1 Introduction
The subject of sprouting has recently garnered some appreciation as a window into the inner workings of syntactic operations when freed from the confines of overt pronunciation. As a sub-type of sluicing, sprouting is particularly interesting in that it has a rather different profile from sluicing despite being otherwise superficially similar. As such and in any case it is important to arrive at the correct analysis of sprouting of the construction lest important conclusions be made prematurely. This is what I attempt here.

In this paper, I note problems for current approaches to sprouting and argue in favor of an analysis in which there is syntactic movement of the sprouted element to the left periphery, albeit movement that is crucially fed by extraposition. That is, I re-envision the movement plus deletion analysis of sluicing found in Ross 1969, Lasnik 2001, and Merchant 2001 and argue against the covert re-use analysis of Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995, 2001. I offer a novel paradigm in which sprouting has a syntactically existent, yet phonetically null, antecedent. This paradigm is inconsistent with the cover re-use analysis.

An example of sprouting is given below in (1a). Here, the wh-word what finds no corresponding overt antecedent in the antecedent clause. The intended interpretation is shown in (1b) wherein the wh-word has moved from the complement position of the verb. This contrasts with the sluicing example in (2) where the wh-word has such an antecedent in something. Call this the ‘inner antecedent’.

(1) a. Ivy was eating, but I don’t know what.
   b. Ivy was eating, but I don’t know what, she was eating it.
   c. Ivy was eating something, but I don’t know what.

I argue for a derivation of (1a) along the lines of the following. First the wh-word is merged into its base position as the complement of the verb (3a). It then extraposes from that base position, adjoining to the VP (3b). Only from here does it undergo movement to the spec,CP position (3c). Thereafter the IP is deleted (3d), resulting eventually in (1a). As will be explained later however, I

---

1 Marcel den Dikken (p.c.) points out that Dutch allows sprouting despite lacking extraposition. I do not intend to argue that extraposition feeds sprouting in every language, just English. Sprouting should be possible so long as there is some sort of extraposition-like movement, namely short-distance, information structure-related movement. In Dutch, this would be scrambling, the constraints on which should apply also to sprouting.
posit that the trace of the moved element in the extraposed position evades deletion.

\[(3)\]
\[\begin{align*}
  a. & \ [VP \ eating \ what] \\
  b. & \ [VP \ [VP \ eating \ t_i] \ what_i] \\
  c. & \ [CP \ what_i \ [IP \ ... \ [VP \ [VP \ eating \ t_i] \ t_i]]] \\
  d. & \ [CP \ what_i \ [IP \ ... \ [VP \ [VP \ eating \ t_i] \ t_i]]]
\end{align*}\]

What goes on beneath the veil of ellipsis, if anything, is amenable only to indirect investigation. There is no overt trace or telltale sign of any structure that leads ineluctably to a particular analysis. All that remains after deletion is some intuited interpretation in the ellipsis site. Evidence for any given analysis must come from elsewhere.

Because of this I employ reasoning similar to that in Ross 1969. He notes a parallelism in the profiles of sluicing and other, more easily analyzable constructions. For instance, many of the same constraints on traditional syntactic movement also apply to sluicing. Thus, Ross reasons that syntactic movement also underlies sluicing despite lacking a clear overt long-distance dependency. If sprouting is fed by extraposition, as I argue, then the same conditions on extraposition should also constrain sprouting. This seems to be the case. Further, positing this analysis allow for a unified analysis of established facts concerning sprouting as well as a novel sprouting paradigm offered herein.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 I rehearse the characteristics of sprouting as portrayed in the literature. In section 3 I show how an extraposition analysis captures those characteristics. Section 4 presents current styles of approaches to sprouting and discusses their shortcomings. Section 5 presents a novel sprouting paradigm that the proposed analysis explains but that the covert re-use analysis cannot. Finally, in section 6 I discuss some further problems, solutions, and repercussions of the extraposition account.

2 Characteristics of sprouting

The unique characteristics of sprouting are those that differentiate it from normal sluicing constructions, the characteristics of which have been amply described by Ross 1969, Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995, Lasnik 2001, and Merchant 2001 among others. In contrast to normal sluicing, sprouting has been relatively under-studied, the most thorough investigations due to Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995, 2011, Chung 2005, 2011.

Aside from the definitional difference in the lack of an overt inner antecedent, a striking difference between normal sluicing and sprouting in particular is that sprouting fails to repair syntactic island violations. Known as Albert’s Generalization, this was first noted by Chris Albert (reported by Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995) and supported by Yoshida et al. 2010. In short, the sluicing example in (4a) displays no island-related degradation in acceptability whereas the sprouting example in (4b) does.
Further, unlike normal sluicing, it is not possible to sprout the object of a preposition. Compare (5a) with (5b). An adjective like jealous can sometimes take a null prepositional argument. When the complement of this prepositional argument is sprouted, the result is unacceptable. First noted in Chung 2005, this is known as Chung’s Generalization.

Another constraint on sprouting is that syntactic subjects cannot appear as the sprouted wh-word. This is shown below in the pairs (6) and (7). Italics serve to explicate the intended meaning (From Chung 2011).

Lastly, sprouting displays what is known as fixed diathesis effects (first noted by Levin, 1982, examples from Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 2011). In theory-neutral terms, it is impossible to sprout indirect objects though normal sluicing of such arguments is possible:

3 Extraposition-fed sprouting
Extraposition applies in sprouting constructions only to be rendered inaudible and invisible by deletion. The effects of certain derivational constraints can nevertheless be felt after the fact in the form of unacceptable sentences. In this section I show that the same constraints on extraposition reappear in sprouting and explain the characteristics discussed above.

Recall that the analysis of sprouting presented here for sentences like (9a) relies on extraposition of the relevant wh-word prior to movement to the left periphery and deletion (9b). As noted earlier, the trace in the extraposed position is not elided.

(9)  
   a. Ivy was eating, but I don’t know what.  
   b. … what, [Ivy was eating, t] t

In English, extraposition of the object of a preposition is grossly unacceptable, no matter how phonologically ‘heavy’ the extraposed element:

(10) *I talked to t, yesterday [the man you were referring to],

If extraposition underlies sprouting, then we have an explanation as to why the example in (5b) above is unacceptable. Just as it is not possible for the object of the preposition in (10) to extrapose, so too is it not possible for its analogue to do the same in (5b), shown here in (11). Sprouting requires the extraposition, but the extraposition is independently ruled out.

(11) *They’re jealous, but it is unclear who, [they’re jealous of, t] t

The same reasoning accounts for the constraint on the extraposition of subjects. Shown in (12), it is not possible in English to extrapose subjects. When forced to extrapose as in (7b), the sprouted subject again runs into this derivational constraint (13) and the sentence is ungrammatical.

(12) *There was t, eating ham yesterday [the man you were referring to],
(13) *Having to compromise is inevitable, but they have no idea who, [t, will have to compromise], t

The constraint on indirect objects is also mirrored in a constraint on English extraposition. In (14), the extraposed indirect object leads to severe unacceptability as does its sprouting analogue in (8b) above.²

² It may be the case that this constraint does not stem from extraposition of dative-shifted indirect object per se. It could be the case that the sluicing does not allow any argument-structure alternation that would lead the elided sentence to be different from its antecedent. In this case, the sprouted element had its base position as the object of a preposition as in (i) but is ruled out anyway. The constraint on argument structure parallelism has been shown for active/passive and causative/inchoative clashes by Merchant 2001.
The island constraint noted above can also be accounted for under certain assumptions. Chomsky and Lasnik 1993 and Merchant 2001 analyze island violations as stemming from the failure to delete the trace of an element that has moved across an island barrier. This trace is *-marked and this marking is uninterpretable at the PF-interface by hypothesis.

Under the present analysis and as will be explained later, the trace in the extraposed position goes undeleted. If we adopt the *-marking analysis for sprouting the fact that sprouting is subject to island constraints is explained: the offending trace goes undeleted and wreaks havoc at the PF-interface, causing the sentence to be unacceptable. This is shown in (16) below:

(16)  *I saw the movie that showed Ivy eating, I just can’t remember what, [I
      saw [island the movie that showed Ivy eat] ]  t,

The extraposition analysis can thus account for the aforementioned characteristics of sprouting. The restrictions on extraposition are found in sprouting as well and a pre-established means of accounting for island constraints lead to the correct predictions with respect to their enforcement under sprouting.

Further, the extraposition analysis enjoys a pedigree in that similar constructions have been analyzed as being fed by extraposition as well. Swiping (Merchant 2002) which is a sub-type of sprouting (Rosen 1976), has been argued by Hasegawa 2007 and Larson 2011 to involve sprouting. The swiping sentence in (17a) is derived via extraposition of the preposition prior to subextraction of its complement (17b).

(17)  a.  Ivy was talking, but I can’t remember who.
      b.  … but I can’t remember who, [Ivy was talking to t] [to t],

If extraposition analysis is the correct one for swiping, it is expected that it should also be correct for sprouting as the general case. Similarly, extraposition feeds both gapping (18) and multiple sluicing (19) in the analyses of Jayaseelan (1990) and Lasnik (in press) respectively:

(18)  a.  Ivy ate apples, and Mary pears
      b.  Ivy ate apples and Mary [ate to t] pears
(19)  a.  Ivy gave some apples to some children, but I can’t remember
      which apple to which child

(i)   *He served the soup, but I don’t know who, [he served the soup to]  t,
b. Ivy gave some apples to some children, but I can’t remember [which apple], [Ivy gave t] [to which child]

As shown in this section, the present analysis accounts for the sprouting data and also finds precursor analyses of similar ellipsis-related constructions in the literature. In the next section, I discuss previous analyses of sprouting and their shortcomings.

4 Previous analyses
In this section I revisit two styles of sprouting analysis. First I discuss the deletion analysis exemplified by Merchant 2001 followed by the LF-copying analysis of Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 2011.

4.1 Deletion analyses
Though Merchant 2001 does not explicit refer to sprouting, it is worthwhile to investigate it here because my approach is foundationally very similar. By discussing its shortcomings I can show how my approach retains its core advantages while correcting its flaws (see Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 2011 for more extensive discussion of said flaws).

Deletion analyses owe their existence to the seminal paper of Ross 1969. As noted earlier, this analysis of sluicing maintains that there is underlying, elided structure in sluicing. Merchant 2001 alters and extends this account. Under this analysis, the ellipsis site has internally structured material throughout the derivation and is deleted phonologically under a condition of semantic mutual entailment with its relevant antecedent (see also AnderBois 2011). That is, for a sentence like (20a), the deletion of the embedded IP is licensed because it (20b) and the antecedent clause (20c) mutually entail each other. The null argument of eating in (20b) is interpreted as an indefinite (as in Johnson 2001) as is the trace in (20c).

(20)  a. Ivy was eating, but I don’t know what, [Ivy was eating t]
b. [[Ivy was eating]] =  \exists x (Ivy was eating x)
c. [[Ivy was eating t]] =  \exists x (Ivy was eating x)

This mutual entailment is sufficient to license the deletion and thus the sprouting. However, sometimes mutual entailment of the clauses holds and sprouting is still not licit. An example of this is found in Chung’s Generalization from above. The sentence in (5b) would be analyzed as (21a) below. Here again the elided IP and its antecedent entail one another. Just as eating entails eating something, so too does jealous entail jealous of someone. The sentence is nevertheless unacceptable. Mutual entailment is insufficient to explain the unacceptability.

(21)  a. *They’re jealous, but it’s unclear who, [they’re jealous of t]
b. [[they’re jealous]] = ∃x (they are jealous of x)
c. [[they’re jealous of t]] = ∃x (they are jealous of x)

Mutual entailment is not only insufficient to account for the sprouting data; it is also sometimes unnecessary. For instance, the sentence in (22a) would be analyzed as (22b). The sentence (and thus the deletion) is acceptable despite the fact that the elided clause and its antecedent do not entail one another (22c).

(22) a. Ivy went to the movies, but I don’t know with who(m).
b. Ivy went to the movies, but I don’t know with who(m), [Ivy went to the movies t]
c. [[Ivy went to the movies]] does not entail [[Ivy went to the moves with someone]]

Finally, the deletion analysis as it stands does not predict the difference in island sensitivity between normal sluicing and sprouting. Recall from the examples in (4) that sprouting was sensitive to island effects while normal sluicing was not. Under the deletion analysis, the only structural difference between the two is that normal sluicing involves an overt inner antecedent. Without further constraints, this is insufficient to predict the difference between the two.

4.1 Covert re-use analyses
The covert re-use analysis of sprouting finds its precursor in Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995 but is most recently explicat ed in Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 2011. The basics of this analysis are sketched below.

Under the covert re-use analysis, the sentence in (23) is derived by first building (24a) in overt syntax. The interrogative C-head in (24) has an ‘empty’ complement, devoid of any syntactic or semantics import. In order for that inchoate clause to receive a proper interpretation, the antecedent IP is re-deployed in the empty complement position (24b). This occurs covertly and only affects the interpretation of the sentence. Lastly, the wh-word undergoes covert syntactic movement that is unremarkable in all respects aside from the fact that it is ‘downward’ to a position to be interpreted in (24c). Since this all happens covertly, all that is pronounced is in (23).

(23) Ivy was standing. Guess where.
(24) a. Ivy was standing. Guess [CP where [IP ] ]
b. Ivy was standing. Guess [CP where [IP Ivy was standing]]
c. Ivy was standing. Guess [CP t, [IP Ivy was standing wherei]]

This analysis explains Chung’s Generalization straightforwardly. The example in (25) is illicit because the IP copying does not introduce a position for the wh-word to covertly move downward into.
They’re jealous, but it’s unclear who.

The island effects are also accounted for. The wh-word actually moves syntactically and as such is subject to island constraints:

Covert Syntax

*I just can’t remember where I saw the movie that showed Ivy eating what.*

This analysis captures these and a good deal of other sprouting facts, but it faces some problems. First, multiple wh-phrases can be sprouted as shown in (27a). These wh-phrases must move covertly as seen in (27b). Chung, Ladusaw, and McClosky posit that this sort of movement is subject to island constraints. It is however unclear why other movement strictures, like relativized minimality, do not seem to apply in this case.

Also, under the covert re-use analysis, the re-used IP maintains its exact interpretation in its new location. This means that any indefinite element in the re-used IP must retain its interpretation. If the IP in (28) is re-used, the reference of the indefinite must also be re-used and the same someone must be referred to. This contrasts with straightforward ellipsis as shown in example (29) with VP-ellipsis. The indefinite under ellipsis can refer to two different people.

Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 2011 offer examples which they claim show that this is borne out. For instance, they claim that the sentence in (30a) can only have the interpretation in which there is only one suspect. This does not seem to hold. The sentences below all seem to easily accommodate interpretations in which the indefinite is interpreted differently in each clause.
and Trisha knew with which knife.

However, they also offer sentences like those in (31). These sentences, in which the indefinite is contained within a complex subject, seem to actually bar differential interpretation of the indefinite:

(31)  a. Where someone commits a crime doesn’t determine how.
     b. The fact that Roger shot one of his victims is not enough to explain why.
     c. Just because you know when someone left doesn’t mean you know why.

While I have no analysis as to why this is the case, it seems that this constraint on indefinite interpretation is independent of sprouting. The un-reduced versions of the above sentences retain the constraint.

(32)  a. Where someone commits a crime doesn’t determine how someone commits a crime.
     b. The fact that Roger shot one of his victims is not enough to explain why Roger shot one of his victims.
     c. Just because you know when someone left doesn’t mean you know why someone left.

The covert re-use analysis actually makes the incorrect prediction that the indefinites must maintain their interpretation. Instead, sprouting patterns more closely with VP-ellipsis. This is a relatively minor problem and by no means fatal. In the following section I present a novel paradigm that more seriously calls into question the viability of this analysis.

5 Sprouting with inner antecedents
The definitional difference between normal sluicing and sprouting is that sprouting lacks an overt inner antecedent. In what sense does sprouting rely on this nullity? It could be that sprouting relies on syntactic non-existence of the inner antecedent, but it is equally logically possible that sprouting only depends on phonetic non-existence of the inner antecedent. The covert re-use analysis crucially assumes the former. In this section I argue for the latter.

This assumption is crucial for the covert re-use analysis because the sprouted wh-phrase requires an empty location to move to. If that position is filled when then IP is re-used, the wh-phrase will have nowhere to land (33). Were it the case that the movement were for some reason not necessary, then the analysis would be indistinguishable from Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey’s analysis of normal sluicing: an unwanted effect.

(33) [Ivy was [VP eating e]], but I don’t know what [Ivy was [VP eating e]]
In arguing that sprouting depends merely on phonetic non-existence of the inner antecedent, I rely on Merchant’s (2004) approach to fragment answers. He argues that the fragment answer in (34a) stems from a structure like (34b) that has been deleted (N.B. Ivy, for instance, is syntactically there, but not pronounced.).

(34)  
   (a) Q: What did Ivy sell?  
       A: Apples  
   (b) Apples, Ivy sold it.

It is possible to construct an example wherein an elided indefinite of a fragment answer serves as the inner antecedent for a sprouted wh-phrase (35a). The inner antecedent of the sprouted wh-word is the elided indefinite from the fragment answer (35b). I show that these constructions share all the characteristics of sprouting and should be considered as such. The example below shows that this construction allows direct objects to be the sluiced wh-word.3

(35)  
   (a) Q: Who sold something?  
       A: Ivy, but I don’t know what  
   (b) Ivy, it sold something but I don’t know what Ivy sold it.

Adjuncts are also allowed (36), but as seen in (37), subjects cannot be similarly sluiced.

(36)  
   Q: Who was dancing?  
   A: Ivy, but I don’t know {where/with who(m)/why}  

(37)  
   (a) Q: What did someone find?  
       A: *Some cats, but I don’t know who  
   (b) Q: What did Ivan say someone stole?  
       A: *A car, but I don’t know who

Recall that objects of prepositions cannot sprout either. They also cannot serve the wh-word in these constructions:

(38)  
   (a) Q: What was stolen by someone?  
       A: *The portrait, but I don’t know who  
   (b) Q: What was beneficial to someone?  
       A: *The rain, but I don’t know who

3 When the fragment answer is a subject, an auxiliary can also be present and the judgments persist:

(i)  
   Q: Who sold something?  
   A: Ivy did, but I don’t know what
As shown in (39), indirect objects also cannot be sprouted in this fashion.

(39)  a.  Q: What did Ivy serve someone?
       A: *Apples, but I don’t know who

       The examples where sprouting is ruled out are saved when the antecedent clause is pronounced. Just like with normal sluicing, as long as the inner antecedent is pronounced most anything can be sluiced.

(40)  a.  Q: What did someone find?
       A: Cats, someone found, but I don’t know who
       b.  Q: What did Ivy say was beneficial to someone?
           A: The rain, Ivy said was beneficial to someone, but I can’t remember who
       c.  Q: What did Ivy serve someone?
           A: Apples, Ivy served someone, but I don’t know who

Further, when the otherwise ruled out examples are not sluiced, the answers are acceptable. There is no IP-ellipsis in the examples in (41) and in turn no extraposition to rule out the sprouted elements. Reprieve is granted to subjects and objects of prepositions alike.\(^4\)

(41)  a.  Q: What did someone find?
       A: Some cats, but I don’t know who found them
       b.  Q: What did Ivy say was beneficial to someone?
           A: The rain, but I can’t remember who she said it was beneficial to

       Lastly, like traditional sprouting, these constructions seem to be sensitive to island violations. Compare the island-violating example in (42a) with a licit extraction in (42b):

(42)  a.  Q: Who made the claim that Ivy sold something?
       A: *Iris, but I don’t know what
       b.  Q: Who said that Ivy sold something
           A: Iris, but I don’t know what

\(^4\) Dative shifted indirect objects are not rescued in this case. The extraction of these in English is independently ruled out when there is no sluicing:

(i)  Q: What did Ivy serve someone?
     A: *Apples, but I don’t know who she served them
In sum, this sort of construction is subject to the same constraints as traditional sprouting: Only direct objects and adjuncts can sprout whereas subject, indirect objects, and objects of prepositions cannot. As such it should be considered to be a genuine instance of sprouting itself.

Most important however is what the above paradigm means for the covert re-use analysis. Sprouting hinges upon the phonetic non-existence of the inner antecedent, not syntactic non-existence. The covert re-use analysis thus cannot capture the entire range of sprouting cases.

6 Some remaining problems, some solutions
In this section I will show that Merchant-style deletion analysis can be salvaged if embellished with extraposition and the decomposed Merge view of adjunction.

First recall that the fact that the Merchant analysis ran into a problem with the mutual entailment condition being insufficient to rule out (5b). Repeated here in (43), the relevant clauses mutually entail each other, but the result is bad.

(43) *They are jealous, but it’s unclear who, [they’re jealous of t_i]

This is no longer a problem for a deletion account if we assume that extraposition feeds sprouting. The object of the preposition cannot extrapoze, thus precluding the sprout. The problems concerning islands and sprouting without mutual entailment require more theorizing to rectify.

6.1 Decomposed Merge
Given Bare Phrase Structure (BPS) of Chomsky 1995, categorical labels are no longer extrinsic entities that remain unchanged throughout the derivation. Instead their status as minimal, intermediate, or maximal projections is relativized. A maximal projection is simply a projection that projected no further. It is thus only possible for a given head to have one maximal projection.

Traditionally, an adjunct would leave the bar-level of its host phrase unaffected as in (44a), with BPS however Merging an adjunct necessarily affects the bar-level of its host (44b).6

(44) a. Ivy [VP [VP red] in the park]
   b. Ivy [VP [V read] in the park]

This new conception creates a problem with the differential targeting of adjuncts by operations acting on maximal projections. It is possible to elide either the VP to the inclusion of the adjunct in (45a) or to its exclusion in (45b):

---

5 Note again that this typology is exactly that of what can extrapoze in English.
6 See Hornstein 2009 for a more extensive discussion of this point and for arguments against reformulation of adjunction as pair-Merge which could potentially avoid this problem.
VP-ellipsis necessarily targets the maximal VP projection and under BPS it should not be possible to delete solely the verb to the exclusion of the adjunct. To address this problem, Hornstein 2009 proposes decomposing the Merge operation of Chomsky 1995 into two sub-operations: Concatenate and Label. It is possible for adjuncts to sometimes merely Concatenate without undergoing Label. If the adjunct in question both Concatenates and Merges and VP-ellipsis applies, the result is as in (46a). If the adjunct only Concatenates, VP-ellipsis results in (46b) (Take the caret to indicate mere Concatenation).

(46)  
a. Iris read in the park and Ivy did [read in the park] too  
b. Iris read in the park and Ivy did [read] at the library

If we assume that adjuncts can optionally forego Labeling, it is possible to maintain the mutual entailment condition on IP-ellipsis in sprouting. An example like (47) does not seem to involve mutually entailing IPs: going to the movies does not entail going with anyone.

(47) Ivy went to the movies, but I can’t remember [with who(m)], [Ivy went to the movies t]

Yet if the adjunct comitative only Concatenates into the structure, it is possible to elide only an IP that is entailed by its antecedent and vice versa (48). Hornstein posits that the merely Concatenated element, while attached to the main structure, is invisible to operations on that structure. Deletion targets the IP, but that operation cannot also target the Concatenated adjunct. What was formerly a problem for the deletion account is no longer one if we assume this.

(48) Ivy went to the movies, but I can’t remember [with who(m)], [Ivy went to the movies ]^[t]

The same idea can be used to capture the sensitivity to island constraints that sprouting shows. If we assume the landing site of an extraposed element is an adjunct to its host and that it merely Concatenates in that position, it is possible to capture the island constraint. The trace need not move beyond the IP to escape the IP-deletion. It only needs to extrapose locally and fail to Label. Were that to happen, the trace of the element that moved from the extraposition site would evade ellipsis. Assuming the *-marking analysis of island violations, we capture the island sensitivity of sprouting while maintaining a deletion analysis (49):

---

7 Hornstein (p.c) does not intend the term Concatenate to imply any fixed linear order but merely an orderless grouping.
(49) *I saw the movie that showed Ivy eating, I just can’t remember what. [I saw the movie that showed Ivy eating ✏️][*t]

Thus the main problems with the Merchant-style deletion analysis of sprouting can be avoided when extraposition is added to the derivation as well as Hornstein’s decomposition of Merge.

7 Conclusion
In this paper I have argued for a reformulation of the deletion account of sprouting. Both the deletion account and its covert re-use counterpart run into problems as they stand, but I have shown that the deletion analysis’s shortcomings can be avoided and that the covert re-use analysis cannot account for a new paradigm of sprouting. This new paradigm refines the definition of sprouting such that it is the phonetic non-existence of the inner antecedent that matters. Further, Sprouting bears the same constraints as extraposition and when extraposition is taken to feed sprouting, those constraints are explained.
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