I. Ellipsis and island violation repair

(1) Sluicing is the ellipsis phenomenon, first investigated by Ross (1969), often found in embedded questions, given appropriate discourse context:

(2) Mary will hire someone.
Tell me who Mary will hire.

(3) The WH-phrase fronts to Spec of CP, and the residual clause (IP, I assume) deletes:

(4) Tell me CP / \ NP C' who / \ C IP / \ NP I' Mary / \ I VP
will / \ NP V' t / \ V NP hire t

(5) Sluicing is also possible when the WH-movement has been 'long distance', out of an embedded clause:

(6) I heard that Mary will someone.
Tell me who you heard that Mary will hire.

(7) Ross observed that unacceptable wh-movement out of an 'island' is rendered much more acceptable by Sluicing, as seen in the following pairs.

(8) I believe that he bit someone, but they don't know who (I believe that he bit)

(9) a *I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who I believe the claim that he bit [Complex NP Constraint, noun complement]
b (??)I believe the claim that he bit someone, but they don't know who

(10) a *Irv and someone were dancing together, but I don't know who Irv and were dancing together [Coordinate Structure Constraint]
b (??)Irv and someone were dancing together, but I don't know who

(11) a *She kissed a man who bit one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize which one of my friends she kissed a man who bit [Complex NP Constraint, relative clause]
b (??)She kissed a man who bit one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize which one of my friends

(12) a *That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who that he'll hire is possible [Sentential Subject Constraint]
b (??)That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who

(13) Chomsky (1972) gives similar Sluicing examples:

(14) a *I don't know which children he has plans to send to college
b He has plans to send some of his children to college, but I don't know which ones

(15) Chomsky's suggests [see also Lakoff (1970), Baker and Brame (1972), Lakoff (1972)] that * (# in Chomsky's presentation) is assigned to an island when it is crossed by a movement operation (the complex NP in (16)).

(16) I don't know CP \\
NP I'NP
which children NP he I VP
I V NP
has plans to send t to college

(17) When Sluicing deletes a category containing the *-marked item, the derivation is salvaged. This indicates that even if island constraints (perhaps falling under Subjacency) are conditions on steps in derivations, violation is ultimately a property of a particular level of representation.

(18) For Chomsky (1972), the condition banning * applies at surface structure. The results are the same if, instead, it is a PF condition, as suggested by Lasnik (1995b), Lasnik (In press).

(19) Merchant (1999) also argues, based on similar phenomena, that Subjacency violations are PF effects, but he rejects Chomsky's implementation.

(20) Merchant argues that island violations fall into two categories, and only one of the categories constitute PF effects.

(21) I know that he must be proud of it, but I don't know how proud (he must be of it)

(22) *I know that he must be proud of it, but I don't know how (he must be proud of it) Ross (1969)
The Left Branch Condition (LBC) is a requirement of a different sort. Ross (1969), Merchant (1999).

Another possibility is that LBC is not, in itself, different, but that in (22), we have not a mere Subjacency violation, but an ECP violation (since the moving item is not an argument). And the ECP is known to hold at LF.

(*)ni xiang-zhidao [Lisi weisheme mai-le sheme] you wonder Lisi why bought what 'What is the reason such that you wonder what Lisi bought for that reason?'

Is VP ellipsis, unlike Sluicing, not a PF process?

*They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do *They want to hire someone who speaks* Merchant (1999)

BUT compare:

*They want to hear a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they do

They want to hear a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which (Balkan language) they want to hear a lecture about

They want the students to attend a lecture about a Balkan language, but I don't know which they do

II. Strong features, defective PF objects, and ellipsis

A. Pseudogapping

a If you don't believe me, you will see the weatherman
b I rolled up a newspaper, and Lynn did see a magazine
c Kathy likes astronomy, but she doesn't see meteorology Levin (1978)

The DA proved Jones guilty and the Assistant DA will prove Smith guilty
b John gave Bill a lot of money, and Mary will give Susan a lot of money

You might not believe me but you will Bob

NP-raising to Spec of AgrO ('Object Shift') is overt in English. [Koizumi (1993); Koizumi (1995), developing ideas of Johnson (1991)]

Pseudogapping as overt raising to Spec of AgrO followed by deletion of VP. [Lasnik (1995a)]

Once the matching feature of the lower lexical V is 'attracted', the lower V becomes defective. A PF crash will
be avoided if either pied-piping or deletion of a category containing the lower V (VP Deletion = Pseudogapping in the relevant instances) takes place. [Lasnik (1999), developing an idea of Ochi (1999)]

B. Sluicing

(43) Sluicing - WH-Movement followed by deletion of IP (abstracting away from 'split Infl' details). [Saito and Murasugi (1990), Lobeck (1990)]

(44) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
Speaker B: I wonder who Mary will see.

(45) Speaker A: Mary will see someone.
Speaker B: Who Mary will see?

(46)                     CP
                             / \  
                           NP   C'
                          who  / \  
                           C   IP
                      [strong F] / \  
                     NP   I'
                        Mary / \  
                           I   VP
                          will /  
                           [F]   V'
                             / \  
                            V   NP
                        see t

(47) *Who Mary will see?
(48) Who will Mary see?

(49) Assume that matrix interrogative C contains the strong feature, with the matching feature of Infl raising overtly to check it. This leaves behind a phonologically defective Infl, which will cause a PF crash unless either pied-piping or deletion of a category containing that Infl (Sluicing) takes place.

IV. A consequence for the EPP

(50) Certain heads have a strong feature, demanding overt movement for checking. Chomsky (1995)

(52)                     AgrsP
                               / \  
                             NP   Agrs'
                          she  / \  
                          / \   TP
                          T  / \  
                        will  / \  
                       NP   V'
                     t    |  

(53) Mary said she won't sleep, although she will sleep

(54) Agr, P
              / \  
           Agrs'  
           / \   
          [TP   
        [strong F] / \  
      will  / \  
    she   / \  
  [F]  

(55) *Mary said she won't sleep, although will she sleep

(56) Agr (or T) requires a Spec. It does not sufficient to check its 'EPP feature'.
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