

EGG 2022 – Topics in ellipsis

01-05 August 2022, Masaryk University, Brno

Contents: Part 3

6	The internal structure of the ellipsis site (clausal ellipsis).....	2
6.1	The “move-and-delete” approach (MDA)	2
6.2	Evidence for the MDA.....	2
6.2.1	The P-stranding generalisation	2
6.2.2	The Major Constituent constraint	2
6.2.3	Island Sensitivity.....	3
6.2.4	Complementizer omission (Merchant 2004).....	4
6.2.5	Infinitivals: raising versus control (Merchant 2004)	4
6.3	Reasons to be sceptical about the MDA	4
6.3.1	Exceptional A'-movement.....	4
6.3.2	Swiping	5
6.3.3	Mixing modal particles and clausal ellipsis in German (Ott & Struckmeier 2018)	5
6.3.4	Changing the antecedent type	6
6.3.5	English reprise fragments (Griffiths et al. 2018, 2020, 2022).....	6
6.4	Summary of the “move-and-delete” approach.....	8
7	Island-(in)sensitivity (clausal ellipsis)	8
7.1	Island evasion versus island repair	8
7.2	Clausal ellipsis, parasitic gaps, and island repair (Yoshida, Hunter & Frazier 2015)	9
7.3	“Each...other” configurations and island repair (Lasnik 2001, 2005)	10
7.4	Bound variable pronouns (Lasnik 2001)	10
7.4	Summary.....	11
	References.....	11

6 The internal structure of the ellipsis site (clausal ellipsis)

6.1 The “move-and-delete” approach (MDA)

- ❖ Within sententialism, the prevailing idea about clausal ellipsis is that remnants always undergo A'-movement to the left-periphery of the elliptic clause.
- ❖ Proponents of MDA motivate this idea by stipulating that ellipsis always targets a constituent. Therefore, the remnant undergoes A'-movement to **escape** ellipsis.

(1) [remnant]₁ [... t₁ ...]

6.2 Evidence for the MDA

6.2.1 The P-stranding generalisation

(2) A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff L allows preposition stranding (P-stranding) under regular *wh*-movement. (Merchant 2001:92)

(3) a. Who₁ was Peter talking [PP with t₁]? English (P-stranding language)
 b. Peter was talking with someone, but I don't know who₁ [Peter was talking with t₁].

(4) a. *Pjon₁ milise [PP me t₁]? Greek (non-P-stranding)
 who speak.3S with
 'Who was she speaking with?'

b. *I Anne milise me kapjon, alle dhe ksero pjon₁ [milise me t₁].
 the Anne speak.3s with someone but not know.1S who speak.3G with
 'Anne is speaking with someone, but I don't know who.'

(5) a. *Wem₁ wollte er [PP mit t₁] tanzen? German (non-P-stranding)
 'Who did he want to dance with?'

b. * Er wollte mit jemandem tanzen, aber ich weiß nicht wem₁ [er wollte mit t₁ tanzen].
 'He wanted to dance with someone, but I don't know who.'

- ❖ The ability for a language to P-strand isn't semantic but syntactic (Abels 2003). This provides additional support for sententialism: we can retain the link between movement and P-stranding under sluicing.

- ❖ The P-stranding generalization also holds for fragment answers (Merchant 2004):

(6) A: John spoke with the blonde girl. B: Yes, and (with) another girl.

(7) German (adapted from Merchant 2004: 685–686)

A: Mit wem hat Anna gesprochen? B: *Ihrem Vater.
 with whom has Anna spoken her.DAT father
 'With whom has Anna spoken?' 'Her father.'

6.2.2 The Major Constituent constraint

- ❖ To be judged as fully acceptable, standard fragments that are anteceded by a declarative assertion or a *wh*-question must be A'-movable syntactic phrases (AdvP, AP, CP, DP, PP) (Hankamer 1979, Morgan 1989, Merchant 2004:675).

- (14) a. A: How often does she swim? B: [AdvP frêquently].
 b. A: He is rich. B: No, [AP pôor].
 c. A: What does she believe? B: [CP That the election was rigged].
 d. A: Who arrived late? B: [DP Bîll].
 e. A: She went home. B: Yes, [PP with Bîll].
- (15) a. A: This policy benefits the poor. B: * No, [NP rîch].
 b. A: It's crucial that something happens. B: * Yes, [TP Sue lêaves].
 c. A: Sue just met with Trump. B: ?? No, [VP met with Bîden].¹
 d. A: Lisa will tilt the image. B: ?? No, [V revôlve].

6.2.3 Island Sensitivity

❖ Let us assume for now that islands are not 'repaired' under ellipsis, but instead that the appearance of island-sensitivity in clausal ellipsis arises from *island evasion*. When we control for island evasion, one observes island-sensitivity for both sluicing and fragments:

- (16) *sluicing*
 a. * She knows a guy who has five câts, but I don't know [how many dôgs]₁ [she knows [ISLAND a guy who has t₁]].
 b. * John wants to hire a hard worker, but I don't know [hôw hard]₁ [John wants to hire [ISLAND a t₁ worker]].
 (Barros et al. 2014)

- (17) *Fragment responses*
 a. A: They examined [ISLAND a (well) prepared student].
 B: * Yes, vêry well. (adapted from Merchant 2001:181)
 [Intended: They examined a vêry well prepared student.]
 b. A: [ISLAND The fact that [ISLAND a Labour MP]] threatened John is comical.
 B: * And Consêrvative, too.
 [Intended: The fact that a Consêrvative MP threatad J is comical, too.]
 c. A: Pete wonders [ISLAND who [ISLAND Sue's father] will fire].
 B: * And môther, too.
 [Intended: P wonders who Sue's môther will fire, too.]
 d. A: [ISLAND A drink during the intermission] will help to lessen one's anger.
 B: * Yeah, (and) the second âct, too.
 [Intended: A drink during the second âct will help, too.] ((17b-d) from Griffiths et al. 2022)

❖ Island sensitivity is straightforwardly explained if all remnants of ellipsis undergo A'-movement to escape ellipsis.

¹ Verb phrases are judged as acceptable responses to questions containing the verbal anaphor *do*, as (i) shows (see Merchant 2004:696 for similar examples). Such fragmentary responses are likely to be the remnants of nonisomorphic elliptic pseudoclefts (see (ii)). This analysis is supported by the observation that the fragment cannot be a tensed lexical verb, just as the predicate phrase of a pseudocleft cannot.

(i) A: What did John do?
 B: Wash*(ed) the car.
 (ii) [What John did was [wash*(ed) the car]].

6.3.2 *Swiping*

❖ *Swiping* stands for “*Sluiced Wh-word Inversion with Prepositions (in Northern Germanic)*”

(Merchant 2002)

- (23) a. Lucy fixed the car, but I don’t know **with what**. *sluicing with PP remnant*
 b. Lucy fixed the car, but I don’t know **what with**. *Swiping*

❖ As the name suggests, swiping is limited to Germanic languages that can ordinarily P-strand (English, Frisian, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic)

❖ The most popular MDA-based analysis of swiping involves a two-step movement process:²

- PP-pied-piping to the specifier of a low left-peripheral projection
- Subextraction of the wh-phrase to the specifier of a higher left-peripheral projection

- (24) ... [what₂ [[PP with t₂]₁ [Lucy fixed the car t₁]]]

❖ Again, this configuration is unique to ellipsis environments, which is our first reason for scepticism:

- (25) * Lucy fixed the car, but I don’t know what with *she fixed the car*.

❖ But our scepticism-levels are raised further when we add an immovable element (*even*) to the mix:

- (26) A: Bob’s writing awful love songs again. (Griffiths et al. 2022)
 B: Oh no, not again! Why? And **who even** fôr?
 B’: Oh no, not again. Why? And who *is he* even *writing them* fôr?
 B’’: Oh no, not again. Why? * And who (even) *is he writing them* (even) fôr?

- (27) [who₃ even₁ [PP fôr t₃]₂ [is he t₁ writing love songs t₂]] *MDA analysis of (26B)*

6.3.3 *Mixing modal particles and clausal ellipsis in German (Ott & Struckmeier 2018)*

❖ German has a rich inventory of *Modal Particles* (MPs), which convey information related to the speaker’s attitude or commitment toward the proposition expressed.

- (28) a. Peter hat **wohl** / **ja** ein paar Leute eingeladen.
 Peter has MP MP a few people invited
 ‘{Probably/As you know}, Peter invited a couple of people.’
 b. Wer hat **denn** die Leute eingeladen?
 who has MP the people invited
 ‘Who invited the people?’

❖ MPs occupy the middle-field and are generally immovable (see (29)). They are not constituent-modifiers and therefore cannot accompany an A’-moved phrase (see (30)).

- (29) a. * **Wohl**₁ / **Ja**₁ hat Peter t₁ ein paar Leute eingeladen.
 b. * Peter hat t₁ ein paar Leute eingeladen **wohl**₁ / **ja**₁.

- (30) a. * [Wèn **denn**]₁ hat er t₁ eingeladen?
 Who MP has he invited
 b. * [Seine Frêunde **wohl** / **Wohl** seine Frêunde]₁ hat er t₁ eingeladen.
 his friends MP MP his friends has he invited

² Hartman & Ai 2009, van Craenenbroeck 2010, Radford & Iwasaki 2015.

- ❖ Reprise fragments show all the (dis)similarity effects as ‘standard’ fragments, and therefore should be treated by sententialists as derived via clausal ellipsis. (Griffiths et al. 2018, 2020, 2022)
- ❖ However, English reprise fragments display **none** of the hallmarks of A'-movement that standard fragments display.³

❖ English reprise fragments they don't need to be A'-movable phrases:⁴

- (37) A: Will the boss fire [_{&P} Dracula [_{&'} and Cthulhu]] on Monday?
 B: Will the boss fire [_{&P} Dracula [_{&'} and CTHULHU]] on Monday? Of course not!
 B': [_{&'} and CTHULHU]? Of course not!
- (38) A: Did Bo finagle a raise?
 B: Did Bo FINAGLE a raise? He's earned it!
 B': [_V FINAGLE]? He's earned it! (adapted from Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:299)
- (39) A: Is John a neurophysiologist?
 B: Is John a neurophysiologist? He's just a physiologist!
 B': [_{Pref}NEURO]? He's just a physiologist!

❖ English reprise fragments can contain much more deaccented material than standard fragments can:

- (40) A: John often thinks that Pete introduced him to Dracula. *reprise fragments*
 a. B: [_{DP} {WHO / DRACULA}]?
 b. B: [_{PP} to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
 c. B: [_{VP} introduced him to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
 d. B: [_{CP} that Pete introduced him to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
 e. B: [_{VP} thinks that Pete introduced him to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
- (41) A: John often thinks that Pete introduced him to a vampire. *standard fragments*
 a. B: Yeah, [_{DP} Dracula].
 b. B: Yeah, [_{PP} to Dracula].
 c. B: * Yeah, [_{VP} introduced him to Dracula].
 d. B: Yeah, [_{CP} that Pete introduced him to Dracula].
 e. B: * Yeah, [_{VP} thinks that Pete introduced him to Dracula].

❖ In German and Dutch at least, P-omission is possible in reprise fragments, despite these languages disallowing P-stranding in nonelliptic utterances. Thus, reprise fragments disobey the P-stranding generalization:

- (42) *German*
 A: Maria hat mit ihrem Vater gesprochen. B: Ihrem VATER?
 Maria has with her.DAT father talked her.DAT father
 'Maria has spoken with her father.' 'Her FATHER?'
- (43) *Dutch*
 A: Maria heeft met Jan gesproken. B: JAN?
 Maria has with Jan talked

³ Unlike Hungarian reprise fragments! Hungarian reprise and standard fragments both display exactly the same A'-movement characteristics.

⁴ Based on the examples in (37) to (39), you might wonder whether any old string of words can function as a reprise fragment. This is not the case: a reprise fragment cannot be a morphosyntactic nonconstituent:

- (i) a. A: This is unbelievable! B: * UNBE-?
 b. A: Will the boss fire Dracula and Cthulhu on Monday? B: * DRACULA and?

❖ English reprise fragments are island-insensitive, even when island-evasion is controlled for:

- (44) A: [_{ISLAND} The fact that [_{ISLAND} a Labour MP] threatened John] is comical.
B: LABOUR?
- (45) A: Pete wonders [_{ISLAND} who [_{ISLAND} Sue's father]] will fire.
B: FATHER? / Sue's {WHAT/WHO}?
- (46) A: [_{ISLAND} A drink during the intermission] will help to lessen one's anger.
B: The INTERMISSION / the WHAT?

6.4 Summary of the “move-and-delete” approach

Reasons to favour the MDA	Reasons to be sceptical of the MDA
<p><i>For English fragments with decl & wh antecedents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Major Constituent Constraint is observed ❖ P-stranding generalization is obeyed ❖ Island sensitivity is observed ❖ Unavailability of complementizer-omission ❖ Control vs. raising infinitival clause fragments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Requires exceptional movement for non-wh fragments ❖ Swiping is hard to derive ❖ Immovable items (MPs) can appear in frags <p><i>For English fragments with altQ antecedents</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Major Constituent Constraint disobeyed ❖ P-stranding generalization disobeyed (<i>Dutch</i>) <p><i>For English reprise fragments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Major Constituent Constraint disobeyed ❖ P-stranding generalization disobeyed ❖ Island-<u>in</u>sensitivity is observed

- ❖ The MDA seems too coarse-grained. Whether a fragment shows the hallmarks of A'-movement depends on:
- The type of the fragment (*reprise versus standard*)
 - The type of the antecedent (*declarative assertion and wh-questions versus alternative question*)
 - The language being investigated (e.g., *Hungarian fragments always show the hallmarks of A'-movement*)

Qs: Why this variation? Does it necessitate an approach where ellipsis can occur ‘around’ designated base-generated items? If so, how could such an approach account for the A'-movement properties that some fragments display?

7 Island-(in)sensitivity (clausal ellipsis)

- ❖ We've been adopting the *island-evasion* approach to apparent island-insensitivity, according to which island-insensitivity arises because the elliptic clause is nonisomorphic to its antecedent, containing no island-boundaries.
- ❖ Let's now review this approach, and compare it to the ‘island-repair’ approach

7.1 *Island evasion versus island repair*

- ❖ If the island-evasion approach is correct, then island-sensitivity arises for an elliptic clause whenever:
- (i) the correlate in the antecedent clause is island-bound

(ii) there is no plausible island-evading nonisomorphic elliptic clause available

- (47) John wants to hire a hard worker, but I don't know [h_{ôw} hard]₁...
- a. * ... [John wants to hire [_{ISLAND} a t₁ worker]]. *isomorphic - ungrammatical*
- b. # ... [John is t₁]. *nonisomorphic – incongruent in this context*
- (48) A: They examined [_{ISLAND} a (well) prepared student].
- B: * Yes, v_êry well.⁵
- a. * [v_êry well]₁ [they examined [_{ISLAND} a t₁ prepared student]] *isomorphic - ungrammatical*
- b. # [v_êry well]₁ [they examined [_{ISLAND} a prepared student] t₁] *nonisomorphic – incongruent*
- c. [v_êry well]₁ [the student is t₁] *nonisomorphic – incongruent*

- ❖ The ‘island repair’ approach to clausal ellipsis states that strong islands simply cease being islands under ellipsis.
 - ❖ Such an approach isn't necessarily against the idea that nonisomorphic elliptic clauses exist – rather, it states that one needn't appeal to nonisomorphic elliptic clauses to explain island-insensitivity in cases such as (49).
- (49) a. Abby wants to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't remember which (Balkan language).
- b. ... [which Balkan language]₁ [Abby wants to hire [_{NOT-ISLAND} someone who speaks t₁]]?

- ❖ The ‘island repair’ approach obviously cannot explain why island-sensitivity is ever observed in clausal ellipsis utterances.
- ❖ However, there are configurations for which the island repair approach works better. In these cases, island-insensitivity is observed, but **no** plausible island-evading nonisomorphic ellipsis site is available. Let's check some cases out...

7.2 Clausal ellipsis, parasitic gaps, and island repair (Yoshida, Hunter & Frazier 2015)

- (50) This is [a book]₁ that you should burn t₁ [_{ISLAND} after reading ____{PG}]. *A'-movement*
- (51) a. * I will burn this book [_{ISLAND} after reading ____{PG}]. *no movement*
- b. * [This book]₁ should be burned t₁ [_{ISLAND} after reading ____{PG}]. *A-movement*
- (52) This is [a book]₁ that you should burn t₁ [_{ISLAND} after reading ____{PG}], but I don't know [_{ISLAND} how l_ông after reading ____{PG}].

Possible structures for the elliptic clause:

- a. ... [_{ISLAND} how l_ông after reading ____{PG}]₁ [you should burn the book t₁] *nonisomorphic*
- b. ... [_{ISLAND} how l_ông after reading ____{PG}]₁ [this is [_{ISLAND} [a book]₂ that you should burn t₂ t₁]] *iso*

Problem with (52a): no island in the ellipsis, but no A'-movement for licensing the PG

Problem with (52b): A'-movement for licensing the PG, but island-violating movement in the ellipsis site.

- ❖ For proponents of island-repair, the acceptability of (52) is taken as evidence for island repair.

⁵ We've gone back to employing the “move-and-delete” analysis here. Accounting for the island-sensitivity of non-wh fragments is obviously far less straightforward on an in-situ approach to ellipsis (though see Griffiths et al. 2018, 2020, under review for a recent attempt).

7.3 “Each...other” configurations and island repair (Lasnik 2001, 2005)

- (53) **Each brother** had a teacher [_{ISLAND} that criticised the work of the **other**].
- (54) **Each brother** had a teacher [_{ISLAND} that criticized the work of **the other**], but I’m not sure how much of the work of the other.

Possible structures for the elliptic clause:

- a. ... [how much of the work of the other]₁ [the teacher criticized t_1] *nonisomorphic*
- b. ... [how much of the work of the other]₁ [each brother had a teacher that [_{ISLAND} criticised t_1]]?

Problem with (54a): no island in the ellipsis, but no licenser for *the other*

Problem with (54b): licenser for *the other*, but island-violating movement in the ellipsis site.

- ❖ For proponents of island-repair, the acceptability of (54) is taken as evidence for island repair.

7.4 Bound variable pronouns (Lasnik 2001)

- ❖ To obtain a bound variable interpretation for a pronoun, the quantified DP must c-command the pronoun:

- (55) **Every Englishman** loves **his** mother

Referential interpretation of ‘him’: Gerald loves John’s mother,
Norman loves John’s mother,
Trevor loves John’s mother, ... etc.

Bound variable interpretation of ‘him’: Gerald loves Gerald’s mother,
Norman loves Norman’s mother,
Trevor loves Trevor’s mother, ... etc.

- (56) The people who know **him** hate **every professor**.

Referential interpretation of ‘him’: The people who know John hate Prof. Brown,
The people who know John hate Prof. Smith,
The people who know John hate Prof. Jones, ... etc.

Bound variable interpretation of ‘him’: Not available.

- ❖ A bound variable interpretation is available for pronouns inside A’-moved phrases because A’-moved phrases can be reconstructed back into their base-position:

- (57) [Which of **her** tools]₁ does **every mechanic** use t_1 most?

Referential interpretation of ‘her’: Which of Sue’s tools does Pete use most?,
Which of Sue’s tools does Laura use most?,
Which of Sue’s tools does Astrid use most?, ... etc.

Bound variable interpretation of ‘her’: Which of Sue’s tools does Sue use most?,
Which of Laura’s tools does Laura use most?,
Which of Jo’s tools does Jo use most?, ... etc.

- ❖ Quantifier-binding is island-insensitive:

- (58) **Every woman** knows a man [_{ISLAND} who envies **her** success].

Referential interpretation of ‘her’: Sue knows a man who envies Sally’s success,
Kate knows a man who envies Sally’s success,
Jo knows a man who envies Sally’s success, ... etc.

Bound variable interpretation of ‘her’: Sue knows a man who envies Sue’s success,
 Kate knows a man who envies Kate’s success,
 Jo knows a man who envies Jo’s success, ... etc.

- (59) At the conference, **every woman** met a man _[ISLAND] who envies some of **her** work], but I’m not sure how much of **her** work.

Bound variable interpretation of ‘her’ is attested!

Possible structures for the elliptic clause:

- a. ... [how much of her work]₁ [each man envies *t*₁] *nonisomorphic*
 b. ... [how much of **her** work]₁ [**every woman** met a man _[ISLAND] who envies *t*₁]? *isomorphic*

Problem with (59a): no island in the ellipsis, but no quantified DP binder for *her*

Problem with (59b): binder available for *her*, but island-violating movement in the ellipsis site.

- ❖ For proponents of island-repair, the acceptability of (59) is taken as evidence for island repair.

7.4 Summary

- ❖ The overall picture is mixed: there is clear evidence for island-sensitivity under clausal ellipsis, yet there are some recalcitrant (and rather complex) cases that point towards the possibility of island repair being permitted when (i) there is no sensible nonisomorphic elliptic clause available, and (ii) a filler-gap or binding dependency must be maintained.

References

- Abels, K. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.
- Van Craenenbroeck, J. 2020. *The syntax of ellipsis: evidence from Dutch dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barros, M., P. Elliot & G. Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Manuscript, New Brunswick, NJ; London; Edinburgh: Rutgers University, University College London, Edinburgh University. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002100>.
- Hankamer, J. 1979. *Deletion in coordinate structures*. PhD thesis, Yale University.
- Hartman, J & R. R. Ai. 2009. A focus account of swiping. *Selected Papers from the 2006 Cyprus Syntaxfest 92*.
- Ginzburg, J & R. Cooper. 2004. Clarification, ellipsis, and the nature of contextual updates in dialogue. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27: 297–365.
- Griffiths, J. 2019. A Q-based approach to clausal ellipsis: Deriving the preposition stranding and island sensitivity generalisations without movement. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4:12.1–41.
- Griffiths, J., G. Güneş, & A. Lipták. 2018. A Minimalist investigation of Reprise Fragments. Paper presented at the “Relating Elliptical Utterances to Information in Context” workshop at the 40th Annual Meeting of the German Society of Linguistics (DGfS). Stuttgart, 03/18.
- Griffiths, J., G. Güneş, & A. Lipták. 2020. *The unbearable lightness of WHAT? A clausal ellipsis analysis of English reprise fragments*. Paper presented at the Workshop in honor of the defense of Anastasiia Ionova. Leiden, 01/20.
- Griffiths, J., G. Güneş, & A. Lipták. 2022. *Reprise fragments in English and Hungarian: Further support for an in-situ Q-equivalence approach to clausal ellipsis*. Under review.

- Lasnik, H. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In M. Kim & U. Strauss (eds.), *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society* 31, vol. 2. GLSA, 301–320.
- Lasnik, H. 2005. Review of *The syntax of silence*, by Jason Merchant. *Language* 81: 259–265.
- Merchant, J. 2001. *The syntax of silence. Sluicing, islands, and a theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, J. 2002. Swiping in Germanic. In C. J.-W. Zwart & W. Abraham (eds.), *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, 295–321
- Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27: 661–738.
- Morgan, J. 1989. Sentence Fragments Revisited. In B. Music, R. Graczyk & C. Wiltshire *Chicago Linguistics Society 25, Parasession on Language in Context*, ed. by, 228–241. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Ott, D, & V. Struckmeier. 2018. Particles and deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49:2.393–407.
- Radford, A. & E. Iwasaki. 2015. On swiping in English. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33: 703–744.
- Yoshida, M. T. Hunter & M. Frazier. 2015. Parasitic Gaps licensed by elided syntactic structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33: 1439–1471.
- Zwicky, A. 1982. Stranded to and phonological phrasing in English. *Linguistics* 20: 3–57.