Multiple Remnant Sluicing is Phase Constrained

1. Phase based Information Structure: Focus is local

*Focus prominence assigned phase by phase Kratzer & Selkirk (2007). All focus:topmost XP in a Spell-out Domain receives focus pitch*

2. dass ein Jünges [VP DP *eine Géige*] [VP im Supermarkt] kaufe] that a boy a violin in.the.DAT supermarket bought

3. dass ein Jünges [VP [PP im *Súpermarkt*] lebte] that a boy in.a.DAT supermarket lived

Proposal: (i) XP Focus movement is local to nearest Phase Edge; (ii) movement appears covert since copy is linearized. (iii) Focus features percolate via phase heads to focus particle only. (iv) Feature percolation is not Island Sensitive.

1. They only [vP [PP CHAIR the Zoning Board]]

Focus feature percolation via phase heads

Focus must be local independently of ellipsis: Association with only not island sensitive

Focus covert movement

Focus XP LF movement to nearest phase edge edge

Focus feature percolation via phase heads

Focus movement crossover effects are phase bound: LF Focus movement is phase local

Focus feature percolation via phase heads

4. We only [vP [PP expect [him]]] to be betrayed by the woman he loves.

Focus covert movement

him does not raise over the coindexed pronoun [Kratzer 1997].

Bound variable reading possible. We expect nobody but John to have the property: ‘λve,t [ve,t is betrayed by the woman ve,t loves]’

Referential reading possible. We expect nobody but John to have the property: ‘λve,t [ve,t is betrayed by the woman John loves]’

Focus feature percolation via phase heads

5. We only expect the woman he loves to [vP PRO betray [him]]

Focus covert movement

him covertly raises over coindexed PRO at LF - Crossover effect:

Bound variable reading possible. We expect nobody but John to have the property: ‘λve,t [the woman ve,t loves betrays ve,t]’

Referential reading possible. We expect nobody but John to have the property: ‘λve,t [the woman John loves betrays ve,t]’

Focus feature percolation via phase heads

Prompt: What should we expect in a situation where a man’s lover is determining whether one of his subordinates may be in a posi

6. We only expect [the woman he loves] to investigate the question of whether someone will [vP betray [him]]

Focus covert movement

him covertly raises to local phase edge - no Crossover: Both Bound and Referential readings possible.

Only topmost XP can receive focus/prominence pitch in all new context since it has to move to Edge of local phase. Lower XP’s blocked via Relativized Minimality/MLC Probing effects

Prediction: Focus movement should exhibit Crossover effects only when focused pronoun Movement to a local phase edge does not cross a co-indexed pronoun. This is the case of (4) not (5).

We see an interaction of cross-over effects and island insensitivity in (6). The lower pronoun is associated with only across an island and across a co-indexed pronoun. No Crossover, No islands in (6)
Givenness is Presuppositional (Sauerland 2005)
- Givenness $G$ operator inserted anywhere within a phase, terminates at Phase head.
- Multiple Focus constructions

7. Q: Who is talking with who?

A: [CPFG [TP [DP Mary [is $G$ [vPFG talking $G$ [PP with $G$ [DP John]]]

- Focus computed off Givenness: covert movement to nearest Focus licensing Phase head
- In the case of Ellipsis, always FP licenses remnants, in non ellipsis contexts not necessary.

Givenness is Propositional and assigned locally. Multiple focus cannot be presuppositional since it leads to over-generation

we would need to presuppose that 'Mary is talking with someone' To have Mary $v$ is defined. We would need to presuppose that 'someone is talking to John' in order for the complement of Mary$^v$ to be defined. Neither presupposition is satisfied in (7). Presupposed Givenness yields correct results: presupposes 'someone is talking with someone.'

Givenness needs to be computed locally terminate at a phase level in order for Givenness movement Kučerová (2012) to be licensed and because of examples like below Wagner (2006):

Givenness licensed within DP phase:

Mary’s uncle, who produces high-end convertibles, is coming to her wedding. I wonder what he brought as a present.

8. a. He brought [a CHEAP convertible] #b. He brought [a RED convertible] c. He brought [a red CONVERTIBLE]

- Givenness/Focus within DP: 'Red' is not valid alternative to 'high-end' and cannot be focused. Givenness/Focus cannot be evaluated within CP then 'brought' should be focused.
- Givenness is presuppositional and computed on a phase by Phase basis.
- Focus is computed off Givenness.

An XP that is focused needs to move to the nearest Phase Edge.
- Focus features percolate upwards via phase heads until ~ operator (Rooth 1992) the resets an Alternatives computation to a normal one is encountered at Spell-Out.

~ { [xF....yF....zF....hF]} Focus Percolation + MaximizePresupposition = Avoid Focus!
- Focus covert movement can be analyzed as overt movement that forces the trace to be linearized and thus pronounced. In line with Fanselow & Lenertová (2011) who argue that prominence focused XP’s are linearized immediately: For example: What’s new?

a. GULáši jsem uvarˇila ti.(Cz)   b. #GULáš matka uvarˇila ti. c. Matka uvaˇrila GULáš.
goulash aux.1sg cooked.sg.fm ‘goulash mother cooked.sg.fm Mother cooked goulash
I cooked goulash’ ‘Mother cooked goulash’

-Prosody/Focus Forces linearizing a focus moves copy/trace to receive prominence pitch marking.

Focus marking of ellipsis remnants
- a Phase head that has non inherited Focus features combined with an E feature triggers

projection of a Focus head that becomes the phase
- overt movement of the focused XP to Spec-FP.

The difference between an ellipsis context and non ellipsis context is the way focus is linearized. In ellipsis focused remnant does not have any PF elements to linearize against so it moves to Spec-F to linearize against a Focus feature.
In ellipsis:
- The Phase containing a Remnant projects a FP as the edge
- Remnant overtly moves to Spec-FP
- F features percolate via phase heads until ~
- Focus is computed off Givenness within a phase
- Givenness is assigned on a phase-by-phase basis
- E feature licenses ellipsis (Merchant 2001)
- E feature is on a Phase head (Genegel 2007, Bošković 2014).
- Ellipsis is suppression of PF material in Spell-out Domain
- Ellipsis is constrained by mutual entailment modulo focus (Merchant 2001)
- E feature is inherited from phase head to phase head via Givenness. MaxElide!
- Phase Impenetrability Condition applies to
- E features, G marking, F marking, Linearization
- IS and Ellipsis need to be computed on a phase-by-phase system
- Linearization triggers cyclic movement to avoid ordering paradoxes during Spell-out (Fox & Pesestky 2005)
- PF null terminal nodes do not become linearized or participate in LCA
- computation: otherwise copies/traces would yield ordering paradoxes.
- Immediate Linearization in Ellipsis - when multiple remnants in same phase \( \alpha \): \([\alpha \ R1 \ R2 \ ]\)
- R1 linearized as R1> F{E}
- R2 rightward moves to Spell-out Domain of R1 linearized as F{E}>R2 -> R1>R2
- Discontinuous Ellipsis

---

**Ellipsis feature propagates via G operator** Szczegielniak (2016)

- MaxElide! (Takahashi & Fox 2005) reduced to phase based {E} feature propagation via G

---

9. John read something but I do not know \([fp \ \text{what}, \ [f_{\ FGE} \ [cp \ \text{he did}, \ [g, \ [v_{\ FGE} \ [r, \ [v_{\ FGE} \ [\text{read}, \ [t_{\ FGE}]]]]]]]]]]_G\)

10. John read something but I do not know \([cp_{\ FGE} \ [cp_{\ FGE} \ [\text{he did}, \ [g_{\ FGE} \ [v_{\ FGE} \ [r_{\ FGE} \ [v_{\ FGE} \ [\text{read}, \ [t_{\ FGE}]]]]]]]]]]_G\)

---

**Wh-remnant in Spec-FP not G-marked and NOT ELIDED**
Prosodic ellipsis (PE) needs to be phase based
- PE Bruening (2015) cannot be licensed by evacuation movement (Sailor & Thoms 2013)

11. a. I disproved theories held by Wittgenstein last year and ((φ ☐ disproved theories held by (ΦEinstein))(φ this year))
    b. Einstein, I disproved theories held by t, this year.
- Full relatives have more prosodic structure and ‘the guy’ is prominent (red) and cannot be deleted.

*12. I taught the guy that knows Icelandic how to dance and (φ ☐ taught (Φthe guy)) (φ that knows (ΦFaroese)(φ how to sing))
- Bruening (2015): Ellipsis targets a syntactic/prosodic unit XP and deletes all but the head of XP, where the head of XP is the most prominent syntactic/prosodic sub-constituent of XP.
- Above needs to be modified. PE needs to be phase based. Most prominent prosodic/syntactic unit must move to nearest phase edge Spec-F. Multiple remnants must be in the same Phase. Then it accounts for full relative clause below, where both remnants need to be in the same Phase.

Compare (13) with (11).

13. I disproved theories that were held by Wittgenstein last year and \[ \text{CPGE} \{ \text{DPGE} \text{disproved} \text{theories} \text{that were} \{ \text{FP} \text{Einstein}, \text{this year}, \{ \text{FP} \text{Faroese} \text{held by} \text{t}, \text{t}, \text{t} \} \} \] 

16. Oni zatrudnili lingwistę który podarował jakiś książkę jakiemuś profesorowi ale nie wiem którą książkę którego profesorowi

They hired linguist who gave some book some professor but not know which book which professor ??They hired a linguist who gave some book to some professor but I do not know which book to which professor.

*16. Oni zatrudnili jakiegoś lingwistę który zna jakiś dialekt, ale nie wiem którego lingwistę który dialekt

They hired some linguist who knows some dialect but not know which linguist which dialect

*They hired some linguist who knows some dialect but I do not know which linguist which dialect.

Multiple remnants in Sluicing: R1 and R2 inside relative clause island: Example 15

Multiple remnants in Sluicing: R1 outside Island, R2 inside island: Example 16
Second Remnant (R2) rightward moves to Spell-out Domain of First Remnant (R1)
- Movement cannot cross an Island  - Rightward Movement cannot strand a PP (Lasnik 2013)
17. Jan podszedł do jakiegos artysty na pewnym koncercie ale nie wiem (do) ktorego artysty *(na) ktorym koncercie
Jan approached to some artist on certain concert but not know (to) which artist (on) which concert
‘Jan approached some artist at some concert but I do not know which artist at which concert’
18. John read about some linguist at some airport but I do not know (about) which linguist *(at) which airport

Focus must have the option of being licensed at the DP phase level
but only when DP is complex

- DP focused locally below P - there is no movement across PP. - P-omission possible only when DP is complex (Nykiel 2013)
- DP complexity required to license focus via Givenness within DP
Clefts or wh-move cannot account:
19 a. Bylaś ubrana w coś czerwonego tamtej nocy, ale nie pamiętam (w) co.
were dressed in something.ACC red.ACC that night but not remember (in) what.ACC
‘You were dressed in something red that night, but I don’t remember what’
*b. Byłaś ubrana w coś czerwonego tamtej nocy, ale nie pamiętam co to w czerwonego byłaś ubrana tamtej nocy
were dressed in something.ACC red.ACC that night but not remember what.ACC it in red (ACC) were dressed that night
‘You were dressed in something red that night, but I don’t remember what it was.’
*c. Byłaś ubrana w coś czerwonego tamtej nocy, ale nie pamiętam co byłaś ubrana w t czerwonego tamtej nocy
were dressed in something.ACC red.ACC that night but not remember what.ACC were dressed in red (ACC) that night
‘*You were dressed in something red that night, but I don’t remember what you were dressed in red that night’
Phase heads carry Information Structure features (Givenness, Focus) = IS is computed on a phase-by-phase basis. Givenness is presuppositional; Focus is licensed via covert movement (non-ellipsis).

Phase heads carry Ellipsis features = Ellipsis is computed on a phase-by-phase basis via Givenness, phase-by-phase Focus licenses remnants.

Linearization is computed on phases (not Spell-out Domains).
Focus triggers immediate linearization.
A phase head carrying an Ellipsis feature projects an FP.
Ellipsis requires overt R(emanent) movement to FP.
Focus features percolate via phase heads limiting Focus (Schwarzschild (1999) AvoidFocus).
We need to investigate Focus feature percolation when there are two Focus Phrases as in P-omission with multiple remnants.

In (24) Indonesian allows both R1 and R2 to omit PP’s (Saito 2011)
- vP is a weak phase (Aldridge 2008)
  - cannot license a Spec in Active (25)
  - A weak vP cannot license a Focus head and Spec. there is no possible rightward movement
  - Both DP’s need to license respective FP’s and DP focus possible for both R1 and R2

Languages with a non-defective vP cannot NOT license FP

---

DP complexity and Internal Focus

20. Jan rozmawiał z kimś ale nie wiem kim
   Jan talked with someone but not know who

21. Jan rozmawiał z pewnym profesorem, ale nie wiem którym

22 a. Jan zatańczył z tylko nią b. Jan zatańczył tylko z nią
   Jan danced with only her Jan danced only with her

23 a. Jan zatańczył z tylko chłopcem
   Jan danced with only boy
   b. Jan zatańczył z tylko wysokim chłopcem
      Jan danced with only tall boy

---

Indonesian

24. Esti bilang kamu bicara dengan seseorang tentang sesuatu yang penting di sini, tapi saya tidak tahu (dengan) siapa (tentang) apa
   ‘Esti said that you were talking with someone about something important here, but I don’t know who you were talking with about what.

   what C Ali ACT-buy
   “What did Ali buy?”
   b. Apa yang di-beli (oleh) Ali?
   what C PASS-buy by Ali
   “What did Ali buy?”

Languages with a non-defective vP cannot NOT license FP