Unelided basic remnants in Germanic ellipsis or: ÜBRIGE Arguments
Bradley Larson *University of Maryland*

Aim: I argue that sentences involving *swiping* (Ross 1969, Merchant 2002) are instances of a more general pattern. That is, the characteristics of swiping **[1]** are not unique to prepositions.
The data presented adjudicates between competing analyses of the swiping construction in favor of an analysis in which generalized swiping is fed by extraposition.

Background: The first analysis of swiping is found in Ross 1969. He posits that the example in [1] is derived via wh-movement followed by ellipsis of everything except the wh-word and the preposition **[2]**. The next prominent analysis is that of Merchant 2002. He posits that the prepositional phrase is pied-piped to spec,CP in its entirety and that the wh-word head-moves at PF to incorporate into the preposition **[3]**. Richards (1997) (also van Craenenbroeck 2004 and Hartman and Ai 2007) posits that the PP pied-pipes to a left-peripheral functional projection prior to the wh-word sub-extracting further **[4]**. Finally, Kim (1997) (also Nakao et al. 2007, Hasegawa 2007, and Larson 2011) posits an analysis in which the wh-word moves to spec,CP and its host PP extraposes and avoids the IP-ellipsis **[5]**. Either the extraposition occurs first derivationally (Nakao et al. and Larson) or the wh-movement (Kim and Hasegawa) occurs first.

Generalized Swiping: Following Rosen (1976), swiping is a sub-type of sprouting. That is, the antecedent clause cannot contain an overt analogue of the sluiced element **[6]**. It is however not the case that only PPs (and DPs **[7]**) can be implicit in the antecedent. It is also the case that in English both gerundive and non-finite phrases can be implicit **[8,9]**. These implicit phrases are mostly devoid of lexical specification, containing indefinites and semantically bleached verbs like *do*. Like with prepositions, it is possible for for these erstwhile implicit phrases to 'swipe'.
This is seen in examples **[10-12]** with clefting because of an ambiguity that that arises when no clefting has occured **[13]** (examples like [11] are noted by Hartman and Ai).

Summary: In short, swiping generalizes to any implicit element with an extractable complement. It is not just prepositions that can swipe, but rather any element that 1) can go **U**nelided, 2) is **B**asic in the sense that it can have an implicit antecedent, and 3) is a **R**emnant phrase out of which a wh-word has moved. I show this to be possible **I**n **G**ermanic **E**llipsis constructions. Swiped elements are thus sub-types of *ÜBRIGE* (German for 'leftover') elements.

Problems for previous accounts: The Ross account can handle these facts but such an analysis was acknowledged even by him to be unexplanatory. The Merchant account fails because the movement of the wh-word qua head is too far and would violate the head movement constraint (Travis 1984). The Richards account also fails to account for this data as the sprouted gerundive and non-finite phrases cannot independently pied-pipe and thus could not feed the swiping **[14-17]**. The extraposition account however can predict these data as all three types of implicit element can extrapose **[18-20]**. For this reason and others I argue for an extraposition analysis of ÜBRIGE elements following Nakao et al. and Larson in particular.

Extensions: In the account argued for here, extraposition feeds these constructions. This predicts that sub-parts of ÜBRIGE elements, however implicit their antecedent, should not be able to survive ellipsis if they cannot independently extrapose. The object of the gerundive in **[21]** cannot extrapose and it is correctly predicted that it cannot also survive ellipsis to the exclusion of the gerundive **[22]**. The same holds for the non-finite clauses **[23-25]**. Furthermore, German has been shown to disallow swiping **[26]** and this has been attributed to its ban on preposition stranding. If what has been called swiping can extend to non-prepositional remnants, 'swiping' of a sort should be possible in German. This is shown to be the case in **[27]** (not clefted as the previous ambiguity does not arise here). On analogy with [12], German allows a formerly implicit element to appear under sluicing with its internal argument wh-word fronted.

[1] Sal was talking, but I don't know what about.
[2] Sal was talking, but I don't know $what_i$ Sal was talking about t_i
[3] Sal was talking, but I don't know $[what_i+about\ t_i]_j$ Sal was talking t_j
[4] Sal was talking, but I don't know $what_i\ [about\ t_i]_j$ Sal was talking t_j

[5] Sal was talking, but I don't know what$_i$ Sal was talking t$_j$ [about t$_i$]$_j$

[6] Sal was talking (*about something), but I don't know what about.

[7] Sal ate, but I don't know what

[8] 'Sal was caught' allows the interpretation in which Sal was caught *doing something*

[9] 'Sal was eager' allows the interpretation in which Sal was eager *to do something*

[10] Sal was talking, but I can't remember what it was about (*what it was Sal was talking about*)

[11] Sal was caught, but I can't remember what it was doing (*what it was Sal was caught doing*)

[12] Sal was eager, but I can't remember what it was to do (*what it was Sal was eager to do*)

[13] S was eager, but I can't remember what to do (*what S was eager to do* or *what I should do*)

[14] *I can't remember doing what it was Sal was caught. (cf. *what it was Sal was caught doing*)

[15] *I can't remember to do what it was Sal was eager. (cf. *what it was Sal was eager to do*)

[16] ***Doing what was Sal caught? **[17] *To do what was Sal eager

[18] Sal was talking yesterday to someone

[19] Sal was caught yesterday doing something wrong

[20] Sal was eager yesterday to do something exciting

[21] *Sal was caught doing yesterday something wrong

[22] Sal was caught, but I can't remember what it was *(doing)

[23] Sal was eager to (*yesterday) do (*yesterday) something exciting

[24] Sal was eager, but I can't remember what it was *(to) do

[25] Sal was eager, but I can't remember what it was *(to do)

**[26] ***Sal hat gesprochen, aber ich weiss nicht wem mit

Sal has spoken but I know not who.dat with

'Sal spoke, but I don't know who with'

[27] Sal war bereit, aber ich hatte keine Ahnung was zu machen

Sal was ready but I had no idea what to do

'Sal was ready, but I had no idea what *Sal was ready* to do'

References:

van Craenenbroeck. 2004. *Ellipsis in Dutch dialects*. Diss. University of Leiden.

Hartman and Ai. 2007. A focus account of swiping. Ms. Harvard University

Hasegawa. 2007. Swiping involves preposition stranding, not pied-piping. GLOW 30. Tromso.

Kim. 1997. Syntactic Focus Movement and Ellipsis: A Minimalist Approach. Diss. UCONN.

Larson. 2011. Swiping Subdued: A simpler approach. *CGSW* 26. Amsterdam.

Merchant. 2002. Swiping in Germanic. In *Studies in Germanic Syntax*. John Benjamins.

Nakao, Hajime, and Yoshida. 2006. When a Complement PP Goes Missing: A Study on the Licensing of Swiping. *WCCFL 25*

Richards. 1997. What moves where when in which language? Diss. MIT.

Rosen. 1976. Guess What About? *NELS 6.* Montreal.

Ross. 1969. Guess who? In Papers from the 5th Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.

Travis. 1984. Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation, Diss, MIT.