To be or not to be elided: VP ellipsis revisited

Abstract
The main question that this paper addresses is: what happens to non-finite auxiliaries under English VP ellipsis (VPE)? Do they remain overt like finite auxiliaries, or do they disappear together with lexical verbs? Akmajian & Wasow (1975) and Sag (1976) observed the following pattern: non-finite have always stays overt, being is obligatorily elided, and be and been are optionally elided. We provide an analysis for this pattern. As preliminaries for our account we follow Chomsky (1993) and Lasnik (1995b) in assuming that English auxiliaries carry uninterpretable inflectional features which force the auxiliary to raise to the relevant inflectional head for feature checking at PF. As we argue that VPE includes the progressive projections in the ellipsis site, but nothing higher, the have and being data automatically fall out: have is base-generated outside the ellipsis site, so is never elided, whilst being's landing site is inside the ellipsis site, so being is always elided. For be and been, which are base-generated in the ellipsis site and raise out of it to get their inflectional features checked, we take an optional raising approach: in non-elliptical sentences raising is obligatory, otherwise the derivation crashes at PF because of unchecked features. Ellipsis contexts, on the other hand, provide the option of not raising for be and been, because ellipsis then deletes be and been in their base positions, along with their unchecked features, avoiding the PF violation. We extend this account to other phenomena, such as VP fronting, pseudo-clefts and predicate inversion.
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1. Introduction: the puzzle
VP ellipsis (VPE) typically involves non-pronunciation of the verb phrase. This phenomenon, which has already been widely discussed for English in the literature, is illustrated in (1). The second conjunct of this sentence is interpreted as "...and Peter was hassled by the police, too", but the verb phrase is omitted because there is a salient antecedent in the first conjunct that renders the verb phrase in the second conjunct recoverable for the hearer (in fact, repetition of the full verb phrase often feels redundant).

(1) Betsy was hassled by the police, and Peter was, too.

In English VPE it is quite clear that finite auxiliaries cannot be elided, as in (2)a,b. The lexical verb, on the other hand, cannot survive ellipsis.¹ Even

¹ Unlike with Verb-stranding VPE languages (see Goldberg 2005).
when finite, the English lexical verb is still elided under VPE, leading to insertion of the finite dummy auxiliary *do*, see (2)c,d.2

(2) a. An elephant can’t fly, but maybe a rhino *(could) [fly].
   b. I thought the auxiliary hadn’t disappeared, but it *(had)
      [disappeared].
   c. * The chicken didn’t put the tuna on the table, but the penguin put
      [the tuna on the table].
   d. The chicken didn’t put the tuna on the table, but the penguin did
      [put the tuna on the table].

This is why it has been assumed that either finite auxiliaries or finite T act as the licensor for VPE, and that what is elided is VP, or more recently vP (Aelbrecht 2010; Gengel 2007a; Johnson 2001; Lobeck 1995; Merchant 2001; Zagona 1982, 1988), as is schematized in (3):

(3) Betsy was hassled by the police, and [TP Peter [T has
been hassled...], too.

The question this paper addresses is: what happens to non-finite auxiliaries under VPE: do they pattern with the finite auxiliary and survive ellipsis, or do they disappear just like the lexical verb? Consider the maximum range of auxiliaries that one clause can contain, as exemplified in (4)a with (4)b as a schematic summary of the auxiliary sequence.3

(4) a. Betsy must have been being hassled.
   b. finite modal > perfect HAVE > progressive BE > passive BE > lexical verb

Akmajian & Wasow (1975) and Sag (1976) observed that when VPE is applied to such an auxiliary sequence, not all auxiliaries behave alike, as (5) shows (from Sag 1976:31). Specifically, they assume that perfect *have* cannot be elided (see (5)a), whilst *been* can be optionally elided (see (5)b,c).4 Being,

---

2 We indicate a VP ellipsis site with strike-through.
3 The auxiliary types (perfect, progressive, passive), abstracting away from surface forms, are indicated with capitals, whereas the actual morphological forms (*have*, *be*, *being*, *was* etc) will be given in italics.
4 There is some discussion in the literature on whether or not the non-finite perfect auxiliary *have* can be elided under VPE. We address this issue in more detail in section 3.2. As the results of our exploration will be that *have* generally cannot be elided, we agree with the pattern observed by Akmajian & Wasow (1975) and Sag (1976) though admit that some dialectal variation may be involved.
on the other hand, is obligatorily included in the ellipsis site, (see (5)d). The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>modal/finite aux</th>
<th>have</th>
<th>be</th>
<th>been</th>
<th>being</th>
<th>lexical verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>elided</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remaining</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Deletion of verbal elements in VP ellipsis

Since this pattern was first discovered, it has received relatively little attention (compared to the vast literature on VPE in general), until recently. The aim of this paper therefore is to account for this pattern. The puzzle thus consists of three parts which an adequate analysis of English VPE has to cover. It needs to explain why VPE (i) never deletes have, (ii) optionally elides be/been, and (iii) always elides being. Our main claims are that VPE targets the progressive aspectual layer (when present), and that optional auxiliary deletion is the result of optional auxiliary raising out of the ellipsis site and rescue by PF-deletion in the case of non-raising.

It has been pointed out to us that the obligatory deletion of being could also be contested. Again, we keep the original pattern in mind as the one our analysis has to account for, and come back to the potential non-deletion of being in section 9.1 at the end of this paper.

The data in (5) do not actually illustrate the behaviour of non-finite be. As is illustrated in section 3.1, this auxiliary patterns similar to been in that it can also be optionally elided.

See, however, Akmajian et al. (1979) for an analysis, as well as Bošković (2014), Sailor (2012) and Thoms (2012). In sections 6, 7 and 9 we discuss these approaches and their major drawbacks.

We purposely only discuss VPE in finite clauses and stay away from infinitival clauses and gerunds. The judgements we collected on such clauses were too inconsistent to draw any generalisations from. We do not go into this issue here, and refer the interested reader to Thoms (2011: section 3.5.1) for some discussion. Thoms notes as well that VPE in infinitivals behaves differently from finite VPE in some respects and similarly in others. Although we do not agree with his conclusion that perhaps infinitival VPE involves a null proform instead of PF deletion, we adhere to his suggestion that we might not want to capture all cases of VPE with one and the same analysis. One argument in favour of a different approach is that Hebrew only allows for VPE in finite clauses. As for VPE in gerunds, there too the data are not clear. Thoms (2011: footnote 23) already mentions some variation in judgements given in the
Section 2 discusses some preliminaries needed for our analysis regarding the structure of the English verbal domain. The analysis itself is presented in sections 3, 4 and 5. In section 6 we show ways in which this approach is superior to other recent analyses of the data. Section 7 extends this account to related phenomena, namely VP fronting, pseudo-clefting and predicate inversion. In section 8 we provide additional support for our analysis using cross-linguistic evidence. Section 9 tackles some remaining issues, and section 10 concludes.

2. Preliminary ingredients of the analysis

2.1 The structure of the verb phrase

Following Bošković (2014), Cinque (1999), Harwood (2013, 2014b), Iatridou et al. (2001), Kayne (1993) and Tenny (1987) we take (7)a to have the structure in (7)b below. Here, only the subject occupies its surface position. The capitalised auxiliaries are the abstract, uninflected verb forms in their base positions.

(7) a. Ted should have been being trained by a lion tamer.

\[
\begin{align*}
TP & \\
    & \text{Ted} \\
    & \text{T' } \\
    & T^\circ \text{ModP} \\
    & \text{Mod^o SHOULD} \text{InfP} \\
    & \text{Inf^o } vP_{\text{perf}} \\
    & vP_{\text{perf}} \text{HAVE PerfP Perf^o } vP_{\text{prog}} \\
    & vP_{\text{prog}} \text{BE ProgP Prog^o } vP_{(\text{voice})} \\
    & v^o \text{BE VoiceP Voice^o } VP \\
    & V^o \text{ TRAIN} 
\end{align*}
\]

literature (see also Aelbrecht 2010; Sag 1976). For this reason we stick to the finite clauses, as these are already proving to be complicated enough at this point.
Crucially, we assume a modal layer just below $T^\circ$, which precedes the perfect aspectual layer, which itself precedes the progressive aspectual layer, which precedes the Voice layer, which precedes VP. We also assume a paired layering in which each layer is comprised of two projections. The higher of the two projections is headed by the relevant auxiliary verb, whilst the lower projection licenses the inflectional form of the following verb.

Concretely, we take modals to be merged in their own independent ModP, whose head selects an infinitival phrase (InfP) licensing infinitival verb forms. The aspectual auxiliaries (perfect have and progressive be) are inserted in their own $vP_{\text{perf}}$ and $vP_{\text{prog}}$ shells, which select an aspectual PerfP and ProgP, respectively, licensing perfect and progressive verb forms. We also assume that these aspectual projections encode aspectual interpretations. In the next subsection we clarify the role of these projections in relation to verbal inflection.

Since they are in complimentary distribution, we assume that passive be and copular be are both base-generated in the lowest $vP$ shell which – following our notation – could also be labelled $vP_{\text{voice}}$ (see Baker 1997; Bošković 2004, 2014; Bowers 2002; Eide & Áfarli 1997; Harwood 2013, 2014b). VoiceP is situated below this, encoding the passive/active status of the clause. In other words, neither the auxiliaries themselves, nor the $vP$ shells they head are where the inflectional interpretation is encoded. This differs from the modal layer, because there it is the modal itself, in Mod°, that triggers the modal meaning, and not the InfP selected by it. This is not a crucial aspect of our analysis, however.

The analysis does not hinge upon the assumption that passive and copular BE are merged in the same position. It is entirely possible to have a slightly different structure, with, for instance, a separate $vP_{\text{voice}}$ and VoiceP for the passive auxiliary and have copular BE introduced in $vP$ proper, dominating VP.
inflectional features. These features need checking against the relevant inflectional head $T^\circ$, $\text{Inf}^\circ$, $\text{Perf}^\circ$, or $\text{Prog}^\circ$, which carry the matching interpretable inflectional feature. If the auxiliary fails to check its feature, the derivation crashes. Moreover, we take this checking of inflectional features to cause auxiliaries to overtly raise to the relevant inflectional head.

Concretely, finite auxiliaries are merged bearing a $[uT]$ feature which causes them to raise to $T^\circ$ to be checked against $T^\circ$’s interpretable feature. Infinitival *have* and *be* enter the derivation bearing $[u\text{Inf}]$ and raise to $\text{Inf}^\circ$ to be checked against $[\text{Inf}]$. *Been* bears a $[u\text{Perf}]$ feature and raises to $\text{Perf}^\circ$ to be checked against $[\text{Perf}]$. Finally, *being* bears a $[u\text{Prog}]$ feature which must raise and check against $\text{Prog}^\circ$’s $[\text{Prog}]$. This is illustrated in the structure in (8) below.\(^{10}\)

For completeness’ sake we outline how the lexical verb behaves in this system. We assume, following Baker (2003) and Lasnik (1995b), that lexical verbs, unlike auxiliaries, enter the derivation uninflected and, consequently, without any kind of inflectional features. The lexical verb therefore stays in situ and receives its inflections via linearisation at PF.\(^{11}\)

Finally, we take the overt raising of auxiliaries for reasons of feature checking to be a matter for PF rather than LF. This is assumed in Chomsky (1993, 1995) and especially also Lasnik (1995b), who takes the features responsible for verbal inflection to “not [be] legitimate PF objects”, which would cause a crash at PF in the case of non-raising and hence, non-checking, “even though LF requirements would be satisfied” (Lasnik 1995b: 256). This implies that the movement and checking of auxiliaries should be construed as licensing of the auxiliary’s form for PF reasons: if the feature is not checked overtly (in the syntax), it causes a crash at PF, though no such violation occurs at LF (see Lasnik 1995b).\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) We take this raising and checking of auxiliaries to take place in a manner consistent with Bošković’s (2007) theory of foot-driven movement. Under this approach, raising is triggered by an uninterpretable feature on the moving item, whilst maintaining the requirement of c-command on Agree. We refer the interested reader to Bošković’s paper for an understanding of exactly how this can occur under current Minimalist assumptions, and to Harwood (2014b) for the specific application of this idea to verbal head-movement.

\(^{11}\) There are many ways in which one can implement the difference between auxiliaries and main verbs, and this is only one of them. Nothing hinges on the claim that lexical verbs receive their inflections through linearisation.

\(^{12}\) Although the term ‘uninterpretable’ immediately conjures up a link with LF, we use it, for lack of a better one, for features that need checking in order to avoid a PF crash. It is of course possible that the uninterpretable inflectional features on the auxiliaries we propose must be checked at LF too, but this would inevitably take place in the covert (LF branch) part of the syntactic component. However, whether the uninterpretable features on auxiliaries are a concern for LF or not is relatively immaterial. The crucial point is that (overt) movement of the auxiliary is a concern for PF, not LF. See also Zeijlstra (2011) for a discussion on the nature of features.
Before proceeding further, we take a brief aside here to justify the model of the auxiliary-inflectional system that we adopt and compare it in particular to the more popular alternative at present, namely Bjorkman’s (2011) Reverse Agree model. We have posited a model of the inflectional system which involves paired layering, i.e., each inflectional layer essentially consists of a vP shell in which the auxiliary originates, and an inflectional head below it which acts as the locus of aspectual inflections. In order for an auxiliary to have its inflectional form licensed, it raises out of its vP shell into the inflectional head above it, where it has its inflectional feature checked. For instance, *been* originates in $v_{\text{prog}}^\circ$, but raises to $\text{Perf}^\circ$ in order to check its inflectional feature.

A number of authors (Adger 2003; Bjorkman 2011; Wurmbrand 2012a) alternatively argue that vP shells are not needed. Instead, auxiliaries are directly merged into their inflectional heads (for instance, progressive BE is merged directly into $\text{Prog}^\circ$). They subsequently remain in their base positions and have their inflectional features checked/valued by the next inflectional head up via Reverse Agree (see Aelbrecht 2010, Baker 2008, Haegeman & Lohndal 2010, Merchant 2011, Wurmbrand 2011 and Zeijlstra 2008, 2010 for discussion and application of this mechanism in other domains). For instance, progressive BE, merged in $\text{Prog}^\circ$, can have its features checked/valued in its base position by the inflectional head $\text{Perf}^\circ$, causing the progressive auxiliary to be realised in-situ as *been*. 
As Harwood (2013, 2014b) discusses, these two approaches lead to drastically different predictions with regards to auxiliary distribution. With the paired-layering/auxiliary raising model that we posit, auxiliary distribution is determined by the morphological form of the auxiliary. That is, infinitival *be*, irrespective of whether it is progressive, passive or copular in origin, should always surface in Inf°, *been*, irrespective of whether it is progressive, passive or copular, should always surface in Perf°, and *being*, irrespective of whether it is originally passive or copular, should always surface in Prog°. So we should potentially see distributional differences between *be*, *been* and *being*.

Under the Reverse Agree approach, however, auxiliary distribution should always be determined by auxiliary type. That is, perfect HAVE should always surface in Perf°, progressive *BE*, irrespective of its inflectional form, should always appear on Prog°, and passive/copular *BE*, irrespective of its inflectional form, should always appear on Voice°. So we should potentially see distributional differences between, for instance, progressive and passive/copular *BE*.

Harwood (2013, 2014b) shows that auxiliary distribution in fact appears to be determined by its inflectional form, given that auxiliaries behave differently depending on their inflection. This is already illustrated in this paper with VPE – *being*, irrespective of whether passive or copular, is obligatorily elided, and *be/been*, irrespective of whether progressive, passive or copular, are only optionally elided. Below we present additional data from Harwood (2013, 2014b), involving existential constructions, to further illustrate that auxiliary distribution is determined by inflectional form, and not auxiliary type.

Within passive existential constructions, Harwood (2013, 2014b) notes that the passive auxiliary must follow the associate when inflected for progressive morphology, i.e., *being*, but must precede the associate when inflected for perfect or infinitival morphology, i.e., *been/be*:

(9) a. There were many smurfs *being* arrested for anti-social behaviour.
    b. * There were *being* many smurfs arrested for anti-social behaviour.
    c. There will *be* many smurfs arrested for anti-social behaviour.
    d. * There will many smurfs *be* arrested for anti-social behaviour.

---

13 The exception is finite auxiliary verbs, which are standardly assumed to raise to T°. In order to explain how non-finite auxiliaries surface in their base-positions, and finite auxiliaries in T°, proponents of the Reverse Agree approach are forced to stipulate raising of the finite auxiliary to T°, usually through a verbal equivalent of an EPP feature.

14 In section 7 it is also shown that auxiliaries behave different from one another depending on their inflectional form in VP fronting phenomena as well – *being* is obligatorily fronted, whilst *be* and *been* cannot be.
There have been many smurfs arrested for anti-social behaviour.

Similarly, the copular auxiliary obligatorily follows the associate when realised as *being*, but precedes it when realised as *be* or *been*:

(10) a. There was a gang of smurfs *being* rather loud and obnoxious.
    b. * There was *being* a gang of smurfs rather loud and obnoxious.
    c. There will *be* a gang of smurfs in the garden tonight.
    d. * There will a gang of smurfs *be* in the garden tonight.
    e. There has *been* a lot of commotion in the street today.
    f. * There has *a lot of commotion been* in the street today.

(11) a. There will *be* a gang of smurfs dancing in the garden tonight.
    b. * There will a gang of smurfs *be* dancing in the garden tonight.
    c. There has *been* a gang of smurfs dancing in our garden all night.
    d. * There has a gang of smurfs *been* dancing in our garden all night.

Finally, when realised as *be* or *been*, the progressive auxiliary patterns with the passive and copular auxiliaries of the same morphological form by preceding the associate:

Essentially the data demonstrates that the auxiliaries *be* and *been* uniformly raise to positions beyond the associate, whilst *being* does not. Therefore we can claim in this instance that the distribution of the auxiliary in relation to the associate is sensitive not to the specific type of auxiliary (passive, copular or progressive), but rather to the inflectional form it takes. This is correctly predicted by the inflectional model that we propose, and presents a serious problem for the Reverse Agree approaches, which wrongly predict the converse of this.15

15 See Harwood (2013, 2014b) for a more thorough justification of the auxiliary system that we propose. There is also good reason to believe that there is a certain amount of cross-linguistic applicability of this model. In lexical verb-raising languages such as Portuguese, for instance, the distribution of the lexical verb is determined by its inflectional form. This is evidenced by
Admittedly, the existence of the vP shells within our own system are
questionable since these heads tend to have little to no semantic motivation.
However, Harwood (2013, 2014b) argues that, for the time being, such vP
shells are necessary to allow for non-finite auxiliary raising. If auxiliaries were
merged directly into the heads of their inflectional projections, a locality
violation would arise (Rizzi 1990). That is, auxiliaries, in their quest to have
their inflectional features checked, would inadvertently raise into higher
aspectual heads, which are, however, already filled by either a higher auxiliary,
or, at the very least, a trace of that auxiliary, causing a locality violation. For
instance, if progressive BE was merged directly into Prog°, and then raised to
Perf° for the purposes of inflectional feature checking, a locality violation
would arise since this head would already be filled by perfect HAVE, or at
least a trace of this auxiliary. In order to prevent this, we merge auxiliaries into
their own vP shells, leaving the head of the aspectual projection itself free for
another auxiliary to raise into. Of course, if auxiliary raising can be reconciled
with a structure without split layers, this would be preferred.16

With these structures and implementations in mind, we proceed to
section 3, which presents the first part of our approach: our view on the VP
ellipsis site. We argue that the ellipsis site is as large as vPprog (though no
larger) when that projection is present, and in the absence of vPprog the ellipsis
site corresponds to the highest projection below this, namely vP. In order to
explain the contrast between be/been, being and have in (6), we propose in
section 4 that the forms be and been optionally raise from their base positions
within the ellipsis site to positions outside of it, and that they thus optionally
escape ellipsis, whereas the auxiliary being never raises high enough to
escape. Have, on the other hand, is base-generated outside of the ellipsis site
and so never has the opportunity to be elided.

3. The analysis, part I: a well-defined ellipsis site

behavioural differences between the finite, perfect, progressive and passivised forms of the
lexical verb in VPE.

16 In order for the Reverse Agree approaches to accommodate the facts outlined in this
section they would similarly have to assume that auxiliaries raise out of their base positions to
higher inflectional heads. The problems here, however, are twofold: the movement involved
would be simultaneously unmotivated and structurally unfeasible. That is, (i) since the
auxiliaries concerned have already had their inflectional features checked in their base-
positions via Reverse Agree, they have no motivation to move to a higher inflectional head;
and (ii), under the sparser structures that the Reverse Agree models utilise (which do away
with vP shells), this movement would be structurally unsound as it would give rise to locality
violations as discussed above. In order for the Reverse Agree models to solve these issues,
they would essentially arrive at a model similar to that which we have proposed (though see
sections 6.3 and 6.4 for critical accounts of analyses which attempt to account for some of the
data discussed in this article under a Reverse Agree model).
Standardly, as the label suggests, VPE has been assumed to involve non- pronunciation of the verb phrase. Over the course of the last ten to twenty years, however, there has been some debate as to how big this missing verb phrase is exactly. Many accounts of VPE have claimed that the ellipsis site is either VP, vP or VoiceP (Aelbrecht 2010; Gengel 2007a; Johnson 2001, 2004; Lasnik 1995a; Merchant 2001, 2008a,b, 2013). We argue, contrary to more standard assumptions, that VPE targets a constituent which is larger than just VP, VoiceP or vP. According to us, when the progressive aspectual layer is projected, VPE elides as much as vP$_{prog}$, containing progressive BE, though nothing larger. This implies that the ellipsis site also contains ProgP, with the progressive inflectional feature. In the absence of the progressive aspectual layer, however, VPE targets vP, as standardly assumed.\footnote{We come back to the question of what determines the size of the ellipsis site in section 5.}

In this section we provide evidence for our claim that the progressive layer is included in the ellipsis site. This evidence comes from empirical data concerning ellipsis of auxiliaries: only auxiliaries which are merged inside the ellipsis site can ever be elided. We have seen that some auxiliaries are always elided under VPE, some never, and some only optionally. Several accounts have already been proposed to account for this pattern (see Akmajian et al. 1979; Sag 1976, or more recently Bošković 2014; Sailor 2012; Thoms 2012), but, irrespective of the analysis one chooses, the consensus about auxiliary deletion is that an auxiliary can only be elided if it is at some point in the derivation included in the ellipsis site.\footnote{This is with the exception of Akmajian & Wasow (1975) who posit auxiliary deletion in addition to VPE. See Sag (1976: 25-29), however, for counterarguments against this analysis.} We show that auxiliaries generated within and below vP$_{prog}$ can be elided by VPE, whilst those generated above it cannot be. Consequently, this implies that the ellipsis site is as large as vP$_{prog}$. We first illustrate that all the different types of BE (copular, passive and progressive) can be elided, and then show that HAVE can never be deleted, even though this has been contested in the literature.

### 3.1 Instances of BE can be elided

The auxiliary BE can occur in several morphological forms (been, be, being or finite forms), but these forms can also have different origins: BE can be copular, passive or progressive. The first two instances are in complementary distribution and, as indicated in section 2.1, are taken to be base-generated in the little v head. Progressive BE can co-occur with passive or copular BE and is thus base-generated in a position higher than v, namely v$_{prog}$.

In order to determine which projections are included in the VP ellipsis site, we need to test which auxiliaries can be deleted. If an auxiliary can be elided, its base position (at least) is part of the ellipsis site. We show that all
instances of BE – copular, passive and progressive – can be elided, so VPE must (at least) target \( vP_{\text{prog}} \). First, we illustrate that copular BE can be elided, whether it occurs as \textit{be}, \textit{been} or \textit{being}, see (12). The first two forms are deleted optionally, and \textit{being} is elided obligatorily. Second, passive BE can be deleted too, see (13).

(12)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ted has been in the garden, and Robin has (been), too.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Ted will be in the garden, and Robin will (be), too.} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Ted was being noisy, and Robin was (*being), too.}
\end{align*}

(13)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ted has been arrested, and Barney has (been), too.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Ted will be arrested, and Barney will (be), too.} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Ted was being arrested at that time, and Barney was (*being), too.}
\end{align*}

Progressive BE poses more of a problem. It seems like it can be elided when it occurs as \textit{be} or \textit{been} (progressive BE never occurs as \textit{being}): 

(14)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ted has been questioning our motives, but Robin hasn't (been).} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Ted will be questioning our motives, but Robin won't (be).}
\end{align*}

However, one could argue that the presence of progressive BE in the antecedent does not necessarily imply the presence of the progressive in the ellipsis site. In other words, when the progressive auxiliary is elided, the sentences in (14) could allow for a mismatch reading where the ellipsis clause does not actually contain progressive aspect, but is interpreted as in (15):

(15)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{…but Robin hasn't [questioned our motives].} \\
\text{b. } & \text{…but Robin won't [question our motives].}
\end{align*}

Sailor (2012) has even claimed that in such cases, an interpretation with the progressive is ungrammatical. From his claim it would follow that progressive BE is never elided. Because these interpretation-based arguments are hard to convincingly draw conclusions from, however, it is necessary to find contexts showing whether the progressive auxiliary can genuinely be elided by VPE. Two such contexts are existential constructions and idiomatic expressions. Using these contexts we show that progressive BE can be optionally elided.

We look at existential constructions first. English existentials display aspectual restrictions (Aissen 1975; Deal 2009; Harwood 2011; Milsark 1974):
unaccusative verbs can occur in existentials with all kinds of aspect ((16)), but unergative verbs are only allowed with the progressive, see (17).\footnote{Transitive and ditransitive existentials are subject to the same aspectual restrictions. See Deal (2009) and Harwood (2011, 2013) for explanations of this restriction.}

(16)

a. There arrived a crocodile in the mail. [unaccusative]
b. There has arrived a crocodile in the mail.
c. There will be a crocodile arriving in the mail.

(17)

a. * There danced a crocodile in the garden. [unergative]
b. * There has danced a crocodile in the garden.
c. There was a crocodile dancing in the garden.

This means that when ellipsis is applied to an unergative existential, we can be certain as to the presence of progressive aspect in the ellipsis site.\footnote{It has been argued in the literature (Law 1999; McNally 1992; Moro 1997; Williams 1984) that all the material following the associate in progressive existentials is actually contained inside a reduced relative clause (RRC) and is not part of the main clause (cf. (i)).}

(i) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{TP There was [DP a crocodile [RRC (who was) dancing in the garden]]]}
\end{array}
\]

If this is correct, we cannot use existentials to make any claims about VPE in main clauses: the supposed optional ellipsis of progressive BE that we have uncovered would simply be optional ellipsis of copular BE.

However, although an RRC structure for existentials is possible, transitive and unergative existentials may also behave as full-clausal constructions, and moreover, so can the cases involving ellipsis. This is evidenced by the fact that these progressive existentials exhibit properties which RRCs do not. For instance, Chomsky (2001) has observed that existential constructions permit idiom chunks, whereas existential constructions containing a relative clause do not:

(i) There was all hell breaking loose downstairs.
(ii) * There was all hell which was breaking loose downstairs.

In conjunction with VPE, existentials behave according to the mono-clausal structure:

(iii) Barney said there would be all hell breaking loose downstairs, but I didn’t think there would (be) all hell breaking loose downstairs.

Other differences between progressive existentials and RRCs involve the order of RRCs and full RCs (Deal 2009) and eventive copular constructions (Caponigro & Schutze 2003; Milsark 1974; Rezac 2006), indicating that progressive existentials can not only be formed from RRCs, but also have an underlying full-clausal structure available to them. In the contexts presented in these works as well, VPE can be applied, suggesting that our observations regarding ellipsis of the progressive auxiliary in existentials are genuine. That is, (18) is a genuine case of main clause VPE with the progressive auxiliary being optionally included within the ellipsis site.
though we all know that there won’t (be).

b. He said there had been a clown dancing at his party, even though we all knew that there hadn’t (been).

In other words, (17) indicates that an existential with an unergative verb cannot occur without the progressive. This implies that the hearer cannot interpret (18) without the progressive and therefore that progressive BE is genuinely included in the ellipsis site, just like passive and copular BE.

A second context that can show whether progressive BE can genuinely be elided involves idiomatic expressions. There are certain idioms which depend upon progressive aspect: only the sentence in (19)a with the progressive aspect has the idiomatic reading.

(19) a. Bob is pushing up daisies. = Bob is dead.
b. # Bob pushed up daisies. ≠ Bob died/was dead.
c. # Bob will push up daisies. ≠ Bob will die/will be dead.
d. # Bob has pushed up daisies. ≠ Bob has died/has been dead.

If VPE is applied to such an idiom and the idiomatic interpretation is retained even without the overt presence of the progressive auxiliary, this implies that progressive aspect and, crucially, the progressive auxiliary, are present in the derivation. All our informants still interpret (20) as an idiom, which means they accept ellipsis of the progressive auxiliary:

(20) a. Lola told us that Bob has been pushing up daisies for a while now, and indeed he has (been).
b. Lola told us that Bob might be pushing up daisies by now, and indeed he might (be).

Irrespective of how one accounts for the optional ellipsis of be/been, whether it be optional auxiliary raising (as we argue in section 4.2, but see also Sailor 2012 and Thoms 2012), or optional extension of the ellipsis site (Akmajian et al. 1979; Bošković 2014), the consensus is that for an auxiliary to be elided, it must be included in the ellipsis site at some point in the derivation. Thus, for the progressive auxiliary to be optionally elided in (18) and (20), the ellipsis site must be as large as vP_prog.

3.2 HAVE cannot be elided

Akmajian & Wasow (1975) and Sag (1976) noted that the non-finite perfect auxiliary have is never elided. However, there has been some debate about this claim in the literature, and it is only fair that we explore this issue properly before building our analysis.
Although many authors agree with the original pattern concerning *have* (Bošković 2014; Johnson 2001; Lobeck 1987; Sailor 2009, 2012; Wurmbrand 2012b; Zagona 1988), some linguists argue that this is not true, and that perfect *have* can indeed be elided (Akmajian et al. 1979; Lasnik 1995b; Thoms 2011, 2012). This is evidenced by the following sentence in which *have* appears to have been elided:

(21) John might have called, and Bill might, too. (Wurmbrand 2012b:10)

However, Johnson (2001) and Wurmbrand (2012b) contest the claim that *have* can be elided, and argue that what causes the acceptability of this sentence is the fact that there is a mismatch reading available which lacks perfect aspect altogether. According to them, the ellipsis site is not [have *called*], but [call], which in the right context will be interpreted appropriately by the hearer. Wurmbrand (2012b) rules out this interfering mismatch interpretation by using conflicting time specifications forcing a perfect aspectual interpretation in the second conjunct. In these instances, her informants judged ellipsis of *have* to be unacceptable (Wurmbrand 2012b:10, example (36)b’):

(22) * John might have called yesterday, and Bill might, two days ago.

This therefore constitutes some evidence towards the claim that the perfect auxiliary cannot be elided. In what follows, we look at further contexts which can show us whether the perfect auxiliary can genuinely be elided or not, namely fixed expressions, identity requirements and *before*-clauses. We conclude from these that *have* cannot be elided, conforming to the original findings, although we do not exclude idiolectal or dialectal variation, and offer some speculations below on how to capture this variation in our system.

First, we discuss fixed expressions. There are expressions that are dependent upon perfect aspect, such as in (23). Without the perfect aspect, these sentences are unacceptable.

(23) a. Ted has been to Rome. c. * Ted will be to Rome.

If VPE is applied to these cases, no mismatch interpretation without the perfect aspect is available. Thus, this expression provides us with a test context to determine whether *have* can be elided or not. As it turns out, 80%
of our (British English) informants reject (24) when perfect have is included in the ellipsis.\(^{21}\) This suggests that have cannot be deleted under VPE.

(24) This time next year Ted will have been to Rome, and Barney will *(have), as well.

Another context, involving identity requirements, provides even clearer results regarding ellipsis of have. It has been noted that auxiliaries in English can only be elided when they have a formally identical antecedent (Johnson 2001; Lasnik 1995b; Warner 1986).\(^{22}\) This is illustrated in (25) for be and been: if the antecedent contains the auxiliary in a different morphological form, the normally optional ellipsis of be and been becomes impossible. If the antecedent contains the same form, on the other hand, ellipsis is fine.

(25) a. Sue has been eaten by cannibals, and now Rob might *(be).
   b. Sue will be eaten by cannibals, and Rob will (be), too.
   c. Sue was eaten by cannibals after Rob had *(been).
   d. Sue has been eaten by cannibals, and Rob has (been), too.

This implies that in the following sentence (based on Thom’s 2011), the ellipsis site and its correlate in the antecedent clause must display morphologically equivalent instances of BE for VPE to be licensed:

(26) Bob might have been fired, and Morag might have (been) fired, too.

Thus, the elided passive auxiliary depends on perfect aspect in order to be realised as been and fulfil the identity requirement. If perfect aspect were absent from the second conjunct, the elided auxiliary would be realised as be, which is non-identical to its antecedent. It would not be recoverable, and therefore would lead to illicitness. In short, this gives us another context that depends on perfect aspect. No aspectual mismatch interpretation is available

---

\(^{21}\) We tested these sentences with 20 British English speakers, from all over Britain. Even though 80% of these speakers reject deletion of have, it is true that some speakers still accepted it. We suspect this is due to some dialectal or idiolectal variation. We note, however, that from the people we tested, the few speakers who did accept deletion of have did not come from the same geographical area. Moreover, the next context we use to test have deletion gives us clearer results: none of our informants accepted deletion of have in that context, not even the speakers who were fine with the deletion in the fixed expressions.

\(^{22}\) See Potsdam (1997), however, for a discussion of examples where such mismatches are allowed, under specific circumstances. The examples we use here have been judged by several native speakers and do not fall into the category of such ‘acceptable contexts’.
to mask potential ellipsis of *have*. As it turns out, all our informants rejected
deletion of *have* in this context.23

(27)  * Ted might have been fired, and Barney might, too.

A final context, taken from Sailor (2012), involves temporal clauses that are
sensitive to aspect, such as *before*-clauses. As Sailor observes, these result
in ungrammaticality if *have* is included in the ellipsis site, and without *have* the
sentence does not get a sensible reading:

(28) Mary could have studied harder for the exam. Before finally taking it
     yesterday…
     a. …she really should have.
     b. */#…she really should. (Sailor 2012:(36))

Summing up, we build our analysis on the fact that *have* generally cannot be
elided. If *have* is merged in V_{perf}°, this implies that the perfect aspectual layer
is not included within the ellipsis site.

We acknowledge, however, that there might be some dialectal/idiolaletal
variation regarding deletion of perfect *have*. As already mentioned, 20% of our
informants accepted deletion of *have* in (24). Moreover, Wurmbrand (2012b)
noted a number of dissenting judgments regarding *have*-deletion in (22), and
Sailor (2012) found some Canadian English speakers to accept deletion of
*have* in (28). Also, whilst none of our informants accepted *have*-deletion in
(27), this has been reported as acceptable in Thoms (2011). The system we
develop in the next section cannot straightforwardly capture this variation.
Therefore, before continuing, we offer some speculations on how *have* can be
deleted for some speakers.24

---

23 Note that the ellipsis site can be interpreted in one of two ways: the hearer can interpret the
ellipsis site as containing *have* (see (i)), or they can accommodate with a mismatch
interpretation without *have* (as in (ii)):

(i)  * Ted might have been fired, and Barney might (*have been fired*), too.
(ii) * Ted might have been fired, and Barney might (*be fired*), too.

Both options lead to ungrammaticality: option 2 is illicit because of the identity requirement on
*be* (i.e., there is no *be* present in the antecedent, so *be* cannot be elided), and option 1 is
unacceptable because deletion of *have* is disallowed under VPE. Either way, the data
demonstrates that *have* cannot be included in the ellipsis site.

24 Of the 20% of informants who accepted ellipsis of *have* in (24) above, some still regarded
the sentence as degraded in comparison to cases in which *have* has not been elided. This is
a notable contrast with ellipsis of *be* and *been*, for which speakers notice no difference in
acceptability between sentences in which *be* or *been* have been elided, and sentences in
which they have not. Moreover, it should be noted that no speaker consistently accepted
ellipsis of *have* across the various tested phenomena. Again, this contrasts with ellipsis of *be*
and *been*, in which all informants consistently accepted ellipsis of these auxiliaries. The fact
Because deletion of *have* appears to be somewhat restricted and unstable in comparison to *be/been* deletion, we argue that *have* can never be truly elided as part of the VP ellipsis site, but that some speakers allow for it to go missing in certain contexts due to some additional mechanism. Because it is not yet predictable which speakers allow for apparent ellipsis of *have*, nor in which contexts, it is difficult to ascertain exactly what this additional mechanism should be. In the following paragraphs, we elaborate on what these factors could be. One possibility involves cliticisation (see also Harwood 2013, 2014a). Finite auxiliaries in English – except for modals – can undergo cliticisation:

(29)  
a. He’s/They’ve gone home.  
b. I’m/We’re/He’s going home.

Perfect *have* is unique in being the only non-finite auxiliary that can cliticise as well. This is illustrated by the fact observed by Johnson (1988) and Kayne (1997) that *have* can cliticise to the modal and subsequently be pied-piped along with it under subject auxiliary inversion, whilst *be* cannot:

(30)  
a. Shouldn’t’ve Pam remembered her name?  
b. * Shouldn’t be Pam remembering her name?  
    (Adapted from Kayne 1997:51)

Auxiliaries that can cliticise in English appear to be susceptible to ever-more extreme forms of cliticisation in which their phonological forms may be reduced to the point at which they are not pronounced at all. One such instance of this is with finite auxiliaries in *wh*-questions (see also Fitzpatrick 2006 for auxiliary omission in other contexts):

(31)  
a. % Where you been?  
b. % What you doing?

Furthermore, as noted by Kayne (1997), non-finite *have* can cliticise in increasingly reduced forms. For instance, the more traditional ‘ve cliticisation can be replaced by the significantly reduced form of -a:

(32)  
a. You should’ve closed the door behind you.

also remains that there are many speakers who indeed outright reject ellipsis of *have* in all contexts, whereas there don’t appear to be any exceptional speakers with regards to *be/been* deletion – all native speakers of English accept ellipsis of *be* and *been*. Given the general tendency of the literature and judgements collected to date, we assume that the default option for English is that *have* cannot be elided.
b. You shoulda closed the door behind you.

It seems possible therefore that non-finite have, like its finite counterpart, could cliticise in certain linguistic environments to the point at which it is not pronounced at all. We conjecture that one context in which such extreme cliticisation applies is in the context of VP ellipsis. That is, the apparent ellipsis of non-finite have could in fact be attributed to extreme cliticisation of have to the point of non-pronunciation, adjacent to an ellipsis site.  

(33) a. John might not have called, but Bill might've [called].
b. John might not have called, but Bill mighta [called].
c. John might not have called, but Bill might -- [called].

As an alternative analysis for apparent have-deletion, Kayne (1997:49) has claimed “some [varieties of] English are able to embed participial phrases directly under modals, without the intermediary of an auxiliary verb have.” This is directly observable in other Germanic languages such as Swedish, Norwegian (Julien 2002; Taraldson 1984), Icelandic and Faroese (Einarsson 1945; Lockwood 1977). We illustrate this with examples from Norwegian:

(34) Vi skulle gjort det før.
we should done it before
‘We should have done it before’ (Kayne 1997:50)

It may thus be possible that what looks like ellipsis of non-finite have in the English of some speakers is in fact an instance of the modal introducing perfect aspect without the intervening auxiliary verb. This particular phenomenon may have died out in certain varieties of English, but exists in others in the context of ellipsis when have is apparently elided.

A third possibility for have-deletion, suggested by an anonymous reviewer, is that the cases that appear to delete have along with the rest of the ellipsis site do not involve actual VPE at all, but rather have a completely different source, for instance a null verbal proform. Although the reviewer agrees with the judgement in (27) above, they provide an additional example in which deletion of have is allowed for them:

---

25 Kaisse (1983), King (1970), Pullum (1997) and Zwicky (1970) discuss the different conditions on auxiliary contraction, and observe that contraction is impossible in English when preceding an ellipsis site (among other restrictions). However, whilst this is true for finite auxiliaries, it is crucially not the case for non-finite auxiliaries:

(i) * I will finish work at 5 and you’ll too.
(ii) I will have finished work by 5 and you will’ve too.

See Pullum (1997) also for contraction to infinitival marker to, and see also Fitzpatrick (2006) on auxiliary omission of a different kind.
26 The problem remains, however, of why certain speakers have these additional mechanisms available to them and others do not.
Recall furthermore that we take the ellipsis site to be $vP_{\text{prog}}$, and that auxiliaries raise to check their inflectional PF features against the relevant aspectual head.

In the following sub-sections we explain how this deletion paradigm can be captured with the claims and assumptions made so far. We first tackle the easiest patterns: the auxiliaries that are always overt or always elided, namely *have* and *being* (and the lexical verb), respectively. Section 4.2 turns to the optionally deleted auxiliaries *be* and *been*.

### 4.1 Being and have

The first piece of data we wish to capture with our analysis is the obligatory deletion of *being*:

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Ted was being eaten by a gorilla and Robin was (*being) too.
\item b. Ted is being difficult and Robin is (*being) too.
\end{enumerate}

Under our view of verbal inflections, *being* raises from $v^o$ to $\text{Prog}^o$ to check its inflectional feature, as in (38). This landing site of *being* is still included in the $vP_{\text{prog}}$ ellipsis site, meaning *being* never escapes ellipsis.

The illicit ellipsis of non-finite perfect *have* can be explained as the opposite of this: both the landing site and – crucially – the base position of *have* are outside of the $vP_{\text{prog}}$ ellipsis site and therefore *have* obligatorily escapes ellipsis.

\begin{enumerate}
\item (37)
\item (38)
\end{enumerate}
The lexical verb in English never raises for inflection if we follow Baker (2003), Chomsky (1993, 1995), Emonds (1978), Kayne (1993), Lasnik (1995b) and Pollock (1989), and so it never moves out of the ellipsis site and is always elided. It should also be clear by now why modals and the finite perfect auxiliary HAVE are never elided: both the base position and the landing site are outside of the ellipsis site.\footnote{In the next sub-section it will become apparent, following discussion of optional \textit{be/been} deletion, that finite BE might, at first glance, appear to present a problem for our analysis. Because this issue is only obvious once \textit{be/been} deletion has been explored, we defer discussion of finite BE until footnote 32, at the end of the next sub-section, in which the problem is easily solved.}

4.2 \textit{Be/been}

We have seen earlier that \textit{being} is obligatorily elided, while \textit{have} never is. \textit{Be} and \textit{been}, on the other hand, are optionally elided. The relevant data are repeated in (39).

(39)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Ted has been eating a sandwich and Robin has (been) [\textit{eating a sandwich}], too.
\item b. Ted will be eating a sandwich and Robin will (be) [\textit{eating a ...}], too.
\end{enumerate}

Our approach, in a nutshell, is that optional ellipsis of \textit{be/been} results from their optional raising out of the ellipsis site. In the case of raising, the auxiliaries move out of the ellipsis site, surviving ellipsis, and have their inflectional features checked against the relevant aspectual heads. In the case of non-raising, the auxiliaries remain in the ellipsis site and are deleted, along with their unchecked inflectional features. In other words, there are two derivational paths available, raising and non-raising, both of which result in a grammatical sentence, and so give rise to optionality.

More specifically, recall that for us, the ellipsis site is \textit{\textit{vP}$_{\text{prog}}$}. To surface as \textit{\textit{be}/\textit{been}}, the progressive auxiliary – or passive or copular – should raise to the respective inflectional heads \textit{Inf$^\theta$} or \textit{Perf$^\theta$} in order to check its inflectional feature. This causes it to raise out of the ellipsis site, surviving ellipsis.

However, this raising does not have to occur under ellipsis. When \textit{be} and \textit{been} are elided, it is because they have failed to raise out of the ellipsis site. This implies that the unraised auxiliaries have not had a chance to check their inflectional features on \textit{Inf$^\theta$} or \textit{Perf$^\theta$}. Still bearing unchecked features, our derivation would be in danger of crashing at PF. However, ellipsis, being a PF-deletion operation, saves the derivation from crashing: if we delete the material in the ellipsis site at PF, the auxiliary, including its offending...
unchecked feature, is deleted too. Consequently, it is no longer a problem for PF, and the derivation is rescued.\textsuperscript{28} The structures in (40)b and (40)c illustrate what happens in the sentence in (40)a with optional deletion of \textit{be}.

\begin{enumerate}[(a)]
\item Ted will be eating a sandwich and Robin will (be), too.
\item Deletion of \textit{be}
\item Non-deletion of \textit{be}
\end{enumerate}

![Diagram](image)

This proposal is generally reminiscent of a number of rescue by PF-deletion analyses for various other phenomena (Lasnik 1999, 2001; Merchant 2001; Müller 2011; Ross 1969).\textsuperscript{29, 30, 31}

\textsuperscript{28} For the purposes of this paper we only address the need for the features to be checked at PF, not at LF. Generally head movement is taken to have little to no semantic effect (Chomsky 1993, 1995, 2001; Lasnik 1995b). It has been claimed by various authors, however, that head movement does have a semantic effect (Hartman 2011; Iatridou & Zeijlstra 2012; Lechner 2006; Matushansky 2006; Roberts 2010). This is most directly observable with T-to-C movement, and is debatable with regard to v-to-T (or Asp) movement. Regardless, if one wishes to claim that all types of head movement have a semantic effect, the analysis can be easily adapted to conform to this: the unraised auxiliary’s inflectional feature is deleted at PF but still exists on the LF branch of the syntax after ellipsis and must be checked before arrival at the LF interface so as to prevent a derivational crash. In this case, the inflectional feature covertly raises, thereby correctly converging at LF. Due to the covert nature of this raising and checking, however, such movement of the auxiliary would not be observable. See Harwood (2013) for this view.

\textsuperscript{29} Roughly, there are two main types of rescue by ellipsis (see Merchant 2004): cases where ellipsis feeds an operation (i.e., where an operation takes place under ellipsis, but not in the non-elliptical counterpart), and cases where ellipsis bleeds the operation (i.e., where an operation that normally occurs, does not happen under ellipsis). The current case is one where ellipsis bleeds the head movement of a verb, parallel to what has been argued in pseudogapping by Lasnik (1995a, 2001) and in matrix sluicing (Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001).

Admittedly, the cases mentioned above have also received analyses not involving bleeding of the movement, and more importantly, the difference between our analysis and these other bleeding cases is that the auxiliary movement is optional, whereas in sluicing and
Recapitulating, we propose that the ellipsis site is maximally vP_{prog}, which includes the base position of all instances of BE (progressive, passive and copular). *Being* never raises beyond Prog°, so is always contained within the ellipsis site, explaining why this form is always elided under VPE. HAVE and modals on the other hand, are always merged outside of the ellipsis site, and can never be elided. *Be* and *been* are merged within the vP_{prog} ellipsis site, but raise out of it to check their uninterpretable inflectional features. This captures their optional deletion: if they raise out of the ellipsis site to check their features, they survive ellipsis, and if they remain in the ellipsis site, they are deleted along with their uninterpretable features, preventing a derivational crash at PF.32

30 An alternative analysis from the one we propose would be one inspired by Lasnik’s (2001) approach to pseudogapping: the uninterpretable feature could also be checked by feature movement only, leaving the auxiliary behind. In non-elliptical sentences, feature movement is not an option, as this turns the auxiliary into a deficient PF object, and causes the derivation to crash. Ellipsis, on the other hand, avoids such a violation by removing the auxiliary. Therefore, no crash occurs at PF.

31 Note that it is not the case that just any unchecked features can be repaired by ellipsis. Crucially, the unchecked features of the auxiliaries must be situated in the ellipsis site. Any unchecked features outside of the ellipsis site will cause a violation. For instance, wh-movement is generally taken to check a [Q]-feature on the wh-element, and a [wh]-feature on C. The same holds for subject movement: this is also triggered by an EPP-feature on T. These features are situated outside the ellipsis site and so cannot be deleted by ellipsis. Therefore movement is obligatory in these cases, not optional, even under ellipsis.

Note additionally that if the features situated outside of the ellipsis site are satisfied by alternative means, then movement will not take place out of the ellipsis site and the relevant item will be deleted. For instance, in existential constructions the EPP on T° is satisfied by the expletive *there*, causing the subject to remain low:

(i) There was an army of gorillas dancing the waltz.

When ellipsis is applied in these instances, the subject is deleted since it remains within the ellipsis site:

(i) In my dreams there was an army of gorillas dancing the waltz, but in reality there wasn’t.

32 This implies, however, that finite BE, which originates within the ellipsis site and raises out to T°, would also have the possibility of optionally remaining within the ellipsis site and being deleted by the ellipsis. This is not the case, as VPE can never elide the finite auxiliary.

It has been claimed, however, that T° must be filled, either by *to* or by a finite auxiliary, in order for VPE to be licensed (Aelbrecht 2010; Gengel 2007; Johnson 2001; Lobeck 1995; Zagona 1982, 1988). This independently rules out ellipsis of finite *be*, since this auxiliary would be required to raise to T°, outside of the ellipsis site, to actually license the ellipsis in the first place.
This implies that the option of not raising is only possible for auxiliaries under ellipsis. We predict that raising is obligatory in all other contexts since no ellipsis occurs to delete the unchecked PF features on the auxiliary otherwise. As we show in section 7 below, where we extend our analysis to VP fronting and other related phenomena, this prediction is borne out. Before we show how exactly these other contexts are captured, however, the next section formalises how the ellipsis site is determined. We claim that the maximal ellipsis site is $vP_{prog}$, but if the clause does not express progressive aspect, $vP_{prog}$ and the ProgP selected by it are absent from the structure. This would make the ellipsis site smaller: VPE elides $vP$ in that case. In other words, we do not assume a variable ellipsis site to account for the optionality of be/been deletion (unlike other proposals, such as Akmajian et al. 1979 and Bošković 2014), but because we only take those aspectual projections which are expressed to be present in the syntax, the actual projection targeted by VPE does vary depending on what is present in the structure, that is, either $vP$ or $vP_{prog}$. This makes it difficult to pin down exactly what the ellipsis site for VPE is, in a generalising statement. Whilst the principle aim of this paper is simply to capture the auxiliary ellipsis paradigm of English, the next section presents a tentative formalised solution for how the ellipsis site is determined.

5. **Phasal ellipsis**

In section 3 we claimed that $vP_{prog}$ is the maximal ellipsis site: when the clause contains progressive aspect, VPE targets $vP_{prog}$ (see (41)a). When there is no progressive aspect in the clause, $vP_{prog}$ and ProgP are absent, and VPE targets $vP$, as in (41)b. This implies that the projection that is elided differs depending on what is present in the clause, making it harder to formalise how the ellipsis site is targeted.

(41) a. $$(TP Ted should [vPmod t should [InfP have [vPerf t have [PerfP been [vPproj t been [ProgP being [vP t being [VoiceP ed [VP train]]]]]]]]].$$

b. $$(TP Ted should [vPmod t should [InfP have [vPerf t have [PerfP been [vP t been [VoiceP ed [VP train]]]]]]].$$

The unsolved question of how the ellipsis site is determined is common to almost all approaches to VPE: although it might be empirically demonstrable which constituent is included in the VP ellipsis site, it remains a mystery why a specific projection is targeted. Our solution is that VPE always targets the clause-internal phase.\(^{33}\)

\(^{33}\) An anonymous reviewer pointed out that the use of ‘the clause-internal phase’ might be confusing, as there might be other phases present within the clause. For simplicity’s sake, we will keep using this term, but want to make explicit that we mean the phase corresponding to the verbal/predicational layer of the clause, the one that in Chomsky’s (2000) original
5.1 The progressive phase

The vP domain is traditionally assumed in the generative literature to form a discrete unit of structure (see for instance Bowers 2002; Chomsky 2000) separate from the temporal domain which is typically comprised of tense and aspect. Harwood (2013, 2014a), Ramchand & Svenonius (2013) and Wurmbrand (2012b), however, have argued that the verbal domain in English is actually somewhat larger than vP and in fact extends as far as progressive aspect when the progressive projections are present, although perfect aspect remains external to this domain.

Ramchand & Svenonius (2013) define this lower domain as the event zone, whilst Harwood (2013, 2014a) defines it as corresponding to the predicational domain of the clause, similar to Bowers (2002).\footnote{Harwood (2013, 2014a) supports this assumption by a number of intriguing facts regarding progressive aspect in English. Firstly, progressive aspect is sensitive to lexical restrictions. Not all lexical verbs can occur with progressive aspect, while all verbs do allow perfect aspect. This suggests that the former is much more closely tied with the lexical verb than the latter.}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. I \{\textit{am knowing/am learning}\} French.
   \textnormal{[stative: \textit{prog/dynamic: prog}]}
   \item b. I have known/loved/sung that song for years.
   \textnormal{[stative: \textit{perf/dynamic: perf}]}
\end{enumerate}

Another indication involves its morphological form in many languages: progressive formation (on the verb following the progressive phrase) seems to have more nominal properties than other verbal inflections. In English the \textit{–ing} suffix makes clear the link with gerunds, which can be seen as nominalisations (to different degrees, see Chomsky 1970), as in (ii). Also in other languages the progressive inflection has nominal properties, such as in Gungbe (see iib) (Aboh 2005), Dutch and German: in Dutch (see iic) for instance, it comes with a definite article. Thus, it seems that in languages that express the progressive, its form is quite different from how verbal inflections normally behave in these languages, and seems to have some nominal properties.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Ted('s) growing (of) a beard was the worst idea ever.
   \item b. Køjó tô àmî ló zân.
   \textnormal{Kojo IMPERF oil DET NOMINALISER}
   \textnormal{‘Kojo is using the oil.’ (Aboh 2005:140)}
   \item c. De krokodil was aan het dansen.
   \textnormal{the crocodile was on the dance.\textsc{inf}}
   \textnormal{‘The crocodile was dancing.’}
\end{enumerate}

A third possible indication that progressive (and passive too) is part of the predicate, is that it uses BE as its auxiliary in English (and Dutch and other languages). This is identical to copular BE, which occurs with AP, NP and PP predicates. It is thus possible that progressive BE is simply another instance of a copular appearing alongside a verbal predicate, suggesting once again the predicational nature of the progressive. The perfect auxiliary in English on the other hand, is HAVE, which is rather distinct from the copular auxiliary, suggesting that the use of auxiliary BE instead of HAVE for the progressive but not the perfect might reflect a sensitivity to predicate structure.
specifically argues that this lower domain of structure corresponds to the clause-internal phase (Chomsky 2000, 2001) on the basis of syntactic evidence from existential constructions, idioms and various facts associated with VPE and VP fronting. We present the evidence from existential constructions here.

Consider the distribution of the derived subject of a passive existential:

(42) There were several men arrested for drunkenness.

In this sentence the expletive there occupies Spec-TP, preventing the derived subject from raising to this position. However, the derived subject occurs pre-verbally, and is thus not occupying its base, post-verbal position. Some form of intermediate raising must have taken place. Essentially, Chomsky (2001) claims the derived subject raises to the clause-internal phase edge so that it can enter into Case checking relations in the higher phase. However, merger of expletive there into Spec-TP satisfies the EPP on T° and blocks further raising of the subject, which must then have its Case features checked through non-local Agree (Chomsky 2000, 2001). The derived subject is thus stranded on the edge of the clause-internal phase where it precedes the lexical verb.\footnote{Despite postulating raising to the edge of this phase, Chomsky (2001) actually assumes the clause-internal phase in passive constructions to be a weak phase, though Legate (2003) has shown the clause-internal phase to always be strong, even with passives and unaccusatives.}

Consider now the distribution of the derived subject in light of a more articulated structure:

(43) a. There were many people being arrested for drunkenness.

b. There have been many people arrested for drunkenness.

c. There will be many people arrested for drunkenness.

The crucial fact here is that the subject must precede being but follow be/been. If being surfaces in Prog°, the subject must be occupying a position higher than Spec-vP in order to precede this auxiliary. The question then is which position has the subject raised to, and why? Since the subject follows be, which occupies Inf°, and been, which surfaces in Perf°, we can rule out the subject occupying Spec-InfP or Spec-PerfP. Given the structural hierarchy we posited in (7) and (8), the only two other positions available are Spec-ProgP and Spec-vP\textsubscript{prog}. If vP\textsubscript{prog} projects the clause-internal phase when present, as Harwood (2013, 2014a) argues, Spec-vP\textsubscript{prog} acts as the clause-internal phase edge. This potentially gives us a position for the subject to raise to that would automatically explain its distribution, and furthermore provides a motivation for this movement. Following Chomsky’s basic analysis the subject, driven by a
need to check its Case feature, raises to the Spec-vP\textsubscript{prog} phase edge so as to escape spell-out and ultimately get its feature checked in the higher phase. Obviously the subject in existential constructions does not raise any higher than this since merger of there in Spec-TP blocks any further movement of the subject and strands it on the clause-internal phase edge. Finally, with the subject occupying the Spec-vP\textsubscript{prog} position, it correctly precedes being, but follows be and been.

Thus, the claim that vP\textsubscript{prog} projects the clause-internal phase when present correctly explains the distribution of existential subjects without having to resort to any additional mechanisms.

This data also provides direct evidence against the possibility that the perfect aspectual layer also constitutes part of the clause-internal phase. If the perfect aspectual layer were to project the clause-internal phase when present in the derivation, we would expect the subject to raise to the edge of this layer, incorrectly predicting existential subjects to precede been as well as being. This suggests therefore that perfect aspect, unlike progressive aspect, is not contained within the clause-internal phase.\footnote{See Harwood (2013, 2014a) for more in-depth discussion on the evidence for progressive aspect being part of the clause-internal phase. See also Ramchand & Svenonius (2013) for additional arguments from British English do and temporal modification.}

Along with other purveyors of the dynamic phase approach (Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2005; Bošković 2014, to appear; Wurmbrand 2012a, to appear), Harwood’s (2013, 2014a) claim implies that the size of the clause-internal phase is not rigid as Chomsky (2000) originally proposed, and instead can vary in size depending upon the syntactic context. That is, in the presence of progressive aspect, vP\textsubscript{prog} is the clause-internal phase, and in its absence, vP is the phase.\footnote{We follow Harwood (2013, 2014a), who creates this variable phase boundary by claiming that the completion of a phase is not dependent upon merger of a specific head, such as v°, but upon merger of the last item from a sub-numeration, \textit{irrespective of what that item is}. By including the progressive aspectual material (v\textsubscript{prog}° and Prog°) within the first sub-numeration of the clause, along with v°, V° etc. this would entail that v\textsubscript{prog}°, when present, would be the last item to be merged from this sub-numeration, and so would project the phase, instead of v°. In the absence of the progressive aspectual material, v° would be the last item to be merged from the first sub-numeration, and so would project the phase in such instances. Harwood (2013, 2014a) furthermore claims that the perfect aspectual material is not included within the first clausal sub-numeration, rather the second. Therefore, the perfect aspectual projections cannot act as the first phase. See also Bošković (2014) for an alternative approach to establishing variable phase boundaries involving extended projections.}

\begin{verbatim}
(44) a. [TP Ted should [vP\textsubscript{mod} t\textsubscript{should} [InfP have [vP\textsubscript{perf} t\textsubscript{have} [PerfP been

\begin{verbatim}
        [vP\textsubscript{prog} t\textsubscript{been} [ProgP being [vP t\textsubscript{being} [VoiceP \text{-ed} [VP train]]]]]]]]]]

b. [TP Ted should [vP\textsubscript{mod} t\textsubscript{should} [InfP have [vP\textsubscript{perf} t\textsubscript{have} [PerfP been
\end{verbatim}
This claim obviously parallels our own claims regarding the structural domain that VPE targets in English. Indeed, it has been claimed by Aelbrecht (2012b), Bošković (2014), van Craenenbroeck (2010), Fox & Pesetsky (2003), Gallego (2010), Gengel (2007b, 2008), Harwood (2013, 2014a), Holmberg (1999, 2001), Rouveret (2006, 2011, 2012), Sailor (2012) and Wurmbrand (2012b) that ellipsis is constrained by phases, and specifically that VPE targets the clause-internal phase. Therefore, following Harwood’s (2013, 2014a) claim that vP\textsubscript{prog} acts as the phase when present, and the above-mentioned authors’ claim that VPE targets the clause-internal phase, we argue that VPE in English targets as much as the progressive aspectual layer because this layer corresponds to that of a phase.\footnote{Following Grohmann’s (2003) notion of prolific domains, one could divide the clause into the discourse domain, the agreement projections and the thematic and lexical projections (the predicational domain), roughly corresponding to CP, IP and VP respectively. Moreover, the arguments from Harwood (2013, 2014a) above indicate that the progressive is likely to be included in the lexical domain, unlike perfect aspect (see also Coon & Preminger to appear, Phan 2013, Ramchand & Svenonius 2013 and Wurmbrand 2012b for a split between progressive and perfect). Instead of linking the VPE target to phases, one could also posit that VPE targets the predicational layer of the clause (i.e., VPE is predicate ellipsis).} In the absence of progressive aspect, vP acts as the phase, and so vP is targeted in such instances.\footnote{Harwood (2013) cites evidence from various other languages, however, to show that the size of the clause-internal phase is not universally consistent. Whilst languages such as Taiwanese, Irish and European Portuguese appear to pattern like English in including as much as progressive aspect within the clause-internal phase, Brazilian Portuguese, Belfast English, Icelandic, Dutch and Welsh appear to behave contrary to this by including the perfect aspectual layer within the first phase. Indeed, this might be expected given that languages such as Welsh select perfect aspect using the copular auxiliary BE rather than HAVE, potentially indicating that perfect aspect is contained within the predicational layer in these languages (see footnote 34). This would lead one to expect that VPE, if licensed in such languages, is able to target as much as the perfect layer. Rouveret (2012) shows that this is potentially the case for Welsh: the particle realising perfect aspect can be elided under VPE, suggesting that as much as perfect aspect is included in the ellipsis site (examples from Rouveret 2012:(44)).}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(i)] Mai Siôn wedi bod yn gweithio am awr rwan...
\item[a.] \ldots a mae Mair hefyd.
\item[b.] * \ldots a mae Mair wedi bod hefyd.
\end{itemize}

‘Siôn has been working for an hour now and Mair has been too.’

Of course, these are not perfect examples since (i)b strands the progressive auxiliary as well, so we do not know whether the perfect particle is obligatorily or optionally elided: the
5.2 Ellipsis targets the entire phase

The task now is to implement this claim that VPE targets the clause-internal phase, which extends as far as the progressive projections. The question that must be raised at this point is, exactly which part of the phase does VPE target: the spell-out domain or the entire phase? Traditionally it has been claimed that VPE targets the complement of the phase head, i.e., spell-out domain (van Craenenbroeck 2010; Gallego 2010; Gengel 2007b, 2008; Rouveret 2006, 2011, 2012; Wurmbrand 2012b). However, Bošković (2014) and Harwood (2013, 2014a) have shown, using arguments from existential constructions, argument ellipsis and certain extraction facts, that this might not necessarily be the case and that ellipsis might in fact apply to entire phases. Indeed, Aelbrecht (2012b), Fowlie (2010), Fox & Pesetsky (2003, 2005), Richards (2011) and Svenonius (2004, 2005) have all argued that spell-out domains should be dispensed with and replaced by full phasal spell-out. Given this, Aelbrecht (2012b), Bošković (2014), Fox & Pesetsky (2003), Harwood (2013, 2014a) and Holmberg (1999, 2001) have all claimed that ellipsis in fact targets entire phases. We follow this claim: when progressive aspect is present, VPE targets the entire $vP_{prog}$ clause-internal phase rather than the $ProgP$ phasal complement; and in the absence of progressive aspect, VPE targets the $vP$ phase rather than the $VoiceP$ phasal complement.\(^{40}\)

Claiming that VPE targets the entire clause-internal phase gives rise to a number of additional issues. The first such issue is that if ellipsis targets entire phases, and therefore that entire phases are spelled out, how can items raise out of the phase if there is no escape hatch for movement? We do not elaborate an answer for this here, but instead refer the reader to Fox & Pesetsky (2003, 2005) or Richards (2011) for two potential solutions to this problem. The second issue, which was also raised by an anonymous reviewer, is how the claim that VPE targets the clause-internal phase can be extended to other ellipses, such as TP ellipsis, for instance in sluicing (i):

(i) Robin ate something horrible, but I don’t know [CP what [TP Robin ate]].

Traditionally TP is not considered a phase, so it is difficult to see how the approach developed here can be applied to sluicing. One relatively simple answer to this problem could be to either follow Branigan (2005), van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen (2012) and López (2009) in saying that FinP – which can count as the highest projection in the IP-domain, right below the CP-domain – is in fact a phase (in this case, the $vP_{prog}$ phase would no longer count as the clause-internal phase, but just the lowest phase of the clause). Or one could argue that ellipsis always targets prolific domains (see Grohmann 2003 and the discussion in footnote 38 above), and that VPE targets the predicational/lexical domain, whereas sluicing targets the
To summarise, we follow Harwood (2013, 2014a) in assuming that \( vP_{prog} \) in fact constitutes the clause-internal phase when present in the derivation, and \( vP \) otherwise. We furthermore assume, following Aelbrecht (2012b), Bošković (2014), Fox & Pesetsky (2003), Harwood (2013, 2014a) and Holmberg (1999, 2001), that VPE targets the entire clause-internal phase. This explains why VPE targets as much as \( vP_{prog} \) when this projection is present.\(^{41}\)

The next section presents some alternative accounts from the literature for the auxiliary ellipsis paradigm, and outlines some of their problems.

6. Previous accounts of the auxiliary deletion pattern

The majority of the ellipsis literature avoids the behaviour of non-finite auxiliaries under English VPE, particularly regarding the optional deletion of *be* and *been*. However, some proposals have been made, especially more recently. In what follows, we review these accounts. We first discuss Baker et al. (1989), and present its advantages and drawbacks, and then move on to Bošković (2014), Thoms (2012) and Sailor (2012).

6.1 Baker et al. (1989)

Baker et al. (1989), following Lobeck (1987) and Sag (1976), claimed that the obligatory ellipsis of *being* under VPE actually reflects a general property of ellipsis in that it cannot apply when governed by a V+\textit{ing} form. Evidence for this comes from the fact that VPE is not permitted following a gerund either:

\begin{align*}
(45)\quad & \text{a. } * \text{ I remember Mary having eaten an apple, and Gary having, too.}
\end{align*}

\[^{41}\text{An issue that was pointed out to us is that, as it stands, our analysis fails to account for Bresnan’s (1976) generalisation stating that the VP ellipsis site needs to be adjacent to a head. Data supporting this view are given in (i).}
\]

(i) \quad \text{Don’t worry about John – he’ll have merely been delayed a while, and…}
\begin{align*}
& \text{a. } * \text{ Pete’ll have merely been, too.}
& \text{b. } * \text{ Pete’ll have merely, too.}
\end{align*}

At present it is unclear to us how these facts can be reconciled with the analysis we propose. We thank an anonymous reviewer, however, for the suggestion that the adjunction site for adverbs like *merely* happens to fall within the ellipsis site in structures in which e.g. *been* is licensed. This is an issue for further research.
b. * I remember Mary having been angry about it, and Gary having, too.

(Baker et al. 1989:(81))

In the case of *being*, if VPE cannot apply following any form of *-ing*, then it has no choice but to include the *being* form within the ellipsis site in order for VPE to be licit. This easily explains the obligatorily ellipsis of *being*. However, there are a number of problems facing this analysis. First of all, Abney (1987), Hudson (2003) and Malouf (1998) have all noted that gerunds cannot be elided, even though common nouns in the same environment can be:

(46)  a. *John's passing the exam was surprising, and Bill's was even more so.*

        b. John's success in the exam was surprising, and Bill's was even more so.

        (Hudson 2003:31)

This contrasts with *being* which obviously can be elided. If gerunds therefore cannot be elided, despite appearing in a context in which ellipsis is licensed (as evidenced by the NP ellipsis in (46)b), whereas *being* can be elided, this suggests that the connection between the two in terms of ellipsis is untenable. That is, if it is simply the case that ellipsis cannot apply following an *-ing* form, why is it that the syntax treats *being* and gerunds entirely differently when it comes to ellipsis: the ellipsis site is somehow expanded to include *being* when this auxiliary is present, whereas the ellipsis is not stretched to included the gerund. In fact, gerunds actually witness a possible reduction of the ellipsis site so that it is not immediately governed by the *-ing* form:

(47) Which bothers you more, John's having been arrested for drug dealing, or Bill's having been?

This contrast in behaviour between *being* and gerunds under ellipsis we consider to be problematic for Baker et al.'s (1989) approach.

The second problem is that the *-ing* form found in gerunds is not the same as progressive *-ing*, as demonstrated by the fact that progressive *-ing* and gerunds are not in complementary distribution:ž

---

42 An anonymous reviewer indicates that according to their judgements, (46)a is not as bad as Hudson claims. Another reviewer adds that the example improves if the auxiliary in the second clause is also deleted (similar to gapping). We have no explanation for these facts, but it is still clear that the deletion of a gerund is degraded, or at least more restricted, than deletion of *being*.

43 Thanks to Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (p.c.) for the following examples, collected from the British National Corpus (search term: having been + ING-form).
(48) a. Maggie glanced sideways at the river, having been concentrating on the fairly heavy traffic.

b. Play resumed just after four o’clock, the pitch having been sweating under the covers in the meantime.

c. Wayne was enchanted to see Hermia and Perdita, and gave the appearance of having been searching for them all day.

Therefore it might be spurious to claim that ellipsis cannot apply after –ing forms if, whilst morphologically identical, the two –ing forms exhibit completely different syntactic functions. For these reasons we are sceptical of the generalisation linking the obligatory ellipsis of being under VPE and the inability for VPE to apply immediately following a gerundive –ing form.

Furthermore, it is also worth mentioning that Baker et al.’s (1989), Lobeck’s (1987) and Sag’s (1976) analysis misses the fact that being is not only uniquely privileged by VPE, but also by existential constructions (as seen in section 5.1) and fronting phenomena (as will be illustrated in section 7). By attributing the ellipsis of being to a peculiar fact about ellipsis itself, one is unable to explain why being behaves apart in phenomena other than ellipsis. Finally, note that, as it stands, Baker et al.’s (1989) approach has no means of capturing the optional deletion of be and been.

6.2 Bošković (2014)

Our proposal is not the only option to capture the optional deletion of be and been. One possible solution, instead of having a fixed ellipsis site and optional raising out of it, is to say that the size of the ellipsis site can fluctuate, in the sense that the ellipsis site normally does not contain be or been, but can be optionally extended to included them (or vice versa). Bošković’s (2014) account uses this tactic, as does the original proposal by Akmajian et al. (1979).

Bošković (2014) makes a number of assumptions as to the structure of the middle field which are highly similar to our own. He essentially assumes the same functional hierarchy that we established in (7), and the same analysis with regards to auxiliary raising (though he motivates this through a morphological requirement rather than through feature checking). He also takes a WYSIWYG approach to the syntactic structure.

Bošković assumes a degree of optionality with respect to what VPE can target. That is, he claims VPE can target the highest projection in the

---

44 Of course, the ‘fixedness’ of our ellipsis site is not as rigid as it seems: as we have claimed, our ellipsis site differs depending on which projections are present in the structure. But this variation does not occur in the derivation of a single sentence in order to capture the optionality of be/been deletion.
extended domain of the lexical verb, or the projection just below it. In the absence of any aspectual projections, he takes VPE to target either vP or VP (there is no VoiceP intervening between vP and VP in his system). Following Lasnik (1999), Bošković claims that the lexical verb does not raise out of its base position of V° in ellipsis contexts. Therefore the lexical verb is obligatorily elided under VPE, as is illustrated in (49).

(49)

a. \[TP \{vP \{\text{\[\text{VP lex V}\]}\}\}\]  
b. \[TP \{vP \{\text{\[\text{VP lex V}\]}\}\}\]

In the presence of progressive aspect, which Bošković assumes constitutes part of the extended projection of the lexical verb, Bošković claims VPE targets either ProgP, or vP below it. Note that the vP prog shell above ProgP is not targeted by VPE under his view. This is the first problem with his account: vP shells also form part of the extended projection under Bošković’s assumptions, and in the absence of any higher aspectual material, vP prog would constitute the highest projection in the extended domain of the lexical verb. So it is a mystery why he assumes nevertheless that the vP prog shell should not be targeted by VPE.45

In order to account for the obligatory ellipsis of being, Bošković claims, following Akmajian et al. (1979), Akmajian & Wasow (1975), Bošković (2004), Iwakura (1977), Lobeck (1987) and Thoms (2011), that being is the only auxiliary that does not raise for inflectional purposes and instead has its inflection lowered onto it in its V° base position. The reason for this is clear: if being raises to Prog° for inflectional purposes, it is predicted to only be optionally elided. In order for being to remain consistently in the ellipsis site, Bošković is forced to claim that being does not raise from its base position.

(50)

a. \[TP \{vPprog \{\text{ProgP \{\text{\[\text{\[\text{\[\text{\[\text{VP lex V}\]\]}\]\]}\]}\]\]}\]\}\]  
b. \[TP \{vPprog \{\text{ProgP \{\text{\[\text{\[\text{\[\text{\[\text{VP lex V}\]\]}\]\]}\]\]}\]\]}\]\}\]

However, this is a stipulation since there is no principled reason as to why being should be the only auxiliary not to raise. Furthermore, Harwood (2013, 45 Bošković takes a phasal approach to ellipsis as per Gengel (2007b) and Holmberg (2001) in which the ellipsis site is either the complement of the phase head or the entire phase itself. He furthermore proposes a dynamic approach to phases in which the highest phrase in the extended projection of the verb is the clause internal phase. However, the issue of VPE targeting an AspectP, but not the vP shell above it, remains. By allowing an AspectP to act as a phase and not the vP shell above it, we are separating aspects and their associated auxiliaries by a phasal boundary. As was stated earlier, auxiliaries are always closely tied to their aspectual forms: whenever vP prog is present, so is ProgP, or whenever vP perf is present, so is PerfP. It seems strange then that the auxiliary should be separated from its aspect by a phase boundary, as Bošković implies.
2014b) has explicitly shown, using the distribution of being in relation to
adverbs, that being uniformly raises out of the vP domain for inflection.

In the presence of perfect aspect, which Bošković also assumes to
consist part of the extended projection of the lexical verb, VPE may target
either PerfP, or the complement of PerfP (\(vP_{prog}\) or \(vP\), depending on whether
the progressive aspectual layer is present or not). Again, the \(vP_{perf}\) shell
above PerfP is curiously not targeted by VPE despite being the highest
projection in the extended domain. The optional deletion of been now falls out
of this analysis: been raises for inflectional purposes to Perf°, which is
optionally targeted by ellipsis.

The analysis raises problems, however, with respect to the optional
ellipsis of be under similar mechanisms. Unfortunately, Bošković does not
specifically discuss the optional ellipsis of be, but by extending the analysis he
has made so far we can observe which data can and cannot be accounted for.
In the presence of the modal layer, Bošković allows for ellipsis to target either
the complement of InfP, or InfP itself. This instantly explains the optional
ellipsis of be: if we decide to elide the complement of InfP, be – surfacing in
Inf° – survives ellipsis. If on the other hand, we elide InfP itself, be is
contained within the ellipsis site and so is elided.

This claim gives rise to a number of issues. First, what if non-finite have
has risen to occupy Inf° rather than be? Should we not still expect ellipsis to
target either the complement of Inf°, or InfP itself? In that case have is
predicted to be optionally included in the ellipsis site, contrary to fact: Bošković (2014) assumes, as we do, that infinitival have is never elided.
Moreover, if in the presence of InfP the complement of Inf° must always be
elided under VPE, we should expect everything below the infinitival auxiliary
to be obligatorily elided under ellipsis. Consider, however, (52), with non-finite
have in Inf°, and been in Perf°, in the complement of Inf°. Here one incorrectly
expects been to be obligatorily elided.

(52) John could have been defeated, and Peter could have (been)
defeated too.

Bošković’s analysis is reminiscent of an early generative approach by
Akmajian et al. (1979). For them the optional ellipsis of be/been is accounted
for via optional extension of the ellipsis site to include the aspectual
projections. Many of the arguments against Bošković’s account can therefore
be extended to Akmajian et al.’s (1979) also.
6.3 Thoms (2012)

Thoms (2012) takes a different approach to the ellipsis of *being* and the optional deletion of *be* and *been*: He argues that all auxiliaries check their inflectional features in their base positions via Reverse Agree (as per Bjorkman 2011), and that ellipsis is licensed by subsequent movement of the finite auxiliary to T°. Under Thoms’ analysis, everything in the complement of T° is uniformly targeted by VPE in English. The only way that additional material, such as negation and non-finite auxiliaries, can survive is by cliticising to T°, thereby raising out of the ellipsis site. He claims that *have*, *be* and *been* optionally survive ellipsis by this optional cliticisation to T°. Since *being* is a prosodically heavy item, it cannot so easily cliticise to T°, which explains why it is obligatorily elided.46

The fundamental problem with this approach is that, whilst there is plenty of evidence to suggest that non-finite *have* can cliticise to T°, the evidence regarding cliticisation of non-finite *be* seems to point the other way. As already discussed, in Johnson (1988) and Kayne (1997), it is shown that non-finite *have* can cliticise to the modal in T° and subsequently undergo subject auxiliary inversion, whilst, crucially, *be* cannot:

(53) a. Shouldn’t*ve Pam remembered her name?
    b. * Shouldn’t *be Pam remembering her name?

This suggests that optional cliticisation to T° cannot be used to explain optional ellipsis of *be* and *been*. Furthermore, this optional raising of *be* and *been* cannot capture the obligatory raising of these auxiliaries under VP fronting, an issue which we discuss in section 7 below.

6.4 Sailor (2012)

Like Thoms (2012), Sailor (2012) also assumes uniform lowering of affixes onto the auxiliaries through a Reverse Agree model, as in Bjorkman (2011). Sailor claims, however, that ellipsis targets the projection headed by the passive auxiliary, which is equivalent to vP in the hierarchy we assume. In order to explain the obligatory ellipsis of *being*, Sailor proposes that *being* does not raise out of vP. He motivates this by claiming that the projection

46 Thoms (2012) discusses some data where *being* actually survives VPE. We present Thoms’ view on this issue as well as our own in section 9.1.

Furthermore, Thoms (and Bošković) can capture the dialectal variation that seems to occur with respect to *have*: as indicated above in section 3.2 there is some discussion about whether or not *have* can be deleted, and some speakers or certain dialects seem to allow for it. Our informants, however, generally did not accept this deletion, and with our analysis we capture the original pattern.
immediately above vP, ProgP, is headed by the progressive auxiliary in such instances.\footnote{As already discussed in section 2, under the Reverse Agree analyses of the auxiliary system, auxiliaries are merged directly into the head of their associated aspectual projections, as no raising takes place. Therefore there is no need to posit vP shells.} This prevents being from raising out of the ellipsis site as there is no available position for the auxiliary to raise to. In the case of passive be and been, Sailor assumes that ProgP still projects onto the clausal spine, but that its head is spelt out as null. Therefore Prog° presents a potential position for the passive auxiliaries be and been to raise to. This raising out of the ellipsis site Sailor claims to be optional, accounting for the optional deletion of be and been.

The problems with Sailor’s analysis are twofold: first, this optional raising of be and been to Prog° is unmotivated. These auxiliaries have already checked their inflectional features in their base position of v° through Reverse Agree. Second, Sailor has no means of capturing the optional ellipsis of progressive be and been. His ellipsis site is vP, which means that ProgP, which according to Sailor is headed by the progressive auxiliary, is outside of the ellipsis site. Therefore there is no way in which the progressive auxiliary can undergo ellipsis. Sailor (2012) responds to this by claiming that ellipsis of the progressive auxiliary is impossible, but as the data in section 3.1 has shown, this claim is untenable.

As said before, our account captures the auxiliary pattern, but also makes the interesting prediction that optional raising of be and been out of vP_{prog} is only made possible because of ellipsis, and that contexts without deletion would force the auxiliaries to raise and check their features. This is exactly what happens in VP fronting (VPF) cases, as section 7 will show, but none of the approaches presented above can account for this contrast between VPE and VPF.

7. Extending the analysis

7.1 VP fronting

A phenomenon that has been related to VPE in the literature is VP fronting (see Aelbrecht 2012a; Aelbrecht & Haegeman 2012; Funakoshi 2012; Johnson 2001; Kim 2003; Roberts 1990, 1998; Zagona 1982). It has been amply noted that VPE and VP fronting (VPF) exhibit parallel syntactic behaviour (Johnson 2001; Zagona 1982). They occur in the same environments: “both an elided VP and the trace left by a fronted VP must be governed by an Aux” (Johnson 2001:444). Neither occurs without a modal,
temporal auxiliary or do-support, as the contrasts in (54) show (examples adapted from Aelbrecht 2012a). \(^{48}\)

(54) a. * I never thought I’d see Jess become a cook, but I saw [Jess become a cook].

   b. * I never thought I’d see Jess become a cook, but [Jess become a cook] I saw t.

   c. I never thought I’d see Jess become a cook, but I did [see Jess become a cook].

   d. I never thought I’d see Jess become a cook, but [see Jess become a cook] I did t.

A second similarity between VPE and VPF is that both generally target the same chunk of the verb phrase. For instance, perfect have cannot be elided under VPE, and as (55)a,b, adapted from Johnson (2001:(19)), show, it cannot be fronted either. Moreover, Akmajian & Wasow (1975) note that, just as VPE always deletes being, VPF cannot leave it behind, cf. (55)c,d.

(55) a. * Julia hadn’t eaten fish, but Peter claimed that [have eaten fish] she should t.

   b. Julia hadn’t eaten fish, but Peter claimed that [eaten fish] she should have t.

   c. Will thought he was being seduced and [being seduced] he was.

   d. * Will thought he was being seduced and [seduced] he was being.

Given these facts, we hypothesise that VPF, like VPE, targets as much as vP\(_{\text{prog}}\) when the progressive layer is present. \(^{49}\)

With this in mind, it is remarkable that VPF never includes be or been in the fronted verbal structure, not even optionally, as observed by Akmajian et

\(^{48}\) Or infinitival to, see Aelbrecht (2012), Aelbrecht & Haegeman (2012) and Johnson (2001) for examples. As was indicated in footnote 7, we stay away from infinitival clauses in the present paper.

\(^{49}\) Harwood (2013, 2014a) uses the VPF facts as further support for the claim that the progressive aspectual layer constitutes part of the clause-internal phase. Chomsky (2005), Fowlie (2010), Holmberg (2001) and Roberts (2010a,b) have all claimed that the only phrases that can undergo movement are phases. This has been further assumed by Aelbrecht & Den Dikken (2013) and Koopman (2010) in the context of prepositional phrases. Therefore, if only phases can undergo phrasal movement, this would suggest that the VPF-type phenomena discussed above must be instances of the clause-internal phase undergoing movement to the left periphery. Since it is shown that the fronted constituent corresponds to vP\(_{\text{prog}}\), this suggests that vP\(_{\text{prog}}\) acts as the clause-internal phase when it is present in the derivation (and vP otherwise). Similarly it suggests that higher aspectual layers such as perfect aspect are not included within this lower phase.
al. (1979) and Roberts (1998). These auxiliaries are obligatorily stranded by the fronted constituent, see (56).

(56) a. *If he says he will be working all night, then [**be** working all night] he will.
   b. If he says he will be working all night, then [working all night] he will be.
   c. *If he says he has been working late, then [**been** working late] he has.
   d. If he says he has been working late, then [working late] he has been.

If VPE and VPF target the same chunk of the verb phrase, it is curious that VPE optionally includes be and been in this chunk, but VPF never does. This contrast can be easily captured under our analysis: optional deletion of be and been under VPE is due to the fact that the uninterpretable inflectional features on the auxiliaries are deleted at PF by ellipsis when the auxiliary does not raise out of the ellipsis site. Under VPF, however, the auxiliaries have to raise because there is no repair by ellipsis here. If they do not raise, their [uF] features remain unchecked in the (moved) higher copy of the verb phrase, causing a crash at PF, see (57).

(57) a. No raising of be out of vP prog:
   * If he says he will be working all night, then...
   [vP prog [be [uInf] working all night] [TP he [will [InfP Inf° [i Inf] + be [uInf] tP prog]]].

   b. Raising of be out of vP prog:
   If he says he will be working all night, then...
   Step 1: Raising out of vP prog
   [TP he [will [InfP Inf° [Inf] + be [uInf] tP prog] tP prog working all night]].
   Step 2: Fronting of vP prog (not including be)
   [vP prog [be working all night] [TP he [will [InfP Inf° [uInf] + been [uInf] tP prog]]].

We consider this to be the most significant advantage of our approach over prior analyses. None of the alternative approaches reviewed in section 6 are

---

Sailor (2012) actually gives contrasting judgements for (56)a,c, which would pose a problem for our analysis. However, our own informants, as well as those of Akmajian et al. (1979), Ramchand & Svenonius (2013), Roberts (1998) and Thoms & Walkden (2013), all report such sentences to be ungrammatical. If there is indeed dialectal variation with respect to these sentences, we do not have access to any speakers who accept them and cannot capture the variation within our system.
able to explain the contrast between VPE and VPF straightforwardly.

Bošković recognises in a footnote that there is a connection between VPE and fronting, though explicitly stays away from the issue. If we wish to maintain this link, however, in that the site targeted by VPE is the same site targeted by fronting, then be and been, which according to Bošković can be elided by optionally extending the ellipsis site to include them, are incorrectly predicted to be optionally fronted.

For Thoms (2012) and Sailor (2012), optional raising of auxiliaries out of the ellipsis site occurs independently of the ellipsis operation. Therefore auxiliaries should optionally raise in all contexts. This implies once again that be and been should optionally raise out the fronting site in VPF contexts, wrongly predicting optional fronting of these auxiliaries.

In short, the analysis that we proposed for the optional deletion of be and been under VPE can be successfully extended to capture the non-optional stranding of the same auxiliaries under VPF.

Note that the analysis we have presented leads to an interesting prediction: under other phenomena making use of VPE, we expect the auxiliaries be and been to also be optionally elided, whereas in other phenomena involving movement of the VP, we expect the same auxiliaries to be obligatorily stranded. This is in fact confirmed by (American English) tag questions, which have been argued to involve VPE (Sailor 2009), and by both specificalional pseudo-clefts and predicate inversion, which are claimed to involve movement of the verbal predicate. We discuss the latter two contexts in the next section.

7.2 Extending the data range

Another context in which the verb phrase is fronted is specificalional pseudo-clefting, as claimed by Blom & Daalder (1977), Declerck (1988), Den Dikken (1995), Heggie (1988), Heycock (1994), Higgins (1979), Moro (1997) and

---

51 Akmajian & Wasow (1975), Bošković (2004) and Sailor (2009) have noted that in American English, the lexical verb and the passive/copular auxiliary being are always absent from tag questions, whilst non-finite have is always present (if the sentence being tagged contains perfect aspect, naturally), parallel to VPE. This has led Sailor (2009) to analyse tag questions as involving VPE. Interestingly, Sailor also notes that, just as with VPE, be and been occur optionally in tags (see (i)). This optional ellipsis of be and been conforms with our predictions, and supports both our analysis and Sailor’s (2009) account of tag questions.

(i) a. Ted has been eating dolphin sandwiches, hasn’t he (been)?
   b. Ted will be eating dolphin sandwiches, won’t he (be)?

Interestingly, British English speakers (and reportedly certain dialects of American English as well) behave differently. Their tag questions only contain the finite auxiliary. Unlike in American English, no non-finite auxiliaries remain, not even perfect have (Sailor 2009). This is a remarkable contrast for which we do not provide an answer in this paper.
Verheugd (1990) (cited in Den Dikken 2006). Sailor (2012) notes that, parallel to VPF, *being* is included in the moved phrase:

(58) Ted should be being praised. – No, *<being> criticised is what he should be *<being>. (Sailor 2012:8)

Crucially, Sailor (2012) notes that *be* and *been* are obligatorily stranded in such constructions, again conforming with our predictions that auxiliaries only have the option of not raising in ellipsis contexts, in which their unchecked PF features can be deleted via ellipsis:

(59) a. Ted should be praised. – No, *<be> criticised is what he should *<be>.
   b. Ted should have been praised. – No, *<been> criticised is what he should have *<been>. (Sailor 2012:8)

A second context that has been argued to involve displacement of the predicate (i.e., the verb phrase in this case) is predicate inversion, see Emonds (1976), Haegeman (2008), Heycock & Kroch (1999), Hooper & Thompson (1973) and Samko (2014). This phenomenon too patterns like VPF: *being* is obligatorily fronted with the inversed predicate, see (60).

(60) a. [Also *being* loud and obnoxious today] is my old friend Bugs Bunny.
   b. * [Also loud and obnoxious today] is *being* my old friend Bugs Bunny.

As predicted by our analysis of these fronting contexts, *be* and *been* can never be included in the fronted constituent, see (61): these auxiliaries obligatorily raise out of vPprog in order to check their inflectional features. If they do not, there is no ellipsis operation to rescue the derivation from a crash at PF, so the resulting sentence is unacceptable.

(61) a. [Also with us in the studio today] will *be* my old friend Bugs Bunny.
   b. * [Also *be* with us in the studio today] will my old friend Bugs Bunny.
   c. [Also with us in the studio today] has *been* my old friend Bugs Bunny.
   d. * [Also *been* with us in the studio today] has my old friend Bugs Bunny.

In sum, we have provided an analysis that accounts not only for the VP ellipsis paradigm of auxiliary verbs, but also for other cases with VPE, such as
tag questions, and for auxiliary behaviour in phenomena involving movement of the verbal layer, such as VPF, specificational pseudo-clefts and predicate inversion. In the next section we provide additional support for our analysis using cross-linguistic data.

8. Cross-linguistic evidence

Given the analysis presented in this paper, the question arises as to whether there is any cross-linguistic justification for such an account. That is, is there any evidence to suggest that optional raising out of an ellipsis site is manifested cross-linguistically? We argue here that such optional raising is attested in verb-stranding VPE in European Portuguese (EP).

EP has been noted for being one of the few Romance languages which actually permits VPE (Cyrino & Matos 2002, 2005; Goldberg 2005; Matos & Cyrino 2001; Raposo 1986; Tescari 2013):

\[(62)\] Ana já tinha lido o livro à irmã,
mas a Paula não tinha [lido o livro à irmã].

\[\text{‘Ana had already read the book to her sister but Paula had not.’}\]

(Cyrino & Matos 2002:(1))


Such overt raising of the lexical verb gives rise to what tends to be referred to as ‘V-stranding VPE’ in which the finite lexical verb raises out of the (traditionally vP) ellipsis site to T, thereby escaping ellipsis. Therefore the only elements which are in fact elided in such instances are the arguments and prepositional phrases internal to the vP ellipsis site:\(^{52}\)

\[(63)\] Ana não leva o computador para as aulas, pois

\[\text{the Ana not brings the computer to the classes, because}\]

\[os amigos também não levam[o computador para as aulas].\]

\(^{52}\) Cyrino & Matos (2002) and Raposo (1986) discuss diagnostics to disambiguate V-stranding VPE from (superficially-similar) null object constructions, demonstrating that Portuguese indeed exhibits VPE.
the friends too not bring the computer to the classes.

‘Ana does not bring her computer to classes because her friends don’t, either.’ (Cyrino & Matos 2002:(9))

Interestingly, Cyrino & Matos (2002, 2005) have observed that lexical verbs inflected for progressive or passive morphology cannot escape VPE in EP, parallel to being in English: 53

If lexical verbs raise for inflectional purposes in EP, but are obligatorily elided under VPE when they have risen into the Voice or progressive aspectual layers for inflection, this suggests that these layers are targeted by VPE in EP. In other words, VPE in EP targets as much as the progressive aspectual layer, parallel to English. Indeed, Cyrino & Matos (2002) and Matos (2001) have claimed exactly this.

Most interesting of all, however, is the fact that lexical verbs inflected for perfect aspect are only optionally elided in EP, parallel to been in English:

53 Cyrino & Matos (2002) note that stranding of the progressive and passive participles in (64) and (65) are permissible under an object drop interpretation. This, however, is a very different derivation from those involving ellipsis.
Since the lexical verb need not be elided when it has risen to the perfect aspectual layer for inflection, we conjecture that the perfect projections are not targeted by VPE in EP, once again parallel to English. In order to explain the optional ellipsis of the perfect participle we assume an optional raising account similar to the optional deletion of been: lexical verbs in EP overtly raise in the narrow syntax for inflectional feature checking. When the perfect participle is stranded by VPE in EP, it has risen out of the ellipsis site (which we take to be as large as the progressive layer) to Perf°, where it has its feature checked and escapes ellipsis. When the perfect participle is elided, however, it remains in the ellipsis site and has its feature deleted at PF by ellipsis, thereby rescuing the derivation.  

In sum, the data above appears to suggest that, parallel to English, VPE in EP targets the progressive aspectual layer and, more importantly, that the lexical verb, when inflected for perfect aspect, can either remain inside this ellipsis site and be deleted, or raise out of it and survive ellipsis. In other words, optional raising out of an ellipsis is a cross-linguistically attested phenomenon. A point for further research is to explore how widely attested this phenomenon is in natural language and to uncover how it is constrained.

9. Further issues

In this section we present some problematic issues that arise for our analysis and speculate about potential solutions to them. We first deal with instances in which being can apparently be stranded and then discuss the principle of economy.  

In contrast to EP, progressive and passive participles actually behave similarly to the perfect participle in Brazilian Portuguese (BP): they are only optionally elided under VPE. Cyrino & Matos (2002) essentially analyse this as indicating that the identity of the ellipsis site in BP corresponds to a smaller unit of structure than in EP. Specifically, we are forced to conclude that only the projection of the lexical verb itself, VP, is targeted by VPE in BP and that the optional ellipsis of the progressive and passive participles, similar to the perfect participle, arises from optional raising of the lexical verb out of the ellipsis site.

One more issue for our proposal, which we will not address at length here, involves voice mismatches under VPE. Merchant (2008a, 2013) notes that voice mismatches between antecedent and ellipsis clause are possible under ellipsis: the antecedent clause may be active, whilst the ellipsis clause bares passive voice, and vice versa. He accounts for this by claiming that VoiceP, encoding the passive or active status of the clause, is contained outside of the ellipsis site and is therefore not subject to the recoverability requirement of ellipsis (but see Nakamura 2013 for a contrasting view). The problem for our analysis is that VoiceP is always contained within the ellipsis site, whether that be vP or vPprog. This implies that VoiceP should be subject to the identity condition, so we expect voice mismatches between the antecedent and the ellipsis clause to be illicit, contrary to fact.

However, the judgements on voice mismatches are more complex. Kehler (2002) and Merchant (2013) note that voice mismatches in VPE in English are only possible in very specific discourse contexts that strongly favour the mismatch reading and exclude the non-
9.1 Being revisited

The data presented in section 1 shows that *being* is, generally speaking, obligatorily elided under VPE. There is, however, a complication to this pattern. As observed by Quirk et al. (1975: 875) and Thoms (2012), the deletion of *being* is not as categorical as it at first sight seems. Sometimes *being* can remain pronounced in certain varieties of English:

(67)  

a. % Remember, always be respectful and courteous, even if the officer isn’t *being*.  
b. % Otherwise you may have some integrity problems because the key that apparently should be enforced actually isn’t *being*.

Does that mean that *being* is in fact optionally elided, just like *be* and *been*? We take this not to be the case: whereas ellipsis of *be* and *been* is really optional when they have an identical antecedent, (as in (68)a,b; see Lasnik 1995), *being* is obligatorily elided when it has an identical antecedent (cf. (68)c), but for some speakers can be stranded by ellipsis when its antecedent is non-identical, as in (67) above and (68)d below:

(68)  
a. Ted should *be* home, and Barney should (*be*), too.  
b. Ted has *been* fired, and Barney has (*been*), too.  
c. Ted was *being* punished this morning, and now Barney is (*being*).  
d. % Ted was punished this morning, and now Barney is *being*.

In other words, *being* survives ellipsis if it is not recoverable from the antecedent, parallel to *be* and *been*, as shown in (25). If it is recoverable

mismatch reading (see also Arregui et al. 2006, Kim 1997, Nakamura 2013 and many others). It is possible that Voice is actually contained inside the ellipsis site but is recoverable in a restricted set of discourse contexts which are adequately set up to prime the mismatch reading, therefore momentarily allowing for a relaxation of the strict identity requirement (Thoms & Walkden 2013). We could then suggest that VoiceP is contained inside the ellipsis site, but that it can be recovered with a great deal of effort so long as enough clues are given by the discourse context as to the value of Voice. However, it should be clear that the debate on voice mismatches is still very much open, especially since – as an anonymous reviewer points out – this suggestion cannot account for the contrast in allowing voice mismatches between sluicing and VPE: in sluicing, such clues can still not make a mismatch acceptable (see Merchant 2013).

however, it is obligatorily deleted, unlike *be* and *been*. To the extent that the stranding of *being* in (68) is acceptable in some English varieties, there is a potential way to capture this fact, which we will very briefly sketch out here.

One could claim that when *being* cannot be recovered, it raises beyond Prog° to a landing site that is external to the ellipsis site, as a last resort rescue operation. This would cause *being* to escape ellipsis and so it would not be subject to the recoverability condition (see Merchant 2001 among many others). However, an issue with this solution is what position *being* raises to in such instances. One potential position is the head of a low focus projection to the specifier of which arguments raise in pseudogapping constructions (see Gengel 2007a, 2008; Lasnik 1995a, 1999; among many others).

Of the alternative analyses reviewed in section 6, the only one which deals with the apparent stranding of *being* is that of Thoms (2012). We briefly discuss his approach. As mentioned in section 6.3, Thoms (2012) takes movement of the finite auxiliary to T° to be the licensor for VPE, and non-finite auxiliaries survive VPE by optionally cliticising to T°. *Being* normally does not move, and therefore does not survive ellipsis, but in these rather rare occasions when it does remain pronounced, Thoms claims that *being* cliticises to T° too. In this case the finite auxiliary bears extra stress to host the prosodically heavy *being* as a clitic.

However, there are some problems with this proposal. First of all, apart from it being quite an ad hoc stipulation to assume that *being* cliticises to T° (without any actual prosodic difference in the realisation of *being*), Thoms’ (2012) proposal depends on the fact that the finite auxiliary in particular bears extra stress so as to host *being*. Although we do not want to deny that

57 An apparent counterexample to our generalisation that *being* can only survive ellipsis when it is absent from the antecedent is the following:

(i) % If Ted wasn’t being difficult, then who WAS (being)?
*Being* occurs in the antecedent and still it can survive VPE. Apparently, *being* can survive ellipsis in certain restricted contexts, such as in this specific construction with ‘if…then’, and – as anonymous reviewers have pointed out – for some, but not all speakers also in comparative contexts as in (ii)a and the sentences in (ii)b-c. At this point we do not know how to analyse this data, as the judgements and the contexts which allow this are not clear.

(ii) a. % John was being louder than Mary was being.
b. % You already told me who WASN’T being difficult. Now tell me who WAS being.
c. % A: Stop being so difficult. – B: I didn’t know I WAS being!

58 Judgements regarding the stranding of *being* in environments in which the auxiliary otherwise cannot be recovered are rather unstable. Whilst some speakers accept it, others find such sentences degraded, and certain other speakers outright reject such sentences.

59 An issue which faces this analysis is why *being* is able to survive ellipsis when it cannot be recovered, while the lexical verb can never survive ellipsis, whether it satisfies the recoverability condition or not.
prosody is at stake here, the finite auxiliary is not the only item that can bear
such stress. In the sentence in (68)d, for instance, the finite auxiliary is
preceding being is not contrasted; the subject is.

Secondly, both floating quantifiers (FQs) and associates from existential
constructions can intervene between being and T°, as in (69). This casts
doubt on the claim that being has cliticised to T°, unless one wants to assume
that FQs and associates could also cliticise to T°. Given the particular
emphasis on the associate, however, this seems unlikely.

Secondly, both floating quantifiers (FQs) and associates from existential
constructions can intervene between being and T°, as in (69). This casts
doubt on the claim that being has cliticised to T°, unless one wants to assume
that FQs and associates could also cliticise to T°. Given the particular
emphasis on the associate, however, this seems unlikely.

(69) a. %Ted said they would all be arrested, and they are all being.
    b. %Ted says there will be more men arrested tomorrow than there are
       
       \[ <WOMEN> being now. \]

Thirdly, Thom's (2012) approach has nothing to say about the fact that
survival of being appears to be subject to recoverability conditions, as we
have argued.

9.2 The Economy Principle

An anonymous reviewer raises the issue of optionality within the Minimalist
Program. Due to Chomsky's (1991) principle Economy of Derivation,
optionality is only allowed when two or more derivations are equally
economical. Under these standard assumptions, our analysis faces a
problem: we have two possible derivations in our discussion of the optional
deletion of be/been, which only differ from each other in whether the auxiliary
raises or stays in situ. Everything else is exactly the same. As movement is a
costly operation, the derivation in which the auxiliary raises and checks its
features should be less economical than the derivation in which the auxiliary
stays in situ and lets ellipsis take care of the unchecked features. Therefore,
derivations in which the auxiliary raises and survives ellipsis should be
degraded, contrary to fact.

The reviewer proposes a potential solution in which the two derivations
have in fact different numerations – e.g. the raising derivation has an
additional feature that the in situ derivation lacks – and therefore are not
identical. However, as the reviewer notes already, this kind of solution lacks
all explanatory power, and we do not think that the best way to deal with this
is to adapt the derivations so that they are no longer identical, or to try and
ensure that the derivations are equally economical. We acknowledge that this
is a problem for our analysis, but at the same time think the Economy
Principle (as it currently stands) makes it almost impossible for the Minimalist
Program to capture the optionality that is obviously present in natural
language, and therefore that perhaps this principle should be revised, or be
made less strict.
One potential solution might be to consider the Economy Principle to apply throughout the course of the derivation and to take into consideration also how long a feature is unchecked for, and hence remains problematic for the derivation. Concretely, in the raising derivation, the auxiliary moves up almost immediately and checks its feature. In the in-situ derivation, on the other hand, raising – which is a costly operation – does not take place. Therefore, the unchecked feature remains a problem for longer, i.e., until ellipsis takes care of it. This would put an additional burden on the derivation in a different way from the raising operation, namely, having to hold this unchecked – and hence problematic – feature in working memory for longer. This would make both derivations equally costly/economical, and therefore give way to optionality.

10. Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper accounts for the fact that, under VPE, modals, finite auxiliaries and perfect have can never be elided, being is standardly elided, and be and been are optionally elided. This was achieved by claiming that ellipsis targets as much as vP_{prog} (though less if progressive aspect is absent from the underlying derivation). We also assumed that auxiliaries uniformly raise in English to check uninterpretable (PF) inflectional features, and explained the relevant ellipsis data as follows: being’s base position and landing site are both contained within the ellipsis site; have is base-generated outside of the ellipsis site; be and been’s base positions are inside the ellipsis site, but they raise out. Their optional deletion comes down to optional raising: they either raise out of the ellipsis site to check their features and survive ellipsis, or they remain inside the ellipsis site and have their features deleted at PF by ellipsis. This option is not available to be and been under fronting phenomena however, since no ellipsis occurs to delete their unchecked features.
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