

Sluicing and Resumption

Chyan-an Arthur Wang / New York University

Background: The recent theoretical development has convincingly shown that sluicing is derived from overt *wh*-movement followed by PF deletion of a TP, resulting in a remnant *wh*-phrase. The two main arguments for this approach are the Form-Identity fact and P-stranding generalization (Merchant 2001). Given overt movement and the fact that the remnant *wh*-phrase can refer to a correlate inside an island in the antecedent, it is thus concluded that sluicing can repair island violation (see also Lasnik 2000).

Problems: The first problem of the sluicing analysis regards island repair. Since Ross (1969), it has been assumed that sluicing can remedy the otherwise fatal violation of island-crossing extraction (1). However, not all kinds of island violations can be ameliorated. Merchant (2001) thus proposes a distinction between LF and PF islands. The relative clause island, for example, is LF-island so violation of such cannot be remedied by PF deletion. A case like (2) where violation of LF-island can be repaired, as argued by Merchant, is just apparent and it has a full representation like (3), as opposed to (4) where the antecedent *anyone* cannot license the pronoun *he*. Nevertheless, when the antecedent correlate is modified by *certain*, the sentence (5) is greatly improved even in the presence of *anyone*. So the PF/LF-island distinction cannot be justified. The second problem is counterexamples to the P-stranding generalization. Although the generalization is based on a survey of more than 20 languages, there are still a few non-P-stranding languages, including Brazilian Portuguese, Chinese, Finnish and Malagasy, that do not conform to it.

Proposal: The proposal is that the otherwise *wh*-trace position in at least island repair cases is a pronominal element left by movement, which is in essence the \bar{A} -bound pronominal in Cinque (1990) or the B-extraction in Postal (1998). This approach is similar to Aoun, Choueiri and Hornstein (2001), Kayne (2002) and Boeckx (2003). The obligatory occurrence of such a pronominal element is enforced by Chung's (2005) supplemental Parallelism Condition on sluicing (6). In this sense, whether island violations can be repaired relies on whether such a pronominal element can be properly recovered by an overt antecedent correlate. The proposal immediately accounts for the fact that sluicing with island repair must have an overt antecedent correlate (7) and thus the *sprouting* type of sluicing (8) never repairs island violation (cf. Chung, Ladusaw, McCloskey 1995). It also captures an important generalization of island repair. Namely, sluicing with island repair tends to have a D-linked phrase (eg. *which x*) as the remnant and/or the antecedent correlate tends to be D-linked (in terms of specificity). This is because of natural compatibility of D-linked (*wh*-)phrases and the resumptive strategy (cf. Doron 1982, Fox 1994 for specificity, Boeckx 2003). I will show how the unified analysis can account for the (un)availability of island repair in various island cases, including the relative clause island, selective islands, island-crossing extraction of an adjunct and left-branch condition (LBC). Thus, the distinction between LF/PF islands is not necessary. In particular, there is an important prediction regarding LBC in English, Russian, and Chinese. Namely, English requires an antecedent correlate to license the repair of LBC violation (9) but Russian (10, cf. Grebenyova 2005) and Chinese (11) do not. This is predicted under the current proposal: Russian allows left-branch extraction (12) and Chinese utilizes another legitimate way (i.e. remnant movement) to extract the apparently left-branched constituent (13). Since the two languages do not involve illegitimate movement, the resumption is not triggered and the antecedent correlate is accordingly not required. For the violation of P-stranding generalization, the proposal predicts that only those languages that otherwise allow (productive) resumptive strategy can tolerate the violation of P-stranding generalization because the inability of P-stranding can be saved by such a strategy and thus leads to apparent counterexamples to the generalization. In this reasoning, Chinese, for example (14), which uses resumptive strategy can thus tolerate the P-stranding violation, given that the antecedent correlate is present (and specific) to fulfill the Parallelism requirement evoked by resumption.

Conclusion: The proposal that a pronominal element is stranded by movement in sluicing when such movement is otherwise prohibited can solve the problems regarding island repair and P-stranding generalization, while retaining other observations like Form-Identity fact since movement still takes place.

Examples:

- (1) I believe the claim that he bit someone, but I don't know which one (*I believe the claim that he bit _).
- (2) They hired *someone* who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which.
- (3) They hired *someone* who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which (B-language) [*he* speaks].
- (4) * They didn't hire *anyone* who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which.
- (5) They didn't hire *anyone* who speaks a *certain* Balkan language, but I don't know which. (Lasnik 2005)
- (6) 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. (Chung 2005)
- (7) Agnes wondered how John managed to cook *a certain food*, but it's not clear what food.
- (8) * Agnes wondered how John managed to cook ____, but it's not clear what food.
- (9) She bought a *(nice) car but I don't know how nice.
- (10) Ivan kupil mašinu, no ja ne znaju naskol'ko novuju.
Ivan bought car but I NEG know how new
Lit. 'Ivan bought a car, but I don't know how new.'
- (11) Lisi mai-le chezi, dan wo bu zhidao duo xin-de
Lisi buy-PRF car but I NEG know how new-MOD
Lit. 'Lisi bought a car, but I don't know how new.'
- (12) Naskol'ko doriguju_i on kupil [t_i mašinu]?
how expensive he bought car
Lit. 'How expensive did he buy a car?'
- (13) a. ta mai-le [duo xin-de chezi]?
he buy-PRF how new-MOD car
Lit. 'How new did he buy a car?'
b. chezi_i ta mai-le [duo xin-de t_i]?
car he buy-PRF how new-MOD
c. [duo xin-de t_i]_j chezi_i ta mai-le t_j?
how new-MOD car he buy-PRF
- (14) Laoshi dui mou-ge xuesheng fa-le piqu, dan wo bu zhidao (dui) na-ge-xuesheng
teacher to certain-CL student lose-PRF temper but I NEG know to which-CL-student
Lit. 'The teacher lost his temper at a certain student, but I don't know (at) which student.'

Selected References:

- Aoun, J., L. Choueiri, and N. Hornstein 2001. Resumption, Movement and Derivational Economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:371-403.
- Boeckx, C. 2003. *Islands and Chains: Resumption as Stranding*. John Benjamins.
- Chung, S. 2005. Sluicing and Lexicon: The Point of No Return. *ms.* University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Chung, S., W. Ladusaw, and J. McCloskey 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *NLS*: 3:239-282.
- Fox, D. and H. Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic Movement and Island Repair: the Difference between Sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 143-154.
- Grebenyova, L. 2005. Sluicing and Left-branch Extraction out of Islands. In *Proceedings of WCCFL XXIV*.
- Kayne, R. 2002. Pronouns and their antecedents. In *Derivation and explanation in the minimalist program*, eds. S. Epstein and T. Seely, 133-166:Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lasnik, H. 2000. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of the NELS 31*.
- Merchant, J. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and Identity in Ellipsis*. New York: OUP.
- Poletto, C. and J.-Y. Pollock 2002. On the left periphery of some Romance *wh*-questions. In *The Structure of CP and IP – The Cartography of Syntactic Structure*, Vol. 2. New York: OUP.
- Postal, P. 1998. *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.