

Swiping in a variety of Ontario French

DENNIS OTT

University of Ottawa

dennis.ott@post.harvard.edu

and

RAYMOND THERRIEN

University of Ottawa

rther084@uottawa.ca

Abstract

This paper documents the existence of *swiping* – that is, inversion of a *wh*-phrase and its associated preposition under sluicing – in a non-Germanic language. We discuss swiping in a variety of Ontario French (Lafontaine French, LFF), which shares some of the characteristics of its extensively-studied English counterpart (Ross 1969, Merchant 2002, among others). We offer a preliminary description of swiping in LFF and consider some implications of these novel facts for the theory of swiping and sluicing. We suggest that LFF swiping supports an analysis in terms of non-constituent deletion, as originally suggested by Ross (1969) in his seminal work on sluicing.

Keywords: syntax, ellipsis, sluicing, swiping, Canadian French

Résumé

Cet article documente l'existence du *swiping* – c'est-à-dire l'inversion d'une phrase *wh* et sa préposition associée sous le *sluicing* – dans une langue non-germanique. Nous discutons du *swiping* dans une variété du français ontarien (le français de Lafontaine, FLF), qui partage certaines des caractéristiques de son homologue anglais largement étudié (Ross 1969, Merchant 2002, etc.). Nous proposons une description préliminaire du *swiping* en FLF et examinons certaines implications de ces nouveaux faits pour la théorie du *swiping* et *sluicing*. Nous

For helpful feedback on the material presented here, we thank audiences at the University of Ottawa, MOTH 2018 (McGill, Montreal), CGG 28 (Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona) and CLA 2019 (Vancouver), as well as Maia Duguine, Aritz Irurtzun, Éric Mathieu, Jason Merchant, three anonymous *CJL/RCL* reviewers, and the *CJL/RCL* editors. We would like to extend our special gratitude to Elizabeth Cowper for invaluable help with the typesetting. For help with the data, we thank Marc Brunelle, Basil Roussel, Priscilla Hebert Breton, Suzanne Therrien, and Greg Therrien. This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

suggérons que le *swiping* en FLF soutient une analyse en termes de l'effacement de non-constituant, comme suggéré par Ross (1969) dans son travail pionnier sur le *sluicing*.

Mots-clés: syntaxe, ellipse, *sluicing*, *swiping*, français canadien

1. INTRODUCTION

This article offers a preliminary description of an elliptical construction known as *swiping* in a variety of Canadian French and discusses some of its theoretical implications. The *swiping* construction, first discussed in Ross (1969) and Rosen (1976) and named by Merchant (2002),¹ is a subtype of *sluicing* in which a sluiced *wh*-phrase and its selecting preposition constitute the remnants of ellipsis, such that the *wh*-phrase precedes the preposition in linear order:

- (1) Jack borrowed some money, but I don't know who from.

Analogous constructions are felicitous in the variety of Ontario French considered in this article, Lafontaine French² (henceforth, LFF):

- (2) Jean a acheté un cadeau, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 Jean has bought a gift but I NEG know not who for
 'Jean bought a gift, but I don't know who for.'

To the best of our knowledge, *swiping* in non-Germanic languages has not been discussed before; previous work has focused exclusively on English and, to a lesser extent, Scandinavian (e.g., Merchant 2002, van Craenenbroeck 2004, Nakao et al. 2006, Hasegawa 2007, Hartman and Ai 2009).

In this article, we investigate the central empirical properties of *swiping* constructions in LFF (section 2)³ and their theoretical ramifications for the theory of *sluicing* (section 3). While we will not attempt to develop a comprehensive theory of *swiping* within the confines of this article, we will argue that an analysis in terms

¹'Swiping' is an acronym for *sluicing with inversion of a preposition in Northern Germanic*. Although this article documents the existence of *swiping* outside Northern Germanic, we will continue to use the established label.

²Spoken in the francophone community of Lafontaine in south-central Ontario, located in a predominantly anglophone region. We make no claims about other varieties of Ontario French, or Canadian French in general. Preliminary informal elicitations suggest that *swiping* is possible in Acadian French but not Quebec French, which raises interesting questions about the relation between *swiping* and P-stranding. We leave these issues to future work.

³The data reported here are based primarily on the introspective judgments of the second author, a native speaker of LFF, and were checked with two additional speakers from the same geographical area; unless noted otherwise, the speakers' judgments converged. While we cannot provide a comprehensive illustration of LFF *wh*-syntax within the confines of this article, we note here that this variety has a preference for the presence of a complementizer in embedded interrogatives (giving rise to 'doubly-filled COMPs') and subject-auxiliary inversion in matrix questions. On the syntax of *wh*-questions in several varieties of Canadian French, see Tailleux (2013).

of P-stranding along with non-constituent deletion fares better overall than existing proposals, which invariably postulate construction-specific reorderings.

2. PROPERTIES OF SWIPING IN LFF

In this section, we describe the external distribution of swiping in LFF in general terms, before turning specifically to the *wh*-phrases and prepositions that can (and cannot) appear in the construction.

2.1 Distribution

Merchant (2001) establishes the generalization that a language will allow P(reposition)-stranding under sluicing only if that language allows P-stranding under *wh*-movement in non-elliptical clauses. English is a prime example of such a language: since it permits P-stranding generally (3a), it permits prepositions to be stranded and deleted in sluicing (3b), in addition to optional pied-piping (3c).

- (3) Jack borrowed money from someone, but...
- I don't know who_{*i*} he borrowed it from *t_i*.
 - I don't know who_{*i*} he borrowed it from *t_i*.
 - I don't know [from who(m)]_{*i*} he borrowed it *t_i*.

In his seminal work on sluicing, Ross (1969) observed that English also allows a subtype of sluicing in which the preposition is retained, but unlike in (3c) follows rather than precedes its *wh*-complement. Thus, the continuation in (4a) has the elliptical variant in (4b).

- (4) Jack borrowed some money, but...
- I don't know who he borrowed it from.
 - I don't know who from.

According to Merchant (2002), the construction is also found in Danish and "some varieties of Norwegian" (see his article for examples; also Hasegawa 2007).

Conversely, a language like German, which does not allow P-stranding under overt *wh*-movement (5a), permits neither preposition omission under sluicing nor swiping (5b).

- (5) Peter hat sich Geld geliehen, aber...
 Peter has REFL money borrowed, but
- ich weiß nicht *(von) wem er es sich (*von) geliehen hat.
 I know not from who he it REFL borrowed has
 - ich weiß nicht *(von) wem (*von).
 I know not from who
 'Peter borrowed money, but I don't know who (he borrowed it) from.'

P-stranding under regular, non-elliptical *wh*-movement is thus a necessary precondition for preposition omission under sluicing as well as swiping. It is not a sufficient

condition for swiping if Merchant's and Hasegawa's claims about the infelicity of swiping in Swedish, Icelandic, and (dialects of) Norwegian are correct: for reasons that remain unclear, these languages do permit P-stranding in non-elliptical contexts but do not permit swiping under sluicing (see also footnote 2).

European French patterns with German in allowing neither P-stranding nor swiping (Dagnac 2019). However, some dialects of Canadian French are known to permit P-stranding productively (see King and Roberge 1990, Roberge and Rosen 1999, among others), as illustrated in (6) for LFF.⁴

- (6) a. Je ne sais pas qui qu'il a acheté un cadeau pour.
 I NEG know not who that.he has bought a gift for
 'I don't know who he bought a gift for.'
- b. Je ne sais pas qui qu'elle parlait avec.
 I NEG know not who that.she spoke with
 'I don't know who she spoke with.'

Apparently as a result of this, LFF also permits swiping in both embedded and matrix contexts, as shown in (7).

- (7) a. Jean a acheté un cadeau, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 Jean has bought a gift but I NEG know not who for
 'Jean bought a gift, but I don't know (who he bought a gift) for.'
- b. A: Jean a acheté un cadeau. – B: Qui pour?
 Jean has bought a gift who for
 A: 'Jean bought a gift.' – B: 'Who for?'

The non-inverted order (*pour qui*) is equally if not more natural.⁵

Following Rosen (1976), Merchant (2002) and Hartman and Ai (2009) claim that swiping is most felicitous when the sluiced PP is a *sprouted* adjunct in the sense of Chung et al. (1995), that is to say, when it has no overt correlate in the antecedent. Hartman and Ai provide the contrast in (8).

- (8) a. She has a date tonight, but she won't tell me who with.
 b. *She has a date with some guy, but she won't tell me who with.

They note that this judgment is not very robust and provide a number of counterexamples. In the judgment of the second author of this article, non-sprouted instances of swiping as in (8b) are fairly natural. The judgment extends to swiping in LFF in both embedded (9a) and matrix contexts (9b), where the non-sprouted variant is at most slightly degraded.

⁴Poplack et al. (2012) claim that Quebec French has no true P-stranding, but instead permits a process of preposition 'orphaning' also found in Standard French (see Authier 2016). LFF is considerably more permissive than the variety considered by these authors, resembling more closely Prince Edward Island French as described in King and Roberge (1990) and Roberge and Rosen (1999). Since LFF P-stranding does not obey the constraints Poplack et al. find to be operative in Quebec French, we assume that it is bona fide P-stranding.

⁵Swiping in LFF generally has a slightly marked character, similar to what several authors have noted about English. We will not speculate here on the reasons for this, which may reduce to extra-grammatical stylistic preferences.

- (9) a. Jean a acheté un cadeau (?pour quelqu'un), mais je ne sais pas
 Jean has bought a gift for someone but I NEG know not
 qui pour.
 who for
 'Jean bought a gift (for someone), but I don't know who for.'
- b. A: Jean a acheté un cadeau (?pour quelqu'un). – B: Qui pour?
 Jean has bought a gift for someone who for
 A: 'Jean bought a gift (for someone).' – B: 'Who for?'

The presence of a PP correlate in the antecedent thus does not appear to significantly affect the felicity of LFF swiping, and we will consequently abstract away from this issue in what follows. We also remain agnostic as to whether (in-)sensitivity to the presence of a correlate constitutes a difference between LFF and English, given the inconsistency of judgments reported in the literature.

As in English, P–*wh* inversion as witnessed in swiping is entirely illicit in non-elliptical contexts like (10), and with non-*wh* fragments, as in (11) (Merchant's 2002 *Sluicing Condition* on swiping).⁶

- (10) a. *Qui pour a-t-il acheté un cadeau?
 who for has-T-he bought a gift
 'Who did he buy a gift for?'
- b. *C'est qui pour qu'il a acheté un cadeau?
 it.is who for that.he has bought a gift
 'Who is it that he bought a gift for?'
- c. *Je me demande qui pour qu'il a acheté un cadeau.
 I wonder who for that.he has bought a gift
 'I wonder who he bought a gift for.'
- (11) A: Elle a acheté un cadeau. – B: Oui, {pour lui / *lui pour}.
 she has bought a gift yes for him him for
 A: 'She bought a gift.' – B: 'Yes, for him.'

In multiple sluicing, only the linearly first remnant can invert with its preposition, as in (12); swiping is illicit for any subsequent remnants, as shown in (13).

⁶An anonymous reviewer reminds us that Tyler (2017) documents cases such as (i) that seem to contradict this generalization:

- (i) Speed is defined as distance divided by time; when and who by was this definition first put forward?

It is not clear to us, however, that the string *and who by* is not an interpolated elliptical parenthetical, that is to say, that the second clause in (i) is not composed out of two components (Ott 2016):

- (ii) a. When was this definition first put forward?
 b. Who ~~was this definition first put forward~~ by?

A parenthetical analysis might be supported by Tyler's observation that the prosody of such coordinated questions resembles that of right-node raising constructions, which exhibit prosodic characteristics of parentheticals (Hartmann 2001). However, since cases of this sort have not been studied in much detail, we leave them aside, noting that they represent a potential problem for all current approaches to sluicing, including our own, developed below.

- (12) Il a gagné, mais je ne sais pas qui contre dans quel match.
 he has won but I NEG know not who against in which match
 ‘He won, but I don’t know who against in which match.’
- (13) Elle a acheté quelque chose, mais je ne sais pas quoi {pour qui /
 she has bought something but I NEG know not what for who
 *qui pour}.
 who for
 ‘She bought something, but I don’t know what for whom.’

While Merchant (2002: 314, fn. 13) questions the possibility of swiping in English multiple sluicing, Richards (1997: 164) reports judgments analogous to those above.

The *wh*-phrase and the preposition can be separated by certain kinds of non-sentential adverbs, as in (14a), as well as by an unelided main clause, as in (14b), but not at all by an island boundary, as shown in (15).

- (14) a. Qui exactement / précisément / ??probablement / ??possiblement pour?
 who exactly precisely probably possibly for
 ‘Who exactly/precisely/probably/possibly for?’
- b. Qui penses-tu pour?
 who think-you for
 ‘Who do you think for?’⁷
- (15) *Elle a dénié qu’elle connaissait un homme qui avait voté (pour
 she has denied that-she knew a man who had voted for
 quelqu’un) dans le référendum, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 someone in the referendum but I NEG know not who for
intended: ‘She denied that she knew a man who had voted (for someone) in the referendum, but I don’t know which person *x* is such that she denied that she knew a man who had voted for the person *x* in the referendum.’

Note that, as indicated above, island-sensitivity obtains whether or not the swiped *wh*-remnant is sprouted.⁸

⁷Conceivably, the string *penses-tu* can be parsed as a parenthetical insertion, but no corresponding prosody is required. For similar cases in English, see Hartman and Ai (2009), Larson (2014), and Radford and Iwasaki (2015).

⁸Unsurprisingly, the same violation obtains in non-swiped and non-elliptical variants of (15) with the same intended interpretation, as shown in (i) and (ii).

- (i) *Elle a dénié qu’elle connaissait un homme qui avait voté pour quelqu’un dans le
 she has denied that-she knew a man who had voted for someone in the
 référendum, mais je ne sais pas pour qui.
 referendum but I NEG know not for who
- (ii) *Elle a dénié qu’elle connaissait un homme qui avait voté (pour quelqu’un) dans le
 she has denied that-she knew a man who had voted (for someone) in the
 référendum, mais je ne sais pas qui qu’elle a dénié qu’elle connaissait un homme qui
 referendum but I NEG know not who that-she has denied that-she knew a man who
 avait voté pour dans le référendum.
 had voted for in the referendum

Swiping is not clause-bounded, however: (16) permits both a short and a long construal, depending on whether the ellipsis is resolved against the entire preceding matrix clause or only against the embedded clause.

- (16) Jean croit que Marie a acheté un cadeau, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 Jean thinks that Marie has bought a gift but I NEG know not who for
 ‘Jean thinks that Marie bought a gift, but I don’t know who for.’
- a. ... but I don’t know who she bought a gift for.
 b. ... but I don’t know who he believes that she bought a gift for.

What we can glean from the facts presented in this subsection is that swiping exists in LFF, that it does not categorically require sprouting, that it occurs only in (initial) sluicing remnants, and that the *wh*-phrase and the preposition can be separated as long as locality of movement is respected. We turn next to the question of which *wh*-phrases and prepositions can appear in LFF swiping.

2.2 *Wh*-phrases in LFF swiping

Swiping is fairly limited with regard to the *wh*-phrases that can appear in the construction. For English, Merchant (2002) claims that only morphologically simplex *wh*-elements are felicitous in swiping; by contrast, Hartman and Ai (2009) and other authors report that certain complex *wh*-elements are felicitous as well. The picture in LFF is similarly diffuse: while by and large, swiping in LFF prefers simplex *wh*-phrases, not all of them can appear in swiping; furthermore, LFF swiping does tolerate some complex *wh*-phrases.

The examples from LFF in (17) are in line with Merchant’s (2002) claim (based on English data) that complex *wh*-phrases are typically infelicitous in swiping:

- (17) a. *Il a voté, mais je ne sais pas quel candidat républicain pour.
 he has voted but I NEG know not which candidate republican for
 ‘He voted, but I don’t know for which republican candidate.’
- b. Elle a été déclarée gagnante. *Devinez quel juge par!
 she has been declared winner guess which judge by
 ‘She has been declared the winner. Guess by which judge.’
- c. A: Marie a reçu des fleurs. – B: *Quel prétendant de?
 Mary has received some flowers which suitor from
 A: ‘Mary received some flowers.’ – B: ‘From which suitor?’

All of the above are fully felicitous in their non-elliptical form, as in (18), showing that their deviance is not due to illicit P-stranding.

- (18) a. ... mais je ne sais pas quel candidat républicain qu’il a
 but I NEG know not which candidate republican that-he has
 voté pour.
 voted for
 ‘... but I don’t know which republican candidate he has voted for.’

We assume that sluicing in (15) and (i) does not permit a semantically equivalent ‘short’ (non-island-containing) source, and thus shows sensitivity to the island boundary (Merchant 2001, Lasnik 2001).

- b. Devinez quel juge qu'elle a été déclarée gagnante par!
 guess which judge that-she has been declared winner by
 'Guess which judge she was declared a winner by!'
- c. Quel prétendant est-ce qu'elle a reçu des fleurs de?
 which suitor is-it that-she has received some flowers from
 'Which suitor did she receive flowers from?'

The same is true when the *wh*-phrase and the preposition appear in the uninverted order, as in (19).

- (19) a. ... mais je ne sais pas pour quel candidat républicain.
 but I NEG know not for which candidate republican
 '... but I don't know for which republican candidate.'
- b. Devinez par quel juge!
 guess by which judge
 'Guess by which judge!'
- c. De quel prétendant?
 from which suitor
 'From which suitor?'

The cases in (17) contrast with instances of swiping with simplex *wh*-phrases, as in (20).

- (20) a. Il a voté, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 he has voted but I NEG know not who for
 'He voted, but I don't know who for.'
- b. Il a reçu un paquet, mais je ne sais pas où de.
 he has received a package but I NEG know not where from
 'He received a package, but I don't know where from.'
- c. La voiture a été vendue aux enchères, mais combien pour?
 the car has been sold at auction but how.much for
 'The car was sold at auction, but how much for?'
- d. ?Marie doit être à l'école, mais je ne sais pas quand pour.
 Marie must be at the.school but I NEG know not when for
 'Marie needs to be at school, but I don't know for when/what time.'⁹
- e. Il a voté pour un des trois candidats, mais lequel pour?
 he has voted for one of.the three candidates but which.one for
 'He voted for a candidate, but for which (one)?'

As before, the judgments track the status of non-elliptical variants:

- (21) a. Il a voté, mais je ne sais pas qui qu'il a voté pour.
 he has voted but I NEG know not who that-he has voted for
 'He voted, but I don't know who he voted for.'
- b. Il a reçu un paquet, mais je ne sais pas où qu'il l'a reçu de.
 he has received a package but I NEG know not where that-he
 it-has received from
 'He received a package, but I don't know from where he received it.'

⁹The *quand pour* sequence sounds slightly contrived, presumably due to the unusual use of *quand* as a P-complement.

- c. La voiture a été vendue aux enchères, mais combien a-t-elle
 the car has been sold at auction but how.much has-T-it
 été vendue pour?
 been sold for
 ‘The car was sold at an auction, but how much did it sell for?’
- d. ?Marie doit être à l’école, mais je ne sais pas quand qu’elle
 Marie must be at the-school but I NEG know not when that-she
 doit y être pour.
 must there be for
 ‘Marie must be at school, but I don’t know for when/what time she needs to be
 there.’
- e. Il a voté pour un des trois candidats, mais lequel
 he has voted for one of.the three candidates but which.one
 a-t-il voté pour?
 has-T-he voted for
 ‘He voted for one of the three candidates, but which (one) did he vote for?’

With the exception of *lequel* (and possibly *combien*), the *wh*-phrases in (20) are monomorphemic.¹⁰ However, it would be premature to conclude based on this contrast that only simplex, head-like *wh*-phrases can undergo swiping. *Wh*-phrases of the form *combien de N* ‘how much/many N’ and *quel(le) N* ‘which N’, like those in (22), are acceptable in some cases.

- (22) a. Elle a dû attendre, mais combien de temps pour?
 she has must wait but how.much of time for
 ‘She had to wait, but for how long?’
- b. Becky a été recommandé pour une promotion. Devinez quel
 Becky has been recommended for a promotion guess which
 poste pour!
 position for
 ‘Becky has been recommended for a promotion. Guess for which position.’

The paradigm in (23) summarizes the observed restriction. Beyond the simplex *wh*-phrase *qui*, only a minimal [D_{wh} N] remnant is potentially licit in swiping; any additional complexity renders the configuration unacceptable.

- (23) Elle a voté, mais je ne sais pas...
 she has voted but I NEG know not
 ‘She voted, but I don’t know...’
- a. qui pour.
 who for
 ‘who for.’
- b. quel étudiant pour.
 which student for
 ‘for which student.’

¹⁰We defer discussion of *quel/quoi* ‘what’ to [section 3](#).

- c. *quel étudiant de linguistique pour.
 which student of linguistics for
 ‘for which linguistics student.’
- d. *quel jeune étudiant pour.
 which young student for
 ‘for which young student.’
- e. *quel jeune étudiant de linguistique pour.
 which young student of linguistics for
 ‘for which young linguistics student.’

Thus, while the claim that “swiping is perfectly well-formed with simple *wh*-phrases [but] systematically excluded with complex ones” (van Craenenbroeck 2012: 57) is too strong at least for LFF, we see that LFF swiping is restricted with regard to the *wh*-phrases that can occur in the construction, as also reported for English (Culicover 1999, Culicover and Jackendoff 2005).

2.3 Prepositions in LFF swiping

Next, we consider the question of which prepositions can appear in LFF swiping. We will not attempt, within the confines of this article, to comprehensively test all possible prepositions; rather, our discussion will aim to develop a first sketch of the general picture, to be refined in future research.

As was observed for English by Ross (1969, 266), strandability of a preposition *P* is a precondition for *P* to appear in LFF swiping. For instance, the complex preposition *jusqu’à* cannot be stranded under regular *wh*-movement (24a), and is likewise excluded from swiping (24b).

- (24) a. *Quand est-ce que Marie sera à l’école jusqu’à?
 when is-it that Marie will.be at the.school until
 ‘Until when will Marie be at school?’
- b. *Marie sera à l’école, mais je ne sais pas quand jusqu’à.
 Marie will.be at the.school but I NEG know not when until
 ‘Marie will be at school, but I don’t know until when.’

Turning now to strandable prepositions, functional *de* ‘of/from,’ semi-functional *pour* ‘for’ and *par* ‘by,’ and locative *sous* ‘under’ are permissible in swiping:

- (25) a. A: Il a reçu une lettre. – B: Vraiment? Qui de?
 he has received a letter really who from
 A: ‘He received a letter.’ – B: ‘Really? Who from?’
- b. Il a voté, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 he has voted but I NEG know not who for
 ‘He voted, but I don’t know who for.’
- c. Elle a été choisie comme candidate. Devinez qui par!
 she has been chosen as candidate guess who by
 ‘She has been chosen as a candidate. Guess who by!’

- d. Au XVII^e siècle, ils vivaient sous le règne d'un certain roi,
 in.the 17th century they lived under the reign of.a certain king
 mais qui sous exactement?
 but who under exactly
 'In the 17th century they lived under the reign of a certain king, but which one?'

The lexical prepositions *contre* 'against' and *entre* 'between' are likewise licit in LFF swiping:¹¹

- (26) a. Il a gagné le match, mais qui contre?
 he has won the match but who against
 'He won the match, but against who?'
 b. Il y a eu une bataille, mais qui entre?
 it there has had a battle but who between
 'There's been a battle, but between who?'

Unlike *de* (25a), the other purely functional preposition *à* 'to' is excluded from swiping, as are comitative *avec* 'with,' locative (*de*)*dans* 'in,' *dessus* 'on (top of)' and *dessous* 'under,'¹² as well as temporal *après* 'after' and *avant* 'before'.¹³

- (27) a. %Marie parlait, mais qui à?
 Marie talked but who to
 'Marie was talking, but who to?'
 b. %Lois parlait, mais je ne sais pas qui avec.
 Lois talked but I NEG know not who with
 'Lois was talking, but I don't know who with.'
 c. *Ils dorment dans une cabane, mais laquelle dans?
 they are.sleeping in a cabin but which.one in
 'They're sleeping in a cabin, but in which one?'
 d. *Il a mis le dossier dans une armoire, mais laquelle dedans?
 he has put the file in a cabinet but which.one in
 'He put the file in a cabinet, but in which one?'
 e. *Il a placé le livre, mais quelle table dessus?
 he has placed the book but what table on
 'He placed the book, but on which table?'
 f. *Jeans'est caché, mais quel siège dessous?
 JeanREFL.is hid but what seat beneath
 'Jean hid, but beneath which seat?'
 g. *On doit présenter notre projet, mais qui après?
 we must present our project but who after
 'We have to present our project, but after who?'

¹¹One of our consultants rated these cases as slightly degraded, whereas they are fully acceptable to the other consultant as well as the second author.

¹²Unlike in European French, *dedans*, *dessus*, and *dessous* are regularly used transitively in LFF.

¹³One of our two consultants accepted swiping with *à* (27a) and *avec* (27b), whereas the other sided with the second author in judging these cases infelicitous.

- h. *Elle est arrivée à la réunion, mais qui avant?
 she is arrived at the reunion but who before
 ‘She arrived at the meeting, but before who?’

As indicated in the translations, English swiping appears to be somewhat more liberal than LFF swiping with regard to the range of permissible prepositions in at least some cases (permitting *who with* and *who to*).¹⁴

Prepositional complexes such as *à côté de* and *en faveur de* are likewise excluded:

- (28) a. *Elle s’est assise, mais qui à côté de?
 she REFL-IS sat.down but who at side of
 ‘She sat down, but beside who?’
 b. *Les juges sont biaisés, mais qui en faveur de?
 the judges are biased but who in favour of
 ‘The judges are biased, but in favour of who?’

Importantly, LFF permits stranding of all illicit prepositions above under *wh*-movement in non-elliptical constructions; their infelicity when following the associated *wh*-phrase in linear order is specific to the swiping construction. The examples in (29) are representative.

- (29) a. Qui a-t-elle parlé à?
 who has-T-she talked to
 ‘Who did she talk to?’
 b. Qui est-ce qu’on doit présenter notre projet après?
 who is-it that-we must present our project after
 ‘Who do we need to present our project after?’
 c. Qui est-ce qu’elle s’est assise à côté de?
 who is-it that-she REFL-IS sat.down at side of
 ‘Who did she sit down beside?’

The empirical picture emerging here is rather murky and in need of further clarification, which we hope future work can provide. The prepositions permissible in LFF swiping do not seem to form a natural class syntactically, phonologically, or semantically. In addition, the set of permissible prepositions is not coextensive with the corresponding set in English swiping.

2.4 Interim summary

So far, we have seen that swiping exists in LFF sluicing (including multiple sluicing), that it is parasitic on *wh*-movement and P-stranding but does not seem to require sprouting, and shows general properties of *wh*-movement. Like English swiping, it tolerates only a subset of *wh*-phrases and prepositions, with a preference for elements of minimal internal complexity.

¹⁴English *against* and *between* have been claimed to resist swiping (Culicover 1999, Culicover and Jackendoff 2005), whereas their LFF counterparts *contre* and *entre* naturally appear in swiped orders (26). However, as a reviewer points out (citing attested examples), the claim about English appears to be too restrictive, leaving it unclear whether there is any discrepancy in this domain.

3. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

In this section, we discuss some rather significant implications of LFF swiping for the theory of swiping and sluicing. After briefly sketching existing approaches to swiping, we suggest an alternative analysis according to which swiping reduces to P-stranding, as originally suggested by Ross (1969). While this approach will not immediately derive all properties and constraints observed above, we show that it avoids certain serious problems faced by alternative analyses.

Existing analyses of swiping fall into two major categories. Building on a suggestion in van Riemsdijk (1978), Lobeck (1995: 61f.) and Merchant (2002) propose that swiping is the result of P-*wh* inversion internal to the remnant PP; on Merchant's analysis, this is achieved by *wh*-to-P head movement, whereas Lobeck assumes that the *wh*-phrase moves to the PP's edge.¹⁵ Abstracting away from this difference in implementation, the analysis is schematically illustrated in (31) for the example in (2), repeated in (30) for convenience.

- (30) Jean a acheté un cadeau, mais je ne sais pas qui pour.
 Jean has bought a gift but I_{NEG} know not who for
 'Jean bought a gift, but I don't know who for.'

- (31) *Internal inversion*
 [CP [PP *qui*_i pour *t*_i]_k ... [TP ... *t*_k...]]

As an alternative to this *internal*-inversion approach, Richards (2001), van Craenenbroeck (2004), Hartman and Ai (2009), and Radford and Iwasaki (2015) develop variants of what we refer to as an *external*-inversion analysis. On this approach, the PP containing the *wh*-phrase is raised to some left-peripheral position (labeled XP in (32)),¹⁶ and subsequently the *wh*-phrase is subextracted to an even higher position:

¹⁵For a recent version of this analysis, assuming articulated structure within the sluicing site (unlike Lobeck), see Murphy (2016).

¹⁶Modifying this external-inversion approach, Hasegawa (2007) and Larson (2014) suggest that the *wh*-containing PP moves not leftward but rightward (i.e., is extraposed) prior to *wh*-extraction, exempting it from deletion:

- (i) *Extraposition*
 [CP *qui*_i ... [TP ... *t*_k...]] [PP pour *t*_i]_k]
 The postulated extraposition operation is exceptional and construction-specific, however, since ordinary extraposition in non-elliptical contexts does not permit P-stranding in English and LFF alike (see Wexler and Culicover 1980, Baltin 2006):
- (ii) Who_i did John talk (*yesterday) [to *t*_i] (yesterday)?
- (iii) Je ne sais pas qui_i qu'il a acheté un cadeau (*hier) [pour *t*_i] (hier).
 I_{NEG} know not who that.he has bought a gift yesterday for
 'I don't know who he bought a gift for yesterday.'

Furthermore, given the general clause-boundedness of extraposition (Baltin 2006), such an approach cannot account for long-distance construals of sluices (as in (20) above) in any principled way (as also observed in Murphy 2016). We will therefore not consider the extraposition analysis further here.

(32) *External inversion*

$$[_{CP} \text{ qui}_i [_{XP} [_{PP} \text{ pour } t_i]_k \dots [_{TP} \dots t_k \dots]]]$$

What both types of approach have in common is the assumption that sluicing is derived by TP-deletion, and consequently that all and any remnants must be evacuated from TP.¹⁷ This assumption turns out to be problematic, since the relevant configuration cannot be created outside of elliptical contexts. However the inversion of P and *wh*-phrase is assumed to come about, it can never occur in *wh*-in situ configurations or when no deletion takes place (recall the analogous examples from LFF in (10)).

- (33) a. *He was talking WHAT about?!
 b. *What about was he talking?

To account for this fact, Merchant's (2002) head-movement operation, which adjoins a minimal *wh*-complement to its selecting P-head, is stipulated to apply only under sluicing; but no principled reason for this restriction is given. It remains unclear why this operation can apply only in initial remnants in multiple sluicing (recall (12) vs. (13)). In fact, it is not even clear on this approach why P-*wh* inversion could not take place in a language like German (a non-P-stranding language, which consequently lacks swiping; recall (5) above), since the postulated head-movement operation, assumed to apply at PF, is formally entirely distinct from P-stranding under phrasal \bar{A} -movement. Furthermore, an analysis of swiping in terms of head movement falsely rules out any swiping with non-minimal *wh*-phrases (as in (23b)), as proponents of external-inversion analyses have pointed out (e.g., Hartman and Ai 2009).

While permitting complex *wh*-phrases in swiping, external-inversion approaches as illustrated in (32) above do not fare much better with regard to the other points mentioned. To rule out cases like (33b) (and, by extension, their LFF counterparts in (10) above), these analyses likewise restrict the application of swiping to sluicing contexts by mere stipulation. Similarly, the asymmetry between initial and non-initial remnants in multiple sluicing again remains unaccounted for.¹⁸ Nonetheless, external-inversion approaches might appear to have an edge over Merchant's (2002) approach by establishing a more direct link between inversion in swiping and genuine P-stranding (as explicitly claimed, e.g., in Hartman and Ai 2009): the possibility of *wh*-extraction from PP within the left periphery is claimed to be an

¹⁷An exception is Kimura's (2010) analysis (couched in a general in situ approach to sluicing; see also Abe 2015), according to which the *wh*-containing PP remains in situ and movement of the *wh*-phrase to the PP's specifier derives the inverted order. On this analysis as on those discussed in the main text, it remains mysterious why no such inversion is possible in the absence of sluicing.

¹⁸Due to their insistence on TP-deletion in sluicing, multiple sluicing must be assumed by such approaches to be derived either by exceptional multiple *wh*-fronting (Richards 2001, Merchant 2001) or else by extraposition of the second remnant (Lasnik 2013). Either approach generates the false prediction that both remnants should permit the inverted swiping order, unless the inversion operation applying to the first remnant is blocked from applying to subsequent remnants by stipulation.

instance of P-stranding, which must be independently licensed in the language for swiping to occur. But as observed by Merchant (2002: 300) in response to Richards (2001), the postulated inversion operation has very little in common with bona fide P-stranding, stranding the preposition in a derived, left-peripheral position.¹⁹ In fact, as Merchant points out, this kind of derivation *violates* a robust and general ban against P-stranding in left-peripheral positions (first discussed in Postal 1972).²⁰

(34) *Who_i do you think [_{CP} [to *t_i]_k (that) John talked *t_k*]?*

But illicit peripheral P-stranding as in (34) is essentially what all external-inversion analyses of swiping explicitly countenance (recall (32)). Consequently, P-stranding in the derivation of swiping can only be *exceptional* P-stranding on these approaches, licensed – for unspecified reasons – under sluicing but not otherwise. But then, there is no longer any direct, principled link between swiping and bona fide P-stranding, which means in turn that external-inversion approaches fail, just like internal-inversion analyses, at explaining why English and LFF permit swiping whereas German does not. In short, a major generalization about swiping – its dependence on P-stranding, recognized clearly by Ross (1969) – ultimately remains unaccounted for on all existing approaches.²¹

We would like to suggest an alternative approach that does not suffer from this defect, by rejecting the assumption that sluicing is deletion of a syntactic constituent (IP/TP). Instead, we propose that deletion simply targets all given and prosodically demoted material in the clause (the clausal *background*, excluding any *F*-marked material including *wh*-phrases; see Reich 2007):

(35) ... je ne sais pas qui, ~~qu'il a acheté un cadeau~~ [pour *t_i]_F*

The preposition is spared not due to some sort of exceptional, ellipsis-induced evacuation movement, but simply by virtue of being part of a surface-discontinuous focal constituent; inversion of preposition and *wh*-phrase is effected by P-stranding

¹⁹The same applies to Lobeck's (1995) and Murphy's (2016) internal-inversion analyses, which rely on phrasal movement rather than head movement.

²⁰As noted by a reviewer, this ban can be taken to follow from Wexler and Culicover's (1980) *Generalized Freezing Principle*, which prohibits extraction from moved XPs.

²¹As an anonymous reviewer points out, this also means that the non-swipability of prepositions that resist stranding (e.g. English *during*) remains unaccounted for. What is more, paired with Merchant's (2004) move-and-delete analysis of non-*wh*-fragments, all existing approaches falsely predict swiping in declarative fragments, which is never an option (recall (11)). This is so because Merchant unifies the syntax of sluicing and fragments, analyzing both as a combination of \bar{A} -movement and subsequent TP-ellipsis. (As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, Hartman and Ai 2009 argue that declarative fragments lack a relevant movement step, but as far as we can see this is no more than a convenient stipulation on their part.) If all remnants of clausal ellipsis front in the same way, it is not clear why only a subset (those containing a *wh*-phrase) should be able to undergo swiping. To be clear, none of the approaches mentioned in the text explicitly adopt Merchant's (2004) analysis of fragments, but all subscribe to an analysis of clausal ellipsis as TP-deletion and countenance exceptional movements, making an analogous approach to non-*wh* remnants virtually inevitable.

wh-movement of *qui* alone. This analysis of swiping is not new: it spells out Ross's (1969) original suggestion that "it is possible to delete everything in [a question] but the question word and a stranded preposition" (p. 265).²² This view of deletion aligns it with deaccentuation, an alternative means of prosodic givenness-marking, which can likewise affect non-constituents (see Tancredi 1992, Chomsky and Lasnik 1993).²³ The insistence on single-constituent deletion has been argued to be problematic by Bruening (2015) and Ott and Struckmeier (2018) and is rejected in earlier works such as Hankamer (1979) and Morgan (1973).

By eschewing exceptional operations, our alternative view of clausal ellipsis in swiping as the purely prosodic deletion of recoverable material straightforwardly explains why swiping can occur only where P-stranding is independently possible, and why the swiping pattern can only arise in elliptical contexts: as shown in (35), the order *wh* < *P* arises simply as a result of ordinary P-stranding under *wh*-movement (potentially with intervening material: (14)).

By the same token, this analysis correctly predicts the availability of long-distance construals in swiping (20) as well as the island-sensitivity of the construction (15).²⁴ Multiple sluicing with swiping in the first remnant is the result of combining P-stranding with a second in situ remnant, as shown below for (12):

(36) ... je ne sais pas qui_i ~~qu'il a gagné~~ [contre *t_i*]_r [dans quel match]_r

This reduction of swiping to P-stranding makes sense of the fact that initial, but not non-initial remnants in multiple sluicing permit the swiping pattern (recall (13)). The latter always necessarily remain in situ, LFF not being a multiple-*wh*-fronting language. As far as we can see, none of the existing, inversion-based analyses make accurate predictions about swiping in multiple sluicing.

In the remainder of this section, we present two empirical arguments in favor of our alternative approach, based on LFF data. The first argument concerns the immobile *wh*-phrase *quoi* 'what', which fails to participate in swiping; we claim that only our approach provides a principled explanation for this behavior. The second argument shows that where P-stranding and pied-piping of P are not in free variation but correlate

²²Ott and Struckmeier (2018: 400) also point out that this is the most natural analysis of swiping once clausal ellipsis is analyzed as background deletion rather than TP-deletion.

²³On deaccentuation ('dephrasing') in French, see Féry (2001).

²⁴A reviewer wonders why this sensitivity obtains, given that sluicing has been argued to ameliorate island effects in certain cases (Ross 1969, Merchant 2008). Recent research has converged on the conclusion that island amelioration under sluicing (and other forms of clausal ellipsis) does not amount to literal *repair* of a movement violation, but rather constitutes *evasion* of the violation by means of a non-island-containing, semantically parallel source structure (e.g., Merchant 2001, Barros 2012, Barros et al. 2013, Barros et al. 2014). However, as shown by Abels (2019), sluices where such construals are impossible *are* just as island-sensitive as regular *wh*-movement in non-elliptical contexts. Furthermore, it has been known since Chung et al. (1995) that 'sprouting'-type sluicing without an overt correlate, which subsumes typical instances of swiping, *is* generally island-sensitive. From this perspective, it is natural to expect island-sensitivity in LFF swiping; see also footnote 8.

with meaning differences, it can be detected that swiping involves genuine P-stranding rather than initial pied-piping of P, contrary to what is assumed in all previous accounts.

Like European French, LFF has *wh*-phrases that robustly resist fronting. One example is the French counterpart of English *what*, which has a strong (tonic) form *quoi* and a weak (clitic) variant *que*.²⁵ The former only appears in situ, whereas *que* must surface ex situ:

- (37) a. Que/*quoi faut-il faire?
 what must-it do
 b. Il faut faire quoi/*que?
 it must do what
 ‘What must be done?’

As observed by Dagnac (2019), *quoi* can be sluiced; in fact, only *quoi*, but not its weak ex-situ counterpart *que*, can appear in a sluiced question:

- (38) Il faut faire quelque chose. Mais quoi/*que?
 it must do something but what
 ‘Something must be done. But what?’

The sluiceability of immobile *quoi* is unproblematic for a theory of sluicing permitting deletion of a non-constituent string, as suggested here: on such an approach, *quoi* in (38) is simply an in-situ remnant of deletion. Approaches that insist on single-constituent deletion must resort to either exceptional evacuation movement, or else a process of ellipsis-conditioned allomorphy.²⁶ Either type of approach will struggle to capture the facts discussed immediately below, however.

There is one important exception to the general immobility of *quoi*:²⁷ when it is the complement of a preposition, this *quoi*-containing PP *can* be fronted, as long as the preposition is pied-piped.

- (39) a. L’homme a été tué avec quoi/*que?
 the.man has been killed with what
 ‘What was the man killed with?’
 b. Avec quoi/*que a-t-il été tué?
 with what has-T-he been killed
 ‘With what was he killed?’
 c. *Quoi a-t-il été tué avec?

As before, only strong *quoi* but not clitic *que* can appear in this context, including under sluicing, as shown in (40). Outside of sluicing, *quoi* can never invert with its preposition, whether in situ or ex situ, as shown in (41).

²⁵On *que/quoi* as allomorphs, see Hirschbühler (1978).

²⁶Some such process may be independently needed for embedded *quoi*-sluices (as in (13)), where the need for overt *wh*-movement in conjunction with stress assignment appears to override the general immobility of *quoi*, unless such cases could be shown to be composed paratactically. Be this as it may, the facts discussed presently, which use matrix contexts, are inconsistent with the assumption that movement of *quoi* is generally licensed under sluicing.

²⁷Another exception, irrelevant here, is certain nonfinite contexts; see Obenauer (1976).

- (40) A: Il parlait. – B: De quoi/*que?
 he talked about what
 A: ‘He talked.’ – B: ‘What about?’
- (41) a. *Quoi de parlait-il?
 what about talked-he
 ‘What did he talk about?’
 b. *Il parlait quoi de?
 he talked what about
 ‘What did he talk about?’

Given that *quoi* can be fronted as part of a PP (39), Merchant’s (2002) analysis predicts that it should optionally invert with its selecting preposition just in case sluicing applies. The prediction is not borne out, however:²⁸

- (42) a. A: Il parlait. – B: *Quoi de?
 he talked. what about
 A: ‘He talked.’ – B: ‘What about?’
 b. *Il a été tué, mais quoi par?
 he has been killed but what by
 ‘He was killed, but by what?’

By contrast, on our analysis, an illicit swiping construction as in (42a) is derived as shown in (43a), making it underlyingly identical to non-elliptical (43b), which is equally infelicitous.

- (43) a. **quoi*_i ~~a-t-il~~ *parlé* [de *t_i*]_r
 b. **Quoi* a-t-il *parlé* de?

Recall that external-inversion analyses establish no direct link between illicit P-stranding in non-elliptical contexts as in (43b) and the infelicity of swiping, as in (42), since these approaches uniformly resort to exceptional P-stranding subsequent to pied-piping of P. In other words, on such an approach there is no reason that the infelicity of P-stranding in (43b) should block the application of the sluicing-specific inversion operation illustrated in (32) above, since PP-contained *quoi* can move to the left periphery, as in (39b) (and can appear in sluicing, as in (40)). We thus submit that the categorical absence of *quoi*-sluices in LFF points to the conclusion that pied-piping-plus-inversion analyses of swiping are flawed: swiping reduces to P-stranding and deletion of recoverable material separating the fronted *wh*-phrase from its selecting preposition.²⁹

Our second argument militates even more directly against both internal- and external-inversion analyses of LFF swiping. This argument capitalizes on meaning

²⁸Note that clitic *que* is equally infelicitous in these configurations (**que de*, **que par*), showing that the infelicity of (42) is not merely due to a wrongly chosen morphological form.

²⁹The force of this argument might appear to be diminished by the fact that we currently lack an understanding of why swiping only tolerates certain *wh*-*P* sequences. Nevertheless, given that the prepositions *de* (25a) and *par* (25c) and other simplex *wh*-phrases (20) can appear in swiping, whereas the infelicity of *quoi*-swipes appears to be categorical, we take the above facts to point to the conclusion that swiping does *not* involve PP-extraction at all.

differences between otherwise identical questions with and without P-stranding. The following paradigm illustrates a case in point.³⁰

- (44) a. Tu aimerais avoir une des photos de qui?
 you would.like to.have one of.the pictures of who
 ‘Who would you like to have one of the pictures of?’
 b. Qui aimerais-tu avoir une des photos de?
 who would.like-you to.have one of.the pictures of
 ‘Who would you like to have one of the pictures of?’
 c. De qui aimerais-tu avoir une des photos?
 of who would.like-you to.have one of.the pictures
 ‘Who would you like to have (get) one of the pictures from?’

The in situ question in (44a) is most naturally interpreted with *de qui* construed as the complement of *photos*. The same “of who” reading obtains in (44b), indicating that the *wh*-phrase is subextracted from the complement PP to the exclusion of its selecting preposition. Extraction of the entire PP (44c), however, yields a different salient interpretation, which instead construes the extracted PP as a modifier in the underlying structure, asking about the source of the picture rather than its content (“from who”).³¹

These cases allow for a direct comparison of the predictions of inversion analyses (both internal and external) of swiping on the one hand and our P-stranding analysis on the other, since the former approaches assume that the source of swiping is PP-extraction as in (44c), whereas we derive it directly from P-stranding as in (44b). To see this, consider the swiped variant of the above questions, in an analogous context:

- (45) A: J’aimerais avoir une des photos.
 I.would.like to.have one of.the pictures
 ‘I’d like to have one of the pictures.’
 B: Qui de?
 who of
 ‘Who would you like to have a picture of?’

According to all TP-deletion-based analyses of swiping, B’s response must involve fronting of the PP *de qui* and subsequent inversion, either internal to the PP or by means of subextraction of *qui*. The latter analysis is illustrated below.

- (46) a. [_{XP} [_{PP} de qui]_k ... [_{TP}...*t*_k...]] →
 b. [_{CP}qui_i [_{XP} [_{PP}de *t*_i]_k ... [_{TP}...*t*_k...]]]

As we saw with (44c), fronting of the entire PP yields the modifier reading (source of the picture, “from who”); consequently, the swiped question in (45) should have the same reading, given that it derives from an analogous source (46a). Crucially,

³⁰The examples are modelled after similar cases discussed in Starke (2001), but without any reference to P-stranding.

³¹We suspect that this reading is in principle also possible for (44a), but is near-inaccessible due to a preference for parsing the postnominal PP as a complement rather than an adjunct in the absence of any indications to the contrary.

however, this is not the case: its interpretation matches that of (44b), not that of (44c).³² While inversion analyses thus make the wrong prediction about the meaning of B's response in (45), our approach derives the swiping order directly from the meaning-identical question with P-stranding in (44b):

- (47) Qui, ~~aimerais-tu avoir une des photos~~ [de t_i]_F?
 'Who would you like to have one of the pictures of?'

We thus submit that the interpretation of swiping constructions as in (45) strongly suggests that LFF swiping – and presumably swiping in general – involves bona fide P-stranding and prosodic deletion of the informational background, not exceptional P-stranding fed by PP-fronting and TP-deletion.

An analogous argument based on English data is mentioned in passing by Merchant (2002: 314, fn. 13). He observes that the combination of *for* and *what* can have an idiomatic reading (roughly meaning 'why, for what reason') if and only if *for* is stranded:

- (48) a. What did he do that for? (≈Why did he do that?)
 b. #For what did he do that?

Merchant points out that a corresponding swiping construction has the idiomatic reading (as already noted by Ross 1969: 265), suggesting that it does *not* derive from the same source as (48b).

- (49) He did it, but I don't know what for. (≈ ...why he did it)

As with the above LFF case, it is unclear how any approach assuming movement of the entire PP to the left periphery could account for this fact, given that such an approach necessarily postulates an underlying structure for the swipe in (49) that is isomorphic to that of (48b) in relevant respects. By contrast, the P-stranding-*cum*-deletion analysis advocated here does not face this problem, since it analyzes (49) as shown in (50), correctly predicting interpretive equivalence with (48a).

- (50) what, ~~did he do it~~ [for t_i]_F

The above observations strongly suggest that inversion analyses are untenable for English and LFF swiping alike, and that swiping should instead be analyzed as ordinary *wh*-movement and P-stranding in syntax and subsequent prosodic (non-constituent) deletion at PF.

What is left open by this approach (and any other, as far as we can tell) is an account of the contrasts and subtleties described in sections 2.2 and 2.3, where only a subset of the possible combinations of (strandable) prepositions and (mobile) *wh*-phrases was found to be permissible in swiping, while others are perceived as less natural. We leave it to future research to address this gap in the current understanding of swiping. Given that the observed restrictions on permissible

³²Interestingly, a non-swiped sluice in response to A's statement in (45), *De qui?* 'Of who?' also appears to match the reading of (44b) rather than that of (44c). This might suggest a preference for deriving sluices in LFF from in situ questions where possible. For reasons of space, we cannot explore this interesting question further here.

prepositions and *wh*-phrases have no obvious characterization in syntactic or semantic terms, it seems likely to us that the *wh* < *P* surface sequence remaining after deletion must satisfy prosodic constraints and conform to phonotactic preferences. Future work should seek to unravel these factors which, jointly with syntactic constraints pertaining to the mobility of the *wh*-phrases and strandability of the prepositions involved, determine the range of felicitous swiping configurations. Hopefully these investigations will also shed light on the vexing question – left unanswered by all approaches, including ours – why certain languages that permit P-stranding under non-elliptical *wh*-movement, such as Quebec French and Icelandic, nevertheless do not appear to tolerate swiping.

- (i) *Elle a dénié qu'elle connaissait un homme qui avait voté pour quelqu'un dans le
 she has denied that-she knew a man who had voted for someone in the
 référendum, mais je ne sais pas pour qui.
 referendum but I NEG know not for who
- (ii) *Elle a dénié qu'elle connaissait un homme qui avait voté (pour quelqu'un) dans le
 she has denied that-she knew a man who had voted for someone in the
 referendum but I NEG know not who that-she has denied that-she knew
 a man who
 référendum, mais je ne sais pas qui qu'elle a dénié qu'elle connais-
 sait un homme qui
 avait voté pour dans le référendum.
 had voted for in the referendum

4. CONCLUSION

In this article, we have shown that swiping exists outside the Northern Germanic languages: Like English but unlike Standard French, LFF permits P-stranding under *wh*-movement and swiping under sluicing. However, as in English, the swiping pattern in LFF is heavily constrained: only *wh*-phrases of relatively low internal complexity consistently yield natural results, and the range of prepositions that can appear in LFF swiping is quite limited. Why this is and how the relevant constraints are to be stated remain to be elucidated in future work. We indicated furthermore that swiping in LFF poses significant problems for the widely-adopted TP-deletion approach to sluicing, and that a purely prosodic approach to clausal ellipsis that permits in situ remnants establishes a more insightful and empirically accurate link between swiping and P-stranding. Like all other approaches, the analysis leaves open the important question of why P-stranding is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for swiping both in LFF and more generally across languages.

REFERENCES

- Abe, Jun. 2015. *The in-situ approach to sluicing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Abels, Klaus. 2019. Movement and islands. In *The Oxford handbook of ellipsis*, ed. Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Tanja Temmerman, 389–424. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Authier, J.-Marc. 2016. French orphan prepositions revisited. *Probus* 28(2): 231–270.

- Baltin, Mark. 2006. Extraposition. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 237–271. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Barros, Matthew. 2012. Arguments against island-repair: Evidence from contrastive TP-ellipsis. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Barros, Matthew, Patrick D. Elliott, and Gary Thoms. 2013. More variation in island repair: Clausal vs. non-clausal islands. In *Proceedings of CLS 49*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Barros, Matthew, Patrick D. Elliott, and Gary Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Ms., Rutgers University, University College London, and University of Edinburgh.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2015. Non-constituent coordination: prosody, not movement. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 21(1): article 5.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. In *Syntax*, ed. Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, 506–569. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chung, Sandra, William A. Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3(3): 239–282.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2004. Ellipsis in Dutch dialects. Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2012. How do you sluice when there is more than one CP? In *Sluicing: crosslinguistic perspectives*, ed. Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson, 40–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, Peter W. 1999. *Syntactic nuts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, Peter W., and Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dagnac, Anne. 2019. French. In *The Oxford handbook of ellipsis*, ed. Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Tanja Temmerman, 785–814. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Féry, Caroline. 2001. Focus and phrasing in French. In *Audiatu vox sapientiae*, ed. Caroline Féry and Wolfgang Sternefeld, 153–181. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Hankamer, Jorge. 1979. *Deletion in coordinate structures*. New York: Garland.
- Hartman, Jeremy, and Ruixi Ai. 2009. A focus account of swiping. In *Selected papers from the Cyprus 2006 Syntaxfest*, ed. Kleanthes Grohmann and Phoevos Panagiotidis, 92–122. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hartmann, Katharina. 2001. *Right-node raising and gapping*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hasegawa, Hiroshi. 2007. Swiping and related phenomena in English and other languages. In *Proceedings of WECOL 2007*, 68–85. Fresno: California State University.
- Hirschbühler, Paul. 1978. The semantics and syntax of *wh*-constructions. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kimura, Hiroko. 2010. A *wh-in-situ* strategy for sluicing. *English Linguistics* 27(1): 43–59.
- King, Ruth, and Yves Roberge. 1990. Preposition stranding in Prince Edward Island French. *Probus* 2(3): 351–369.
- Larson, Bradley. 2014. UnElided Basic Remnants In Germanic Ellipsis, or: ÜBRIGE arguments. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 20(1): article 20.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of NELS 31*, ed. Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, vol. 2, 301–320. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2013. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17(1): 1–20.
- Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, Jason. 2002. Swiping in Germanic. In *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, ed. Jan-Wouter Zwart and Werner Abraham, 289–315. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27(6): 661–738.
- Merchant, Jason. 2008. Variable island-repair under ellipsis. In *Topics in ellipsis*, ed. Kyle Johnson, 132–153. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, Jerry. 1973. Sentence fragments and the notion “sentence”. In *Issues in linguistics*, ed. Braj Kachru, Robert Lees, Yakov Malkiel, Angelina Pietrangeli, and Sol Saporta, 719–751. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Murphy, Andrew. 2016. A note on the swiping/P-stranding generalization. Ms., University of Leipzig.
- Nakao, Chizuru, Hajime Ono, and Masaya Yoshida. 2006. When a complement PP goes missing: A study on the licensing condition of swiping. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 25*, 297–305. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 1976. *Études de la syntaxe interrogative du français*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ott, Dennis. 2016. Ellipsis in appositives. *Glossa* 1(1): article 34. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.37>.
- Ott, Dennis, and Volker Struckmeier. 2018. Particles and deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49(2): 393–407.
- Poplack, Shana, Lauren Zentz, and Nathalie Dion. 2012. Phrase-final prepositions in Quebec French: an empirical study of contact, codeswitching, and convergence. *Bilingualism: language and cognition* 15: 203–225.
- Postal, Paul. 1972. Some rules that are not successive-cyclic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3(2): 211–222.
- Radford, Andrew, and Eiichi Iwasaki. 2015. On Swiping in English. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(2): 703–744.
- Reich, Ingo. 2007. Toward a uniform analysis of short answers and gapping. In *On information structure, meaning and form*, ed. Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 467–484. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richards, Norvin. 1997. What moves where when in which language? Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk. 1978. *A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Roberge, Yves, and Nicole Rosen. 1999. Preposition stranding and *que*-deletion in varieties of North American French. *Linguistica Atlantica* 21: 153–168.
- Rosen, Carol. 1976. Guess what about? In *Papers from the 6th meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society*, 205–211. Montreal: Montreal Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the fifth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252–286. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Starke, Michal. 2001. Move dissolves into Merge: A theory of locality. Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Tailleur, Sandrine. 2013. The French *wh*-interrogative system: *Est-ce que*, clefting? Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Tancredi, Christopher. 1992. Deletion, deaccenting and presupposition. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Tyler, Matthew. 2017. Swiping without sluicing. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 23: Article 32.
- Wexler, Kenneth N., and Peter W. Culicover. 1980. *Formal principles of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.