WH NEG Ellipsis: Sluicing or Polarity Ellipsis?
Barbara Citko (University of Washington)

Polish is well known to allow sluicing (Grebenyova 2007, Szczegielniak 2007, among many others):

(1) Maria kogoś   zaprosiła, ale nie pamietam **kogo.**
     Maria someone   invited   but not remember who.$_{ACC}$
     'Maria invited someone but I don't remember whom.'

It also allows so-called polarity ellipsis (Zaleska 2015, Citko 2018, and Kazenin 2006, Gribanova 2017 on Russian): the ellipsis licensed by the polarity particles *nie* 'no' or *tak* 'yes':

(2) Maria zaprosiła Piotra a   Janka   **nie**.
     Maria invited   Piotr   and   Jan.$_{GEN}$ not
     'Maria invited Piotr but she didn't invite Jan.'

The wh-phrase and the polarity particle can co-occur in elliptical constructions, which I refer to as **WH NEG Ellipsis**, illustrated in (3a-b).

(3) a. Wiem, że   Maria zaprosiła Piotra, ale nie wiem   **kogo   nie.**
             know   that Maria invited   Piotr   but not know   who.$_{GEN}$ not
             'I know that Maria invited Piotr but I don't know who she didn't.'
      b. Kto   ma prawo głosować, a   **kto   nie**?
             who   has right   vote.INF   and   who.$_{NOM}$ not
             'Who has the right to vote and who doesn't?' https://alternatywa.net.pl/wybory-samorzadowe-2018-jak-glosowac/

The WH NEG Ellipsis raises the following questions: Is it a case of sluicing that violates the generalization that the head licensing sluicing be empty? Or is it polarity ellipsis in which the remnant happens to be a wh-word? I argue that it is polarity ellipsis based on the fact that with respect to diagnostics that distinguish sluicing from polarity ellipsis, WH NEG Ellipsis patterns with polarity ellipsis rather than sluicing. First, sluicing differs from polarity ellipsis with respect to islands; sluicing allows island violations (see (4a)), as first noted by Ross (1969) for English, but polarity ellipsis doesn't (see 4b)), as noted by Kazenin (2006) for Russian. WH NEG Ellipsis doesn't, either (see (4c)).

(4) a. Przeczytałam artykuł, który jakiś sławny lingwista napisał, ale nie pamiętam **kto.**
             read   article which some famous linguist wrote   but not remember who
             'I read an article that some famous linguist wrote but I don't remember who.'
      b. *Przeczytałam artykuł, który Chomsky napisał, a   **Lakoff nie.**
             read   article which Chomsky wrote   but Lakoff not
             Int. 'I read an article that Chomsky wrote but I didn't read the article which Lakoff wrote.'
      c. *Przeczytałam artykuł, który Chomsky napisał, ale nie pamiętam **kto nie.**
             read   article which Chomsky wrote   but not remember who not
             Int. 'I read an article that Chomsky wrote but I don't remember who I didn't read an article that
             wrote.'

Second, sluicing allows implicit correlates, as shown in (5a), but polarity ellipsis does not, as noted by Morris 2008 for French: the sluice in (5a) is fine without an overt correlate in the antecedent clause, but polarity ellipsis is not. WH NEG Ellipsis in (5c) is also out without an overt correlate in the antecedent clause.

(5) a. Jan czyta **(coś)**,   ale nie wiem **co.**   b. Jan czyta ***(Chomskiego),** a   **Lakoffa nie.**
             Jan reads something but not know what   Jan reads   Chomsky   and Lakoff   not
             'Jan reads (something) but I don't know what.'   *Int.* 'Jan reads (Chomsky) but he doesn't Lakoff.'
      c. Wiem, że   Jan czyta ***(Chomskiego)**, ale nie wiem **kogo nie**.
             know that Jan reads   (Chomsky)   but not know who not
             Int. 'I know that Jan reads but I don't know who he doesn't'

Based on this parallelism, I conclude that WH NEG Ellipsis is a type of polarity ellipsis, which Kazenin 2006, Citko 2018, among others, treat as ellipsis licensed by the Polarity head:

(6)   [$_{PolP}$ **WH**$_i$ [$_{Pol'}$ **NEG** [$_{\overline{XP}}$ .... $\boldsymbol{t_i}$ ...]]]

The behavior of WH NEG ellipsis (and polarity ellipsis more generally) with respect to islands is somewhat mysterious; it does suggests that the ellipsis is smaller in polarity ellipsis than in run-of-the-mill wh-sluicing, and aligns it more with VP Ellipsis in English, which also obeys islands and requires overt correlates (see Fox and Lasnik 2003 on islands in VPE). The obligatory presence of the correlate follows from the fact that polarity ellipsis requires contrast; in the absence of the correlate, there is nothing for the remnant to be contrastive with. Having established that WH NEG Ellipsis is polarity ellipsis, I turn to the relationship between polarity ellipsis and the so-called negative stripping (compare polarity ellipsis in (2) above to negative stripping in (7).

(7) Maria zaprosiła Piotra, a   **nie**   Janka.
    Maria invited   Piotr   and not   Jan.$_{ACC}$
    'Maria invited Piotr and not Jan.'

Zaleska (2015) analyzes both as VP ellipsis and treats *nie* in both as clausal negation. She focusses on the loss of Genitive of Negation in (7); the remnant *Jan* is genitive in polarity ellipsis in (2) but accusative in negative stripping in (7). She attributes the loss of Genitive of Negation to a defective intervention effect; the E feature on *v* acts as a defective intervener and blocks genitive case assignment. When the remnant moves 'around' negation (as in (2)), it escapes the domain of the v head. If polarity ellipsis and negative stripping involve the same derivation (modulo movement of the remnant), and if WH NEG Ellipsis is a type of polarity ellipsis, we would expect it to have a stripping variant. This is not the case; compare the grammatical (3a) above with the ungrammatical (8) below:

(8) *Wiem, że   Maria zaprosiła Piotra, ale nie wiem **nie kogo.**
     know that Maria invited   Piotr   but not know not who.$_{ACC}$

The ungrammaticality of (8) follows from independent requirements on negation, however, if negation in negative stripping is not clausal negation but constituent (or contrastive) negation, as proposed by McCawley 1991, Morris 2008 and Depiante 2004 for English, French and Spanish negative stripping (the possibility Zaleska considers, but ultimately rejects). On such an account, the ungrammaticality of (8) can be attributed to the lack of contrast that constituent negation requires. Once it is controlled for, as in (9) below, NEG WH sequence becomes possible:

(9) Nie, pan zapytał co,   a   **nie kogo.**
     No, you asked   what and not whom
     'No, you asked me what not whom.'   https://books.google.com/books?isbn=8324030964

Constituent negation is known to differ from clausal negation in Polish in that it does not license Genitive of Negation (Błaszczak 2001, Kupść and Przepiórkowski 2002, Witkoś 2008, among others). This provides a more straightforward explanation for the loss of genitive in negative stripping.

Another argument against treating polarity ellipsis and negative stripping alike comes from preposition stranding; polarity ellipsis disallows it (as shown in (10a)), as expected if it involves movement of the remnant. Interestingly, negative stripping allows it (as shown in (10b)), which is expected if constituent negation can attach to any XP: DP or PP in the case at hand.

(10) a. Jan pokłócił   się z   Tomkiem, a ***(z)   Piotrem nie.**
        Jan quarreled REFL with Tomek   and with Piotr   not
        'Jan quarreled with Tom but with Peter, he didn't.'
    b. Jan pokłócił   się z   Tomkiem, a **nie (z)   Piotrem.**
        Jan quarreled REFL with Tomek   and not with Piotr
        'Jan quarreled with Tom but not with Peter.'

To conclude briefly, WH NEG ellipsis in Polish is a type of polarity ellipsis not a type of sluicing. And second, polarity ellipsis is not related to negative stripping.