1. Introduction: The preposition-stranding generalization (PSG)

- One of the strongest arguments for the existence of unpronounced syntactic structure inside an ellipsis site:

  \textit{Preposition stranding generalisation (PSG)} (Merchant 2001, p.92)

  \begin{equation}
  \text{A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing only if L allows preposition stranding under regular wh-movement.}
  \end{equation}

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. Who did John talk \textbf{about}\textsuperscript{\textit{regular wh-movement}}?
  \item b. I know John talked about someone, but I don't know \ldots
  \end{enumerate}

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textbf{conforming to PSG} & \textbf{ellipsis \textit{repairs}} & \textbf{ellipsis \textit{bleeds}} \\
\hline
\textbf{P-stranding in wh-movement} & \checkmark & \xmark & \xmark & \checkmark \\
\textbf{P-stranding in sluicing} & \checkmark & \xmark & \checkmark & \xmark \\
\textbf{languages} & English, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish & French, Persian, Czech, Basque, Hungarian & Spanish, Polish, Russian, Indonesian & Dutch German \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}

2. Dutch: ellipsis \textbf{bleeds} P-stranding

- Dutch P-stranding: only possible under ‘R-pronominalization’

  - (\textit{non-human}) complement of P is \textbf{obligatorily} realised as a \textbf{locative adverbial} pro-form
    (van Riemsdijk 1978)

(3) \begin{equation}
\text{Waar}_R \text{ kijkt hij } [\text{PP } \text{naar } t] ? \\
\text{where looks he at} \\
\text{‘What does he look at?’ lit. ‘Where does he look at?’}
\end{equation}
R-pronouns must **precede** their preposition

(4) **Hij kijkt** overal **naar** / *naar* overal.
    He looks everywhere at everywhere
    ‘He looks at everything.’

- R-pronouns cannot strand a preposition in an ellipsis site (such as sluicing, fragments, stripping, gapping)
  Merchant 2001 (p. 95), Zwart 2011, Hoeksema 2014, Kluck 2015

(5) **Jan zit in zijn kamer. Hij kijkt ergens naar, maar ik weet niet waar < hij [PP naar t] kijkt >.**
    Jan sits in his room he looks somewhere at but I know not where he looks
    ‘Jan is in his room. *He is looking at something, but I don’t know what.’
    # He is looking at something, but I don’t know where.’

R-pronouns can pied-pipe their preposition out of an ellipsis site:

(6) **Jan zit in zijn kamer. Hij kijkt ergens naar, maar ik weet niet [PP waar naar] < hij [PP naar t] kijkt >.**
    ‘Jan is in his room. He is looking at something, but I don’t know at what.’

- **the effect is very robust:**
  - online acceptability judgement task
    N=91; 1-7 Likert scale, 7 = fully acceptable
    lexicalisations with: *naar* ‘at’, *op* ‘on’, *aan* ‘to’, mee ‘with’
  - P-stranding vs. pied-piping: statistically significant difference (p<.001)
  - P-stranding vs. clefting (cf. 7): statistically significant difference (p<.001)

(7) ?* **Jan zit in zijn kamer. Hij kijkt ergens naar, maar ik weet niet waar het naar is. cleft**
    Jan sits in his room he looks somewhere at but I know not where it is
    ‘Jan is in his room. He is looking at something, but I don’t know what it is.’

3. **P-stranding has the right prosodic profile for ellipsis to occur**

- for ellipsis to be licensed in P-stranding contexts, …

(8) … but I don’t know [WHR < … preposition … >].

… we expect that: **can bear non-contrastive accent** **and** **can be deaccented**
both expectations are fulfilled:

Figure 2. F0 contour of an accented R-pronoun (sentence-level nuclear accent)

Figure 3. F0 contour of a stranded deaccented preposition

R-pronouns are prosodically suitable ellipsis remnants (contra Merchant 2001).
Stranded prepositions are prosodically suitable items to undergo deletion.

4. Our analysis

4.1. Ingredient 1: Bleeding EPP-driven movement under sluicing

Merchant (2001), van Craenenbroeck & Den Dikken (2006), and Den Dikken (2013) claim that A-movement to SpecTP is bled under sluicing
• This is utilized to explain why
  o The Subject Condition (Chomsky 1973) appears not to apply under sluicing:

(9)  a. * [Which Marx brother]1 is [a biography of t1] going to be published this year?
    b. A biography of a Marx brother is going to be published this year, guess which one!

• Subject NPIs are licensed under sluicing:

(10) A: What didn’t work?
    B: Any of the printing equipment.

• In those varieties of Dutch with complementizer agreement, agreement is absent under sluicing:

(11) [No ellipsis; complementizer agreement when subject occupies SpecTP]
    a. … darr-e wiej allichte de wedstrijd winne zölt.  Hellendoorn Dutch
       that-AGR we probably the game win will
    b. … darr(*-e) allichte wiej de wedstrijd winne zölt.
       that-AGR probably we the game win will
       ‘… that we will probably win the game.’

(12) [Ellipsis; no complementizer agreement obligatorily absent]
    Wiej hebt ’r ene ezeen, en Jan weet niet wie(*-e).  Hellendoorn Dutch
    we have there someone seen and Jan knows not who-AGR
    ‘We have seen someone there, and Jan doesn’t know who.’

• A-movement to SpecTP in English occurs to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) (Chomsky 1981)

• Chomsky (1995): EPP is a description of STRONG features on certain heads. Agree relations involving STRONG elements yields overt movement.

(13) **Bleeding EPP-driven movement under sluicing**
    A TP-ellipsis site contains only WEAK heads.
4.2. Ingredient 2: The syntax of the Dutch PP domain

- **Based on:** van Riemsdijk (1978), Koopman (2000), Den Dikken (2010)
- See Griffiths et al. (2021) for a technical implementation

(14) a. **Standard PP, before movement**

```
PlaceP  
  |               |
  Place'    ...    P
   |       PP       |
  Place*  [F_loc]  PP
   P      DP
```

b. **Standard PP, after movement**

```
PlaceP  
  |               |
  Place'    ...    specPlace
   |       PP       |
  Place*  [F_loc]  PlaceP
   P      DP
```

- **Status of PlaceP**
  - PlaceP is highest projection in PP domain
  - SpecPlaceP is the escape hatch for movement from the PP domain
  - Place is a STRONG head (F*)

- **Interaction between Place* and PP**
  - An agreement relation is established between Place* and P via a locative feature
  - PP undergoes overt movement to SpecPlaceP
  - PP becomes island for extraction (no P-stranding)

---

1 We contend that the edge features that are needed to derive successive-cyclic movement in Chomsky's (2008) system should be excluded from the group of EPP-features proper (i.e., STRONG features) for the following reasons. First, there are WEAK counterparts of the STRONG features, with the variant observed being subject to cross-linguistic variation. The presence/absence of edge-features is not subject to cross-linguistic variation, however. Second, the movement driven by STRONG features is encapsulated: the moved item need not necessarily move further. Conversely, items moved by edge-features always move further, as edge-features attract items into intermediate positions in an A'-chain. Third, while EPP features proper satisfy a PF-demand, edge-features satisfy computational demands: they are only present in a derivation when needed to enforce successive-cyclic movement, unlike the STRONG features we are dealing with. For these reasons, we believe that STRONG features and edge-features do not form a natural class, and consequently there is no expectation that they should behave similarly under ellipsis.

2 Although they concur that movement to SpecPlaceP is EPP-driven movement, both Koopman (2000) and Den Dikken (2010) claim that, in the PP domain, PlaceP is dominated by at least one additional functional projection (FP), and that the highest projection functions as the escape hatch for movement from the PP domain. This proposal is based on word permutations involving R-pronouns and degree / deictic locative modifiers. The claim makes a number of predictions that, according to our investigations, are not borne out. Thus, we refrain from adopting their proposal here. See Griffiths et al. (2021, fn. 16) for details.
NB: PP-pied-piping = movement of PlaceP

(15) a. **R-pronoun case, before movement**

```
PlaceP
  Place'...
  Place* [F2_loc] [F1_loc] PP
  P [F1_loc] [F2_loc] DP_R
```

b. **R-pronoun case, after movement**

```
PlaceP
  Place'...
  Place* [F2_loc] [F1_loc] PP
  DP_R [F2_loc] [F1_loc] P
```

**Interaction between Place* and R-pronoun**

- Nonhuman pronouns are defective in Dutch
- Defectiveness repaired via interaction with specific higher heads; Place* in PP domain
- Place* confers formal LOC value to DP_R = realized as a locative pronoun

**Interaction between PP and R-pronoun**

- PP and R-pronoun compete to fulfil the EPP requirement on Place*
- R-pronoun always wins competition, accounting for obligatory DP_R > P word order
- DP_R occupies escape hatch, therefore either
  - DP_R escapes PP domain alone (P-standing)
  - Entire PlaceP moves (PP-pied-piping)

4.3. **The result: sluicing bleeds P-standing with R-pronouns**

- If Place is a STRONG head, it becomes weak when contained in an ellipsis site.
- Movement to SpecPlaceP, the escape hatch of the PP domain, becomes impossible
- The PP domain becomes opaque for movement

(16) **Attempting to P-strand under sluicing in R-pronoun context**

```
a. * Dirk zit in de woonkamer. Hij kijkt ergens naar, maar ik weet
   Dirk sits in the living.room he looks something at but I know
   niet [CP waar...][TP kijkt hij naar &...]
   not where looks be at
```
5. **Summary**

- Sluicing closes and locks the escape hatch required for P-stranding with R-pronouns, yielding a bleeding effect.
- If we are correct, then we have new support for the notion of EPP-bleeding under sluicing.

(17) **PP-pied-piping under sluicing in R-pronoun context**


b. Dirk zet in de woonkamer. Hij kijkt ergens naar, maar ik weet niet waar hij kijkt.

---

G9: \[ \text{Movement does not proceed via SpecPlaceP escape hatch!!} \]
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