

**TITLE. Voice mismatches in sluicing: An English-Spanish comparative analysis**

**INTRODUCTION.** Sluicing in English is claimed to disallow voice mismatches between the antecedent clause and the clause containing the sluice (Chung 2006, Merchant 2007, among others). This paper provides evidence that Spanish does not conform to this description once we acknowledge the existence of sluiced clauses that derive from a copular source. It is proposed that English can be analyzed along the same lines, thereby explaining some recalcitrant data.

**BACKGROUND.** As (1-2) show, voice mismatches are disallowed in English sluicing. (3) is said to represent a case of preposition stranding:

(1) \*The statue was restored but we don't know who [<who> restored the statue].

(2) \*Somebody restored the statue but we don't know by whom [the statue was restored <by whom>].

(3) The statue was restored by someone but we don't know who [the statue was restored by <who>].

Restricting the discussion of sluicing to PF-deletion proposals, the following premises are commonly accepted to account for (1-3): (i) sluicing is TP deletion; (ii) some degree of syntactic isomorphism between the antecedent and the sluice is required (Merchant 2007, Chung 2006); (iii) voice is hosted by a syntactic head below TP (Merchant 2007, 2008, Gallego 2009).

**PROBLEM.** Spanish does not allow preposition stranding:

(4) \*¿Cuál fue restaurada esta estatua por?

which was restored this statue by

However, a sentence like (5) with passive voice in the antecedent is grammatical:

(5) La estatua fue restaurada por un artista novel pero no dijeron cuál.

the statue was restored by an artist novel but not said-they which

Therefore, the source for the sluice in (5) cannot be the one typically posed for the English equivalent, thus discarding a passive voice verb in it:

(6) a. ... \*no dijeron cuál [la estatua fue restaurada por <cuál>]

b. ... <sup>OK</sup>didn't say which one [the statue was restored by <which one>]

**ANALYSIS.** Several possibilities arise. (i) Spanish sluicing targets a phrase smaller than TP; (ii) Spanish sluicing is TP-deletion but voice is hosted in a higher projection; (iii) voice mismatches are not the responsibility of the syntactic component; (iv) voice specifications are not necessarily computed for syntactic isomorphism. (i) and (ii) can be discarded because, while passive<sub>A</sub>-non-passive<sub>E</sub> is attested, the reverse is not allowed -note that the prepositional agentive remnant in (7-8) below would force the existence of a passive verb in the sluiced clause:

(7) \*Un artista novel restauró la estatua, pero no dijeron por cuál

an artist novel restored the statue but not said-they by which

It is not even possible when the antecedent has an active verb but the informational structure of a passive construction:

(8) \*La estatua la restauró un artista novel, pero no dijeron por cuál.

the statue it restored an artist novel but not said-they by which

(8) also serves to discard (iii) considered from a pragmatics viewpoint, given its passive-like pragmatics. Frazier's (2008) elliptical repair in processing, though appealing, would be questionable. He acknowledges the English situation with respect to sluicing and since Spanish processing of sluicing is supposed to work along the same lines, his proposal could not be used for the observed difference between the two languages.

**PROPOSAL.** (iv) represents the best answer. The source for the sluice in (5) is the specificational copular construction in (9) (which gives support to Vicente 2008):

(9) ... no dijeron cuál [el artista novel fue <cuál>]

not said-they which the artist novel was which

Therefore, the following generalization is proposed:

(10) Voice mismatches between the antecedent and the sluice in Spanish are allowed if the latter is derived from a specificational copular source.

The ungrammatical active<sub>A</sub>-passive<sub>E</sub> in (7-8) are explained because the “by-phrase” remnants preclude a specificational copular source for the sluice.

*ENGLISH*. If copular sources are available as sources to English sluicing, (2) would be ruled out just like (7-8) and it would imply that there is no preposition stranded in the elliptical TP in (3). As for (1), the same grammaticality status is assigned to its Spanish counterpart:

(11) \*La estatua fue restaurada pero no sabemos quién.  
the statue was restored but not know-we who

(1) and (11) cannot be saved because there is no specificational copular source for the remnant. Furthermore, the acceptance of sluices with ungrammatical preposition stranding (Fortin 2007, Chung et al. 1995) may be explained by the availability of a copular source for them:

(12) a. \*Whose wishes did he get married against?

b. John got married against someone’s wishes, but I don’t know whose

- proposed source: ... but I don’t know whose [the wishes were <whose>]

(13) a. \*What circumstances will we use force under?

b. We are willing to use force under certain circumstances, but we will not say in advance which ones

- proposed source: ... but we will not say which ones [the conditions are <which ones>]

*CONCLUSION*. Voice mismatches are allowed in Spanish sluicing when a copular source is available for the remnant. This has been shown to explain why the direction of the mismatch is always passive<sub>A</sub>-active<sub>E</sub>. The same kind of mismatch may be postulated for English under the same circumstances, which would account for data involving impossible preposition stranding cases. Like Merchant (2007), the present proposal maintains full syntactic structure in the sluice and some necessary degree of isomorphism between the antecedent and the sluiced clauses, but requires one addition to be considered with respect to a different source: the X in ‘X be remnant’. Finally, in making available a copular source, it adds an element in the numeration of the elliptical TP that is not present in the antecedent, contra Chung (2006).

#### *REFERENCES*

Chung, S. 2006. Sluicing and the lexicon: the point of no return. In *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 31*, ed. Rebecca T.C. and Y. Kim, 73-91. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Chung, S. Ladusaw, W., and J. McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:239-282.

Fortin, C. 2007. Indonesian sluicing and verb phrase ellipsis: Description and explanation in a minimalist framework. PhD. Dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Frazier, L. 2008. Processing ellipsis: A processing solution to the undergeneration problem? In *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie, 21-32. Sommerville, Ma: Cascadilla Press.

Gallego, A. 2009. Ellipsis by phase. Ms. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Merchant, J. 2007. Voice and ellipsis. Ms. University of Chicago.

Merchant, J. 2008. An asymmetry in voice mismatches in VP-ellipsis and pseudogapping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:169-179.

Vicente, L. 2008. Syntactic isomorphism and non-isomorphism under ellipsis. Ms. University of California, Santa Cruz.