as in the (b) ones.

(22) a. Je dois parler à quelqu'un, mais qui?   *Bare sluice*
      'I must talk   to someone,   but who ?'

    b. Je dois parler à un étudiant, mais je ne sais pas   quel étudiant/lequel.
      I must talk   to a student,   but I SM=do not know   which student/the.which
    'I must talk to a student, but I don't know which (one)'

(23) a. Il faut faire   quelque chose.   Mais **quoi**?   *Quoi* sluices
      It must do   something.   But what?
    'We must do something, but what?'

    b. Tu viens de dire   quelque chose. J'ai oublié   quoi.
      You come from say something.   I have forgotten   what
    'You just said something. I forgot what.'

(24) a. –Est-ce que   tu me trouves   beau?   Degree *comment* sluice[7]
      PART.that   you me=find   handsome
    – Oui.
     Yes
    – Mais beau comment?
     But handsome how
    – Écoute, Boris, je ne sais   pas, moi ! Très très beau.
     Listen Boris I SM=know not   me   Very very handsome
    (Schreiber, *Un silence d'environ une demi-heure*, 1996)
    'Do you find me handsome?

    – Yes.

    – But how handsome?

    – Listen, Boris, I don't know ! Very, very handsome.'

    b. On m'a   dit   qu'il   était grand, mais je sais   pas grand   comment.
      One me=has told   that he=was tall,   but I know   not tall   how
    'I was told that he was tall, but I don't remember how tall.'

The structures in (22-24) all share one property: no grammatical full question exists where what corresponds to the remnant would be fronted, which appears to challenge analyses of sluicing relying on the deletion of a TP-constituent after WH-movement of the remnant.

    Bare sluices show that standard French, together with Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese (Rodrigues et al. 2008), Indonesian (Sato 2011) and Serbo-Croatian (Stepanović 2012), forms an exception to the 'preposition stranding generalization', henceforth PSG (see chapter XXX):[8] while it can't strand

---

[7] 'Degree *comment*' is analyzed in Moline (2013). The answers given to the sluiced questions in (24)

and (42) suggest that *comment* is a degree phrase. Manner interpretations may exist, but this does not

bear on the analysis.

[8] Since Merchant (2001), French bare sluices are often presented as ungrammatical (e.g. Sato 2008).

Merchant himself (2001: 98, fn 7) suggests that judgements may vary. I find his example grammatical

prepositions[9] in regular WH-questions, cf. (25), a prepositionless remnant can correspond to a PP-correlate in sluicing:

(25) a. *Mais qui dois-je parler (à/avec)?[10]
       But who must I talk   (to/with)

   b. *Je ne sais pas   quel étudiant   je dois   parler (à).
    I SM=know not   which student I must   talk   (to).
    'I don't know which student I must talk to'

The remnant can correspond to all kinds of WH-Ps, simple or complex, and the correlate PP can have any syntactic function, but it must be overt; like in English (Chung 2005), bare sluices cannot be sprouted:

(26)   Paul est allé   au cinéma,   mais je ne sais pas   *qui / ✓avec qui.
     Paul has gone to.the movies, but I SM=know not who /   with who.
     'Paul went to the movies, but I don't know with whom.'

     Within mainstream generative grammar, two main types of analyses have been proposed for other non-preposition stranding languages allowing for bare sluices. The first type derives these sluices from underlying clefts (Rodrigues et al. 2009), arguably as a last resort (van Craenenbroeck, 2010). The second type considers them as instances of elliptical repair (cf. Sato 2011), for instance via the deletion of an otherwise illicit trace.

     Rodrigues et al. (2009) propose that in Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese, exceptions to the PSG generalization are derived from underlying clefts, more specifically a cleft based on a specificational copular sentence, as in (27):

(27) Juan ha hablado con una chica pero no sé cuál <es la chica con la que ha hablado Juan>
    Juan has talked with a girl but not know which is the girl with the that has talked Juan
    'John talked to a girl but I don't know which one'.

It is unclear whether a cleft strategy can be extended to French. For some bare sluices, in particular with a non-partitive correlate (roughly, an antecedent whose referent is not part of a salient entity) , no type of cleft seems directly available.[11] For instance, for the bare sluice in (28a), a standard interrogative cleft is of no help, since it would pied-pipe the preposition, cf. (28b-c); a short cleft as in (28d) is not semantically equivalent to (28a): unlike the bare sluice, it presupposes that the speaker has some prior

---

if not perfect: the most natural examples involve a D-linked *wh*-phrase such as *quel* NP, 'which NP',

lequel 'which one', and/or an indefinite correlate.

[9] Varieties of Canadian French allow (some degree of) Preposition stranding (see Poplack & al., 2012

and references therein). We focus here on the standard variety spoken in France.

[10] For ease of reading, most of the examples are illustrated by full root interrogative clauses involving

subject clitic inversion. Less formal structures without inversion are equally ruled out.

[11] In French, the full equivalent to (27) is grammatical, while its sluiced version is ungrammatical (it

requires the pronominal WH-P *laquelle*):

(i) *Jean a parlé avec une fille mais je ne sais pas quelle < ~~est la fille avec laquelle Jean a parlé~~>.

   Jean has talked with a girl but I SM=know not which <is the girl with the-that Jean has talked>

   'John talked to a girl but I don't know which one'.

knowledge of the individual whose identity is questioned (for instance, he has seen him, but does not know his name). As for a specificational construction, to be well-formed (cf. 28e-f), it requires additional material: if an analysis along these lines is to be pursued, it must account for how this additional material is made compatible with the identity conditions on ellipsis.

(28) a. Paul a   probablement parlé   avec quelqu'un, mais qui?
    Paul has probably talked with someone but who

  b. *… mais qui c'est avec qui il a parlé?
     but who it is   with who he has talked

   '... but who is it he talked to?'

  c. … mais avec qui c'est qu' il a   parlé?
     but with who it is that he has talked

  'who it is he talked with?'

  d. … mais qui c'est ?
    but who it is ?
  'but who is it ?'

  e. *… mais qui est le quelqu'un avec qui il a parlé?
     but who is the someone with who he has talked

  f. … mais qui est la personne avec laquelle il a parlé?
    who is the person with which he has talked

Contrary to Spanish (Rodrigues et al. 2009), French admits bare sluices with 'else-modifiers', which cannot occur in clefts (Merchant 2001):

(29) A. Il est assez connu. Il a joué   avec Sokhiev. B. Et qui d'autre?
  A. He's quite famous. He played with Sokhiev. B. And who else?

(30) A. On   peut le remplir avec de l'eau,   de l'huile… B. Et quoi d'autre?
   One can it=fill with of the water, of the oil And what else?
  'A. One can fill it with water, oil… B. And what else?'

Bare sluices can also involve the inanimate WH-phrase *quoi* 'what' (31-32), which is also incompatible with all types of clefts in standard French, cf. (33b-d):

(31) Avec quoi l'as-tu rempli?
  With what it=has=you filled
  'What did you fill it with?"

(32) On pourrait   le remplir avec quelque chose, mais (je ne sais pas)   quoi.
  one could it=fill with some.thing but (I sm=know not) what

(33) a. *…(je ne sais pas) quoi c'est avec quoi on pourrait le remplir.
     I sm=know not what it is with what one could it=fill

  b. *…(je ne sais pas) quoi est la chose avec quoi on pourrait le remplir.
         what is the thing with what one could it=fill

  c. *…(je ne sais pas) quoi   c'est.
        what   it=is

  More generally, *quoi*, whether a complement of a preposition or a direct object as in (23), cannot be fronted by itself in standard European French, cf. (34b) – and neither can degree *comment*, cf. (36).[12] In standard French tensed clauses, *quoi* can only be found *in situ*: the weak form *que* is required in root

---

[12] *Quoi* can be fronted only when it is conjoined with another WH-word (*qui ou quoi* 'who or what'), modified (*quoi d'autre* 'what else'), or in infinitival embedded questions (*Je ne sais pas quoi faire* 'I don't know what to do'). It regularly appears after a preposition and the whole PP can fronted (*Sur quoi est-il?* 'On what is he ?').

questions, cf. (34b), and the corresponding embedded questions take the form *ce que*, where a demonstrative pronoun is modified by a relative clause, cf. (35c). [13]

(34) a. Il faut faire quelque chose mais quoi?

b. …mais que/*quoi   faut-il   faire?

     but   what$_{strong/weak}$ must it do?

c. …mais il faut   faire quoi?

     but it must do what

     'We must do something but what must we do?'

(35) a. Il faut faire quelque chose mais je ne sais pas quoi.

b. … mais je ne sais   pas ce que/*que/*quoi   il faut faire.

     but   I SM=know not that=what/what$_{weak}$/what$_{strong}$ it must do

     'We must do something but I don't know what we must do'

(36) a. A. Il est grand.   B. Grand   comment?

     b.   B. *Grand   comment est-il?

                         Tall   how is he?

     c.   B. Il est grand comment?

                    He is tall how?

     'A. He is tall. B.How tall (is he)?'

If one wants to maintain a deletion analysis of these sluices, it may be more promising to consider that bare sluices, object *quoi* sluices and *comment* sluices stem from *in situ* interrogatives, and investigate which repair device can account for their well-formedness. [14,15]

Non-deletion approaches (see e.g. Chung et al. 1995, 2011, Ginzburg and Sag 2001), on the other hand, account straightforwardly for most of these cases. For instance, Chung et al. (1995, 2011), propose that the *wh*-phrases are base-generated in Spec, CP, and followed by a null (TP) category, *e*, which is replaced at LF by a TP phrase marker copied from the antecedent together with its interpretation. The syntactic structure of the sluice is then similar to (37a); at LF, the *wh*-phrase binds a

---

[13] All judgments here are for standard European French. Varieties of Canadian French may allow fronted Adj+*comment*. Colloquial French may also allow *quoi* and/or Adj+*comment* to be clefted in root and/or embedded clauses. The point here is that the corresponding sluices are not limited to such varieties and are completely unmarked.

[14] Dependency Grammar, which allows the deletion of non-constituent units such as catenae (Osborne et al. 2012), could derive root bare sluices from *in situ* questions. However, standard French does not allow embedded *in situ*, so embedded sluices would remain unexplained.

[15] Assuming that the P-stranding generalization holds for French, Sato (2011) excludes PF-repair for French on the basis of the respective timing of the syntactic violation and TP-deletion – a point that needs reconsidering. French bare sluices may also involve an instance of P-drop in the sense of Stepanović (2012), though whether and why P-drop would be limited to sluicing requires further investigation.

variable provided by the copy of the indefinite correlate, as roughly illustrated in (37). Sprouting consists of the same mechanism, but with the additional insertion of a copy of the wh-phrase, cf. (38).

(37) a. We must do something, but I don't know [$_{CP}$ what C$_0$ [$_{TP}$ e]].

   b. We must do something$_x$, but I don't know [$_{CP}$ what$_x$ C$_0$ [$_{TP}$ *we must do something$_x$*]].

(38) a. They were firing, but at what was unclear.

   b. [$_{CP}$ *at what* C [$_{TP}$ they were firing   ]]

                                ↓

   c.[$_{CP}$ *at what* C [$_{TP}$ they were firing *at what*]]

First, this approach offers a way to deal with the object *quoi* sluices. According to Sportiche (2008), the choice between strong forms (here *quoi*) and weak or clitic forms (here *que*) is a PF-phenomenon. In a perspective where only bundles of features are merged in the syntactic component, and the choice of the morphological variant occurs at Spell Out, *que* is unsurprisingly ruled out in contexts where it has no verb to cliticize onto, which correctly predicts its occurrence in (39):

(39) 1. *Syntax*

   On doit faire quelque chose, mais *wh*-phrase$_{(+DO, +inanimate)}$?

   2. *PF*

   On doit faire quelque chose, mais *wh*-phrase$_{(+DO, +inanimate)}$? > strong form selection before Ø

   3. On doit faire quelque chose, mais quoi.

   'We must do something, but what?'

The coindexing mechanism between the *wh*-phrase and the correlate makes no claim with respect to constituency, hence it also correctly predicts bare sluices to be possible, as in (40):

(40) Jim a parlé   à un étudiant mais je ne sais pas [$_{CP}$ lequel$_x$ [*Jim a parlé   à un étudiant$_x$*]].

   Jim has talked   to a student but I SM=know not   the.which Jim has talked   to a student

   'Jim spoke with some student but I know not which one'

The Adj+*comment* sluices, however, require some stipulation. They question the unspecified degree of the antecedent adjective. As in the measure phrase in (41), from Abeillé and Godard (2003), the degree complements *comme un jet de flèche* and *comment* in (42), are presumably part of the AP:

(41) [$_{AP}$ Haute [$_{PP}$ de 5 m]], une falaise surplombait   le lac.

   High   of 5m   a cliff   overhung   the lake

   '5 meters high, a cliff hung over the lake.'

(42). – C'est qu' il y a   loin du latin   au français.

   it=is that   there.is far   from.the Latin to.the French

   – [$_{AP}$ Loin   [$_{PP}$ comment]]?

       far   how

   – Loin   comme   un jet de flèche. (FT, Lanzmann, *La Horde d'or*, 1994)

    far   like   a throw of arrow

   'French is far from Latin. – How far? – Far as an arrow's throw.'

While this AP cannot move to Spec, CP, in French, an LF approach should postulate that it can still be base-generated in Spec, CP in overt syntax, cf. (43):

(43) Il est grand, mais je ne sais pas [$_{CP}$ grand comment C$_0$ [$_{TP}$ e]].

   He is tall   but I SM=know not   tall how

   'He is tall but I don't know how tall.'

A construction-based approach, in which the sluices are considered as fragments directly inserted into the syntactic structure (see e.g. Ginzburg and Sag 2000, Sag and Nykel 2011), sidesteps this problem, since it would presumably treat the AP fragment *grand comment* as depending directly from the main verb in the syntax.

While non-deletion analyses prove too powerful for languages that *do* comply to the PSG (see Merchant 2006: 278-279 for discussion),[16] they come close to making the right predictions for French. An open question is whether a similar mechanism applies to other clausal ellipses. For instance, fragment answers and gapping have both been argued to involve movement of the remnants to the left periphery of the clause, followed by TP-deletion. But French fragment answers, though sharing most properties with their English counterparts, can strand a preposition, cf. (44), while this is impossible in gapping, cf. (45):

(44) A. Avec qui   parlais-tu?   B. Paul.   (*je parlais avec t$_i$)
　　　 With whom   were.talking=you   Paul   (I was.talking with)
　　　 'A. Who where you talking with? B. Paul.'

(45)　Léa a parlé   avec Jim   et Marie *(avec) Bob.
　　　 Lea has talked with Jim   and Mary *(with) Bob
　　　 'Lea talked with Jim and Mary with Bob.'

If non-deletion approaches seem able to deal with the specific cases studied here, what remains to be explained is why and how such analyses could be constrained for PSG-languages, and whether a non-deletion analysis is a last resort scenario or a regular one for French sluicing.

3. Coordinate ellipses

This chapter deals with coordinate constructions like the ones in (46-47). They differ in the number, nature, and syntactic function of the remnants, but all raise a problem for models in which coordination is assumed to operate on

(i)　　　items of the same category and/or semantics;
(ii)　　 syntactic constituents.

(46) 'Special coordinations'

　　　a. Jim est heureux   et   en bonne santé.　　　　　*Coordination of unlikes*
　　　　 Jim is   happy   and in good form

　　　b. Jim aime Catherine et   est aimé   d'elle.　　　*Tensed VP coordination*
　　　　 Jim loves Catherine and   is loved   of her
　　　'Jim loves Catherine and is loved by her.'

　　　c. Anne va au cinéma le lundi et au théâtre le mardi.　　　*Non-constituent coordination*
　　　　 Ann goes to.the movie the Monday and to.the theater the Tuesday　　　(NCC)
　　　　 'Ann goes to the movies on Monday and to the theater on Tuesdays.'

　　　d. Léa adore et Lina déteste le football.　　　　*Right-node –raising (RNR)*
　　　　 Lea loves and Lina hates   the soccer
　　　'Lea loves and Lina hates soccer.'

(47) a. Jim viendra,   mais pas Léa/ Léa non/ et Léa aussi.　　　*Stripping*
　　　　 Jim come.FUT but   not Lea/ Lea no / and Lea too
　　　'Jim will come but not Lea/ Lea won't/ and Lea too.'

　　　b. Léa est pour l'Allemagne et ses amies   pour le Brésil.　　　*Gapping*
　　　　 Lea is for the Germany and her friends for   the Brazil
　　　 'Lea is for Germany and her friends for Brazil.'

---

[16] According to Merchant (2006, 2013), they predict, contrary to fact, that no case violation would ban bare sluices in languages complying to the PSG; besides, they allow for languages that strand prepositions in full questions but cannot strand them in sluicing – a pattern that seems as yet unattested.

At first sight, in (46a), the conjuncts do not have the same categorial status (AP vs PP); in (46b), they differ in voice features (active VP/passive VP); in (46c), (46d) and (47b), *au théâtre le mardi* 'to the theater on Tuesdays', *Léa adore* 'Lea loves' and *ses amies pour le Brésil* 'her friends for Brazil' respectively do not form a constituent. In (47a), while the first conjunct is a clause, the second one looks like a simple phrase. Unlike the other 'coordinate ellipses', stripping can sometimes be found after subordinating conjunctions in French, as shown in (48).[17]

(48) Paul aime le Baileys alors que Marie non.

    Paul likes the Baileys whereas Marie no

   'Paul likes Baileys, whereas Mary doesn't.'

     The English equivalents to (46-47) have all been argued to rely on clausal coordination plus deletion; deletion has sometimes been argued to be preceded by movement of the parts that remain overt, the *remnants*, to the left periphery of the elided clause (see e.g. Merchant 2003, Sailor and Thoms 2014, and references therein). Under such a view, at the syntactic level, two clauses are conjoined, i.e. two constituents of the same category, cf. (49) for stripping:

(49) [TP Jim speaks passable Korean], and [FP Lea$_i$ [TP ~~t$_i$ speaks passable Korean~~], too.

     In French, however, the dominant view is to consider that none of these constructions involve abstract syntactic structure – see e.g. Zribi-Hertz (1986) for (46a,b,c); Mouret (2006, 2008) for (46a,c), Abeillé & al. (2011) for gapping and RNR, Abeillé (2005, 2006) for stripping. One major argument is that the set of coordinators that can be found in (46-47) does not match the set of coordinators found in clausal coordination but the set found in regular non-clausal coordination. We illustrate this argument for stripping here, though the same holds for the other constructions. For instance, *car* 'for' can conjoin clauses (50a), not smaller constituents (50b): its incompatibility with 'elliptical' coordinations (51) argues against their clausal status.[18] Conversely, *ainsi que* 'as well as', a constituent coordinator, cannot

---

[17] The cases in (i-ii), which look like instances of gapping with a negative remnant, may be exceptions to the generalization that gapping is licensed by coordination. This, to my knowledge, has never been investigated.

(i) Son père   a été reçu   à l'Élysée   alors que moi jamais.

   His father be.PPFT received   at the Elysée   whereas me never

  'His father was received by the president whereas I never was."

(http://collectif69palestine.free.fr/spip.php?article382, consulted on 01/01/2016)

(ii) Léa fume 5 cigarettes par jour tandis que Marie aucune.

   Lea smokes five cigarettes by day whereas Mary none

   'Lea smokes five cigarettes a day, while Mary smokes none.'

[18] Morphological mismatches are also put forward: in (47b), for instance, the missing verb requires plural agreement while the antecedent is singular. The authors arguing for a non-deletion analysis in French consider that such mismatches argue against a deletion analysis in other languages, too (e.g. Abeillé et al. 2011: 8-10).

conjoin tensed clauses cf. (52a), but it is possible with elliptical structures (52b), again suggesting that they cannot be clausal:

(50) a. Paul prendra son rhum à 10h car il prend son Xanax à 8h.
      Paul take.FUT his rum at 10 for he take his Xanax at 8
      'Paul will take his rum at 10 o'clock for he's taking his Xanax at 8.'

b.   * Paul a acheté une imprimante car un ordinateur.
      Paul has bought a printer because a computer
      Intended: 'Paul bought a printer because he bought a computer.'

(51)   *Paul prendra son rhum à 10h car Marie aussi/car pas Marie.   *Stripping*
      Paul take.FUT his rum at 10 for Marie too / for not Marie
      'Paul will take his rum at 10 o'clock because Marie will too/ won't.'

(52) Jim aime le whisky...
    'Jim likes whisky...
       a. *ainsi qu'   il aime la tequila.
         as.well.as he likes the tequila'
         b. ainsi que la tequila.
           as well as tequila.'

(53)   Jim boira   un whisky à 8h ainsi que Marie   *Stripping*
      Jim drink.FUT a whisky at 8   as.well.as Marie
      'Jim will drink whisky at 8 and so will Mary.'

These authors focus on finding a proper way to redefine coordination, so that it can select fragments (stripping, coordination of unlikes) or non-headed strings of two (or more) constituents (gapping, NCC). In this approach, fragments are a proper syntactic unit, which can be found in fragment answers or questions, as well as being conjoined to a clause. Such analyses focus on (a) formalizing these units, (b) investigating which grammatical, morphological and semantic features condition (i) actually subsumes, and (c) define exactly how each conjunct and their union contribute to external grammatical relations such as case, agreement, extraction, selection or theta-marking (see detailed proposals in the references mentioned). In parallel, the licensing conditions on ellipsis are restated as licensing conditions on fragmentary coordination, and are argued to rely on discourse relations, for instance SYMMETRY and CONTRAST for gapping (see in particular Abeillé et al., 2011): (54) can be interpreted as a symmetrical (semantically reversible) descriptive coordination, but not as an asymmetrical coordination conveying consequence.

(54) a. Han est content et Luc furieux / Luc est furieux et Han content.
      Han is happy and Luke furious/ Like is furious and Han happy
      Intended 'Han is satisfied and at the same time Luke is furious.'
   b. Han est content et (??donc) Luc furieux / #Luc est (donc) furieux et Han content.
      Han is happy and   hence Luke furious/ Luke is then   furious and Han happy
      Intended 'Han is satisfied and as a consequence Luke is furious'

     One of the questions raised is whether the labels in (46-47), such as 'stripping' or 'gapping', describe homogeneous classes of constructions. For instance, (55), in which the remnant is preceded by the negative marker *pas* 'not', and (56), in which it is followed by the negative proform or polarity

particle (Authier 2013) *non* 'no',[19] though generally considered as two cases of stripping, have been shown to differ by Abeillé (2006) and Morris (2008):[20]

(55) Jim a écrit une lettre au directeur, mais/et pas Lea.   *negative delayed coordination*
     Jim wrote a letter to.the director, but/and not Lea

(56) Jim est venu mais/et Jules non.   *polarity stripping*
     Jim is come but/and Jules no
     'Jim came but Jules didn't.'

Polarity ellipses differ from other cases of 'stripping' in that they must follow the antecedent clause (57), they can be embedded (58), and they require an overt antecedent for the remnant (59):

(57) a.??Jean, mais Marie non,   écrira une lettre au président.
        John, but Marie no,   will write a letter to the president

     b. Jean, mais pas Marie, écrira une lettre au président.
        John, but not Marie, will write a letter to the president

     'John will write a letter to the president but Marie won't.'

(58) a. Jim sera là,   mais je crois que/alors que Jules non.
        Jim will be there but I think that/whereas   Jules no

     b. *Jim sera là,   mais je crois que/alors que   pas Jules.
        Jim will be there but I think that/whereas   not Jules

     'Jim will be there but I think that/whereas Jules won't.'

(59) a. Paul aime chasser,
                         a. *mais le sanglier non.
                            but the boar no
                         b. mais pas le sanglier.
                            but not the boar
            'Paul likes hunting, but he doesn't like to hunt boars.'

---

[19] *Non* 'no', *oui/si* 'yes' are commonly held to be TP-proforms, see for instance Rowlett (2007). They

can be embedded under a finite complementizer:

    (i)   Je pense que non.

             I think that no

    (ii)   Si oui, j'irai à la piscine.

             If yes, I will.go to the swimming pool

Authier (2013) argues they are polarity particles heading FinP and licensing the ellipsis of their

complement TP.

[20] Somewhat confusingly, Morris and Abeillé name the former *negative stripping* and *delayed*

coordination, and the latter *polarity ellipsis* and *stripping* respectively. I name them *delayed*

coordination and *polarity ellipsis*. The term *delayed* captures the empirical impression that the

remnant is conjoined to its correlate as an addendum.

If *non* is a TP-proform in (58), it already conveys a clausal meaning and Abeillé (2005) argues it involves no syntactic TP. What is to be explained, then, is the source of the remnant. Abeillé (2005) proposes that it is directly adjoined to the proform, cf. (60a). Morris (2008) and Authier (2013) argue that such structures do involve TP-deletion. According to this approach, the remnant is the left-dislocated component of an elided TP which is dominated by a PolarityP headed by the proform, cf. (60b). All analyses can account for the fact that such constructions can be extracted from or bound into, as in (61): the relative pronoun *dont* 'whose' is interpreted as a complement of *souvenir* 'memory' in both conjuncts. In Morris's or Authier's view, the relative is syntactically extracted from the TP, cf. (62a); in Abeillé's view, the relative does not involve movement and the pronoun's interpretation is integrated into the anaphoric resolution of the proform *non,* cf. (62b).

(60) a. Paul viendra mais [TP [Marie] [TP non]]

    b. Paul viendra mais [CP [Marie$_i$] [PolP non ~~[TP t$_i$ elle ne viendra pas]~~]]

     Paul will come but   Mary   no

     'Paul will come but Mary won't.'

(61) Un individu dont l'Histoire n'avait pas gardé souvenir, mais lui oui. (Garat Anne-Marie, *Pense à demain*, 2010, p. 679)

  A fellow of.which History SM=has not kept memory but him yes

  'A fellow that History didn't remember but HE did.'

(62) a. Un individu dont$_i$ l'Histoire n'avait pas gardé souvenir t$_i$, mais [CPlui [PolP oui [TP il avait gardé le souvenir t$_i$]]].

    b. Un individu dont$_i$ l'Histoire n'avait pas gardé souvenir t$_i$, mais [XP lui oui], (oui: 'il avait gardé le souvenir de cet individu')

Morris's proposal additionally accounts for the fact that sprouted remnants and indefinite remnants that do not correspond to a subtopic are ruled out: they would not be salient enough to be left-dislocated. This can be extended to Authier's analysis. Along these lines, if 'stripping' refers to TP-deletion with an XP remnant, polarity ellipses are actual instances of stripping. Note that the main argument against TP-deletion in French stripping does not apply to polarity ellipsis (contrary to negative delayed coordination): polarity ellipsis is, indeed, compatible with clausal coordinators (63), and excluded with constituent coordinators (64):

(63) a. Marie aime le rhum. Or, Pierre non.

     Mary likes rhum. Yet, Peter no.

     'Mary likes rhum. Yet, Peter does not.'

    b. Quand vous avez reçu votre carte mère, était-elle sous blister (…)? car la mienne non.[21]

     when you have received your motherboard was=it under blister?   For the mine no

     'When you received your motherboard, was it in a blister pack? Because mine wasn't.'

(64) *Paul est venu ainsi que Marie oui.

    Paul come.PPF as well as Marie yes

    'Paul came as well as Mary.'

    The uncovering of their distinct properties argues for a fine-grained investigation of other, barely studied, structures, such as (65a-b), which display a reverse order for the remnant and the negative item: (65a) yields a corrective interpretation absent from other cases of stripping; in (65b) the negative reinforcement allows an otherwise impossible remnant/negation order.

(65) a. Jim est venu et non Jules.

     Jim is come and no Jules

     'JIM came, not JULES.'

    b. Jim aime le café et/mais Jules pas *(du tout).

---

[21] Example from: http://www.amazon.fr/forum/-

/Tx17QA9DRRDWQFL/ref=ask_ql_ql_al_hza?asin=B00K8KODYQ, consulted on 30/12/2015.

Jim likes the coffee   and/but Jules not *(at all)

That 'gapping' also subsumes different constructions is argued by Dagnac (to appear), on the basis of gapped sentences with simple *ni* 'nor' and double *ni* 'neither… nor'. *Ni* is a strong Negative Polarity item (NPI) (cf. De Swart, 2001; Mouret, 2007) that must be c-commanded by a negative expression in overt syntax, which accounts for the grammaticality contrasts in (66): in (66a), contrary to (66b), *ni* fails to be c-commanded by *jamais* 'never'. Double *ni* is a negative expression (cf. De Swart 2001, Mouret 2007) that does not require such a licensing configuration, cf. (67).

(66) a. *[Jean ne votera   pas/jamais pour Tim] ni [Marie ne   votera pour Bob].*
      John SM vote.FUT not/never for Tim nor Mary SM   vote.FUT for Bob
      'John will not/never vote for Tim nor will Mary vote for Bob.'

    b. [CP ***Jamais*** *[Jean ne votera pour Tim ni Marie ne   s'abstiendra]*].
      Never John SM vote.FUT for Tim   nor Mary   SM   abstain.FUT
      'Never will John vote for Tim nor will Mary abstain from voting.'

(67)   Ni Jean ni Marie n'aiment les huîtres.
      Neither John nor Mary SM like the oysters
      'Neither John nor Mary like oysters.'

Dagnac (to appear) argues that neither a clausal deletion view nor a fragment analysis of gapping can account for French gapped constructions conjoined by simple *ni* 'nor': the grammaticality contrast between the full and gapped sentences in (68) *vs* (66a) cannot be explained if (68) is derived from (66a). The non-pronunciation of part of the second conjunct should not affect a syntactic licensing configuration occurring *outside* of it. Likewise, the semantic reconstruction of the fragment *Marie pour Bob* cannot affect the external licensing of *ni*.

(68) *Jean ne votera   pas/jamais pour Tim ni   Marie pour Bob.*
      John SM   vote.FUT not/never   for Tim nor Mary for Bob
      'John will not/never vote for Tim nor Mary for Bob.'

A more plausible analysis is to view (68) as an instance of vP-coordination, instead of clausal coordination, relying on ATB-movement of the verb out of the conjoined vPs, rather than an instance of TP-deletion (see Dagnac to appear, and Johnson 1996, 2009 for detailed argumentation). However, gapped constructions involving French double *ni* must be clausal. A subject inside the first conjunct can bind into the gapped one when the conjunction is simple *ni*, cf. (69). This is predicted if vPs are conjoined, since the upper subject *chaque enfant* c-commands the lower one *ses parents*, which stays in spec,vP. However, this is not possible with the double conjunction, cf. (70): this, as Centeno (2011: 97-99) argues for Spanish, is expected if clauses rather than vPs are conjoined, since the upper subject does not c-command the lower one.

(69) *Ici,   jamais **chaque enfant**ᵢ n'   auraⱼ   [ᵥP tⱼ un violoncelle ni*
      Here, never   each   kid   SM   have.FUT   a   cello   nor

      sesᵢ parents   tⱼ les moyens   de   lui   en   louer   un.]
      his parents   the money   of   to.him PART rent   one
      'Here, never will each child have a cello, nor his parents enough money to rent one for him.'

(70) *Ici,   ni   **chaque enfant**ᵢ   n'   aura   (jamais) un   violoncelle*
      Here, nor   each   kid   SM   have.FUT (never)   a   cello

      [*ni   sesᵢ parents   les   moyens   de   lui   en   louer un.*]
      nor   his parents   the   money   of   to.him PART rent   one
      'Here, neither will each child (ever) have a cello, nor his parents enough money to rent one for him.'

Besides, in French double coordination, the first conjunction must immediately precede the first conjoined item, as in (71) (cf. Abeillé & Godard 2000, Mouret, 2006), and this holds for *ni...ni*. While the position of the first coordination clearly argues for a non-clausal analysis of NCC (cf. Mouret 2006), since in (72) the first *et* can only precede *whisky*, not *Jim*, it argues in turn for a clausal view of gapping

with *ni...ni* (and more generally with double conjunctions): in gapped examples such as (73), the only licit position for the first *ni* is clause initial.[22]

(71) a. Jim boira   (**et** un whisky et une tequila).
       Jim will.drink and a whisky and a tequila
       'Jim will drink both a whisky and a tequila.'
    b. (**Et** Jim boira un whisky)   (**et** Marie boira une tequila).
       And Jim will.drink a whisky and Marie will.drink a tequila
       'Jim will drink a whisky and Mary will drink a tequila.'

(72) (***Et**) Jim boira   (**et**) un whisky à 8h et   une tequila à 10h.   *NCC*
     And Jim will.drink (and) a whisky at 8 and a tequila at 10

(73) a. **Ni** Paul   ne   connait (***ni**) un   mot   d' anglais ni Jim   *Gapping*
       Nor Paul SM   knows   nor one word of English nor   Jim
    .   un   mot   de   français.
       one   word of   French
       'Paul knows neither a single word of English, nor does Jim know a single word of French.'

       What the French data suggest so far, then, is that research must now focus on a finer-grained investigation of coordinate ellipses, in particular stripping and gapping, and that the lexical items that surround the remnants may be of greater import to define their syntactic structure than was previously thought – a conclusion also reached by Repp (2009) for gapping in other languages. If conflicting approaches have not evolved into a consensus so far, it may be partly because languages have more than one way to produce coordinate ellipses.

4. Ellipses and Comparatives

Ellipses in comparatives come in two species: an obligatory type, specific to comparatives, illustrated in (74) and an optional type, consisting of a predicate or coordinate ellipsis occurring inside a comparative clause, as in (75).

(74) a. Paul has more cats than we have [~~x many cats~~].   Comparative Deletion
    b. Paul has more cats than he has [[~~x many~~]kids].   Comparative Subdeletion
(75) Paul is happier than Mary.   Stripping in a comparative

       The size of this chapter makes it impossible to do justice to the whole range of questions raised by French elliptical comparatives, all the more so because it has received relatively little attention within formal frameworks (but see Desmets 2001). I will first focus on stripped and gapped comparatives, which look similar to the English ones. I will then briefly discuss the specific properties of French in the other cases.

4.1. Stripping and Gapping in Comparatives

The first question raised by these comparatives in French is whether they are all syntactically clausal. In other Romance languages the equivalent of a stripped comparative such as French (76a) is formed as a phrasal complement to a preposition-like item, as was sometimes the case in Old French (76c).

(76) a. Marie est plus belle   que moi/*je.   [French]
      Mary is   more handsome than me/ I
    b. Maria è   più bella   di me /*io.   [Italian]
      Mary is   more handsome of me/ I

---

[22] Note that the main argument against a clausal view of coordinate ellipses in French is not applicable

in these cases, either: the coordinating conjunctions that only select either clauses or non-tensed

constituents, such as *car* 'for', *or* 'yet' and *ainsi que* 'as well as', only exist as single functors.

'Mary is prettier than I am.'

   c. N'est pas   mains   riche   de mon père.   [Old French]
     SM is not   less   rich   of my father
     'He is not richer than my father.'

Though nowadays the remnant seems to be introduced by the complementizer *que*, it could be a homonymous preposition-like item, as argued for Romanian and Italian by Van Peteghem (2009). In Romanian, indeed, the complementizer-like word *ca* can be followed by a pronominal remnant that, though corresponding to a subject antecedent, bears accusative case and not nominative case as expected under a clause deletion analysis, cf. (77a). This, however, does not extend to gapping-like comparatives, whose subject remnant bears nominative case, cf. (77b):

(77) a. El este   la fel de   înalt   ca   **mine**   **/*eu.**
       He is   the same big   as   P1sg.Acc P1sg.Nom
       'He is as big as you are.'

   b. Ea lucreaza mai mult   acasa   decât   **tu/*tine**   la serviciu.
     she works   much more at.the.house   as   you.NOM/*you.ACC   at work
     'She works much more at home than you do at your office.'

Case can be of no help for French, though: strong pronouns that appear in these constructions are not overtly marked for Case. *Moi* in (76a) could equally correspond to the argument of a preposition-like *que* or to a dislocated subject remnant in a clausal-deletion analysis. However, French displays another contrast between stripping-like and gapping-like constructions in comparatives, suggesting that the former are not instances of ellipsis. Most overt quantifiers select a *de*-NP, cf. (78). So do covert quantifiers, noted as e_Q here, found for instance (cf. Müller 1997) before the indefinite object of a negative clause, cf. (79a). Such *de*-NPs cannot be licensed when preceded by a preposition, cf. (79b):

(78) Léa a bu beaucoup de champagne.
     Lea has drunk much of champagne
     'Lea has drunk much champagne.'

(79) a. Il   n'a pas   mangé e_Q de pommes.
      He   SM=has not eaten   of apples
    'He didn't eat apples.'

   b. *Il n'a   pas parlé à/avec e_Q de gens.
      he SM=has   not talked to/with   of people
     'He did not talk to anyone.'

A covert quantifier is generally assumed to precede the compared item in full comparatives, cf. (80).[23]

(80) Léa a bu   plus de champagne [que Jim n'a bu e_Q de tequila].[24]
     Lea has drunk more of champagne   than Jim SM=has drunk   of tequila
     'Lea drank more champagne than Jim drank tequila.'

De-NPs also occur in comparatives when they have a PP correlate, as in (81a). If stripping-like comparatives involve TP-deletion, it is unclear how (81a) could be derived from the ungrammatical (81b), as argued by Zribi-Hertz (1986). If they have a monoclausal structure similar to (82), where *que* acts as a phrase functor, this fact finds an explanation: no empty quantifier is required to account for the presence of *de femmes*, both *de*-NPs are directly licensed by the comparative quantifier *plus* 'more'.

(81) a. Il a parlé   à/avec plus d'hommes que de femmes.

---

[23] Its representation and analysis varies; Bresnan (1973) initially marks it as *x much*, Kennedy (2002)

as *Op*. I mark it as e_Q.

[24] Comparative constructions trigger the presence of an expletive *ne* in the *than*-clause, which I will

not analyze – I gloss it as NE.

He has talked   to/with more of men   than of women
'He talked to/with more men than women.'

    b. *Il a   parlé   à/avec plus   d'hommes   qu'il n'a   parlé à/avec e_Q de femmes.
    He has   talked to more of men   than he NE=has talked to/with   of women
    'He talked to more men than he talked to women.'

(82) Il a parlé   à/avec   [$_{QP}$ plus [$_{PP}$ d'hommes   que de femmes]].
He has talked to/with   more   of men   than of women
'He talked to/with more men than women.'

In putatively gapped comparatives, on the other hand, remnants with PP-correlates are ruled out, just as in full comparatives, cf. (83):

(83) *Paul a parlé   à/avec   plus d'hommes   que Marie (à) de femmes.
    Paul has talked to/with   more of men   than Mary to of women
    'Paul talked to more men than Mary women.'

    The questions raised by these comparatives are then: if stripped comparatives are monoclausal, how are they mapped to a biclausal meaning? If other French comparatives are embedded clauses (Desmets, 2010), do they actually involve gapping, which is generally viewed as unavailable in embedded contexts – and if so, why and how is gapping licensed only in these contexts?

4.2. Anaphora in comparatives

Comparative deletion and comparatives with predicate ellipses raise another related question in French: they involve an overt pronoun, cf. (84-85) or can alternate between an overt pronoun and a gap, cf. (86).

(84) a. Paul a   plus de chats   que nous   n'**en** avons.   (, e_Q de chats).
    Paul has   more of cats   than we   NE=of-it have (of cats)
    'Paul has more cats than we have.'

    b. Paul est plus heureux que   ne **l'**est   Marie. (, e_Q heureuse).
    Paul is   more happy than   NE=it=is   Mary (happy)
    'Paul is happier than Mary is.'

(85) a. Marie a parlé   à plus d'étudiants   que Léa ne l'a fait.   *VP-anaphor*
    b. Marie a parlé   à plus d'étudiants   à Madrid   que Léa ne l'a fait   à Berlin.
    Mary has talked   to more of students (in Madrid)   than Lea NE=it=has done   (in Berlin)
'May talked to more students (in Madrid) than Lea did (in Berlin).'

(86) a. Marie a parlé   à plus d'étudiants   que je ne   pensais.   *NCA*
    b. Marie a parlé   à plus d'étudiants   que je ne le   pensais.   *Clausal pronoun*
    Marie has talked   to more of students   than I NE=(it=)thought
'Mary talked to more of students than I thought.'

Modals can be followed by TP-ellipsis (cf section 1), but also by a vP anaphor (*le faire* 'do it') or by a full clausal proform (*le* 'it'), and all three structures show up in comparatives:

(87)   Marie a parlé   à plus d'étudiants...
    Marie has talked   to more of students

    a. qu'elle   n'aurait dû.   *Modal Ellipsis*
      than she   SM=must.PST.COND

    b. qu'elle   n'aurait dû   le faire.   *Predicate anaphor*
      than she   SM=must.PST.COND   it=do

    c. qu'elle   ne l'aurait dû.   *Clausal proform*
      than she   SM=it=must.PST.COND

    'Mary talked to more students than she should (have (done)).'

What is of concern here is the nature and behavior of the null degree item e_Q, which has been extensively debated for other languages (see Kennedy 2002 and references therein). The French data indeed challenge the view that e_Q or a constituent containing e_Q is moved (overtly or covertly) to an operator position in spec,CP. (88) illustrates (one simplified version of) such an analysis with an adjectival comparison:

(88) Paul is more faithful than e_{Qi} Mary <is <t_i faithful>>.

Since proforms are reputedly opaque to syntactic extraction, e_Q would have no position to move from in (85), (86b) and (87b,c), as well as in (86a) if, as argued in section 1, it involves an opaque null pronoun.[25] For instance, in (89) illustrating a comparative with a VP-anaphor, e_Q should have moved from the syntactically opaque *le*.

(89) Paul est plus fidèle que e_{Qi} je ne le pensais.
      Paul is more faithful than   I SM=it=thought
      'Paul is more faithful than I thought.'

One may then assume that in comparatives all these cases involve, one way or another, the deletion of a clause. But such a solution must explain why remnants with PP correlates are allowed, cf. (90a,c), while they are ruled out in full clauses, cf. (90b,d):

(90) Paul a écrit à plus de collègues
      Paul has written to more of colleagues
      'Paul has written to more colleagues

          a. que Jim ne l'a   fait
             than Jim SM=it=has   done
          'than Jim has done.'

          b. *que Jim n'a écrit   à e_Q de collègues.
             than Jim SM=has written   to x much of colleagues
          'than Jim has written to.'

          c. que Jim ne le pensait.

            than Jim SM=it=thought

          'Paul wrote to more colleagues than Jim thought.'

          d. *que Jim ne pensait qu'il avait   écrit   à e_Q de collègues
             than Jim SM=thought   that he had written   to e_Q of colleagues
          'Paul wrote to more colleagues than Jim thought he had written to.'

        The French data may then argue for a semantic reconstruction of the comparative clause. Predicate anaphors, indeed, cannot be WH-extracted from: (91a) shows that, for instance, *le faire* rules out WH-extraction. However, predicate-anaphors can be bound into.[26] In (91b), the quantifier *chaque*

---

[25] Kennedy and Merchant (2000) deal with a related problem for English NCA, Bentzen et al. (2013) with a similar one raised by German *es können* 'it can' structures. Whether one of these proposals could extend to all the French cases discussed here has not been investigated yet. As argued by Houser et al. (2007) for the Danish proform *det* found in similar contexts, *le* can (to a certain extent) be A-extracted from: finding some common property between A-movement and e_Q-movement may provide a solution to this problem.

[26] They also seem to license a wide scope reading of quantifiers, cf. (i). This is reminiscent of Japanese null arguments, which also ban overt extraction while allowing binding and QR (Sakamoto 2015).

(i) Un médecin examinera chaque victime et un psychologue le fera aussi.

  a doctor   examine.FUT each victim and a psychologist iy=do.FUT too

'each' in the second conjunct must bind into the VP-anaphor for the possessive to be correctly interpreted:

(91) a. *Paul devait voir plusieurs collègues, mais je ne sais pas lesquels il l'a fait.
Paul should see several colleagues, but I SM=know not which.ones he it=has done
'Paul was meet several colleagues, but I don't know which ones he did.'

b. Chaque adulte$_i$ a déclaré son$_i$ identité, et chaque enfant$_j$ le fera aussi. *[de déclarer son$_j$ identité]*
Each adult has declared his identity, and each child it=do.FUT too
'Each adult declared his identity, and each child will, too.'

The exact nature of this coindexing should then be investigated in parallel to that of the e$_Q$ item, in order to see whether and how it fits in with the arguments put forward to diagnose the presence of movement in non-pronominal comparatives.

5. Noun Phrase ellipses (NPE)

French has two main kinds of nominal ellipses, indefinite NPE and definite NPE, exemplified in (92) and (93) respectively.[27]

(92) Des étudiants sont venus.
DET.INDF.PL students have come.
Trois/ certains/ plusieurs <(de ces) étudiants> sont déjà repartis.
Three/ some/ several (of these) students are already gone
'Three students came. Three/some/several (of them) are already gone.'

(93) J'aime bien la robe bleue,
I like well the dress blue
'I like the blue dress,

    a. mais je préfère la < robe > rouge.
      but I prefer the < dress> red.
   but I prefer the red one'

    b. mais la < robe> rouge me va mieux.
      but the dress red to.me=goes better
   but the red one fits me better.'

Definite ellipses can be found in any syntactic position. They require the presence of an unmodified adjective or adjective-like constituent sometimes described as classifying (superlatives, color and measure adjectives, ordinals, possessives, and *seul* 'only', *autre* 'other', *même* 'same'), cf. (94).[28] Other adjectives may be found only in explicitly contrastive contexts, cf. (95). Additional constituents, such as PPs or relatives, may be present, cf. (96). Though much more infrequently, possessive and demonstrative determiners sometimes also allow definite NPE, cf. (97).

(94) a. *Je préfère la de Léa.
    I prefer the of Lea
    'I prefer Lea's.'

'A doctor will examine each victim, and a psychologist will, too.'

($\forall$ victim, $\exists$ doctor/ $\forall$ victim, $\exists$ psychologist)

[27] The properties of French NPE have been most comprehensively studied by Sleeman (1993, 1996) –

but see also Corblin et al. (2003) and references therein, Cabredo-Hofherr (2006), and Gagnon (2013).

[28] When a PP or relative modifier is present, in the absence of an adjective the demonstrative pronoun

celui must be used. See Cabredo-Hofherr (2006) for a detailed analysis.

b. Je préfère   la   rouge de Léa.
       I prefer   the red   of Léa
       'I prefer Lea's red one.'

(95) Il y a   actuellement deux types d'énergies propres: la solaire et   l'éolienne.
     there are presently   two kinds of energies   clean: the solar and the aeolian
        'There are presently two kinds of energy available: solar energy and wind power.'

(96)   Je préfère la rouge que tu   portais   la dernière fois.
        I   prefer   the red   that you   wore   the last time
        'I prefer the red one you were wearing last time.'

(97) % J'aime   bien   ta   robe bleue   mais je préfère   ma/cette rouge.
       I like   well   your dress blue   but I prefer   my/this red
     'I like your blue dress but I prefer my/this red one.'

Indefinite NPE is limited to the subject preverbal position: in postverbal direct object position the nominal content must be expressed either by a noun or by the quantitative clitic *en*, cf. (98). Within PPs a local set-triggering modifier, such as *autre* 'other', *d'entre eux* 'of them' is required, cf. (98c). The ellipsis as well as the pronouns can have a partitive or non-partitive reading cf. (99).

(98) a. Deux sont partis.
        Two have left.
     b. J'*(en) ai vu deux.
        I of.it have seen two
     'I saw two.'
     c. Ils ont parlé à deux *(autres/d'entre eux).
     'They talked to two more/two of them.'

(99) Ils   ont arrêté   plusieurs étudiants
     They   have arrested   several students

        a. et ils *(en)   ont   emprisonné   deux _.
           and they of.it   have   jailed   two
        'They have jailed two of these students'   *partitive reading*
        'They have jailed two (more) students'   *non-partitive reading*

        b. Deux ont été   emprisonnés.
           Two have been   jailed
        'Two of these students were jailed.'   *partitive reading*
        'Two (more) students were jailed.'   *non-partitive reading*

Note that in both definite and indefinite NPE, if the nominal content corresponding to the missing N is right-dislocated, it takes the form *de N*:

(100)   a. Je préfère   la rouge, *(de) robe.
           I prefer the red   of dress
         'As for dresses, I prefer the red one.'

        b. Deux   sont venus, *(d') étudiants.
           Two   have come   of students
         'As for students, two came.'

Among the many questions raised by French NPE are the following, none of which have received a clear answer so far. First, do they involve deletion of a nominal constituent (cf. Ronat 1977), a null proform (Gagnon 2013 for definite ellipsis), or, as is argued by Marandin (1996) for definitive ellipses, some other mechanism, such as a DP headed by a morphologically nominalized adjective in cases like (93) or by a non-N in the other cases? Unlike verbal and clausal ellipses, nominal ellipses lack consensual tests to tell these analyses apart: they mostly rely on the distribution and potential anaphoric range of the remnants. A related question is whether in all French nominal ellipses, a NP is missing. Gagnon (2013), for instance, argues that both in French and in English, indefinite ellipses elide an anaphoric Partitive Phrase *d'entre eux* 'of them'. This is consistent with the full structure of most of the stranded determiners, which does involve a PartP, cf. (101b,c):

(101) Ils   ont arrêté   plusieurs étudiants.

They   have arrested   several students

   a. Beaucoup ont été   emprisonnés.

    'Many have been   jailed.'

  b. *Beaucoup étudiants ont été   emprisonnés.

   Many students   have been jailed

  c. Beaucoup d'entre eux   ont été emprisonnés.

   Many of them   have been jailed

But this analysis is only consistent with the partitive reading (cf. 99b); if a PartP is elided, it cannot always take the form *d'entre eux* 'of them'. Instead, two underlying forms should be postulated, *d'entre eux* 'of them' (partitive indefinite ellipsis) and *de N* 'of N' (non-partitive indefinite ellipsis).

More generally, both the structure of partitive DPs and the structural position of various kinds of adjectives and modifiers or adjuncts and how they can account for their ability to appear in a nounless DP, cf. (102), have not reached a clear consensus so far: the answer is linked to how much structure a given framework is ready to admit for DPs:

(102)   a. La jaune/ ??Plusieurs jaunes / Plusieurs des jaunes

   the yellow   several yellow   several of.the yellow

  'The yellow one. Several yellow ones. Several of the yellow ones.'

  b. Les autres / Plusieurs autres/ Plusieurs des autres

   the others / several others / several of.the others

  'The other ones. Several other ones. Several of the other ones.'

How nounless DPs are licensed is also an open question. Lobeck (1995), and, to some extent, Bouchard (2002), propose that agreement morphology on the (governing) remnants, D (+Adj) or Q, license NPE: this would account for the difference between English (103) and its French counterpart (104):

(103) *I want the green.   *no agreement morphology*

(104) Je veux les rouges/la rouge.   *plural/feminine morphology*

  I want the.PL red.PL / the.FEM red

  'I want the red ones / the red one.'

However, acquisition data (Sleeman and Hulk 2013) show that in French, NPE is mastered well before adjective agreement. Besides, gender and number agreement *per se* fails to license NPE with relational adjectives, as in (105).

(105) L'énergie est chère,   *mais la solaire est prometteuse.

  The energy is expensive   but the solar   is promising

  'Energy is expensive, but solar energy is promising.'

A more promising view is to consider that NPE is licensed via the partitive semantics of the remnant (Bouchard 2002, Sleeman 1996) or contrastive focalization on it (Corver and van Koppen 2009). Partitive adjectives as well as focalization create a subset of the larger set introduced by the antecedent DP. Explicit contrast, cf. (95), indeed enables the otherwise relational adjectives, as in (105), to create subsets of 'clean energy'. In Sleeman's view, classifying adjectives, such as color and measure adjectives denote subsets, while *intéressant* 'interesting', a non-classifying adjective, in (106a) does not: *les plus* in (106b), extracts the upper part of the scale from the contextual set of interesting conferences, then licensing NPE:

(106) a.   *Je n'ai   pas entendu   les intéressantes,   (de conférences).

    I SM=have   not heard the interesting.FEM.PL (of conferences)

  b. Je n'ai pas   entendu   les plus intéressantes, (de conférences).

   I SM=have   not heard   the most interesting.FEM.PL

  '(As for conferences,) I missed the (most) interesting ones.'

A difficulty for assessing syntactic proposals for the licensing of NPE stems from the lack of consensus on what actually counts as NPE. Structures such as (107), for instance, have received diverging treatments:

(107) Il y a des pommes.

  a. Quelques-unes sont gâtées.

Some.ones   are bruised

'Some are bruised.'

  b. La mienne / Celle de Léa est gâtée.

   The mine / That of Lea is bruised

'Mine/Lea's is bruised.'

  c. Chacune est gâtée.

   Each.one is bruised

'Each one is bruised.'

According to their etymology, one can indeed conceive of *quelques-uns* lit. 'some ones', *la mienne* lit.'the mine', *celui* lit. 'this him/it', *chacun* lit. 'each one' as sequences composed of a determiner and an adjective (or two determiners). In this case, most of them are clear cases of NPE, since a nominal head is missing, and their properties can be compared to those of other cases of NPE, in French or cross-linguistically. But, they can also be analyzed as atomic pronouns in present day French, as generally assumed in French grammars. In this case, nothing is 'missing' in their structure, and (107) lies outside the empirical body of elliptical phenomena.

Nominal ellipses in French provide more questions than answers, so far – including one about the exact range of empirical data to be accounted for under the label 'nominal ellipsis'. As such, they form part of the many issues for future work on French ellipsis to address, and may shed light on other aspects of the grammar, in particular on the structure of the French DP.

Conclusion

French provides evidence that ellipsis, as well as its subtypes, is a label that may, cross-linguistically or within one language, encompass various anaphoric devices, some of which are best analyzed by a deletion process while others are not. Coordinate ellipses in particular call for a much finer-grained investigation than has yet been done, in order to account for their syntactic properties, the lexical items they rely on (including the coordinators) and the contextual discourse relations that license them. As sluicing and comparatives in particular point out, our understanding of these phenomena is crucially correlated with our understanding of the way wh-movement, binding and coindexing can variously interact with ellipsis and anaphora. While within French the licensing of these constructions is still a barely explored domain, the particular and sometimes puzzling properties of the French data can, no doubt, provide a stimulating testing-ground for existing and/or new cross-linguistic theories of ellipsis licensing.

References

Abeillé, Anne (2005). Les syntagmes conjoints et leurs fonctions syntaxiques. *Langages* 160, 42–67.

Abeillé, Anne (2006). Stripping constructions in French. Paper presented at the 'Coordination and ellipsis' conference. University of Paris 7, June 26th 2006.

Abeillé, Anne, Gabriella Bilbîie and François Mouret (2011, to appear). A Romance perspective on gapping constructions, in H. Boas and F. Gonzalvez Garcia (eds.) *Romance in Construction Grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, Constructional approaches to Language series.

Abeillé, Anne and Danièle Godard (2000). Varieties of 'esse' in Romance languages, in D. Flickinger *et al.* (eds.) *Berkeley Formal Grammar Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Abeillé, Anne and Danièle Godard (2003).The Syntactic Flexibility of French degree adverbs, in S. Müller (ed.) *Proceedings of HPSG 2003*. Stanford: CSLI publications, 26–46.

Aelbrecht, Lobke (2009). *You have the right to remain silent: The syntactic licensing of ellipsis.* PhD thesis, Catholic University of Brussels.

Authier, J.-Marc (2011). A movement Analysis of French Modal Ellipsis. *Probus* 23(2)*,* 175–216.

Authier, J.-Marc (2013). Phase-Edge Features and the Syntax of Polarity Particles. Linguistic Inquiry 44 (3), 345–389.

Bentzen, Kristine, Jason Merchant and Peter Svenonius (2013). Deep properties of surface pronouns: Pronominal predicate anaphors in Norwegian and German. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 16(2), 97–125.

Bouchard, Denis (2002). *Adjectives, number and interfaces: Why languages vary*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Bresnan, Joan (1973). Syntax of the comparative clause construction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 275-343.

Busquets, Joan and Pascal Denis (2001). L'Ellipse modale en français: le cas de 'pouvoir' et 'devoir'. *Cahiers de Grammaire* 26, 55–74.

Cabredo Hofherr, Patricia (2006). Pronouns, determiners and N-ellipsis in Spanish, French and German, in Christopher Davis, Amy Rose Deal and Youri Zabbal (eds), *Proceedings of NELS 36*. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, GLSA36, 167–178.

Centeno, Naiara (2011). *Gapping and determiner sharing in Spanish*. PhD thesis, University of the Basque Country,Vitoria-Gasteiz.

Chung, Sandra (2005). Sluicing and the lexicon: The point of no return, In Rebecca Cover and Yuni Kim (eds), Proceedings of the Thirty-First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society., Berkeley, Calif.: Department of Linguistics, UC Berkeley, 73–91.

Chung, Sandra,William Ladusaw and JamesMcCloskey (1995). Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3, 239–282.

Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw and James McCloskey (2011). Sluicing: Between structure and inference," in R. Gutiérrez-Bravo, L.Mikkelsen and E. Potsdam (eds.) *Representing Language: Essays in Honor of Judith Aissen*. California Digital Library eScholarship Repository. Linguistic Research Center, University of California, Santa Cruz, 31–50.

Corblin, Francis, Jean-Marie Marandin and Petra Sleeman (2003). Nounless determiners, in F. Corblin and H.de Swart (eds.) *Handbook of French Semantics.* Stanford: CSLI Publications, 21–38.

Corver, Norbert and Marjo van Koppen (2009). Let's focus on NP-ellipsis. *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik*, 48, 3-26.

Dagnac, Anne (2010). Modal Ellipsis in French, Spanish and Italian: evidence for a TP-deletion analysis, in K. Arregi et al. (eds) *Romance Linguistics 2008. Interactions in Romance* [CILT 313]. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 157–170.

Dagnac, Anne (to appear). Gapping needs vP-coordination: An argument from French NPI licensing. *The Linguistic Review.*

Desmets, Marianne (2010). Ellipses dans les constructions comparatives en 'comme'. *Linx* 58, 47–74.

De Swart, Henriëtte (2001). Négation et coordination: la conjonction *'ni',* in R. Bok-Bennema, B.de Jonge, B.Kampers-Manhe and A. Molendijk (eds.) *Adverbial Modification*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 109–124.

Desmets, Marianne (2001). *Les typages de la phrase en HPSG : le cas des phrases en 'comme'*. PhD, University of Paris 10.

Gagnon, Michaël R. (2013). Part and Parcel of Eliding Partitives. *Proceedings of SALT* 23, 316–335. http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/salt.v23i0.2672.

Ginzburg, Jonathan and Ivan A. Sag (2001). *Interrogative Investigations*. Stanford: CSLI.

Hankamer, Jorge and Ivan A. Sag (1976). Deep and Surface Anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3), 391–426.

Houser, Michael, Line Mikkelsen and Maziar Toosarvandani (2007). Verb Phrase Pronominalization in Danish: Deep or surface anaphora? In Erin Brainbridge and Brian Agbayani (eds) *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth Western Conference on Linguistics*. Fresno, CA: Department of Linguistics, 183-195.

Johnson, Kyle (1996[2003]). In search of the English Middle Field. Manuscript. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Johnson, Kyle (2001). What VP ellipsis can do, and what it can't, but not why, in M. Baltin and C. Collins (eds.) *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Malden, Oxford, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 439–479.

Johnson, Kyle (2009). Gapping is not (VP-) ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40(2), 289–328.

Kayne, Richard (1984). *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kennedy, Christopher (2002). Comparative deletion and optimality in syntax". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20(3), 553–621.

Kennedy,Christopher and Jason Merchant (2000). The Case of the 'Missing CP' and the Secret Case, in S. Chung, J. McCloskey and N. Sanders (eds.) *Jorge Hankamer Webfest*. University of California, Santa Cruz, http://ling.ucsc.edu/ Jorge/index.html.

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

Marandin, Jean-Marie (1996). 'Pas d'identité sans identité': l'analyse des groupes nominaux en Det + A, in Bernard Fradin and Jean-Marie Marandin (eds), *Mot et grammaire*. Paris: Didier Erudition, 129-164.

Merchant, Jason (2001). *The Syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason (2003). Remarks on stripping. Ms., U Chicago.

Merchant, Jason (2006). Sluicing, in M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Syntax Companion.* London: Blackwell, 269–289.

Merchant, Jason (2007). *Voice and Ellipsis*. Ms, University of Chicago.

Merchant, Jason (2008). An Asymmetry in voice mismatches in VP-ellipsis and pseudogapping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(1), 169–179.

Miller, Philip (1997). Auxiliary verbs in Old and Middle French A Diachronic study of substitutive 'faire' and a comparison with the Modern English auxiliaries, in A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent (eds.) *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 119–133.

Moline, Estelle (2013). 'Comme' et 'comment' en français contemporain: spécificités et recouvrements, in A. Gautier and T. Verjans (eds), *'Comme', 'comment', 'combien': concurrences et complémentarité.* Paris: L'Harmattan, 57–96.

Morris, Amanda (2008). *Polarity ellipsis and negative stripping*. M.A. Thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz. http://babel.ucsc.edu/~hank/PolarityEllipsisandNegStripping.pdf

Mouret, François (2006). A Phrase structure approach to argument cluster coordination, in S. Müller (ed.) *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Varna.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 247–267.

Mouret, François (2007). Syntaxe et sémantique des constructions en 'ni' . *Faits de langues* 28, 196–205.

Mouret, François (2008). Les coordinations de termes dissemblables sont-elles elliptiques?, in J. Durand, B. Habert and B. Laks (eds) *Actes du Congrés Mondial de Linguistique française.* Paris: CMLF Online Publications. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/cmlf08031.

Müller, Claude (1997). 'De' partitif et la négation, in Danielle Forget, Paul Hirschbühler, France Martineau and Maria-Luisa Rivero (eds) *Negation and Polarity*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory [CILT] 155, 251-270.

Osborne, Timothy, Michael Putnam, and Thomas Groß (2012). Catenae: Introducing a novel unit of syntactic analysis. *Syntax* 15(4), 354–396.

Poplack, Shana, Lauren Zentz and Nathalie Dion (2012). Phrase final prepositions in Quebec French: An Empirical study of contact, codeswitching, and resistance to convergence. *Bilinguism: language and cognition* 15(2), 203-225. DOI: http/dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1366728911000204

Repp, Sophie (2009). *Negation in Gapping*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins, and Luis Vicente (2008). Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and preposition stranding, in L. Wetzels and J. van der Weijer (eds.) *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175–198.

Ronat, Mitsou (1977). Une contrainte sur l'effacement du nom, in M. Ronat (ed.) *Langue: Théorie generative étendue*. Paris: Collection Savoir, 153–169.

Roussarie, Laurent and Pascal Amsili (2007). Interpréter les pronoms phrastiques. *Modèles Linguistiques* 56, 83-112.

Rowlett, Paul (2007). *The Syntax of French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruwet, Nicolas (1972). *Théorie syntaxique et syntaxe du français*, Paris: Seuil.

Sag, Ivan and Joanna Nykiel (2011). Remarks on sluicing, in S. Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Stanford: CSLI, 188–208. http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2011

Sailor, Craig, and Gary Thoms (2014). On the non-existence of non-constituent coordination and non-constituent ellipsis. In *Proceedings of the 31st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 361-370.

Sakamoto, Yuta (2015). Japanese null arguments as mixed anaphora: evidence for the LF-copy analysis. To appear in *Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL11)*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Ms: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0BxzV2BrxFnu0ajZVSG82WFNrTDA/view?pref=2&pli=1

Sato, Yosuke (2008). Sluicing in Bahasa Indonesia, P-Stranding, and Interface Repair, *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 34, 1 : 269-280. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/bls.v34i1.3575

Sato, Yosuke (2011). P-stranding under sluicing and repair by ellipsis: why is Indonesian (not) special? *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 20, 339–382.

Sleeman, Petra (1993). Noun ellipsis in French. *Probus* 5, 271–295.

Sleeman, Petra (1996). *Licensing empty nouns in French*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Sleeman, Petra and Aafke Hulk (2013). L1 acquisition of noun ellipsis in French and in Dutch: consequences for linguistic theory, in S.Baauw, F. Drijkoningen, L. Meroni, and M. Pinto (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sportiche, Dominique (2008). Inward bound: splitting the wh-paradigm and French relative qui. Ms: http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000623.

Stepanović, Sandra (2012). Two cases of violation repair under sluicing, in Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson (eds), *Sluicing: cross-linguistic perspectives*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 68-82.

Van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen (2010). Invisible Last Resort. A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120 (7), 1714-1726.

Van Peteghem, Marleen (2009). Sur le subordonnant comparatif dans les langues romanes. *Langages* 174, 99–112.

Zribi-Hertz, Anne (1986). *Relations anaphoriques en français: esquisse d'une gramaire générative raisonnée de la réflexivité et de l'ellipse structurale*. Thèse de Doctorat, Université de Paris 8.

Abstract

This chapter is a case study of elliptical constructions in French. It reviews the elliptical constructions that French does and doesn't display, and the language-specific properties some of them show. It argues that French does not display predicate ellipses but only predicate anaphors, including in comparatives. It also so shows that not all clausal ellipses may rely on the same mechanism: while the gap following modal verbs in French, known as French Modal Ellipsis, is an ellipsis based on clausal deletion, some cases of sluicing and fragment answers resist such an analysis, while stripping and gapping subsume different types of elliptical phenomena which cannot be given an homogeneous analysis. It also briefly presents the main properties of nominal ellipses and of the various short structures in comparative clauses.

Key-words: VP-ellipsis, French Modal ellipsis, clausal ellipsis, Coordinate ellipsis, coordination, sluicing, comparatives, stripping, gapping, noun phrase ellipsis.