

### *Rightward Movement and Ellipsis in the Syntax of Spanish*

It has been argued that a variety of ellipsis constructions in Spanish show properties of rightward movement, e.g., Wh-Stripping (ellipsis with a wh-remnant other than *why* followed by a non-wh-remnant, [1]), (1a), Multiple Sluicing (Sluicing with multiple remnants, [2] following [3]), (1b), and Gapping (an ellipsis construction where a verb goes missing in the second conjunct of a coordinate structure, [4], a.o.), (1c). **Goal:** to capture the fact that i. rightward focus movement does not apply in non-ellipsis contexts; ii. rightward focus movement arguably does not apply in ellipsis structures involving a single remnant, e.g., Sluicing; iii. rightward focus movement is restricted to a subset of ellipsis structures involving multiple remnants, e.g., it applies in the structures in (1), in contrast to Why-Stripping, which typically involves the wh-element *why* (*por qué* in Spanish) followed by a non-wh-phrase, (2). **Analysis:** Following [5] and references therein, evidence is provided for the view that in the structures in (1) there is full-fledge syntax at the ellipsis site, as shown by various connectivity effects, and (ii.) the remnant at the right edge shows properties of rightward movement (see [6], a.o), as shown by the fact that it is clause-bound and that it cannot drop the preposition, (3a) and (3b), respectively (data exemplified for Gapping; see [7]), in contrast to Sluicing; see (4) for illustration of the P-stranding facts in Sluicing ([8]). Under the assumption that derivational antisymmetry ([9]) bans multiple Specifiers due to their not being linearizable, it is argued that ellipsis provides a way to solve this linearization conflict. Specifically, ellipsis creates an escape hatch for multiple remnants competing for the same position when attempting to survive ellipsis, e.g., in the structures in (1) as opposed to Why-Stripping, where *why* is generated higher than the landing site of the focused XP and, therefore, there is no competition among the remnants, [10]). It is claimed that in the former constructions one of the Specifiers may take the place of the elided chunk of structure *at PF*, resulting in what looks like rightward movement. This means that specific aspects of the LCA in its more recent instantiations ([9]), in particular, the ban on multiple Specifiers, can be violated under well-defined circumstances (see also [11]). Accordingly, an analysis is developed in OT-terms, as this framework is particularly well-suited to handle the interaction among multiple factors. Inasmuch as no competition is involved in Why-Stripping, this structure patterns with Sluicing in that it shows no properties of rightward movement, e.g., it is not clause-bound as seen in the long-distance interpretation in (5) and P-Stranding is allowed, (2B) (in turn, see [10] for evidence that there is full-fledge syntax at the ellipsis site in this construction). Finally, various alternative analyses (e.g., [12], [13], [14]) and issues raised by structures involving more than two remnants or the availability of rightward movement without ellipsis in English-kind of languages are discussed. **Conclusion:** The study of the interplay between focus and ellipsis reveals that rightward movement is not just restricted to English-kind of languages, rather ellipsis conspires to allow for it in other languages. Specifically, rightward movement is argued to be part of the syntax of Spanish, clearly a non-standard assumption (though see [11] and [15] for notable exceptions).

(1) a. A: Alguno de estos catedráticos me recomendó una revista de filosofía.

some of these full professors me recommended a journal of philosophy

‘One of these full professors recommended me a philosophy journal.’

B: Y cuál de ellos un artículo?

and which of them an article

‘And which of them recommended an article to you?’

b. Un catedrático me recomendó una revista de filosofía, pero no recuerdo

a full professor me recommended a journal of philosophy but not remember.1SG

- cuál de ellos qué revista.  
 which of them what journal  
 ‘A full professor recommended a certain philosophy journal to me, but I cannot remember which professor which journal.’
- c. Un catedrático me recomendó una revista, y un estudiante un artículo.  
 a full professor me recommended a journal and a student an article  
 ‘A full professor recommended a journal to me, and a student an article.’
- (2) A: Pedro se casará con María. B: Por qué (con) María?  
 Pedro CL will-marry with María why with María  
 ‘Pedro will marry María.’ ‘Why María?’
- (3) a. Luis sabe que María juega al tenis y Antonio al baloncesto.  
 Luis knows that María plays to-the tennis and Antonio to-the basketball  
 ‘Luis knows that María plays tennis, and Antonio basketball.’  
*Short-distance reading:* ‘Luis knows that María plays tennis and that Antonio plays basketball.’ / *Long-distance reading:* ‘\*Luis knows that María plays tennis and Antonio knows that she plays basketball.’
- b. Pedro habló con María y Jorge \*(con) Susana.  
 Pedro talked.3SG with María and Jorge with Susana.  
 ‘Pedro talked to María, and Jorge to Susana.’
- (4) Felicitas habló con alguno de estos tíos, pero no sé (con) cuál de ellos.  
 Felicitas talked with one of these guys, but not know.1SG with which of them  
 ‘Felicitas talked to one of these guys, but I don’t know (with) who(m).’
- (5) A: Pedro jura que Juan se casará con María. B: Por qué con María?  
 Pedro swears that Juan CL will-marry with María why with María  
 ‘Pedro swears that Juan will marry María.’  
*Short-distance interpretation of B:* ‘Why will Juan marry María?’ / *Long-distance interpretation of B:* ‘Why does Pedro swear that Juan will marry María?’

[1] Nevins, A. 2008. “Sluicing ≠ Stripping: Evidence from P-Stranding”. Paper presented at The 3rd Annual Moscow Student Conference on Linguistics, Moscow. [2] Rodrigues et al. 2009. Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and P-stranding. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 245-270. [3] Lasnik, H., 2014. Multiple Sluicing in English? *Syntax 17*: 1-20. [4] Johnson, K. 2009. Gapping is not (Vp-) Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry 40*, 289-328. [5] Ortega-Santos et al. 2014. On ellipsis structures involving a wh-remnant and a non-wh-remnant simultaneously. *Lingua 138*, 55-85. [6] Ross, J. R. 1967. Constraints on Variables in Syntax. Ph. D. dissertation, MIT. [7] Bruçart, J. M. 1987. La elisión sintáctica en español. Bellaterra: Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. [8] Vicente, L. 2008. On the availability of copular clauses as sources for clausal ellipsis. Talk at 44th Chicago Linguistics Society, Chicago, IL. USA. [9] Kayne, R. S. 2013. Why are there no directionality parameters. *Theoretical Approaches to Disharmonic Word Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 219-244. [10] Yoshida et al. 2014. The syntax of Why-Stripping. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 33*, 323-370. [11] López, L. 2009. A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. [12] Richards, N. 2001. Movement in Language: Interactions and Architectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [13] Fox, D., and D. Pesetsky. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics 31*, 1-45. [14] Abe, J. 2015. The In-Situ Approach to Sluicing. John Benjamins. [15] Parafita Couto, M. C. 2005. Focus at the interface. Ph.D. Diss., University of Kansas.