

A Syntactic Analysis of Gapping and Multiple Sluicing

Rumi Takaki
Kyushu University

This research presents an account for previously unknown contrast between gapping and multiple sluicing for the island repair effect, analyzing their syntactic structures. To begin with, island violations in sluicing such as (1a) can be circumvented under ellipsis as in (1b).

(1) a. *Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn't remember which Ben will be mad if she talks to.

b. Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn't remember which.

(Bošković (2011):1)

The same phenomenon can be seen in multiple sluicing as in (2).

(2) a. *Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers about something, but she couldn't remember which of the teachers about what Ben will be mad if she talks to.

b. ?Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers about something, but she couldn't remember which of the teachers about what.

By contrast, in gapping such an island repair does not occur under ellipsis as illustrated in (3).

(3) a. John must be a fool to have married Jane, and Bill must be a fool to have married Martha.

b. *John must be a fool to have married Jane, and Bill, Martha.

Contrasts between gapping and multiple sluicing in terms of the island repair effect can also be observed in other islands, such as *wh* and subject islands.

To account for the island repair in sluicing, for example in (4), Merchant (2008) presents an analysis, in which * feature is assigned to *wh* remnants when they cross islands and * feature is carried along the derivation. However, the head C, which has [+*wh*] and [+Q], checks the * feature of the topmost *wh* remnant so that it can be deleted. Further, * features of lower copies are removed when TP is deleted at PF. Therefore, no *s remain in (4a).

(4) a. They want to hire someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't remember which.

b. [_{CP} which₂ C [_{TP} *t₂ [_{TP} they [_{VP} *t₂ [_{VP} want to hire [_{NP} [_{NP} someone [_{CP} who speaks t₂]]]]]]]]]]

[+wh, +Q]

speaks t₂]]]]]]]]

Following Merchant (2008), we assume that the * feature is assigned to remnants of gapping when they cross islands and propose the following: () the remnants of gapping and multiple sluicing move to FocP in the CP domain, and are transferred in the same transfer domain to have pair-list interpretation; () consequently, TP deletion applies under identity with the antecedent clause; () there is no agreement for rightward movement, while there is obligatory agreement between C head and *wh* words for leftward movement. Based on (), () and (), we demonstrate that our syntactic arguments are derived from the remnant movements; namely, the second remnant adjoins rightward to vP, and finally to FocP in gapping, while in multiple sluicing, the second *wh* phrase moves leftward to vP and finally tucks in under the first *wh* phrase in CP. This is supported by the following facts. As is well known, objects of prepositions cannot be

Heavy NP Shifted as in (5a). This is true of gapping in (5b).

(5) a. *John looked at t_1 in the living room yesterday [the man who lived next door]₁.

b. John talked about Bill and Mary *(about) Susan.

This suggests that gapping includes rightward movement of remnants. On the other hand, the evidence against rightward adjunct analysis of multiple sluicing, in which the remnants move rightward in the CP domain followed by TP deletion (cf. Lasnik (2007)), comes from ECM construction as in (6).

(6) a. *I believe to be dishonest the politician with high profile in international affairs.

b. One of the boys believes behind one of the trees to be the best place to hide, but I don't know which of the boys behind which tree.

In the ECM construction, the subjects of the infinitival clause cannot be Heavy NP Shifted. If the second remnant of multiple sluicing moves rightward, (6b) would be ungrammatical, contrary to the fact. Therefore, in gapping, when the second remnant moves rightward and crosses the island, * feature is assigned to the remnant. However, the * feature remains unchecked, and the derivation crashes at PF. Whereas, in multiple sluicing, * feature is checked and deleted under agreement, thereby the derivation converges.

Thus, we will demonstrate that the relevant factor for the differences between gapping and multiple sluicing follows from the directionality of remnant movements and show that our claim successfully explains the differences of island phenomena in gapping and multiple sluicing.

References

- Bošković (2011) "Rescue by PF Deletion, Traces as (Non)interveners, and the That-Trace Effect," *Linguistic Inquiry* 42, 1-44.
- Lasnik, Howard (2007) "Multiple Sluicing", a handout given in LING 819 Spring 2007, University of Maryland.
- Merchant, Jason (2008) "Variable Island Repair under Ellipsis," *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson, 132-153, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.