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MAIN TOPIC
The use of non-isomorphic ellipsis sites as a repair strategy in sluicing

CENTRAL DATA
The interaction between repair and morphological case marking

MAIN GIST OF THE ANALYSIS
Isomorphism between antecedent and ellipsis site is determined both globally (semantic parallelism) and locally, i.e. for every individual feature bundle

OUTLINE OF THE TALK
1. Some background: sluicing and isomorphism
   (1) John saw someone, but I don’t know who.

   question: assuming there is unpronounced syntactic structure in sluicing, how can we determine what exactly it looks like?

   option (i): the sluiced clause in (1) is derived from a regular, full wh-question (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001):
   (2) John saw someone, but I don’t know who \textit{John saw}.

   option (ii): the sluiced clause in (1) is derived from an underlying copular clause (Erteschik-Shir 1977, Pollman 1975):
   (3) John saw someone, but I don’t know who \textit{it was}.

   more generally: the question raised here is to what extent or in what way an ellipsis site has to be isomorphic or parallel to its antecedent:

   Fiengo & May (1994): structural, syntactic parallelism is required
   → only option (i) is allowed

   Merchant (2001): semantic parallelism (mutual entailment) is required
   → both option (i) and option (ii) are allowed

in this talk I argue:
- that both (2) and (3) are in principle viable analyses of the example in (1);
- that the isomorphism requirement on sluicing is partly semantic, partly morphosyntactic

2. Repair: copular clauses and preposition stranding

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

(4) 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
(5) Peter was talking with someone, but I don’t know (with) who.
(6) Who was Peter talking with?
2.2 Apparent exceptions to the PSG: copular clauses to the rescue

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

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions

(9) *¿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

(10) *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:

(11) *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

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

2.3 Conclusion

Copular clauses can be used in sluicing to repair preposition stranding violations. More generally, a non-isomorphic ellipsis site repairs a violation that would have been incurred in the corresponding isomorphic ellipsis site.

**note:** these observations don’t just hold for Spanish, but also French, Italian (Vicente 2008), Dutch, and possibly English (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, Fortin 2007) and Brazilian Portuguese (Nevins, Rodriguez & Vicente 2007, pace Almeida & Yoshida 2007)

3. Failure to repair: 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

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

**Greek: no P-stranding**

(7) * I Anna milise 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.’

(8) *Pjon milise me?
who she.spoke with
INTENDED: ‘Who did she speak with?’ (Greek, Merchant 2001:94)

no P-stranding under sluicing with else-modification

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

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

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

**note:** these observations don’t just hold for Spanish, but also French, Italian (Vicente 2008), Dutch, and possibly English (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, Fortin 2007) and Brazilian Portuguese (Nevins, Rodriguez & Vicente 2007, pace Almeida & Yoshida 2007)
nominative case for the pivot of a copular clause

(16) Dhen `ksoro pjos itan. 
not `know who.NOM it.was
'I don’t know who it was.'

no P-stranding in a regular wh-question

(17) * 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

(18) * I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe `ksoro 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

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

note: the ill-formedness of (18) is expected given (17), but the ill-formedness of (19) is puzzling, esp. given the fact that (20) is perfectly well-formed, i.e. Greek has a perfectly acceptable copular clause alternative for the P-stranding violation in (18), but doesn’t use it under sluicing.

(20) I Anna milise me kapjon, alla dhe `ksoro pjon 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. Šimik p.c.)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions

(21) * 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

(22) * 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

(23) * 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.'

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions

(25) * 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-nominative wh-phrase

(26) * Anna je govorila z nekom, ampak ne vem kom. 
Anna AUX 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

(27) * 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

(28) 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

(29) * 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-nominative wh-phrase

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

(31) * 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

(32) 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.'

3.2.4 Hindi (Merchant 2001:100; Dave e.a. 2002:29; R. Bhatt p.c.)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions

(33) * Kis dukaan John gayaa mein? which shop John go to
INTENDED: 'Which shop did John go into?'

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

(34) * Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii, Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST
lekin mujhe pataa nahiθi ki. but I.AT 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

(35) * Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii, Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST
lekin mujhe pataa nahiθi kaun. but I.AT knowledge NEG who.NOM
INTENDED: 'Gautam spoke with someone, but I don’t know who.'

non-elliptical copular clause alternative

(36) Gautamne kisi se baat kii thii, Gautam.ERG someone with talk do PAST
lekin mujhe nahiθi pataa ki vo kaun thaa. but I.AT NEG knowledge that he who.NOM was
'Gautam spoke with someone, but I don’t know who he was.'

3.3 Conclusion

Copular clauses cannot be used to repair preposition stranding violations in languages with morphological case marking on wh-phrases. Informally, it looks like repair is allowed as long as it is not visible in the surface representation (LF can know that there is non-isomorphism in the ellipsis site, but PF cannot).

4. Repairing the failure to repair: non-isomorphic 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, repair should re-emerge (PF is fooled into thinking isomorphism is respected)
4.1 PSG-violations in Polish (Szczegelniak 2005, 2008)

no P-stranding in regular wh-questions

(37) * Którym Anna tańczyła z mężczyzną? which Anna danced with man INTENDED: ‘Which man did Anna dance with?’

(38) * Którym mężczyzną Anna tańczyła z? which man Ana danced with INTENDED: ‘Which man did Anna dance with?’

P-stranding under sluicing

(39) 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:

(40) Anna tańczyła z jednym mężczyzną ale nie wiem którym
którym to z mężczyzną ona tańczyła?
which it with man she danced
‘Anna danced with a man, but I don’t know which (man it was with which she danced.’

supporting evidence: no cleft rescue with simple wh-phrase

no P-stranding under sluicing with simple wh-phrase

(41) * 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 pivot

(42) * 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 elliptical repair of preposition stranding violations

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

(43) Którym to z mężczyzną ona tańczyła? which.ACC it with man she danced ‘Which man was it with which she danced?’

→ this shows that elliptical repair 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 in Greek and German (A. Giannakidou p.c., T. Klein p.c.)

nominative and accusative are syncretic with the neuter wh-phrase tis ‘what’ in Greek

(44) Ti egne? whatNOM happened ‘What happened?’

(45) Se ti anakateftikes? in whatACC mixed.up.2SG ‘What did you get mixed up in?’

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

(46) O Giannis anakateftike se kati, ala dhen ksero (se) ti. the Giannis mixed.up.3s in something but not I know in what ‘Giannis got mixed up in something, but I don’t know what.’

nominative and accusative are syncretic with the neuter wh-phrase was ‘what’ in German

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

(48) 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

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

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

→ this shows that copular repair is allowed in languages with morphological case marking on wh-phrases when (the case on) the wh-phrase is simultaneously compatible with an isomorphic and a non-isomorphic source.

**important caveat:** judgments concerning (syntretism and) morphological case are notoriously subtle and subject to inter-speaker variation (cf. Pullum & Zwicky 1986:759, Ingria 1990:203). In particular, for syntretic complex wh-phrases the results are—at this point—less clear-cuts. The effect of D-linking/structural complexity on instances of (apparent) P-stranding under sluicing might be an interfering orthogonal factor here (cf. also Nevins, Rodriguez & Vicente 2007, Barros 2008, Van Craenenbroeck 2004:40-42 for related discussion).

4.3 Conclusion

Copular rescue 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 source.

5. The analysis: implementing isomorphism

**main idea:** the case facts show that the recoverability requirement on sluicing doesn’t just apply wholesale to the entire elided constituent, but that recoverability must also be assessed at a local, morphosyntactic level.

5.1 Chung (2005): sluicing cares about words

(50) a. * They sent the package—find out who they sent the package to.
    b. * Mary was flirting, but they wouldn’t say who Mary was flirting with.
    c. * We’re donating our car, but it’s unclear which organization we’re donating our car to.

→ in these examples ellipsis site and antecedent mutually entail one another → a purely semantic isomorphism requirement on sluicing does not suffice

on the other hand, copular rescue shows that a strictly syntactic isomorphism requirement fails to capture the facts as well.

Chung (2005): semantic licensing needs to be supplemented by an additional lexical requirement:

(51) [NO NEW WORDS: Every lexical item in the numeration of the sluice that ends up (only) in the elided IP must be identical to an item in the numeration of the antecedent CP.

5.2 Local isomorphism

**proposal:** Sluicing is recoverable iff

(i) the elided TP is in a mutual entailment relation with a salient antecedent TP (global isomorphism), and

(ii) every terminal node (i.e. every morphosyntactic feature bundle) in the elided TP has an appropriate antecedent in the antecedent TP (local isomorphism).

→ local isomorphism is the translation of Chung’s NO NEW WORDS into a Late Insertion model: it applies to morphosyntactic feature bundles, not to actual lexical items.

5.3 Some sample derivations

5.3.1 Baseline data: isomorphic ellipsis site

(52) [TPₐ, Rudolf hat jemand-en gesehen], aber ich weiß nicht R. has someone-ACC seen but I know not
    we-n [TPₑ, Rudolf we-n gesehenhat], who-ACC R. who-ACC seen has
evaluation

- global isomorphism: ok (TPₐ and TPₑ mutually entail one another)
- in order to evaluate local isomorphism, we need to determine the set of morphosyntactic feature bundles in TPₑ:

  - Rudolf \( \rightarrow \) N[+PN, +count, ...]
  - hat \( \rightarrow \) T[+pres]
  - gesehen \( \rightarrow \) V[+part]
  - -n \( \rightarrow \) K[+ACC]
  - we- \( \rightarrow \) D[+ø]
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5.3.2 Repair: copular rescue

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

evaluation
- global isomorphism: ok
  - \[ TP_A \] = \[ TP_E \] x, Anna spoke with x
  - \[ TP_A \] = \[ TP_E \] y, the person Anna spoke with is y
- local isomorphism:
  - \[ feature bundle in TP_E \] is anteceded by \[ lexical item in TP_A \]
    D[\[ pro\]] (pro)
    T[\[ pres\]] (iten)
  - \[ lexical item in TP_A \] is anteceded by \[ feature bundle in TP_E \]
    Katjas
    milie

however:
\[ \text{K}_{1[NOM]} \] (s) is not anteceded by \[ -n \]

→ given that local isomorphism is not satisfied, ellipsis is not recoverable and (54) is not well-formed

5.3.4 Repairing the failure to repair: case syncretism

(55) \[ TP_A \] O Giannis anakateftike se kati],
the Giannis mixed.up.3s in something-ACC but not I know
\[ TP_E \] ti itan
what-NOM what-NOM it.was
‘Giannis got mixed up in something, but I don’t know what.’

question: why doesn’t the nominative of it ‘what’ clash with the accusative of kati ‘something’?

answer: because syncretism is the result of Impoverishment (cf. Bohuljik 2002, Müller 2004, Calabrese 2008 and many others) and Impoverishment deletes the offending features prior to ellipsis (and hence prior to the calculation of local isomorphism)

step one: a feature decomposition of the case system (Müller 2004):

(56) \[ \text{OBLIQUE} \] \[ \text{GOVERNED} \]
    NOM
    ACC
    GEN
    DAT

→ the wh-phrase in (55) is marked [-oblique, -governed]

step two: Impoverishment yielding NOM/ACC-syncretism in neuter singular

(57) \[ +[governed, -oblique] \rightarrow [+oblique] / [-+neuter, +singular] \]

→ after Impoverishment, the wh-phrase is marked [-oblique]
evaluation
- global isomorphism: ok
  - \([TP_X] = \exists x. \text{Giannis got mixed up in } x\)
  - \([TP_Y] = \exists y. \text{the thing Giannis got mixed up in is } y\)
- local isomorphism: Giannis got mixed up in \(x\)

\(\vdash\) given that both global and local isomorphism are satisfied, ellipsis is recoverable and (55) is well-formed

5.4 Conclusion

Semantic isomorphism needs to be supplemented by a local isomorphism condition that operates on each individual terminal node, i.e. each morphosyntactic feature bundle. Satisfaction of this requirement is checked after Impoverishment and prior to vocabulary insertion.

Note: one way to make this ordering fall out naturally would be to make ellipsis a subspecies of vocabulary insertion (i.e. failure to insert a vocabulary item, subject to the condition of local isomorphism)

6. The broader picture: good news and bad news

In a nutshell: 
- local isomorphism effects show up in other types of ellipsis as well (good news)
- ellipsis site and antecedent sometimes differ from one another in ways not expected under local isomorphism (bad news)

6.1 The good news

Prediction: local isomorphism should also restrict the form of elements moving out of ellipsis sites in constructions other than sluicing

6.1.1 Hungarian NP-ellipsis

Hungarian has both nominative and dative possessors

(58) a János könnye
the János.NOM book.Poss
‘János’s book’

(59) Jánosnak a könnye
János.DAT the book.Poss
‘János’s book’

Standard analysis: the dative possessor moves to specDP (Szabó 1994, É. Kiss 2002)

prediction: in NP-ellipsis licensed by D° (i.e. PossP-ellipsis), the morphological case marking on the raised possessor should be subject to local isomorphism

Prediction is borne out: only dative-marked possessors can antecede dative-marked possessors in NP-ellipsis

(60) a Jánosnak a háza szébb, mint Marinak.
János.DAT the house more.beautiful than Marinak.
‘János’s house is more beautiful than Mary’s.’

b. * János háza szebb, mint Marinak
János.NOM house more.beautiful than Marinak
INTENDED: ‘János’s house is more beautiful than Mary’s.’

evaluation of (61a (=62))

(62) a Jánosnak a [PossP Jánosnak háza] szebb,
J-DAT the [PossP János.DAT house] more.beautiful
mint Marinak a [PossP Marinak háza],
than M-DAT the M-DAT house
‘János’s house is more beautiful than Mary’s.’


Note: F-closure ensures that focus-marked material in antecedent and ellipsis site are replaced by existentially bound variables of an appropriate type, cf. Merchant 2001 for details

- local isomorphism: is anteceded by

\[
\begin{align*}
N_{\text{[PN]} } (\text{Marinak}) & \rightarrow \text{János} \\
N_{\text{[count, \ldots]} } (\text{háza}) & \rightarrow \text{háza} \\
K_{\text{[DAT]}} (\text{nap}) & \rightarrow \text{nap}
\end{align*}
\]
evaluation of (61)b (= (63)):

(63) [PossP \_a híza] szebb, János-NOM house more.beautiful than Marinak a [PossP \_a híza].
János's house is more beautiful than Mary's.

- global isomorphism: ok (NP, mutually entails NPs, modulo \(\exists\)-type shifting and F-closure, cf. Merchant 2001)
- local isomorphism: is anteceded by 

\[ N_{VP} (Marinak híza) \]
\[ N_{e Remain...} (híza) \]

however: \(K_{VP} \_a\) is not anteceded by \(\_O\)

control: the examples in (61) are well-formed when they are non-elliptical

(64) a. János a híza szebb, mint Marinak a híza.
János's house is more beautiful than Mary's house.

b. János híza szebb, mint Marinak a híza.
János's house is more beautiful than Mary's house.

→ the case-matching effects on possessors that move out of an NP-ellipsis site can be accounted for by local isomorphism

6.1.1 **V-stranding VP-ellipsis** (Goldberg 2005, Gribanova 2009)

\(V\)-stranding VP-ellipsis is VP-ellipsis in which the main verb has raised out of the ellipsis site

(65) Q: (Ha'im) Miryam hevi'a et Dvora la-xanut?
Q: Miryam bring.PAST.3SG ACCDvora to.the-store
'(Did) Miryam bring Dvora to the store?'
A: Ken, hi hevi'a.
yes she bring.PAST.3SG
INTENDED: 'Yes, she brought [Dvora to the store].'

(66) hi hevi'a \[ VP et Dvora la-xanut \]

prediction: the parts of the verbal morphology that originate inside the ellipsis site should be subject to local isomorphism; the ones that originate higher should not

prediction is borne out: Goldberg's (2005) **Verbal Identity Requirement**

(67) **Verbal Identity Requirement** (Goldberg 2005:165)
The antecedent- and target-clause main Vs of V-stranding VPE must be identical, minimally in their root and derivational morphology. Their inflectional morphology may vary.

(68)

same derivational morphology (binyan) and same root: V-stranding VPE = ok

(69) Q: (Ha'im) Miryam hevi'a et Dvora la-xanut?
Q: Miryam bring.PAST.3SG ACCDvora to.the-store
'(Did) Miryam bring Dvora to the store?'
A: Ken, hi hevi'a.
yes she bring.PAST.3SG
INTENDED: 'Yes, she brought [Dvora to the store].'

different derivational morphology (binyan) and same root: V-stranding VPE = *

(70) Q: Li'ora nas'a etmol le-Tel Aviv?
Q: Li'ora travel.PAST.3SG yesterday to-Tel Aviv
'(Did) Li'ora travel yesterday to Tel Aviv?'
A: * Ken — hisa'iti.
yes drove.PAST.1SG
INTENDED: 'Yes—I drove [her yesterday to Tel Aviv].'
same derivational morphology (biyan) and different root: V-stranding VPE is a *

(71) Q: Rivka his/a otax le-beit ha-sif? Rivka drive.PAST.3SG ACC.YOU.LOC.3SG to-house the-book

'Did Rivka drive you to school?'

A: * Ken, hi hev'ta.

yes she bring.PAST.3SG INTENDED: 'Yes, she brought [me to school].'

active/passive-mismatches: V-stranding VPE is a *

(72) Q: Aviva xubka al-yedey Yiczak? Aviva be.embraced.PAST.3MSG by Yitzchak

'Was Aviva hugged by Yitzchak?'

A: * Ken, hu xibek.

yes he embrace.PAST.3MSG INTENDED: 'Yes, he hugged [her].'

→ the verbal identity requirement on V-stranding VPE can be accounted for by local isomorphism

6.2 The bad news

the problem: certain mismatches between copies of movement in an ellipsis site and their antecedent clause are unexpected under local isomorphism

gender mismatch

(73) Ich weiß auf welches KIND Angela wartet, aber ich weiß nicht I know on which child A. waited but I know not auf welchen STUDENTEN [TP—].

on which student

'I know which CHILD Angela is waiting for, but not which STUDENT.'

→ local isomorphism: $N_{1[+masc]}$ is not anteceded by Kind

number mismatch

(74) I know John saw one GIRL, but I don’t know how many BOYS [TP—].

→ local isomorphism: $N_{1[+pl]}$ is not anteceded by one gir

person mismatch

(75) YOU I like, but HIM I don’t [TP—].

→ local isomorphism: $D_{2[+pl]}$ is not anteceded by him

note: in all these cases the remnant is contrastively focused with respect to its antecedent → perhaps focus marking can exempt phrases from local isomorphism (cf. Merchant’s F-closure)?

7. Summary and conclusions

- copular clauses can be used to repair 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
- these facts show that sluicing/ellipsis is subject both to global isomorphism (= semantic parallelism, cf. Merchant’s 2001 e-GIVENNESS) and to local isomorphism
- local isomorphism applies after Impoverishment and before vocabulary insertion, global isomorphism applies after vocabulary insertion
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