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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) redundancy relation 1

redundancy relation 2

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 α

F(α) is the set of denotations produced by replacing all F(ocus)-marked constituents in α by variables of the appropriate type

(5) the FBC applied to (1)/(2):

a. \( F([P_0]) = \) the set of denotations of the form \( \text{x should bring x's maracas} \) (Luigi is F-marked)

b. \([P_1]\) is a member of this set
c. as a result, the FBC is satisfied
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 implicational bridging/accommodation/inference (cf. the phrase or contextually implies in (3))

* First John told $\{\text{VP}_1 \text{ bad-mouthing her}_1\}$ and $\{\text{VP}_2 \text{ bad-mouthing her}_2\}$

(6) the FBC applied to (6):

- F(IP$_1$) = the set of denotations of the form $x$ heard that I was bad-mouthing $x$ (Sue is F-marked)
- $\{\text{IP}_1\}$ is not a member of this set
- however, given that from $A$ tells $B$ about $C$, we can infer $B$ hears about $C$, there is an accommodated antecedent $\text{IP}_{A\text{c}}$ of the form Mary$_1$ heard that I was bad-mouthing her$_1$
- $\{\text{IP}_{A\text{c}}\}$ is a member of F(IP$_1$)
- as a result, the FBC is satisfied

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).

syntactic reconstruction applied to (1)/(2):

a. $\{\text{VP}_1 \text{ bring his}_2 \text{ maracas}\}$ is structurally isomorphic to $\{\text{VP}_3 \text{ bring his}_1 \text{ maracas}\}$ (modulo indices)
- 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

* First John $\{\text{VP}_1 \text{ told } \text{MARY}_1 \text{ I was bad-mouthing her}_1\}$ and $\{\text{VP}_2 \text{ hear I was bad-mouthing her}_2\}$

syntactic reconstruction applied to (10):

a. $\{\text{VP}_3 \text{ hear I was bad-mouthing her}_2\}$ is not structurally isomorphic to $\{\text{VP}_1 \text{ told } \text{MARY}_1 \text{ I was bad-mouthing her}_1\}$
- 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

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

Greek: no P-stranding

- I Anna milise $\text{me kapjon}$, alla dhe ksero *(me) pjon, the Anna spoke with someone but not I know with who
  ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know with who.’
- * Pjon milise $\text{me}$?
  who she.spoke
  INTENDED: ‘Who did she speak with?’
  (Greek, Merchant 2001:94)

2.2 Apparent exceptions to the PSG: copular clauses to the rescue

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

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

P-stranding under sluicing

- 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.’
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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 pero no sé cuál
Juan has talked with a girl but not know which
‘Juan talked to a girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.’

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

3.1.1 Introduction: no copular rescue in Greek


testing the prediction: P-stranding under sluicing in Greek

P-stranding under sluicing with an accusative wh-phrase

(26) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero pjon.
the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who
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 kapjon, alla dhe ksero pjos.
the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who
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)
3.2.2 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. Šimůk 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-nomitive 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) * Kom je govorila Anna s? who.INSTR AUX spoke Anna with

INTENDED: ‘Who did Anna speak with?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nomitive 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 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 kin kapott híreket keresztül? János who.SUBL got news across

INTENDED: ‘Via who did János get some news?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nomitive wh-phrase

(38) * János híreket kapott valakin keresztül, János news got someone.SUBL across de nem tudom kin.

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 híreket kapott 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.’
non-elliptical cleft alternative

(40) János hireket kapott valakine keresztül, 
János news got someone.SUBJ across 

de nem tudom ki voltak, akin keresztül hireket kapott. 
but not. I know who.NOM was that.REL across news got 

‘János got some news via someone, but I don’t know who it was via whom he got some news.’

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 dukāna John gayaa mein? 
which shop John go to 

INTENDED: ‘Which shop did John go into?’

no P-stranding under sluicing with a non-nominative wh-phrase

(42) * Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii, 
Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST 

lekin mujhe pataa nahiī kis. 
but LDAT 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 nahiī kaun. 
but LDAT 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 nahiī pataa ki vo kaun thaa. 
but LDAT 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 ellipses 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?’

(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 which 

którym to z mężczyzną (co) tańczyła? 

which it with man (who) 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.’
nominative and accusative are syncretic for the plural wh-phrase welche ‘which’ in German

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

(56) Auf welche Freunde wartest du?
   Which friends are you waiting for?
   ‘Which friends do you wait 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 on some friends but I don’t know which.
   ‘Rudolf is waiting for some friends but I don’t know which.’

(58) Rudolf ist statt einiger Freunde augetreten, aber ich weiß nicht
   Rudolf has performed instead of some friends, but I don’t know which.
   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 hät mit em Hans gred?
   ‘Who’ or ‘Who was talking to Hans?’
   whoNom has with the Hans spoken
   ‘Who was speaking to Hans?’

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

(61) Mit wem hät de Hans gred?
   ‘Who was Hans speaking to?’
   with whoDat has the Hans talked
   ‘Who is talking to Hans?’

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

(62) De Hans hät für öppert kocht, aber ich wiss nöd ?(für) wëër
   ‘Hans cooked for someone, but I don’t know who.’
   the Hans has for someone cooked, but I don’t know for whoNom/ACC
(63) De Hans hätt mit öppern gredt, aber ich wäiss nöd *(mit) wern.
the Hans has with someone talked, but I know not with whoDAT
‘Hans talked to 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>unto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>kto</td>
<td>čto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</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.vo čto-to, no ja ne znaju ??(vo) čto.
he shot at something_ACC but I not know at what_nom/acc
‘He shot at something, but I don’t know what.’

(66) On vystrelil v kogo-to, no ja ne znaju ?*(v) kogo.
he shot at someone_ACC but I not know at who_acc
‘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 ti ‘what’ in Greek.

(67) Ti egine?
what_nom happened
‘What happened?’

(68) Se ti anakatefikes?
in what_3sg mixed.up.2sg
‘What did you get mixed up in?’

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

(69) O Giannis anakatefikse se kati, ala dhen ksero ?(se) ti.
the Giannis mixed.up.3sg in something but not I know in 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 & Zweicky 1986:759, Ingría 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. Fingerprint proved that I’m innocent.

these two readings are not interchangeable under ellipsis…

(72) a. * John proved that I’m innocent. [Fingerprint] or did, too.
    b. * Fingerprint proved that I’m innocent. [John] or 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. Fingerprint that [Bill] presented did, too.
    b. * Fingerprint that Bill presented proved that I’m innocent. [John] 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 dhe ksero pjos. the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.

INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

(75) CP
    KP …
    K DPs fjo

problem: under this hypothesis, the case ending on fjo ‘who,NOM’ would count as accommodation-seeking material by (70) (it is pronounced, non-F-marked and absent in A) and should license a copular source for sluicing, contrary to fact

option #2: case suffixes on sluiced wh-phrases are F-marked

(76) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe ksero pjos.
    the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who.

INTENDED: ‘Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.’

(77) CP
    KP …
    K DPs fjo

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:

(78) Juan ha hablado con una chica
    Juan has talked with a girl
    pero no sé cuál es pro.
    but not know which it

‘Juan talked to a girl, but I don’t know which girl it was.’

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 someonenoc, but I know not whonoc metJohn.

   INTENDED: ‘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 know not whonoc metJohn.

   INTENDED: ‘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

   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.

   the Anna spoke with someone but not whonoc.

   INTENDED: ‘Anna 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

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

Chung, Ladusaw & 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, jve]

(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, jve] 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) case #2: lack of lack of isomorphism

the constraint is respected and accommodation is allowed

case #2: lack of lack of isomorphism

(88) Juan ha hablado con una chica
Juan has talked with a girl
poco sé cuál
but not know which is it
Juan talked to a girl, but I don't know which girl it was.

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

(90) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhexerio pios.
the Anna spoke with someone but not I know who
INTENDED: Anna spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.

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

(92) * 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) ḕ 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 ḕ the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

(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 whom), but not of the actual antecedent ḕ the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

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

no active/passive mismatches under sluicing (Merchant 2007)

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

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

no sprouted stranded prepositions inside an ellipsis site (Chung 2005)

(96) * who is a member of the LP of the accommodated antecedent (it can be the object of the preposition to), but not of the actual antecedent ḕ the LP-constraint is violated and accommodation is disallowed

no active/passive mismatches under sluicing (Merchant 2007)

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

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)
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 DI-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, and 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 DI-context only a copular clause can be accommodated as ellipsis antecedent

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

**DI-contexts** occur in nominative case

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

Kapjōs / * 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) Aftos  ine * [kapjōs / * kapjon]  pu gnorisi  sto parko.

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

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

**DI-contexts** 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 deontal source underlying these fragments and that the source is copular**

(100)’  it is nice weather, isn’t it?

(101)’  it is 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:

**DI-context-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:]

Pjōn? / * Pjon

who,NOM / who,ACC

...just like the copular version...

(103) Pjōn / * Pjon  tha  ine?

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

’Who will it be?”
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...but unlike the implied full wh-question.
(104) Pjon / * Pjons thha dialektis?
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 A 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?' (Wambeek 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 eije gezien?
who have.you seen
'Who did you see?'
c. Wou is da da ge gezien etij?
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 iederiejn geklappt. 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 geklappt. 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 geklappt ou?
with who not was that not that Louis spoken had
(110) Me wou <*wel> was da <*wel> da Lewie geklappt 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 iederiejn geklappt.
Louis has with almost everyone spoken
B: * Me wou <*nie> da <*nie>?
with who not that not
(112) A: Lewie ei me bekant niemand geklappt.
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) Iederiejn 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.'
(non-echo) multiple wh is disallowed in clefts
(114) * Wou was da da me wou stond te klappen?
   who was that that with who stood to talk

spading patterns with clefts, not with regular sluicing
(115) Iederiejn stond me iemand te klappen,
   everyone stood with someone to talk
   mo kweet nie wou (*da) me wou (*da).
   but I know not who that with who that
   ‘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]
   Wou?
   ‘Who?’
   ... ...
   B: * Nieje? Wou <nog> da <nog>?
   no who else that else
   ‘A: I saw a couple of your friends. B: Who among others?’

7.2.4 else-modification

else-modification is allowed in sluicing
(119) A: Jef eie nie alleijn 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 cleft
(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) A: Jef eie nie alleijn Lewie gezien.
    Jeff has not just Louis seen
    B: * Nieje? Wou <nog> da <nog>?
    no who else that else

7.2.5 Exhaustivity

sluiced wh-phrases are not necessarily exhaustive
(122) A: ‘k Em e puij 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?’

the pivot of a cleft is necessarily exhaustive
(123) * Wou <onder andere> is dat ge gezien etj?
    who among others that you seen have

a spaded wh-phrases is necessarily exhaustive
(124) A: ‘k Em e puij van a kammeruite gezien.
    I have a couple of your friends seen
    B: * Wou <onder andere> da <onder andere>?
    who among others that 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 waranai.

someone,ACC that book,ACC read but I think,who know,not

'Someone read that book, but I don’t know who.'

(127) [CP [TP [PRO dare de ] ka ]] (Kizu 1997)

'de who bePRES Q

'those 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-pronunciation 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 kubinisita rasii kedo, boku-wa Bill ka dooka siranai. I know,not Bill whether know,not

'It seems that John fired someone, but I don’t know whether it was Bill.'

b. John-ga dareka-o kubinisita kedo, boku-wa Bill to omou.

'I think that it was Bill.'

but spading is

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

b. * Jef iemand ontsluiten en ik paus 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) {Wem / 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) {Wem} has-see
defa 't fees?
whoOnom / whoOacc have you seen
'Who did you see?'

subject clefts: only nominative
(134) {Wem} is dat dea noa 't fees
defa
whoOnom / whoOacc is that REL to the party comes
'Who is it that is coming to the party?'

object clefts: only nominative
(135) {Wem} is dat dea-CA you see
defa
whoOnom / whoOacc 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 Kunm murrege inne noa 't fees.
 it comes tomorrow someone to the party
B: {Wem} dat?
whoOnom / whoOacc 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

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 syncretism)
- 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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