

Swiping subdued: A simpler approach

Aim: In this talk I will present a novel account of the swiping phenomenon in Northern Germanic. I argue that swiping is no different than regular sluicing or even ellipsis in general. There are certain elements that can survive ellipsis and I argue that the prepositions from which the swiping wh-words move are among these. That is, wh-movement happens as per usual and the preposition it moves from goes un-elided, it does not move at all itself. This is the novelty that distinguishes this analysis from the current ones. In other words, [1] is underlyingly [2]. This will allow us to cover a broader swath of the empirical landscape and in a more simple fashion than current approaches. It also allows us to make interesting predictions and conclusions about the nature of islands as PF phenomena. Finally it provides an explanation as to why only a subset of the Northern Germanic languages that can strand prepositions can undergo swiping.

Background: Accounts of swiping must account for a few characteristics. Swiping involves non-canonical order of object-preposition as seen in [1]. Swiping *only* occurs with sluicing [3]. The preposition is stressed [4]. There can be no antecedent to the preposition [5]. These restrictions can be found summed up nicely in Merchant, 2002. A final characteristic of swiping is that the moved wh-element must be ‘minimal’ [6]. The analysis presented here assumes the analysis of Hartman & Ai, 2007 in explaining this, which works just as well in this account.

Previous Accounts: There are three relevant previous accounts (ignoring for now those of Ross, 1969 and van Riemsdijk, 1978). The first is that of Merchant, 2002. In his account the wh-word undergoes post syntactic head movement and affixes to the preposition head, the PP having already moved to Spec,CP and the IP elided [7]. This approach captures the minimality restriction on the wh-word quite straightforwardly and Merchant offers more complicated explanation of the subsequent restrictions. In analyses from van Craenenbroeck, 2004 and Hartman & Ai, 2007 the PP moves to a position in the left periphery. The wh-word then sub-extracts from the PP to the Spec,CP position and the IP elides [8]. These accounts handle the fact that the preposition is stressed fairly easily. They claim that the PP lands in a Spec,FocusP position whereby the preposition gets a focus feature checked and is stressed. As focused, new information, the preposition cannot have a discourse antecedent and that fact is thus also explained. Finally, Hasegawa, 2007 suggests that the wh-word moves in the typical fashion to Spec,CP and this is followed by extraposition of the remnant PP outside of the IP, which then elides [9]. This analysis accounts for the same facts as the previous one, just in a different fashion.

Problems: Merchant’s analysis does not predict any intervening material (that can not otherwise affix to wh-heads) to be possible between the wh-word and the preposition. But this is not the case as seen in [10]. The wh-word and preposition can be separated by a clause. This approach also shares problems with the other analyses as discussed presently. The accounts that involve sub-extraction rely on a sort of movement that has been argued to be illicit (Huang, 1982). Be that as it may, they also make the wrong empirical predictions. For one, more than one prepositional phrase can be ‘sluiced’ [11] (from Richards, 1997). Under these approaches the PP phrase is motivated to move out of the IP solely because of its focus feature. Since the second PP is in no way stressed or focused, it has no motivation to move. Even if it did have such a feature it would have no left-peripheral position to move to as Cinque, 1999 argues that there is only FocP per clause. Any IP-external position for the PP to move to would be ad hoc. The Hasegawa analysis also makes the false predictions with respect to multiple sluiced prepositions. When the swiped preposition is extraposed, we expect the order in [12], which is ungrammatical. Finally, swiping obeys island constraints [13] (it can only mean that the speaker cannot remember who the claim was made to, not who was talked to). The analyses above have the island violating trace located within the IP and thus swiping should behave like sluicing and avoid island effects; this is not so.

New Analysis: It is a basic empirical fact that VP-ellipsis can leave adjuncts unscathed [14/15] so long as the adjunct contrasts with something in the antecedent. It is also the case that sluicing can allow adjuncts to avoid deletion [16]. I posit that swiping is merely sluicing that fails to elide the

preposition from which the wh-word has moved. This works by unalloyed analogy to the VP-ellipsis. This explains why swiping only happens with sluicing, it **is** sluicing [2]. The preposition must be stressed because it is always the case that constituents that survive ellipsis are stressed: they contrast with the antecedent sentence. Island effects are predicted as PF phenomenon. The trace of an element that moves out of an island is within the ellipsis site in sluicing. The island violation is ameliorated. Merchant, 2001 (a.o.) argues this is due to the ellipsis. In this account swiping island violations persist because the trace isn't in the ellipsis site and hasn't moved.

Comparative Swiping: It has been noted by Merchant that only a subset of the languages that could potentially allow swiping (those that allow preposition stranding) actually do. For example, English can swipe, but Norwegian can't [17]. Given the parallels between swiping and the availability of adjuncts avoiding ellipsis, we make a prediction. Sentences like [18] in which there is sluicing and an adjunct is not deleted should be impossible in Norwegian. It turns out that this is the case and as such further supports this analysis ([18] is fine without the sluicing).

- [1] J. was talking, I just can't remember who with.
 [2] I just can't remember who_i [_{IP} [_{IP} ~~J. was talking~~] with t_i].
 [3] *J. was talking, I just can't remember who with J. was talking.
 [4] J. was talking, I just can't remember {*WHO with / who WITH}.
 [5] *J. was talking with someone, I just can't remember who with
 [6] *J. was talking, I just can't remember which person with.
 [7] I just can't remember [_{CP} [_{PP} who_i+with t_i]_k [_{IP} ~~J. was talking~~ t_k]]
 [8] I just can't remember [_{CP} who_i [_{FocP} [_{PP} with t_i]_k [_{IP} ~~J. was talking~~ t_k]]]
 [9] I just can't remember [_{CP} who_i [_{IP} ~~J. was talking~~ t_k] [_{PP} with t_i]]
 [10] M. said that J. was talking, I just can't remember who she said to (from van Craenenbroeck)
 [11] J. was talking, I just can't remember who to about what.
 [12] *J. was talking, I just can't remember [_{CP} who_i [_{IP} ~~J. was talking~~ t_k] about what [_{PP} to t_i]_k]
 [13] M. made the claim that J. was talking, I just can't remember who to
 [14] J. read a book in the park and M. did so [VP [~~VP read a book~~] in the park] TOO
 [15] J. read a book in the park and M. did so [VP [VP read a book] in the LIBRARY]
 [16] I know J. read Moby Dick on SUNDAY, I just can't remember what on MONDAY
 [17] *Per gikk på kino, men jeg veit ikke hvem med.
Per went to cinema but I know not who with
 'Per went to the movies but I don't know who with.'
 [18] *Jon møtte to mennesker forrige uke. Jeg husker hvem han møtte på søndag men jeg
John met two people last week. I remember who he met on Sunday but I
kan ikke huske hvem på lørdag.
can not remember who on Saturday
 'J. met two people last week. I remember who he met on Sun. but I can't remember who on Sat.'

- Cinque, G. 1999. Adverbs and functional heads. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 van Craenenbroeck, J. 2004. Ellipsis in Dutch Dialects. LOT dissertation series 96, Utrecht: LOT.
 Hartman, J. & R.R. Ai (2007). *A focus account of swiping*. Ms. Harvard University
 Hasegawa, H. 2007. Swiping involves preposition stranding, not pied-piping. GLOW 30,
 Huang, C.-T. J. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. dissertation, MIT.
 Merchant, J. 2001. The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis. Oxford
 Merchant, J. 2002. "Swiping in Germanic," In C. Jan-Wouter Zwart and Werner Abraham (eds.),
Studies in Germanic Syntax, 289-315. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
 Richards, N. 1997. What moves where when in which language? PhD thesis, MIT.
 van Riemsdijk, H. 1978. A case study in syntactic markedness Foris: Dordrecht.
 Ross, J. R. 1969. Guess who? Chicago Linguistic Society.