Clause Mates Matter

Ekaterina Georgieva[1], Franc Marušič[2], Petra Mišmaš[2], Rok Žaucer[2]

HUN-REN Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics[1] & University of Nova Gorica[2]

Introduction

❑ We investigate the locality restrictions of multiple sluicing and multiple *wh*-questions in Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian (BCMS)

❑ Multiple sluicing has been argued to obey the **Clause-Mate Condition (CMC)**

(see Takahashi 1994; Nishiguchi 1998; Merchant 2001; Lasnik 2014; Abels & Dayal 2017, 2023;

Barros & Frank 2023; Cortés Rodríguez & Griffiths 2024a,b, a.o.)

(1) CMC: All remnants of sluicing must originate in the same (finite) clause (Abels & Dayal 2023)

(2) a. Harriet claimed [$_{CP}$ that every teacher$_1$ spoke with some student$_2$], but I don't know which teacher$_1$ with which student$_2$.

   b. *[$_{CP}$ Every teacher$_1$ reported [$_{CP}$ that Harriet spoke with some student$_2$]], but I don't know which teacher$_1$ with which student$_2$.

(Cortés Rodríguez & Griffiths 2024a)

❑ CMC has been shown to be a **robust cross-linguistic constraint**

- Potential counterexamples: **BCMS**, Romanian, Indonesian, Bangla, and Kashmiri
- but the data/generalizations are not perfectly clear (see Abels & Dayal 2023)

❑ The claim that BCMS allows CMC-violations comes from Lasnik (2014):

- CMC-violations are allowed in BCMS multiple sluicing (3) & multiple *wh*-questions (4)
- the same speakers who accept (3) also accept (4)

(3) [$_{CP}$ Neko$_1$ misli [$_{CP}$ da je Ivan nešto$_2$
   sb.NOM thinks that AUX Ivan smth.ACC
   pojeo]]. ?Pitam se ko$_1$ šta$_2$.
   eaten ask.1SG self who.NOM what.ACC
   'Someone thinks that Ivan ate something. I wonder who what.'
   (Lasnik 2014)

(4) [$_{CP}$ Ko$_1$ šta$_2$ t_1 misli [$_{CP}$ da je
   who.NOM what.ACC thinks that AUX
   Petar pojeo t_2]]?
   Petar eaten
   'Who thinks that Petar ate what?' (Lasnik 2014)

Research questions & methods

❑ Several issues with Lasnik's (2014) data and conclusions

- interspeaker variation: not explained
- limited number of examples
- choice of *wh*-phrases: not optimal
- Single-Pair vs. Pair-List readings: not controlled for

❑ Convincing cases of multiple *wh*-sluicing must containt unambiguous singular *wh*-phrases in contexts that force PL reading (Abels & Dayal 2023); otherwise, this could be (asyndetic) coordination of 2 single sluices

Our study

◆ An acceptability judgment study on multiple sluicing and multiple *wh*-questions in BCMS

◆ 11 native speakers of different varieties of BCMS (all linguists) provided judgments on a 5-point Likert scale

◆ The aim is to determine whether CMC-violations are permissible in multiple sluicing and multiple *wh*-questions in BCMS, if the above-mentioned caveats are avoided

❑ We **re-tested Lasnik's examples** and **constructed further multiple sluicing examples** that control for:

- the initial position of *wh*$_2$
- Pair-List reading (all examples contain an adverbial quantifier that distributes over the indefinite correlates; see Abels & Dayal 2023)
- Superiority: *wh*$_1$ precedes *wh*$_2$ (long-distance *wh*-movement shows superiority in BCMS, Rudin 1988; Bošković 1997, and so does multiple sluicing, Stjepanović 2008)
- simplex and D-linked *wh*-phrases
- the case of the *wh*-phrases: *wh*$_1$:Nom *wh*$_2$:Nom, *wh*$_1$:Nom *wh*$_2$:Dat, *wh*$_1$:Dat *wh*$_2$:Acc

❑ Our study also **included examples of multiple *wh*-questions**, which are minimal pairs of the multiple sluicing examples

Discussion & conclusion

Take-away

◆ Our study does not confirm Lasnik's (2014) results

◆ Based on carefully constructed examples, we showed that CMC holds for multiple sluicing in BCMS

◆ Furthermore, we argued that multiple *wh*-questions and multiple sluicing in BCMS pattern alike: they are both clause-bound

Theoretical implications

◆ According to our findings BCMS is not an exception to the CMC → this brings us a step closer to postulating the CMC as a universal constraint

◆ Existing accounts of CMC tie the clause-boundedness of *wh*$_2$ to a different kind of movement for *wh*$_2$

- Takahashi (1994) for Japanese: *wh*-cluster formation is (locally restricted) A-movement
- Lasnik (2014) for English: *wh*$_2$ undergoes rightward movement (← Right Roof Constraint)
- Citko (2020) for Polish: multiple sluicing = gapping

◆ However, the parallelism between multiple sluicing and multiple *wh*-movement in BCMS suggest that the CMC is related to the nature of multiple *wh*-movement

◆ This parallelism also raises the question of whether the CMC should be understood as a constraint related only to covert *wh*-movement, as proposed by Abels & Dayal (2023)

Selected references:
Abels, K. & Dayal, V. 2023. On the syntax of multiple sluicing and what it tells us about *wh*-scope taking. *LI* • Cortés Rodríguez, A. & Griffiths, J. 2024a. An experimental investigation of the Clausemate Condition in German multiple sluicing *Proceedings of WCCFL 40* • Lasnik, H. 2014. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax* • Rudin, C. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting. *NLLT*

New empirical study: results

① Multiple sluicing

❑ Re-tested Lasnik's sluicing example (3): mean score 1.7

❑ The results of our study:

Simplex *wh*-phrases					**D-linked *wh*-phrases**				
wh$_1$	*wh*$_2$	mean	mode	low	high	*wh*$_1$	*wh*$_2$	mean	mode	low	high
Nom	Nom	1.1	1	1	2	Nom	Nom	2.1	1	1	4
Nom	Dat	2.2	3	1	4	Nom	Dat	2.3	2	1	5
Dat	Acc	1.5	1	1	3	Dat	Acc	2	1	1	5

❑ (5) illustrates the *wh*$_1$:Dat *wh*$_2$:Acc condition for multiple sluicing with simplex *wh*-phrases:

(5) [$_{CP}$ U svakoj kancelariji šef je nekome$_1$ govorio
   in every office boss AUX sb.DAT told
   [$_{CP}$ da je Jovan prevario nekoga$_2$]].
   that AUX Jovan deceived sb.ACC
   *Pitam se kome$_1$ koga$_2$.
   ask.1SG self who.DAT who.ACC
   Intended: 'In every office the boss told someone that Jovan deceived someone. I'm wondering whom ~~the boss told that J. deceived~~ whom.' [mean: 1.5]

❑ For comparison, we also tested well-known cases of CMC-violations, in which the embedded subject is bound by a matrix quantifier, in the *wh*$_1$:Nom *wh*$_2$:Dat condition: mean 3 (simplex) and 3.4 (D-linked)

② Multiple *wh*-questions

❑ Re-tested Lasnik's multiple *wh*-example (4): mean score 2.4

❑ The results of our study:

Simplex *wh*-phrases					**D-linked *wh*-phrases**				
wh$_1$	*wh*$_2$	mean	mode	low	high	*wh*$_1$	*wh*$_2$	mean	mode	low	high
Nom	Nom	1	1	1	1	Nom	Nom	1.1	1	1	2
Nom	Dat	1.4	1	1	2	Nom	Dat	1.3	1	1	2
Dat	Acc	1.6	1	1	3	Dat	Acc	1.8	1	1	4

❑ (6) exemplifies the *wh*$_1$:Dat *wh*$_2$:Acc condition for multiple *wh*-questions with simplex *wh*-phrases:

(6) *[$_{CP}$ Kome$_1$ je koga$_2$ u svakoj kancelariji šef
   who.DAT AUX who.ACC in every office boss
   govorio t_1 [$_{CP}$ da je Jovan prevario t_2]]?
   told that AUX Jovan deceived
   Intended: 'Who did the boss tell in every office that Jovan deceived whom?' [mean: 1.6]

Summary of the findings

◆ CMC does hold for multiple sluicing in BCMS

◆ Similarly to multiple sluicing, *wh*-phrases in multiple *wh*-questions must originate from the same clause

Discussion of the results

❑ Factors that might be influencing the acceptability of individual conditions:

- The *wh*$_1$:Nom *wh*$_2$:Nom condition with simplex *wh*-phrases is further degraded because of Anti-homophony (see Bošković 2002)
- The *wh*$_1$:Dat *wh*$_2$:Acc condition is further degraded since long-distance *wh*-movement has been shown to be generally less acceptable across an overt matrix subject (see Progovac 2005)
- D-linked *wh*-phrases received slightly higher scores in multiple sluicing ('heavy NPs'?)

❑ Interspeaker variation, but:

- the speakers who judged examples with multiple sluicing with D-linked phrases as (somewhat) acceptable judged their minimal pairs in the multiple *wh*-question condition as (completely) ungrammatical, i.e., we cannot establish a correlation like the one reported by Lasnik (2014)
- some speakers showed the opposite pattern, tough: for them the *wh*-phrases originating from two different clauses was more acceptable in multiple *wh*-questions than in multiple sluicing