

Adam Szczegielniak  
 Harvard/Warsaw University  
 absynt@gmail.com  
 WCCFL, UCLA 2008

## Islands in Sluicing in Polish

### I. Sluicing is not special

Ross (1967) first observed that some Islands seem to be alleviated when a string is sluiced.

1. Ben left the party because one of the guests insulted him, but he wouldn't tell me [which of the guests]<sub>t<sub>1</sub></sub> did Ben leave the party because t<sub>1</sub> insulted him

This is not the case of with any type of ellipsis. VP ellipsis does not seem to alleviate Islands (Fox and Lasnik 2003)

2. \*a. What did you leave before they started playing t  
 b. We left before they started playing party games.  
 - \*What did you leave before they did?

Accounts like Merchant (2001) and more recent (Fox and Lasnik 2003, Merchant 2006) have assumed that iff all the offending traces are not pronounced then there is no Island violation. Hence VP ellipsis does not alleviate Islands since it does not eliminate enough material.

### Claim:

3. Deletion of PF material cannot alleviate syntactic violations, regardless of how much material is deleted.
4. Ellipsis is a radical form of de-stressing. It is constrained by the recoverability condition (Johnson 2001).
5. If  $\alpha$  is a sluice and  $\beta$  its antecedent then  $\alpha$  must be given by  $\beta$  and  $\beta$  must be given by  $\alpha$

### Consequences:

6. An elided segment does not have to be structurally parallel to its antecedent, it can be, but does not have to.
7. In apparent island alleviation cases, structural parallelism between the sluice and its antecedent does not hold.

8. In the case of VP ellipsis the set of grammatical strings that can be de-stressed and elided is smaller than in the case of sluicing. VP ellipsis is not licensed by clefting, but by VP Topicalization (Szczegielniak 2004).

### II. Arguments against clefts.

*PP stranding*

9. \*Kim Anna tańczyła z t<sub>1</sub> (Polish)  
 who Anna danced with  
 'Who did Anna dance with?'

10. Anna tańczyła z kimś ale nie wiem \*(z) kim  
 Ann danced with someone but not know (with) whom  
 'Ann danced with someone but I do not know who'

But:

11. Anna tańczyła z jednym mężczyzną, ale nie wiem którym  
 Ann danced with one man but not know which  
 'Ann danced with one man, but I do not know which'

12. \*Którym<sub>1</sub> Anna tańczyła z t<sub>1</sub> mężczyzną  
 Which Ann danced with man  
 'Which man Ann danced with'

PP-stranding looks to be possible in Polish provided the wh-phrase is d-linked (for similar claims for Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese see Rodrigues, et.al. 2007, for Finnish, Hartman 2005, see also Almeida and Yoshida 2007, Stjepanovic 2006).

13. \*Kim<sub>2</sub> to [z t<sub>2</sub>]<sub>1</sub> Ania tańczyła t<sub>1</sub>  
 who it with Ann danced  
 'It was with who that Ann danced'

14. Którym<sub>2</sub> to [z t<sub>2</sub> mężczyzną]<sub>1</sub> Ania tańczyła t<sub>1</sub>  
 which acc it with man Ann danced  
 'It was with which man that Ann danced'

Polish has clefts which are possible with d-linked wh-phrases and case is preserved as shown in (14).

Same holds for Spanish (Rodrigues, Vicente, Nevins 2007).

15. Juan ha hablado con una chica rubia, pero no sé cuál  
 J has talked with a girl blonde but not know which

Here the claim that the continuation is a cleft like construction too:

16. Juan ha hablado com una chica —  
 J. has talked with a girl  
 a. pero no sé cuál es la chica con la que ha  
 but not know which is the girl with the that has  
*hablado Juan*  
 talked J.

Stjepanovic (2003) finds the same for Serbo-Croatian:

17. Petar je sakrio igraku ispod jedne stolice i pored jednog zida ,  
 Petar is hid toy under one chair-GEN and beside one wall-GEN  
 ali ne znam (ispod) koje stolice i (pored) kojeg zida.  
 but not I-know under which chair-GEN and beside which wall-GEN  
 ‘Petar hid the toy under a chair and next to a wall, but I don’t know which chair and which wall’

In SC, case mismatches are also possible:

18. Petar je sakrio igraku ispod jedne stolice i pored jednog zida,  
 Petar is hid toy under one chair-GEN and beside one wall-GEN  
 ali ne znam koja stolica i koji zid  
 but not I-know which chair-NOM and which wall-NOM  
 ‘Petar hid the toy under a chair and next to a wall, but I don’t know which chair and which wall it was under which and next to which he hid the toy.’

Her claim is that (18) has different semantic effects (connectivity, disjoint readings – different toy). However, this just shows that there are other possible continuations to (17) than a regular case-mismatching cleft as in (18). In essence maybe (18) is a real case of something else than sluicing.

### III. Sluicing does not alleviate any Islands.

The claim is that sluicing is no different than VP ellipsis as far as Island alleviation, when we control for the ability of clefts like (14) we see a lack of Island alleviation. One example is multiple wh-sluicing (see also Grebenyova, L. (2007).

19. Oni chcą wynająć kogoś kto mówi dialektem bałkańskim, ale nie  
 They want hire someone who speaks dialect Balkan but not  
 wiem którym ~~to dialektem~~ ~~co on nim mówi~~ oni chcą kogoś wynająć  
 know which it dialect that he it speak they want someone hire  
 ‘They want to hire someone who speaks in Balkan dialect, but I do not know which’

20. \*Oni chcą wynająć ktoregoś tłumacza co mówi jakimś dialektem  
 They want hire some translator who speaks some dialect  
 bałkańskim, ale nie wiem którego którym ~~to dialektem~~ ~~to tłumacza~~ oni  
 Balkan but not know which which it dialect it translator they  
 chcą wynająć ~~co on nim mówi~~  
 want hire that he it speak  
 ‘\*They want to hire some translator who speaks in Balkan dialect, but I do not know who which’

Multiple clefting is not possible hence (20) is bad.

\*21. Który<sub>1</sub> to która<sub>2</sub> to t<sub>1</sub> mężczyzna kupił t<sub>2</sub> zabawke  
 which it which it man purchase toy  
 ‘It was which toy that which man purchased’

There is no possible continuation for (20) that will satisfy the recoverability condition.

### IV. PP stranding and multiple wh-sluicing

The prediction is that if clefts like (14) are impossible, PP stranding should also not be possible. That is precisely the case:

22. Jan napisał jakiś list do jakiegoś ucznia ale nie wiem który  
 Jan wrote some letter to some student but not know which  
 \*(do) którego  
 (to) which  
 ‘\*Jan wrote some letter to some student but I do know which to whom’

The same holds for Spanish (Rodrigues, Vicente, Nevins 2007).

23. Ella compró algo para alguien, pero no sé qué \*(para) quién  
she bought sth for sbody but not know what for whom

Although d-linked wh phrases allow PP-stranding in single wh-sluiques. These data would be hard to account for if we assume that Island alleviation is due to offending trace deletion. The assumption cannot account for:

- why multiple wh-sluiqing does not alleviate islands?
- why does multiple wh-sluiqing interact with PP stranding?

## V. VP ellipsis

VP ellipsis does not alleviate islands not because offending material is not unpronounced but because it cannot be licensed by constructions which are grammatical.

24. \*a. Oni będą chcieli wynająć kogoś kto mówi dialektem bałkańskim, ale nie  
They will want hire someone who speaks dialect Balkan but not  
wiem [którym dialektem], oni będą  
know which dialect they will  
'\*They will want to hire someone who speaks in Balkan dialect, but I do not know  
which they will'
- b. Oni będą chcieli wynająć kogoś kto mówi dialektem bałkańskim, ale nie  
They will want hire someone who speaks dialect Balkan but not  
wiem którym  
know which  
'They will want to hire someone who speaks in Balkan dialect, but I do not know  
which'
25. \*a. Oni będą chcieli wynająć kogoś kto mówi dialektem bałkańskim, ale nie  
They will want hire someone who speaks dialect Balkan but not  
wiem [którym dialektem], oni będą ~~to chcieli wynająć kogoś kto mówi~~<sub>t</sub>  
know which dialect they will it want hire someone who speak  
'\*They will want to hire someone who speaks in Balkan dialect, but I do not know  
which they will'
- b. Oni będą chcieli wynająć kogoś kto mówi dialektem bałkańskim, ale nie  
They will want hire someone who speaks dialect Balkan but not  
wiem którym ~~to dialektem co on nim mówi oni będą chcieli kogoś wynająć~~  
know which it dialect that he it speak they will want someone hire  
'They will want to hire someone who speaks in Balkan dialect, but I do not know  
which'

## VI. Limits of Recoverability

### Case matching

Double object constructions seems to behave differently than passive active:

Regular case mismatch impossible:

26. Jan nawymyślał komuś, ale nie wiem komu/ \*kogo  
Jan insulted someone DAT, but not know who DAT/who ACC  
'Jan insulted someone, but I do not know whom'

But compare (27a,b) which are double object constructions with (28) where active licenses passive:

27. ?a. Jan wysłał komuś list, ale nie wiem do kogo wysłał list  
Jan sent someone DAT letter but not know to who GEN sent letter  
'John sent someone a letter, but I do not know to whom'
- ?b. Jan wysłał list do kogoś, ale nie wiem komu wysłał list  
John sent letter to someone GEN, but not know who DAT sent letter  
'John sent a letter to someone, but I do not know who'
- \*28. Jan zgubił jakąś zabawkę ale nie wiem jaka zabawka została zgubiona  
Jan lost some toy but not know which toy was lost

Same contrast holds for English:

- ?29. John witnessed the city's destruction, but I do not know of which  
city
- ?30. I sent someone a letter, but I do not recall to who

Compare with:

31. \*Someone kissed Mary, but I do not know by who

Same holds for Russian (when compared to passive)

<sup>32</sup>32. Ja prigotovil komu-to obed, no ne znaju dl'a kovo  
I prepared someone dat dinner but not know for who gen  
'I prepared someone dinner but I do not know for whom'

Same for German (when compared to passive):

??33. Hans hat jemandem einen Brief geschrieben, aber ich  
Hans has someone.dat a letter written but I  
weiss nicht an wen.  
know not to who.acc

Case mismatches are more acceptable when the antecedent sluice relation is double object - NP PP, but not when antecedent sluice relation is passive – active.

Active-passive is a transformation, double object-NP PP is not (information is located on the lexical verb). Support comes from Idioms (Harley 2002):

34. a. John let the cat out of the bag.  
b. The cat was let out of the bag

35. a. I sent the salesman to the devil.  
\*b. I sent the devil the salesman.

In the case of active licensing the passive the information is on TP and is lost in the sluice, and not present on the antecedent, whereas when double object licenses NP PP the information about both constructions is on the antecedent (see also Pesetsky 1995).

This predicts that when TP is not elided active antecedents should license passive ellipsis. This is the case with VP ellipsis (Merchant 2007):

36. The janitor must remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be.  
37. The system can be used by anyone who wants to

## VII. Conclusion:

- A. Sluicing does not alleviate Islands, just like VP ellipsis
- B. Ellipsis is not licensed by syntactic identity (no PF, LF Islands)
- C. Ellipsis is licensed by a recoverability condition, if there is enough information in the non-elided signal ellipsis is acceptable, including case-mismatches, PP stranding violations, etc.

## Other stuff

### *Sprouting*

- 38 a. Jan ziewnął, ale nie wiem z którym mężczyzną  
Jan yawned but not know with which man  
'Jan yawned, but I do not know with which man'
- \*b. Jan ziewnął, ale nie wiem którym mężczyzną  
Jan yawned but not know with which man  
'Jan yawned, but I do not know with which man'

Sprouting cannot alleviate islands, like PP stranding since the sluiced part is the antecedent for the non sluiced part as far as the adjunct, and the non-sluiced part is the antecedent for the sluiced part...

### *English*

Can apparent Island alleviation be due to resumptive pronouns?

## References:

- Almeida, D. & M. Yoshida (2007). A Problem for the Preposition Stranding Generalization. *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 38, No 2., 349-362.
- Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. (2003). Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP ellipsis. *LI* 34:143–154.
- Grebenyova, L. (2007). Sluicing in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* Vol. 15, No1. 49-81.
- Harley, H. (2002) "Possession and the double object construction," *Yearbook of Linguistic Variation* 2, pp. 29-68.
- Hartman, Jeremy. (2005). Sluicing in Finnish. Ms., Harvard University.
- Johnson, K. (2001) Sluicing and Quantifier Scope GLOT Squib
- Merchant, Jason. (2001). *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, J. (2006). Sluicing. In: Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Syntax Companion*, 269-289. Blackwell: London.
- Merchant, J. (2007) Voice and Ellipsis. *lingBuzz/000403*
- Pesetsky (1995) *Zero Syntax*. MIT Press.
- Rodrigues, Vicente, Nevins (2007) Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and preposition stranding, MS Harvard, UNICAMP, Leiden.
- Rooth, M. (1992). A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75-116.
- Ross, J.R (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax* MIT Dissertation.
- Stjepanovic, Sandra. (2006). P-stranding under sluicing in a non-P-stranding language. Ms., University of West Virginia
- Szczegielniak, A (2004) *Relativization that you did...* MITOPL 24, MIT