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## Vertical Ellipsis in Tsakhur and Adyghe ${ }^{1}$

The research work on ellipsis has been mostly based on data of languages which strongly restrict what we call here vertical ellipsis (in the subordinate clause with an antecedent in the main clause, or vice versa), but allow horizontal ellipsis (between coordinated clauses) more freely, cf. the well-known facts of English:

## Gapping:

(1) John played piano, and (//*whenever) Max $\qquad$ sax.

## Stripping:

(2) The critics praised your book, and (*someone told me that) $\qquad$ the poem too.

## Right-Periphery Ellipsis (=Right-Node Raising):

(3) Mary ate $\qquad$ and (//*after) Bill cooked the rice.
VP-ellipsis (4), $\mathbf{N}$ '-ellipsis (5), and Sluicing (6) occur with subordinate clauses (rightward only):
(4) a. Mary met Sue at Stanford although John didn't
$\qquad$ .
b. *Mary didn't $\qquad$ , although John met Sue at Stanford.
(5) a. John criticized Bill's arguments whenever Bill criticized John's $\qquad$ .
b. *John criticized Bill's $\qquad$ , whenever Bill criticized John's arguments.
(6) a. John bought something, although I don't know what $\qquad$ .
b. *Although I don't know what $\qquad$ , John bought something.

In some languages of the Caucasus, left-, right-, up- and downward vertical ellipsis is normal with adjunct clauses, cf. constructions with temporal converbs in -inGaI and -me in Tsakhur (East Caucasian, the Lezgic branch):
(7) i-na
me-r zakatala rajon-ē-qa girx-īnGaI, this-ATR.ABS again-COH. 1 Zakatala district-IN-ALL1 come.PF-TEMP __ dost-ā-ši-s Xabar-o-b ha-w-R-u. friend-PL-OBL-DAT story.3-AUX-3 3-do-PF
When he $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{i}}$ came back to Zakataly district, he $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{i}}$ told this story to his friends.
(8)


[^0]d. aXn-ē-qa i-w-č'-u-mē, sjo gi-b-Ril-na
lair-IN-ALL - 3-enter-PF-LIM bear. 3 3-begin.PF-ATR
mir hā?-a. DOWN- and LEFTWARD
growl 3-do-IPF
When the bear ${ }_{i}$ got into the lair, $\mathrm{it}_{\mathrm{i}}$ began to growl.
Likewise with a relative clause:
(9)

| a. $\quad$ a-b-īni | darman-in | malhammadì-s | kumag |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3-bring.PF-AOBL | medicine-ERG | Muhammad-DAT | help.4 |
| h-idj-aR-īn. |  |  |  |
| NEG-do.PF-A |  |  |  |

The medicine brought by him(self) didn't help Muhammad

| b. malhammad-ē | a-b-īni | darman-in | kumag |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\quad$ Muhammad-DAT | 3-bring.PF-AOBL | medicine-ERG | help.4 |

The medicine brought by Muhammad ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ didn't help ( $\operatorname{him}_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ )
With argument clauses, however, upward ellipsis is normally impossible in Tsakhur:
(10)a. zābit-ē amir ha-w-?-u esker-ā-ši-s, officer-ERG order. 3 3-do-PF soldier-PL-OBLPL-DAT
mašin-ē-qa gi-w-Rar-as.
lorry-IN-ALL PL-get-POT
The officer ordered the soldiers to get in the truck.
b. zābit-ē amir ha-w-P-u, esker-ā-r
officer-ERG order. 3 3-do-PF soldier-PL-NOMPL
mašin-ē-qa gi-w-Rar-as.
lorry-IN-ALL PL-get-POT
The officer ordered (someone) that the soldiers should get in the truck. *The officer ordered the soldiers to get in the truck.

In Adyghe (West Caucasian, the Circassian branch), with all kinds of subordinate clauses, adjuncts and complements alike, both upward and downward vertical ellipsis is available (first noticed for Kabardian complement clauses in Kumaxov, Vamling 1998: 101):

## Complement subordinate clause (-n-ew infinitive)

a. $\underset{\text { girl-ERG }}{\text { [pŝâe-m }}$
wered
qว-? ${ }_{\text {w }}$ e-n-ew]
DIR-sing-POT-ADV want
b.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { faj } & \text { [pŝâ̂e-m } \\ \text { want } \\ \text { girl-ERG }\end{array}$
wered
qə-7 ${ }_{\text {w }}$ en-ew]
song DIR-sing-POT-ADV
(She) ${ }_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ wants the girl $_{\mathrm{i}}$ to sing a song
c. pŝaŝe-r faj [_ wered qə-? we-n-ew] girl-ABS want song DIR-sing-POT-ADV
d. [__ wered qə-? ${ }_{w} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{n}$-ew] pŝaŝe-r faj song DIR-sing-POT-ADV girl-ABS хочет
The girl $_{\mathrm{i}}$ wants to sing a song// wants her $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{j}}$ to sing a song

a. [__ pjəs'me-r | pis | ə-txə-n-ew] | mə | ceəfə-r | faj |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| letter-ABS | 3SG-write-POT-ADV | this | man-ABS | want |

This man wants to write a letter // him/her to write a letter.
b. [mə c̣əfə-m pjəs'me-r ə-txə-n-ew]
this man-ERG letter-ABS 3SG-write-POT-ADV want

This man wants to write a letter.// $\mathrm{He} /$ she wants this man to write a letter.

## Adjunct subordinate clause (-n-ew infinitive; meaning of purpose)


b. [ $\qquad$ wəne-m jə-ha-n-ew] ć̣’ale-m pče-r qə-? wə-jə-hə-к house-ERG 3SG-enter-POT-ADV boy-ERG door-ABS DIR-prv-3SG-open-PST
The boy opened the door to enter the house // for someone to enter the house.
c. $\qquad$

| pče-r | qə- ${ }_{n}$ w-jə-hə-к | [č̣'aler | wəne-m | jə-ha-n-ew] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| door-ABS | DIR-PRV-3SG-open-PST | boy-ABS | house-ERG | 3SG-enter-POT-ADV |

d. [c̣̆'ale-r wəne-m jəhanew] __ pče-r qə-? ${ }_{w}$ ə-jə-hə-к boy-ERG house-ERG 3SG-enter-POT-ADV door-ABS DIR-PRV-3SG-open-PST

The boy opened the door to enter the house. // He/she opened the door for the boy to enter the house.

## Adjunct subordinate clause (the temporal ze___-m converb)

a.

| [pŝaŝe-m | ว-š | qə-ze- $\lambda$ е $\left.\bar{s}_{w} \partial-\mathrm{m}\right]$, | qе-кә-к |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| girl-ERG | 3sG-brother | DIR-REL-see-ERG | DIR-cry-PST |

b. __ qe-кә-к [pŝaŝe-m ə-š qə-ze- $\lambda$ еб $\left.{ }_{w} \partial-m\right]$

DIR-cry-PST girl-ERG 3SG-brotherDIR-REL-see-ERG
(She) $)_{i, j}$ cried, when the girl $_{j}$ saw her brother
c. pŝaŝe-r qе-кə-к [ __ ә-š qə-ze- $\lambda$ еб $\left.{ }_{w} \partial-m\right]$ girl-ABS DIR-cry-PST 3SG-brother DIR-REL-see-ERG
d. [ __ ә-š qə-ze- $\lambda$ ее w $_{w}$-m] pŝaŝe-r qe-кә-к 3SG-brother DIR-REL-see-ERG girl-ABS DIR-cry-PST
The girl $_{\mathrm{i}}$ cried, when she $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ saw her brother.

## Relative clauses

a. $\qquad$ $\begin{array}{ll}\text { qə-5 } \\ \text { etə-s } & \text { [c̣ə-ew } \\ \text { DIR-find-PST }\end{array}$ man-ADV $\begin{array}{ll}\text { šak }_{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{m} & \text { šx }_{\mathrm{w}} \text { enč'ə-r } \\ \text { hunter-ERG } & \text { gun-ABS }\end{array}$
ze-r-jə-š'а-ве-r]
REL-3SG-3SG-sell-PST-ABS
b. [çəf-ew šak ${ }_{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{m} \quad$ šx ${ }_{\mathrm{w}}$ enč'ə-r ze-r-jə-š'a-вe-r] man-ADV hunter-ERG gun-ABS REL-3SG-3SG-sell-PST-ABS

## ___ qว-Б ${ }_{w}$ еtว-Б DIR-find-PST

$\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ found the man who had sold the gun to the hunter $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{i}}$

## Shapsug dialect of Adyghe

Informants often produce left- \& upward ellipsis of an NPs spontaneously, especially when the matrix clause conveys new and unexpected information:
(16) we žər-žərew qa-q'w ${ }_{w}$-a. __ faj-ep [rwaslan-e wered $\left.q-j \partial-q_{w}^{\prime}{ }_{w} e-n-e w\right]$ you SELF DIR-Say-IMP want-NEG Ruslan-ERG song DIR-3-say-POT-ADV Sing yourself! Ruslan doesn't want to sing.
$\begin{array}{cllll}\text { (17) wə-žak'e } & \text { wə-ps. } & \text { me-x'əne-x } & \text { [p:ŝaŝe-me } & \text { wə-z-a- } \lambda \mathrm{eb}_{\mathrm{w}} \partial-\mathrm{g} \text { 'e] } \\ \text { 2-beard } & \text { 2-shave } & \text { 3-fear-PL } & \text { girl-ERG.PL } & \text { 2-REL-3PL-see-INSTR }\end{array}$ Shave your beard. The girls get frightened when they see you.

## The phenomenon is apparently related to polysynthesis:

(18) Kadiweu, Waikuru family, Brazil (Sandalo 1997)

| y-owo-God | [me | y-ema:n | João | Maria] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3ERG-know-TRNS | COMP | 3ERG-love | John | Mary |
| John $_{i}$ knows that he loves Mary |  |  |  |  |
| lit. (He $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) knows that John ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ loves Mary |  |  |  |  |

(19) Navajo, Na-Dene Family, North America, in head-internal relative clauses (Hale 1983): [adą'ą'dą'ą ashkii at'ééd yiyiiltsą'nę'e] _ yidoots'ơs yesterday boy girl 3O-3S-see.REL - 3O.3S.kiss
a. $\mathrm{He} /$ she $_{\mathrm{i}}$ will kiss the girl which the boy $_{\mathrm{j}}$ saw yesterday
b. $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ will kiss the girl which the boy $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}$ saw yesterday
(20) Passamaquoddy, Algonquian (Brüning 2005):

Litahasu ['-tahcuwi-tkon-ku-l Susehp hesis-ol
thinks. 3 must.arrest-INV-OBV Joseph his.elder.brother-OBV
not nucihqonket]
this policeman
lit: $\mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ thinks that Joseph ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ 's older brother the policeman must arrest him $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{i}}$
(21) Nootka (Nuuchahnulth), Wakashan (Davis, Wojdak 2004):
wawaa?iš [?en čatšì ẉ̣iṭas-(ḥuk) Christine sapnii ?aṃiiえik]
is.saying that knead-(3ABS) Christine bread tomorrow
Christine is saying that she is gonna knead bread tomorrow, lit. (She $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{i}}$ )-is-saying that Christine ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ is gonna knead bread tomorrow

## The problem with Principle C

(22) Principle C of the Binding Theory (Chomksy 1981; Reinhart 1983):

Referential expression is free (=not bound)
(23) a. ${ }^{*} \operatorname{John}_{\mathrm{i}}$ sees John ${ }_{i}$
b. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{John}_{\mathrm{i}}$ knows, that I see $\mathrm{John}_{\mathrm{i}}$
c. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ sees $\mathrm{John}_{\mathrm{i}}$
d. ${ }^{*} \mathrm{He}_{\mathrm{i}}$ knows, that I see $\mathrm{John}_{\mathrm{i}}$
e. ${ }^{*}$ pro $_{i}$ sees $\mathrm{John}_{\mathrm{i}}$
f. *proi knows that I see John ${ }_{i}$

Within a single clause Principle C is valid:
Shapsug dialect
pro lene $\quad \varnothing$-j-ep $\lambda \boldsymbol{\sigma}$
Lena 3-3-look
He is looking at Lena
*Lena is looking at herself
mwərat:-e mwərat: (j)ә- $\lambda$ ек $_{w} ә-$ -

Murat-ERG Murat 3-see-PST
Murat ${ }_{i}$ saw Murat ${ }_{\text {i }}^{i / j}$
No binding:

| [rwaslan-e | jə-haže] | rwaslan | q-je-šq’a-žə-к-ep |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ruslan-ERG | 3-dog | Ruslan | DIR-3-know-RFC-PST-NEG |
| Ruslan'si ${ }_{\text {do }}$ | dn't re | ze Rusl |  |

## The subordinate clause is really embedded in Adyghe

Evidence from Negative Concord argues for a usual embedded structure of polypredicative constructions. Negative pronouns must be licensed by the negative form of the verb (27).
Negative verb can license a negative pronoun in the same (27a, 28b) or in an embedded clause (28a), but not in the superordinate clause (28c, 29b).
a. zjə qe- $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{a}-$-е-е
nobody DIR-go-PST-NEG
Nobody came
b. *zjə qe-k.kw-к
nobody DIR-go-PST-NEG

nobody DIR-go-PST-NEG 1 SG-think-DYN-NEG
I think that nobody came

nobody DIR-NEG-go-PST-ADV 1SG-think
I think that nobody came
c. *[a-r qe-mə-k. ${ }_{\text {w }}$ a-b-ew] zjə $\hat{\widehat{S}}_{\text {w }}$ eṣ̂ə
he-ERG DIR-NEG-go-PST-ADV nobody think
Nobody thinks that he came
a. zjə feja-к-ер [a-r səme亏̌’ə-n-ew]
nobody want-PST-NEG he-ABS sick-POT-ADV
Nobody wanted him to fall ill
b. *zjə feja-қ [a-r mə-səmeラ̌’ə-n-ew] nobody want-PST he-ABS NEG-sick-POT-ADV
Nobody wanted him not to fall ill
Free pronouns: no Principle C violation of the (23d) type
(30), cf. (11)
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { a. } & \begin{array}{ll}\text { [pŝaŝe-m } \\ \text { girl-ERG }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { wered } \\ \text { song }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { qว-7 }{ }^{2} \mathrm{e} \text {-n-ew] } \\ \text { DIR-sing-POT-ADV }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { a-r } \\ \text { she-ABS }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{aligned} & \text { faj } \\ & \text { wan }\end{aligned}$
b. a-r faj [pŝaŝe-m wered qə-? ${ }_{w} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{n}$-ew] she-ABS want girl-ERG song DIR-sing-POT-ADV
(She) $)_{\mathrm{i}}$ wants the $\operatorname{girl}_{\mathrm{j},{ }^{*}}$ to sing a song
(31), cf. (13)
 he-ERG door-ABS DIR-PRV-3SG-open-PST boy-ABS house-ERG 3SG-enter-POT-ADV
b. [c้̣ale-r wəne-m jə-ha-n-ew] a-š̌ pče-r qə-१ ${ }_{\text {w }}$-jə-hə-к boy-ERG house-ERG 3SG-enter-POT-ADV he-ERG door-ABS DIR-PRV-3SG-open-PST
$\mathrm{He} /$ she opened the door for the boy to enter the house.
*The boy opened the door to enter the house.
(32), cf. (12b)

| $[\mathrm{mə}$ | çəə-m | pjəs'me-r | ə-txə-n-ew] | a-r | faj |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| this | man-ERG | letter-ABS | 3-write-POT-ADV | he-ABS | want |

$\mathrm{He} /$ she wants this man to write a letter.
*This man wants to write a letter.

## Semantic Binding of whatever there is in the "elliptic gaps"

Semantic binder must not c-command the bound anaphoric pronoun:

| jə-he | je-ṣ̆e | [ ${ }_{\text {NP }}{ }_{\text {NP }}$ šak ${ }_{\text {w }} \mathrm{e}$ | рерс̌] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3SG-dog | 3SG-know | hunter | every | 3sG-wife |

His $_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ dog knows every hunter ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ 's wife

| faj | [a | z2-m | š'ət $\chi_{\text {w }}$ - $-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{x}-\mathrm{ew}$ ] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nt | he | -ne-ERG | praise-POT-PL-ADV |

1) He wants that they praise only him.
2) Only he wants them to praise him

$\mathrm{He} /$ she knows which exam every student passed.
Every student ${ }_{i}$ knows which exam he/she ${ }_{i}$ passed.

```
    kid every word 3SG-1SG-give-PST toy
qว-fe-s-š'efə-n-ew]
INV-BEN-1SG-buy-POT-ADV
```

I promised to every kid ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$, to buy him $/$ her $_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ a toy.

| b. |  | je-s-tə-ьа-ь | [ ${ }^{\prime}$ 'eg ${ }_{\text {w }} \mathrm{a} \lambda \mathrm{e}$ | sabaj | pepč |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | word | 3SG-1SG-give-PST | toy | kid | every |

qə-fe-s-š̌'efə-n-ew]
INV-BEN-1SG-buy-POT-ADV
I promised to him $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$ to buy a toy for every $\mathrm{kid}_{\mathrm{i}}$
Shapsug dialect:

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { qe-k } \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{štə-x} & \text { [zewəžjə } & \text { čale-me } & \text { z-j-a-p-q' } \left.{ }_{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{e}-\mathrm{rem}\right]  \tag{37}\\
\text { DIR-go-FUT-PL } & \text { all } & \text { boy-ERG.PL } & \text { REL-3-PL-2-call-CONV }
\end{array}
$$

All the boys $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{i}}$ will come when you call them $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}}$.
They will come when you call all the boys.
(38) Semantic binding (e.g. bound anaphora) requires syntactic binding (i.e. coindexing + c-command)
(Bach, Partee 1980, Reinhart 1983:122-137; Heim, Kratzer 1998: 264; Büring 2005: 89-92)
a. The secretary $h e_{i}$ hired, thinks that Domingo $_{i}$ is despotic.
b. *The secretary he $e_{i}$ hired, thinks that each of the tenors ${ }_{i}$ is despotic.
c. Each of the tenors ${ }_{i}$ thinks that the secretary $h e_{i}$ hired is despotic.
a. Which $\operatorname{girl}_{i}$ told Sue that $\operatorname{she}_{i}$ got a detention?
b. *She $e_{i}$ didn't know, which girl $l_{i}$ got a detention.

Brüning (2005: 105) claims explicitly that in Passamaquoddy the Principle (38) is NOT violated:
(41) w-itapih-il litahasu [ma-te wen olomi-ye-w]

3-friend-OBV think. 3 NEG-EMPH someone go.3-NEG
His friend thinks that nobody left.
*Nobody' ${ }_{i}$ 's friend thinks that he ${ }_{i}$ left.
No relevant data yet from Navajo, Nootka, Kadiweu, or any other polysynthetic language.
Free pronouns cannot be semantically bound from below:

```
a-r me-gwәкe [sabəj pepč \mp@subsup{\hat{s}}{w}{}\mathrm{ әhaftən qə-r-a-tə-n-ew]}
he-aBS DYN-hope kid every gift DIR-3SG-3PL-give-POT-ADV
He }\mp@subsup{\textrm{i}}{\textrm{i},\mp@subsup{}{\textrm{j}}{j}}{}\mathrm{ hopes, that they will give a gift to every kid
```

Personal pronouns cannot either:

```
___ \hat{s}
2PL-want all-ERG-COH DIR-2PL-praise-POT-PL-ADV
```

You want everyone to praise you
*You all want that they praise you
Referential expressions cannot be semantically bound at all:

| mwarat | zə-r | mwərat | jep $\lambda$ a |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Murat | only-ABS | Murat | look |

can only mean:
Only Murat ${ }_{i}$ looks at Murat ${ }_{j}$, , $_{i}$
*Only Murat looks at himself
Referential expressions cannot be semantically bound at all (Reinhart 1983); counterexamples from Thai and Zapotec (Lee 2003); NOT found in Adyghe).
(45) Rome de Rome est le seul monument,

Et Rome Rome a vaincu seulement ( $J$. du Bellay)
Rome is the only monument of Rome
(there are no other monuments of Rome;
*there are no other cities that are monuments of themselves)
and only Rome defeated Rome
(nothing else defeated Rome;
*no other city defeated itself, e.g. Paris didn't defeat Paris etc.)

## Possible explanations

## i) Control?

Unrestricted Control?
Backward Control in Tsez (Polinsky, Potsdam 2002):

| $\left[\begin{array}{ll}\text { kid-bā } & \text { zija }\end{array} \quad\right.$ b-iš-r-a $]$ | j-oq-si |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| girl-ERG | cow.ABS | 3-eat-CAUS-INF | 2-begin-PRF |
| The girl began to feed a cow. |  |  |  |

## ii) Raising?

There are several verbs in Adyghe that very probably allow Backward Raising (Polinsky 2007), but this cannot account for the "raising" into a thematic position.

## iii) Movement?

(Beljaeva, Minor 2005)
No restrictions at all:

## Complex NP Constraint

Shapsug dialect
(47)

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { a. rwəslan šeg } & \text { sp:ŝaŝ-ew } & {\left[\partial g_{w} \partial \text { je? }{ }_{w} \partial-r e-m\right] ~ p: j \partial s m e w ~} \\
\text { Ruslan hope girl-ADV } & \text { like-DYN-ERG letter }
\end{array}
$$

qə-f-jə-txə-n-ew]
DIR-BEN-3-write-POT-ADV
Ruslan hopes that the girl who he likes writes a letter.
b. ___ šeg ${ }_{w}$ әкe [p:ŝaŝe [rwaslane əg $_{w} \partial \quad$ je $\left.{ }_{w} ə r e-m\right]$ p:jəsmew
hope girl Ruslan like-DYN-ERG letter
qə-f-jə-txə-n-ew]
DIR-BEN-3-write-POT-ADV
i) Ruslan hopes that the girl who he likes writes a letter
ii) He hopes that the girl who Ruslan likes writes a letter
iii) The girl who Ruslan likes hopes to write a letter

Likewise with semantic binding:
a. zewəže c̣̆ale-xe šeg ${ }_{w} \partial 6 e-x$ [p:ŝaŝ-e-x-ew $\quad\left[a-g_{w} \partial j e ?_{w} \partial-x e-m\right] p: j \partial s m e w-x e$ all boy-PL hope girl-PL-ADV 3PL-like letter-PL
qว-fe-r-a-txə-n-ew]
DIR-BEN-3-3PL-write-POT-ADV
All the boys hope that the girls that like them write letters.
b. $\qquad$ šeg $_{w}$ әбе-х hope
girl-PL-ADV [zewəže c̣̆e
qə-fə-r-a-txə-n-ew]
DIR-BEN-3-3PL-write-POT-ADV
All the boys hope that the girls that like them write letters.
They hope that the girls that like all the boys write letters

## iv) Ellipsis?

(49) Everyone wants PRO to win $\neq$ Everyone wants everyone to win
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