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MAIN TOPIC
Lack of syntactic isomorphism between an ellipsis (sluicing) site and its antecedent

CENTRAL DATA
The interaction between lack of isomorphism and morphological case marking

MAIN GIST OF THE ANALYSIS
An additional constraint on accommodation: an ellipsis remnant has to be compatible with both the actual and the accommodated antecedent

1. Some background: Rooth’s (1992) redundancy relations
   (1) Jerry should bring his maracas and Luigi should <bring his maracas> too.
   central issue: it is clear that a clause containing ellipsis has to be isomorphic/identical to an antecedent at some level and to some extent, but at what level and to what extent?
   Rooth (1992): ellipsis resolution involves two identity (or redundancy) relations: one at the level of the ellipsis site (here: VP) and one at a higher level (e.g. the entire clause) (cf. also Fiengo & May 1994)

   (2) [\[v_1 \text{Jerry should \[v_2 \text{bring his } 1 \text{maracas}\]}\]] and [\[v_2 \text{Luigi should \[v_3 \text{bring his } 2 \text{maracas}\]}\]]

   in a nutshell: an ellipsis site \(e\) is related to some antecedent site \(a\) and some clause \(E\) that contains \(e\) is related to a clause \(A\) that contains \(a\)

   (3) redundancy relation 1 = Rooth’s Focus-Background Condition (FBC):
   Take an ellipsis site \(e\) with an ellipsis antecedent \(a\) in the discourse. Ellipsis requires that there be some phrase \(E\) containing the ellipsis \(e\) and some phrase \(A\) containing the ellipsis antecedent \(a\) such that \(\[E\]\) is or contextually implies a member of \(F(E)\).
   (Hardt 2004:3)

   (4) Focus semantic value of \(a\)
   \(F(a)\) is the set of denotations produced by replacing all F(ocus)-marked constituents in \(a\) by variables of the appropriate type

   (5) the FBC applied to (1)/(2):
   a. \(F([P_A])\) = the set of denotations of the form \(\text{x should bring \text{x’s maracas (Luigi is F-marked)}\}
   b. \(\[P_A\]\) is a member of this set
   c. as a result, the FBC is satisfied
Ellipsis and accommodation: the (morphological) case of sluicing

Note: given that the FBC is a semantic requirement, it doesn’t require $E$ to be structurally isomorphic to $A \Rightarrow$ discrepancies between the two are allowed, in particular in contexts involving implicative bridging/accommodation/inference (cf. the phrase or contextually implies in (3)).

(6) $[IP_A \text{ First John told MARY$_1$ I was } [VP_A \text{ bad-mouthing her$_1$}] \text{ and } [IP_B \text{ SUE$_2$ heard I was } [VP_B \text{ bad-mouthing her$_2$}]]$

(7) the FBC applied to (6):
   a. $F(IP_A) = \text{ the set of denotations of the form } x \text{ heard that } x \text{ was bad-mouthing } x$ (Sue is F-marked)
   b. $IP_B$ is not a member of this set
   c. however, given that from $A$ tells $B$ about $C$ we can infer $B$ hears about $C$, there is an accommodated antecedent $IP_{Ae}$ of the form $\text{ Mary$_1$ heard that I was bad-mouthing her$_1$}$
   d. $IP_{Ac}$ is a member of $F(IP_E)$
   e. as a result, the FBC is satisfied

(8) redundancy relation 2 = Fiengo & May’s (1994) syntactic reconstruction:
   The ellipsis site $e$ has to be structurally/syntactically isomorphic to an antecedent site $a$ (modulo indices and vehicle change).

(9) syntactic reconstruction applied to (1)/(2):
   a. $[VP_A \text{ bring his$_2$ maracas}]$ is structurally isomorphic to $[VP_A \text{ bring his$_1$ maracas}]$ (modulo indices)
   b. as a result, syntactic reconstruction is satisfied

Note: given that syntactic reconstruction is a structural requirement, no discrepancies between ellipsis site and antecedent are allowed

(10) * First John $[VP_A \text{ told MARY$_1$ I was } \text{ bad-mouthing her$_1$}]$ and SUE$_2$ did $[VP_B \text{ hear I was } \text{ bad-mouthing her$_2$}]$

(11) syntactic reconstruction applied to (10):
   a. $[VP_A \text{ hear I was } \text{ bad-mouthing her$_2$}]$ is not structurally isomorphic to $[VP_A \text{ told MARY$_1$ I was } \text{ bad-mouthing her$_1$}]$
   b. as a result, syntactic reconstruction is not satisfied

In this talk I argue:
- that accommodation is allowed in redundancy relation 2, and hence, that this is a semantic relation as well (cf. Fox 1999, Merchant 2001, Sauerland 2004, Hardt 2004, 2005);
- that existing constraints on accommodation are not sufficient to capture all the relevant data;
- that there is an additional accommodation constraint on the ellipsis remnant.

2. Lack of isomorphism: copular clauses and preposition stranding

2.1 Introduction: Merchant's (2001) P-stranding generalization

(12) P-stranding generalization (PSG) (Merchant 2001:92)
   A language $L$ will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff $L$ allows preposition stranding under regular wh-movement.

English: P-stranding

(13) Peter was talking with someone, but I don’t know (with) who.
(14) Who was Peter talking with?

Greek: no P-stranding

(15) Και Αννα μιςε με καπιόν, αλλά δε νά σερο τσ * (με) πζόν.
   the Anna spoke with someone but not I know with who
   ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know with who.’

(16) * Ξόν μιςε με?
   who she spoke with
   INTENDED: ‘Who did she speak with?’

(17) * ¿Qué chica rubia ha hablado Juan con?
   what girl blonde has talked Juan with
   INTENDED: ‘What blonde girl did Juan talk to?’

Spanish: (Nevins, Rodriguez & Vicente 2007, Vicente 2008)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions

(17) * ¿Qué chica rubia ha hablado Juan con?
   what girl blonde has talked Juan with
   INTENDED: ‘What blonde girl did Juan talk to?’

P-stranding under sluicing

(18) Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé cuál
   Juan has talked with a girl blonde but not know which
   ‘Juan talked to a blonde girl, but I don’t know which.’
Vicente (2008): P-stranding violations under sluicing in Spanish do not derive from a regular wh-question, but from an underlying copular clause:

(19) Juan ha hablado con una chica
Juan has talked with a girl
pero no sé cuál
but not know which
‘Juan talked to a girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.’

supporting evidence: sluicing and else-modification

copular clauses are incompatible with else-modification

(20) * Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé
Juan has talked with a girl blonde but not know
qué chica más es pm.
what girl else is it
*‘Juan talked to a blonde girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.’

no P-stranding under sluicing with else-modification

(21) * Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé
Juan has talked with a girl blonde but not know
qué chica más.
what girl else
‘Juan talked to a blonde girl, but I don’t know what other girl it was.’

copular clauses are incompatible with else-modification

(22) Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé
Juan has talked with a girl blonde but not know
con qué chica más.
with what girl else
‘Juan talked to a blonde girl, but I don’t know to what other girl.’

control: else-modification is allowed in regular (= non-P-stranding) sluicing

(23) Me pjon milise?
who.ACC she.spoke
‘With whom did she speak?’

nominative case for the pivot of a copular clause

(24) Dhen ksero pijos itan,
not I.know who.NOM it.was
‘I don’t know who it was.’

no P-stranding in a regular wh-question

(25) * Pjon milise me?
who.ACC she.spoke with
INTENDED: ‘Who did she speak with?’

3. Lack of lack of isomorphism: morphological case blocks a copular source

prediction: if copular clauses are used to circumvent an otherwise unavoidable preposition stranding violation, this should be easily detectable in languages with morphological case marking on wh-phrases

3.1 Introduction: no copular rescue in Greek


setting the scene: case, copular clauses and P-stranding in Greek

accusative case for the object of a preposition

(23) Me pjon milise?
with who.ACC she.spoke
‘With whom did she speak?’

nominative case for the pivot of a copular clause

(24) Dhen ksero pijos itan,
not I.know who.NOM it.was
‘I don’t know who it was.’

no P-stranding in a regular wh-question

(25) * Pjon milise me?
who.ACC she.spoke with
INTENDED: ‘Who did she speak with?’

testing the prediction: P-stranding under sluicing in Greek

P-stranding under sluicing with an accusative wh-phrase

(26) * I Anna milise me kajpi, alla dhe ksero pjon.
the Anna spoke with someone but not I.know who.ACC
INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

P-stranding under sluicing with a nominative wh-phrase

(27) * I Anna milise me kajpi, alla dhe ksero pjos.
the Anna spoke with someone but not I.know who.NOM
INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

2.3 Conclusion

Copular clauses can be used in sluicing to circumvent preposition stranding violations. As such, they present a case of an ellipsis site that is not structurally isomorphic to its antecedent site, i.e. a case of accommodation in Rooth’s redundancy relation 2.

note: these observations don’t just hold for Spanish, but also French, Italian (Vicente 2008), Dutch and possibly Brazilian Portuguese (Nevins, Rodriguez & Vicente 2007, pace Almeida & Yoshida 2007)
**note:** the ill-formedness of (26) is expected given (25), but the ill-formedness of (27) is puzzling, esp. given the fact that (28) is perfectly well-formed, i.e. Greek has a perfectly acceptable copular clause alternative for the P-stranding violation in (26), but doesn’t use it under sluicing.

(28) I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dheksero pijos itan.
the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM it was
‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who it was.’

### 3.2 Expanding the data set

#### 3.2.1 Czech
(Merchant 2001:96; J. Dotlačil p.c., R. Šimík p.c.)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions
(29) * Kým mluvila Anna s?
who.INSTR spoke Anna with
INTENDED: ‘Who did Anna speak with?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nominative wh-phrase
(30) * Anna mluvila s někým, ale nevím kým.
Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.INSTR
INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a nominative wh-phrase
(31) * Anna mluvila s někým, ale nevím kdo.
Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM
INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

non-elliptical copular clause alternative
(32) Anna mluvila s někým, ale nevím kdo to byl.
Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM it was
‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who it was.’

#### 3.2.2 Slovene
(Merchant 2001:97; T. Marvin p.c.)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions
(33) * Kóm je govorila Anna s?
who.INSTR AUX spoke Anna with
INTENDED: ‘Who did Anna speak with?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nominative wh-phrase
(34) * Anna je govorila z nekom, ampak ne vem kom.
Anna AUX spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM
INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a nominative wh-phrase
(35) * Anna je govorila z nekom, ampak ne vem kdo.
Anna AUX spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM
INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

non-elliptical copular clause alternative
(36) Anna je govorila z nekom, ampak ne vem
Anna AUX spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM
kdo je to bil.
who.NOM AUX it been
‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who it was.’

#### 3.2.3 Hungarian
(A. Lipták p.c.)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions
(37) * János kín káport hişek keresztül?
János who.SUBL got news across
INTENDED: ‘Via who did János get some news?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nominative wh-phrase
(38) * János hişek káport valakin keresztül,
János news got someone.SUBL across
de nem tudom kim.
but not. I know who.SUBL
INTENDED: ‘János got some news via someone, but I don’t know who.’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a nominative wh-phrase
(39) * János hişek káport valakin keresztül,
János news got someone.SUBL across
de nem tudom ki.
but not. I know who.NOM
INTENDED: ‘János got some news via someone, but I don’t know who.’
3.2.4 Hindi (Merchant 2001:100; Dave e.a. 2002:29; R. Bhatt p.c.)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions
(41) * Kis dukān John gayaa mein?
which shop John go to
INTENDED: ‘Which shop did John go into?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nominal wh-phrase
(42) * Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii,
Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST
lekin mujhe pataa nahī kis.
but LCDAT knowledge NEG who.OBL.
INTENDED: ‘Gautam spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a nominative wh-phrase
(43) * Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii,
Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST
lekin mujhe pataa nahī kaun.
but LCDAT knowledge NEG who.NOM
INTENDED: ‘Gautam spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

non-elliptical copular clause alternative
(44) Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii,
Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST
lekin mujhe nahī pataa ki vo kaun thaa.
but LCDAT NEG knowledge that the who.NOM was
‘Gautam spoke with someone, but I don’t know who he was.’

3.3 Conclusion

Copular clauses cannot be used to circumvent preposition stranding violations in languages with morphological case marking on wh-phrases. Informally, it looks like accommodation inside the ellipsis site is allowed as long as it is not visible in the surface representation.

4. Lack of lack of isomorphism: copular case matching and syncretism

prediction: if a language with morphological case marking allows a non-isomorphic ellipsis site that yields the same case on the remnant as the isomorphic ellipsis site, accommodation should re-emerge

4.1 PSG-violations in Polish (Szczegelniak 2005, 2008)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions
(45) * Którym Anna tańczyła z mężczyzną?
which Anna danced with man
INTENDED: ‘Which man did Anna dance with?’

no P-stranding under sluicing
(46) * Którym mężczyzną Anna tańczyła z?
which man Anna danced with
INTENDED: ‘Which man did Anna dance with?’

P-stranding under sluicing
(47) Anna tańczyła z jednym mężczyzną ale nie wiem którym.
Anna danced with one man but not know which
‘Anna danced with a man, but I don’t know which.’

Szczegelniak (2008): P-stranding violations under sluicing in Polish do not derive from regular wh-questions, but from an underlying cleft:

(48) Anna tańczyła z jednym mężczyzną ale nie wiem
Anna danced with one man but not know
którym to z miłością (on) tańczyła
which it with man she danced
‘Anna danced with a man, but I don’t know which (man it was with whom she danced).’

supporting evidence: no cleft rescue with simple wh-phrases

no P-stranding under sluicing with simple wh-questions
(49) * Anna tańczyła z jednym mężczyzną ale nie wiem kim.
Anna danced with one man but not know who
INTENDED: ‘Anna danced with a man, but I don’t know who.’
no clefts with simple wh-phrases as pivots

(50) * Kim to z ona tańczyła?
  who it with she danced
  INTENDED: ‘Who was it that she danced with?’

→ at first sight, Polish contradicts the generalization that languages with morphological case-marking do not allow for accommodation inside ellipsis sites

however: the particular cleft strategy that Polish employs is case-sensitive, i.e. it bears the case assigned by the preposition (Szczeglniak 2008:406):

(51) Którym to z dziewczyną ona tańczyła?
  which,INS it with man she danced
  ‘Which man was it with which she danced?’

→ this shows that accommodation is allowed in languages with morphological case marking on wh-phrases, but only when the case assigned by the non-isomorphic ellipsis site is the same as that assigned by the isomorphic one

4.2 Case syncretism

4.2.1 German (T. Klein p.c., L. Marten p.c., M. Zimmermann p.c.)

nominate and accusative are syncretic for the neuter wh-phrase was ‘what’ in German

(52) Was ist passiert?
  whatNOM is happened
  ‘What happened?’

(53) An was hat Rudolf dich erinnert?
  to whatACC has R. you reminded
  ‘What has Rudolf reminded you of?’

with this form P-stranding under sluicing is well-formed

(54) Rudolf hat mich an etwas erinnert, aber ich weiß nicht mehr
  R. has me to something reminded but I know not anymore
  (ant) was.
  to what
  ‘Rudolf has reminded me of something, but I don’t recall what.’

nominative and accusative are syncretic for the plural wh-phrase welche ‘which’ in German

(55) Welche Freunde haben dich gesehen?
  whichNOM friends have you seen
  ‘Which friends saw you?’

(56) Auf welche Freunde wartest du?
  on whichACC friends wait you
  ‘Which friends are you waiting for?’

with this form P-stranding under sluicing is significantly better than with the non-syncretic genitive

(57) Rudolf wartet auf einige Freunde, aber ich weiß nicht *(auf)welche.
  ‘Rudolf waits for some friends, but I don’t know which.’

(58) Rudolf ist statt einiger Freunde augetreten, aber ich weiß nicht
  Rudolf is instead of some friends performed but I don’t know
  *(statt) welcher.
  instead of whichGEN
  ‘Rudolf has performed instead of some friends, but I don’t know which.’

4.2.2 Zurich German (M. Salzmann p.c.)

in Zurich German the non-neuter wh-word wëër ‘who’ is syncretic between Nom and Acc, but not Dat

(59) Wëër hat mit em Hans gredt
  whoNOM has with the Hans spoken
  ‘Who was talking to Hans?’

(60) Für wëër hat de Hans kocht?
  for whoACC has the Hans cooked
  ‘Who did Hans cook for?’

(61) Mit wem hat de Hans gredt?
  with whoDAT has the Hans talked
  ‘Who was Hans talking to?’

P-stranding under sluicing is allowed with prepositions assigning Acc, but not with those assigning Dat

(62) De Hans hat für öffert kocht, aber ich wiss nöd *(für) wëër
  the Hans has for someone cooked, but I know not for whoNOM/ACC
  ‘Hans cooked for someone, but I don’t know who.’
4.2.3 **Russian** (V. Gribanova p.c., M. Gouskova p.c.)

*Nom and Acc are syncretic for čto 'what', but not for kto 'who'*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>čto</th>
<th>čto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom</strong></td>
<td>kto</td>
<td>čto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acc</strong></td>
<td>kogo</td>
<td>čto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-stranding under sluicing is more acceptable with čto than with kto/kogo

(65) On vystrelil **čto**-to, no ja ne znaju *(vo) čto.*

‘He shot at *something*, but I don’t know what.’

(66) On vystrelil **kogo**-to, no ja ne znaju *(v) kogo.*

‘He shot at *someone*, but I don’t know who.’

4.2.4 **Greek** (A. Giannakidou p.c.)

*nominative and accusative are syncretic with the neuter wh-phrase τι 'what' in Greek.*

(67) Ti egine?

‘What happened?’

(68) Se ti anakateftikes?

in what, mixed up.2SG

‘What did you get mixed up in?’

with this form P-stranding under sluicing is well-formed

(69) O Giannis anakateftike se kati, ala dhven ksero *(se) ti.*

Giannis mixed up.3SG in something but I don’t know what

‘Giannis got mixed up in something, but I don’t know what.’

4.2.5 **Case syncretism: conclusion**

The possibility of P-stranding under sluicing in languages with morphological case marking is sensitive to case syncretism. This confirms that accommodation inside ellipsis sites is only allowed in such languages when (the case on) the wh-phrase is simultaneously compatible with an isomorphic and a non-isomorphic antecedent

**caveat:** Judgments concerning (syncretism and) morphological case are notoriously subtle and subject to inter-speaker variation (cf. Pullum & Zwicky 1986:759, Ingrina 1990:203). Moreover, in this particular case, various other—possibly orthogonal—factors sometimes interfere with the judgments, including:

- the possibility of alternative irrelevant readings (e.g. the direct object reading in (65))
- the presence or absence of NP-ellipsis in the sluicing remnant *(which vs. which boy)*

4.3 **Conclusion**

Accommodation is allowed in languages with morphological case marking if the surface form of the sluiced wh-phrase is simultaneously compatible with both the isomorphic and the non-isomorphic antecedent.

5. The analysis: accommodation is restricted by the licensing potential of the antecedent

5.1 **Restrictions on accommodation**

**note:** recent accounts of the interaction between ellipsis and accommodation (Fox 1999, 2000, Sauerland 2004, Hardt 2004, 2005) assume that ellipsis licensing via accommodation does not come for free

**question:** can any of the existing restrictions/constraints on accommodation account for the data pattern outlined above?

**the short answer:** no
5.1.1 Fox (1999, 2000): accommodation requires accommodation-seeking material

central idea: accommodation needs a lexical trigger

(70) Accommodation has a trigger when S \(=\) the ellipsis-containing clause, jvc\) contains accommodation-seeking material, i.e., when S contains pronounced non-F-marked material which is absent in A \(=\) the clause containing the antecedent, jvc.

example: abstract cause subject alternations with prove

the verb to prove allows either an agent or an abstract cause as its subject

(71) a. John proved that I'm innocent with fingerprints.
   b. Fingerprinted proved that I'm innocent.

these two readings are not interchangeable under ellipsis…

(72) a. * John proved that I'm innocent. [Fingerprinted]s did, too.
   b. * Fingerprints proved that I'm innocent. [John]s did, too.

…unless the ellipsis-containing clause contains pronounced non-F-marked material that is absent in A

(73) a. John proved that I'm innocent. Fingerprints that [Bill]s presented did, too.
   b. * Fingerprints that Bill presented proved that I'm innocent. [John]s did, too.

back to sluicing: in order to determine if (70) is applicable to the sluicing data reviewed above, we need to determine if a case suffix is part of the F-marked material or not (cf. Fox 1999:19n10 on the possibility of F-marking below the lexical level)

option #1: case suffixes on sluiced wh-phrases are not F-marked

(74) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dheksoro piyo. the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.NOM INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.

(75) CP
   KP
   …
   K
   Dp
   s
   piyo

\(\rightarrow\) there is no accommodation-seeking material; as a result, a copular source for sluicing is not licensed and neither is the nominative on the sluiced wh-phrase

problem: this same line of reasoning predicts there to be no accommodation in non-case-marking languages like Spanish, quod non:

(76) Juan ha hablado con una chica
Juan has talked with a girl
pero no sé cuál qui
but not know which is it
\‘Juan talked to a girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.’

\(\rightarrow\) there is no accommodation-seeking material; as a result, a copular source for sluicing should not be licensed, contrary to fact

conclusion: Fox’s (1999, 2000) restriction on accommodation in terms of accommodation-seeking material does not suffice to account for the sluicing data discussed above (and cf. Sauerland 2004, Hardt 2005 for additional problems with this restriction)

central idea: accommodation is only allowed when the actual antecedent violates some principle

Hardt (2005): accommodation is possible in ellipsis if and only if there is a semantically visible violation

example: agreement mismatches (cf. Webber 1978)

accommodation can be used to avoid agreement mismatches in the ellipsis site…

(79) Irv and Martha wanted to dance together, but Martha couldn’t, because her husband was there.
   a. * Martha couldn’t dance together.
   b. Martha couldn’t dance with Irv.

…but it is disallowed when there is no risk of such a mismatch

(80) Irv and Mary wanted to dance together, but Tom and Susan didn’t want to.
   a. Tom and Susan didn’t want to dance together.
   b. * Tom and Susan didn’t want to dance with Irv.

question: what are ‘semantically visible violations’?

Hardt (2006): they include violations of parallelism (quantifier scope) and agreement mismatches, but not case mismatches

(81) * John traf jemanden, aber ich weiss nicht wer metJohn.
    John met someone, but I don’t know who met John.

→ to meet someone is a symmetric predicate (John met someone is semantically equivalent to someone met John), so if accommodation were allowed here, the nominative on the sluiced wh-phrase should be licensed

however: a case mismatch like the one in (82) is not semantically visible, and as a result, accommodation is not allowed in (81) and the nominative is not licensed

(82) * Ich weiss nicht wer John traf.
    I don’t know who John met.

back to P-stranding under sluicing: the fact that accommodation is possible in the Spanish example in (83) indicates that P-stranding violations are semantically visible (which ties in with the fact that they cannot be repaired under sluicing)

(83) Juan ha hablado con una chica
    Juan has talked with a girl
    pero no sé cuál es it
    but not know which is it
    ‘Juan talked to a girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.’

problem: by that same token, accommodation should be allowed in the Greek example in (84): the P-stranding violation is semantically visible; as a result, accommodation is licensed and the copular source should yield a nominative

(84) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero pjos.
    I spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.

5.1.3 Conclusion

While existing constraints on accommodation might very well be necessary conditions on accommodation in ellipsis, they are not sufficient. In particular, they fail to make the correct empirical distinction between contexts where a copular source for sluicing is allowed and those where it isn’t.

5.2 A new constraint: the licensing potential of the antecedent clause

5.2.1 Introduction: Licensing Potential

sprouting: sluicing in which the sluiced wh-phrase has no overt correlate

Chung, Ladosaw & McCloskey (1995:249-250): “sprouting is not an unconstrained operation. Rather, it is limited by the requirement that the new material added to the copy of the antecedent IP respect the licensing potential of that IP, as regards both arguments and adjuncts, and in all its fine detail.” [my italics, jvc]

(85) John was eating, but I don’t know what.

(86) Licensing Potential (Barros 2009:13)

For a syntactic object A, its Licensing Potential is the set of categories B such that if A and [a member of, jvc] B merge, the resulting structure will meet the legibility conditions at the interfaces (the resulting structure is convergent).
5.2.2 The new proposal

The LP-constraint on accommodation in ellipsis

Accommodation of an ellipsis antecedent is only allowed if the ellipsis remnant is a member of the Licensing Potential of both the actual and the accommodated antecedent.

intuition behind the proposal: even when an ellipsis site is not isomorphic with its antecedent, there still has to be a formal (morphological) link with that antecedent

the constraint in (87) at work:

case #1: lack of isomorphism

(87) Juan ha hablado con una chica
Juan has talked with a girl
but not know which it 'Juan talked to a girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.'

→ cuál 'which' is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the postcopular constituent in a specificational copular clause) and of the actual antecedent (it can be the object of the preposition an 'to') → the LP-constraint is respected and accommodation is allowed

case #2: lack of lack of isomorphism

(88) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero pjon.
the Anna spoke with someone but not know who
INTENDED: 'Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.'

→ pjon 'whoACC' is a member of the LP of the actual antecedent (it can be the object of the preposition me 'with'), but not of the accommodated antecedent (it cannot be the postcopular constituent in a specificational copular clause) → the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

(89) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero pjon.
the Anna spoke with someone but not know who
INTENDED: 'Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.'

→ pjon 'whoACC' is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the postcopular constituent in a specificational copular clause), but not of the actual antecedent (it cannot be the object of the preposition me 'with') → the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

case #3: lack of lack of lack of isomorphism

(90) * Joe was mugged, but we don’t know who mugged Joe.

→ who is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the by-phrase in a passive sentence), but not of the actual antecedent (it is not licensed in an active sentence) → the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

(91) Rudolf hat mich an etwas erinnert, aber ich weiß nicht mehr
R. has me to something reminded but I know not anymore
was.

→ ‘Rudolf has reminded me of something, but I don’t recall what.’

→ was 'what' is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the postcopular constituent in a specificational copular clause) and of the actual antecedent (it can be the object of the preposition an 'to') → the LP-constraint is respected and accommodation is allowed

note: the notion “ellipsis remnant” refers to the element typically licensing the ellipsis operation (e.g. the wh-phrase in sluicing, Tº in VP-ellipsis; cf. Aelbrecht in prep for recent discussion of ellipsis licensing).

summing up: the constraint in (87) makes the correct empirical split for the sluicing data reviewed above

moreover: it provides a straightforward account for a number of other cases of lack of isomorphism under sluicing (cf. also Barros 2009):

no active/passive mismatches under sluicing (Merchant 2007)

(92) * Someone mugged Joe, but we don’t know by who Joe was mugged.

→ by who is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the by-phrase in a passive sentence), but not of the actual antecedent (it is not licensed in an active sentence) → the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

(93) * Joe was mugged, but we don’t know who mugged Joe.

→ who is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the subject of the active sentence), but not of the actual antecedent → the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

no stranded prepositions inside an ellipsis site (Chung 2005)

(94) * She’s jealous, but she won’t say who she is jealous of.

→ who is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the object of the preposition of), but not of the actual antecedent → the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed
6. Support for the analysis (I): pragmatically controlled sluicing

**prediction:** if there is no actual antecedent for a particular elliptical construction, half of the LP-constraint is trivially satisfied and only the LP-requirements of the accommodated antecedent should be reflected in the ellipsis remnant.

6.1 Introduction: pragmatic control

**Merchant (2004):** when used without an explicit linguistic antecedent (i.e. in DL\text{eng}-contexts = Hankamer & Sag’s 1976 pragmatic control), fragments are derived from copular structures.

(95) [Abby and Ben are at a party. Abby sees an unfamiliar man with Beth, a mutual friend of theirs, and turns to Ben with a puzzled look on her face. Ben says:]

Some guy she met at the park.

(96) [Abby and Ben are arguing about the origin of products in a new store on their block, with Ben maintaining that the store carries only German products. To settle their debate they walk into the store together. Ben picks up a lamp at random, upends it, with Ben maintaining that the store carries only German products. To settle their debate they walk into the store together. Ben picks up a lamp at random, upends it,]

From Germany! See, I told you.

(95)’ [some guy she met at the park]

(96)’ [from Germany].

(97) “The contexts are rich enough to make a certain entity salient (a guy and a lamp, respectively), and to make a certain question manifest, namely the question as to the identity or the country of origin of the entity. (…) this is enough to license anaphoric devices like he and this. Further we can be sure that these contexts also make the existence predicate manifest. (…) In short, I’m proposing a kind of ‘limited ellipsis’ analysis, one in which a demonstrative (such as this/that or a pronoun in a demonstrative use) or expletive subject and the copula are elided – given the appropriate discourse context, which will be almost any context where the speaker can make a deictic gesture, and where the existence predicate can be taken for granted (and it’s hard to imagine a context where this wouldn’t be the case)” (Merchant 2004:724-725).

**rephrasing:** in a DL\text{eng}-context only a copular clause can be accommodated as ellipsis antecedent

**supporting evidence (I): case matching**

**DL\text{eng}-fragments occur in nominative case**

(98) [context: same as in (95)]

Kapjon / *Kapjon pu gnorisi sto parko.

someone.NOM / someone.ACC that she.met in.the park

this is the case that we find in copular clauses

(99) Aflos ine {kapjon / *kapjon} pu gnorisi sto parko.

he is someone.NOM / someone.ACC that she.met in the park

**new supporting evidence (II): tag questions**

**DL\text{eng}-fragments can be combined with tag questions consisting of it and a copula**

(100) [Upon meeting someone in the park:]

Nice weather, isn’t it?

(101) [While shaking the hand of a business associate one is meeting in person for the first time:]

How do you do? John Smith, is it?

these tag questions show that there is a clauseal source underlying these fragments and that the source is copular

(100)” ‘Nice weather, isn’t it?’

(101)” ‘John Smith, is it?’

6.2 Pragmatically controlled sluicing

**note:** given that there is no actual (i.e. linguistic) antecedent in this case, the sluicing remnant should only be sensitive to the LP of the accommodated antecedent; given that this accommodated antecedent is copular, the wh-phrase should show up in the nominative:

**DL\text{eng}-sluicing in Greek triggers nominative…**

(102) [A contestant of a game show has to choose which one of her two closest friends she wants to take on a luxury cruise. She is explained this choice at the very beginning of the game show, after which the whole show takes place and deals with completely unrelated topics. No mention whatsoever is made of the required choice. After an hour and a half, at the very end of the show, the game show host walks up to the contestant holding a picture of friend A in his left hand and a picture of friend B in his right hand; he says:]

Pj0s? / * Pj0n

who.NOM / who.ACC

…just like the copular version…

(103) Pj0s / * Pj0n tha ine?

who.NOM / who.ACC FUT be.3SG

‘Who will it be?’
...but unlike the implied full wh-question.

(104) *Pjân / *Pjos tha dialeksis?
who.ACC / who.NOM FUT choose.2SG

*Who will you choose?

6.3 Conclusion

The LP-constraint predicts that the (morphological) nominative of a copular source for sluicing should emerge when there is no actual antecedent. This prediction is borne out in the case of pragmatically controlled sluicing.

7. Support for the analysis (II): spading and morphological case

this section in a nutshell: the LP-constraint on accommodation can account for intricate morphological case patterns in a dialect Dutch variant of sluicing

7.1 Introduction: spading

spading: Sluicing Plus Demonstrative In Non-insular Germanic (Van Craenenbroeck 2004/to appear)

(105) A: Jef ei gisteren iemand gezien. B: Wou da?
Jeff has yesterday someone seen who that

'A: Jeff saw someone yesterday. B: Who?' (Vanbeek Dutch)

Van Craenenbroeck 2004/to appear: - spading derives from an underlying cleft - spading involves IP-ellipsis/sluicing (i.e. it is not a case of pseudosluicing)

7.2 Spading derives from an underlying cleft

claim: the spading example in (106)a derives not from the full wh-question in (106)b, but rather from the cleft in (106)c

I have someone seen who that

'A: I saw someone. B: Who?' b. Wou ei je gezien?
who have you seen

'Who did you see?'

c. Wou is da da ge gezien etj?
who is that that you seen have

'Who is it that you saw?' (Wambeek Dutch)

7.2.1 Modification of the wh-phrase by negation and affirmation

sluiced wh-phrases can be modified by negative or affirmative particles

(107) A: Lewie ei me bekant iederei geklapt. B: Me wou nie?
Louis has with almost everyone spoken with who not

'A: Louis has spoken with almost everyone. B: With whom didn't he speak?'

(108) A: Lewie ei me bekant niemand geklapt. B: Me wou wel?
Louis has with almost nobody spoken with who AFF

'A: Louis has spoken with almost no-one. B: With whom DID he speak?'

such modification is not allowed in clefts

(109) Me wou <*nie> was da <*nie> da Lewie geklapt ou?
with who not was that not that Louis spoken had

(110) Me wou <*wel> was da <*wel> da Lewie geklapt ou?
with who AFF was that AFF that Louis spoken had

spading patterns with clefts, not with regular sluicing

(111) A: Lewie ei me bekant iederei geklapt.
Louis has with almost everyone spoken

B: * Me wou <nie> da <nie>?
with who not that not

(112) A: Lewie ei me bekant niemand geklapt.
Louis has with almost nobody spoken

B: * Me wou <wel> da <wel>?
with who AFF that AFF

7.2.2 Multiple wh

(dialect) Dutch allows for (a limited type of) multiple sluicing

(113) Iederei stond me iemand te klappen, mo kweet nie wou me wou.
everyone stood with someone to talk but I know not who with who

'Everyone was talking to someone, but I don't know who to whom.'
7.2.3 Pragmatic control

sluicing can be pragmatically controlled

(116) [A contestant of a game show has to choose which one of her two closest friends she wants to take on a luxury cruise. She is explained this choice at the very beginning of the game show, after which the whole show takes place and deals with completely unrelated topics. No mention whatsoever is made of the required choice. After an hour and a half, at the very end of the show, the game show host walks up to the contestant holding a picture of friend A in his left hand and a picture of friend B in his right hand; he says]

A: Wou?
B: * Nieje? Wou <nog> was da <nog> da Jef gezien ou?
   no who else that else that Jeff seen had

else-modification is allowed in sluicing

(119) A: Jef ei nie alieijn Lewie gezien. B: Nieje? Wou nog?
   Jeff has not just Louis seen no who else

'A: Jeff hasn't just seen Louis. B: No? Who else (has he seen)?'

else-modification is not allowed in clefts

(120) * Wou <nog> was da <nog> da Jef gezien ou?
   who else was that else that Jeff seen had

spading patterns with clefts, not with regular sluicing

(121) * Wou <nog> was da <nog> da Jef gezien ou?
   who else was that else that Jeff seen had

7.2.5 Exhaustivity

sluiced wh-phrases are not necessarily exhaustive

(122) A: 'k Em e puir van a kammeruite gezien.
   I have a couple of your friends seen

B: Wou onder andere?
   who among others

'A: I saw a couple of your friends. B: Who among others?'
7.2.6 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLUICING</th>
<th>SPADING</th>
<th>CLEFTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>modification by NEG and AFF</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple wh</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-overt antecedent</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modification by neg 'else'</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhaustivity requirement</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion:** there is ample empirical evidence supporting the claim that spading derives from an underlying cleft.

7.3 Spading does not involve pseudosluicing

(125) pseudosluicing = _def_ An elliptical construction that resembles a sluice in having only a wh-XP as remnant, but has the structure of a cleft, not of a regular embedded question (Merchant 1998:91). The fact that the cleft is unpronounced is due to the combined effect of pro-drop and copula drop.

(126) Dareka-ga sono hon-o yonda ga, watashi-wa dare ka wakaranai. someone ACC that book ACC read but I TOP who Q know.not 'Someone read that book, but I don’t know who.' (Japanese)

(127) [cP [IP [pro dare it] be:pres:Q ] ka ] (Kizu 1997) '…who it is.'

→ the fact that the cleft in (127) is reduced to its pivot is due to (a) pro-drop of the expletive subject of the cleft, and (b) copula drop

**Pseudosluicing ≠ sluicing a cleft**

(128) sluicing = _def_ A case of clausal ellipsis that leaves a wh-phrase as remnant (though see Van Craenenbroeck & Lipták 2006, 2009 for a modification).

(129) sluicing a cleft = _def_ An instance of sluicing applied to an underlying cleft.

**Back to spading:** dialect Dutch is neither pro-drop nor copula drop → the non-ellipsis of the verb in spading cannot be due to copula drop → instead, spading involves TP-ellipsis, just like regular sluicing → spading is involves sluicing of a cleft

**Supporting evidence:** declarative pseudosluicing

Japanese pseudosluicing is not restricted to interrogative contexts

(130) a. John-ga dareka-o kuhinisita rassii kedo, John COM someone ACC fired seem but boku-wa Bill ka dooka siranai. I TOP Bill whether know not 'It seems that John fired someone, but I don’t know whether it was Bill.'

b. John-ga dareka-o kuhinisita rassii kedo, John COM someone ACC fired seem but boku-wa Bill to omou. I TOP Bill that think 'It seems that John fired someone, and I think that it was Bill.' (Japanese)

but spading is

(131) a. * Jef iemand ontsluiigen, mo ik weet nie of Lewie da. Jeff has someone fired but I know not if Louis that

b. * Jef iemand ontsluiigen en ik paaus da Lewie da. Jeff has someone fired and I think that Louis that

7.4 Interim summary

Spading is a case of sluicing that necessarily contains an underlying cleft. Given that the antecedent of a spading example does not need to contain a cleft, they involve accommodation. As a result, the LP-constraint in (87) should be applicable here as well.
7.5  Spading and morphological case

7.5.1  Introduction: morphological case in Waubach Dutch (Hinskens 1992, F. Hinskens p.c.)

subject wh-questions: only nominative
(132) { Wea / * Wem } kemp noa ’t fees?
whoNOM / whoACC comes to the party
‘Who is coming to the party?’

object wh-questions: accusative and — more markedly — nominative
(133) { ?Wea / Wem } has-te gezieë?
whoNOM / whoACC have you seen
‘Who did you see?’

subject clefts: only nominative
(134) { Wea / * Wem } is dat dea noa ’t fees kemp?
whoNOM / whoACC is that REL to the party comes
‘Who is it that is coming to the party?’

object clefts: only nominative
(135) { Wea / * Wem } is dat dea-s-te gezieë has?
whoNOM / whoACC is that REL-CA you seen have
‘Who is it that you saw?’

7.5.2  Morphological case and ellipsis in Waubach Dutch (F. Hinskens p.c.)

prediction: given that spading involves accommodation, the morphological case of a spaded wh-phrase should be subject to the LP-constraint in (87)

subject spading: only nominative
(136) A: ’t Kumt murrege inne noa ’t fees.
it comes tomorrow someone to the party
B: { Wea / * Wem } dat?
whoNOM / whoACC that
‘A: Someone is coming to the party tomorrow. B: Who?’

→ both the actual and the accommodated antecedent only yield nominative → the only case allowed in spading is nominative

object spading: only — and markedly — nominative
(137) A: Ich han inne gezieë.
I have someone seen
B: { ?Wea / * Wem } dat?
whoNOM / whoACC that

→ the accommodated antecedent only yields nominative, the actual antecedent yields accusative and — more markedly — nominative → the only form for the spaded wh-phrase that satisfies the LP-constraint in (87) is — markedly — nominative

note: regular sluicing tracks the case patterns found in non-elliptical wh-questions (i.e. (132)-(133));

subject sluicing: only nominative
(138) A: ’t Kumt murrege inne noa ’t fees.
it comes tomorrow someone to the party
B: { Wea / * Wem }?
whoNOM / whoACC
‘A: Someone is coming to the party tomorrow. B: Who?’

object sluicing: accusative and — more markedly — nominative
(139) A: Ich han inne gezieë.
I have someone seen
B: { ?Wea / Wem }?
whoNOM / whoACC

7.5.3  Conclusion

The LP-constraint in (87) accounts for the distribution of morphological case on spaded wh-phrases in Waubach Dutch.
8. Summary and conclusions

- copular clauses can be used to circumvent preposition stranding violations under sluicing.
- this repair fails when it involves changing the morphological case ending of the sluiced wh-phrase.
- this failure to repair can be overcome by using surface forms of the wh-phrase that are compatible both with a copular source and with an isomorphic one (case-matching copular clauses or syncrasis).
- these facts show that accommodation of an ellipsis antecedent is allowed.
- this accommodation is subject to a restriction on the ellipsis remnant, which has to be in the licensing potential of both the actual and the accommodated antecedent.
- this implies that the recoverability requirements of ellipsis cannot be entirely reduced to those on deaccenting.
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