

Adam Szczegielniak, Rutgers University

adam.s@post.harvard.edu<http://scholar.harvard.edu/adam/>

Multiple remnant sluicing is phase constrained

1. Multiple Remnants must be contained in the smallest common phase. Base Generated Remnants have been proposed in order to account for (1a), which cannot be derived via evacuation movement in (1b). Examples like (1a) are argued to be coordination of full CP's plus ellipsis since they allow 'either' modification (1c) that needs to target CP's (Hofmeister 2010). Bruening (2015) proposes that ellipsis in (1a) targets a prosodic unit φ and deletes all but Φ , the head of φ , which is the most prominent subconstituent as is shown in (1c).

1. a. I disproved theories held by Wittgenstein last year and
 ((φ I disproved theories held by (φ Einstein))(φ this year))
 b. * Einstein_i, I disproved theories held by t_i this year.
 c. Either I disproved theories held by Wittgenstein last year, or Einstein this year

I show that prosodic ellipsis needs to be syntactically constrained via phase-based linearization (Fox & Pesetsky 2005) that forces both remnants to be spelled out in the same cycle. Consider (2), where the adjunct 'this year' can only modify 'held'.

2. I met a man who disproved theories held by Hawking last year and (~~φ I met a man who~~ [~~disproved theories held by~~ (φ Penrose) (φ this year)])

Prosodic deletion per se cannot account for this restriction. However, a requirement that both remnants are linearized vis a vis each other in the same spell-out domain makes the correct prediction. A similar restriction exists in sluicing. English allows marginally multiple wh-remnants as seen in (3a) (Lasnik 2013), but they cannot be in different phases that are separated by an Island (3b). The same holds for Spanish (4a vs 4b), Polish (5a vs 5b). The second remnant must move to the minimal phase containing the first remnant in prosodically licensed ellipsis. Islands block this movement.

3. a. One of the students spoke to one of the professors, but I don't know which *(to) which
 *b. John saw one of the professors who spoke to one of the students but I don't know which to which
4. a. Contrataron a un lingüista que le dio un libro a un profesor, pero no sé qué libro
 hired a linguist who gave some book to some professor but not know which book
a qué profesor.
 to which professor
 *b. Contrataron a un lingüista que sabe un dialecto, pero no sé qué lingüista qué dialecto.
 hired some linguist who knows some dialect but not know which linguist which dialect
6. a. Oni zatrudnili lingwistę który podarował jakaś książkę jakiemuś profesorowi, ale nie
 They hired linguist who gave some book some professor but not
 wiem którą książkę któremu profesorowi
 know which book which professor
 *b. Oni zatrudnili jakiegoś lingwistę który zna jakiś dialekt, ale nie wiem
 They hired some linguist who knows some dialect but not know
którego lingwistę który dialekt
 which linguist which dialect

2. Second Remnant must right adjoin to Spec of common phase. Lasnik (2013) argues that the lack of P-stranding in the second remnant is due to it being right adjoined as high up as the position of the first remnant. Rightward movement (7) does not allow P-stranding

- *7. A linguist spoke about yesterday a paper on sluicing.

This correlates with the lack of possible P-omission in (3a).

Selkirk & Kratzer (2007) show that prominence is assigned to the topmost XP in a phase. In

multiple remnant ellipsis both remnants are equally prominent when the second remnant right adjoins as high as the first. The first can then remain in situ. Both remnants are then equally high structurally, but linearly ordered at Spell-out.

3. First Remnant can remain in-situ since in languages like Polish (8) and Spanish (9) P-omission is only possible with the first remnant but not the second. Both languages do not allow P-stranding (Rodrigues 2009 Nykiel 2013) and P-omission cannot be via movement, or clefts (multiple clefts are out). In (8,9) second remnant moves within a phase, first is in-situ.

8. Jan podszedł do jakiegoś artysty na pewnym koncercie

Jan approach to some artist on certain concert

ale nie wiem (do) którego artysty *(na) którym koncercie

but not know (to) which artist (on) which concert

‘Jan approached some artist at some concert but not know which artist at which concert’

9. Juan leyó un libro sobre un político en una biblioteca, pero no sé

Juan read a book about some politician in some library but not know

(sobre) qué político *(en) qué biblioteca

about which politician (in) which library

4. Phase deficiency interacts with prosodic ellipsis in languages like Indonesian, where the v-phase is considered deficient (Aldridge 2008) because it prevents inner Argument extraction from an active v (10). The inability to extract from v, permits both remnants to be licensed as most prominent in-situ thus allowing P-omission in both (11), even though Indonesian does not allow P-stranding via clefting or wh-movement (Sato 2011).

10. *a. Apa yang Ali mem-beli?

what C Ali ACT-buy

b. Apa yang di-beli (oleh) Ali?

what C PASS-buy by Ali

‘What did Ali buy?’

11. Esti bilang kamu bicara dengan seseorang tentang sesuatu yang penting di sini, tapi saya

Esti say you talk with someone about something that important in here but

tidak tahu (dengan) siapa (tentang) apa

I NEG know (with) who (about) what

‘Esti said that you were talking with someone about something important here, but I don’t know who you were talking with about what.’

Aldridge. 2008 Phase-based account of extraction in Indonesian. *Lingua*, 118(10)

Bruening. 2015. Non-Constituent coordination: Prosody, not movement. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, 21(1), 5.

Fox & Pesetsky. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 31(1-2), 1-45

Hofmeister. 2010. A linearization account of either... or constructions. *NLLT* 28. 275-314.

Lasnik. 2013. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax*, 17(1), 1-20.

Nykiel. 2013. Clefts and preposition omission under sluicing. *Lingua*, 123, 74-117.

Rodrigues et.al. (2009). Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and P-stranding. *Romance languages and linguistic theory* 2006, 175-198.

Sato. 2011 P-stranding under sluicing and repair by ellipsis: Why is Indonesian (not) special? *J East Asian Linguist*, 20(4), 339-382.

Selkirk & Kratzer. 2007. Phase theory and prosodic Spell-out: The case of verbs. *The Linguistic Review*, 24(2-3).