SLUICING IN LEBANESE ARABIC: MORE EVIDENCE FOR CLEFT SOURCES*

Yasmine Abou Taha and Dennis Ott
University of Ottawa

1.   Introduction

This paper discusses instances of apparent preposition stranding (P-stranding) under sluicing in Lebanese Arabic (LA). LA allows the omission of a preposition from a sluiced *wh*-phrase when the correlate of this sluicing remnant is a PP:

(1)   Adam ħaka   maʕ ħada,   bas ma   baʕref   (maʕ) meen.
         Adam talked.3sm to   someone but NEG know.1s to   who
         'Adam talked to someone, but I don't know (to) who(m).'

Since LA does not allow P-stranding in non-elliptical *wh*-questions, such instances of P-less sluicing remnants appear to violate Merchant's (2001) Preposition-stranding Generalization:

(2)   *Preposition-stranding Generalization (PSG)*
         A language *L* will allow P-stranding under sluicing iff *L* allows P-stranding under regular *wh*-movement.

This paper aims to show that LA is not in fact a counterexample to the PSG: in line with what has been claimed for other languages, we argue that cases such as (1) are not instances of regular sluicing, where the sluiced question is syntactically isomorphic to the antecedent, but instead derive from cleft sources, instantiating so-called 'pseudo-sluicing' (e.g., Rodrigues et al. 2009, van Craenenbroeck 2010, Algryani 2012, Barros 2014, Abels 2017). Deletion resulting in apparent P-stranding indicates that the *wh*-remnant is the pivot of an underlying cleft; since cleft pivots generally appear in a bare nominal form, no actual P-stranding is involved in the derivation of the sluice. This, we claim, is what yields the impression of PSG-violating P-stranding under sluicing in LA.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces sluicing and the PSG. Section 3 turns specifically to sluicing in LA. After presenting the types of *wh*-questions found in LA, we propose an analysis of P-stranding effects in sluicing along the lines indicated above, showing that such an analysis generates various welcome predictions. Section 4 concludes the paper.

Actes du congrès annuel de l'Association canadienne de linguistique 2020.
Proceedings of the 2020 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association.
© 2020 Yasmine Abou Taha and Dennis Ott

2. Background

Ross (1969) coined the term *sluicing* to refer to a class of elliptical constructions in which the non-*wh* portion of an interrogative clause is deleted, leaving only the *wh*-phrase as a surface remnant. The following example schematically summarizes the (standard) terminology we will be using in this paper:

(3) [*antecedent* John bought [*correlate* something]], but I don't know

[*sluice* [*remnant* what] (*ellipsis site*)].

Chung et al. (1995) distinguish two types of sluicing: *merger* and *sprouting*. In the former type, the sluiced *wh*-phrase has an overt correlate, typically an indefinite pronoun or DP, as in (3) above. In sprouting, on the other hand, the remnant has an implicit (nonovert) correlate:

(4) Adam ʕam yeʔra, bas ma baʕref shu.
     Adam PROG read.3sm but NEG know.1s what
     'Adam is reading, but I don't know what.'

The above example shows that syntactic isomorphism between the elided clause and its antecedent is not required to license sluicing, since there is no correlate present that matches the sluiced remnant.[1] This observation motivated Merchant (2001) to propose a semantic isomorphism requirement, according to which recoverability requires mutual entailment between the elided clause (E) and its antecedent (A) under F(ocus)-closure:

(5) e-GIVENness
     An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo ∃-type shifting,
     a.   A entails F-closure(E), and
     b.   E entails F-closure(A).

(6) Focus condition on IP-ellipsis
     An IP α can be deleted only if α is e-GIVEN.   (Merchant 2001: 26)

Merchant's identity condition is relevant to our purposes here in that it permits syntactically non-isomorphic antecedents of sluicing that are nevertheless *semantically* identical; this is what permits sluicing over cleft sources with non-cleft antecedents (see Potsdam 2007).

Merchant (2001), building on original arguments in Ross 1967, argues furthermore that sluicing is PF-deletion, i.e. the ellipsis site contains full syntactic structure. Regular (or 'true') sluicing occurs when this syntactic structure parallels that of the antecedent. Merchant uses several diagnostics to show that the unpronounced structure in the ellipsis site is parallel to the antecedent, such as case-matching and P-stranding effects. As per the PSG, languages such as English, which allow P-stranding in questions (7a), also allow

---

[1]This does not mean, however, that syntactic identity should be ignored altogether; see Chung 2013.

P-stranding in sluicing (7b).

(7) a. Who was John talking with?
    b. John talked with someone, but I don't know (with) who(m).

However, in languages such as Greek, P-stranding is not allowed in questions (8a), and it is also ungrammatical in sluicing (8b), just as the PSG predicts.

(8) a. *Pjon milise   me?
       who talked.3s with
       'Who did he talk with?'

    b. I   Anna milise me   kapjon,   alla dhe ksero   *(me) pjon.
       the Anna talked with someone but not I.know   with who
       'Anna talked with someone, but I don't know who.'   (Merchant 2001: 94)

There are non-P-stranding languages other than Greek that do not show the same pattern, i.e. P-stranding in sluicing is seemingly allowed. For these languages, a 'pseudo-sluicing' analysis has been proposed. Pseudo-sluicing occurs when the elliptical clause but not its antecedent is a cleft, a possibility first considered in Erteschik-Shir (1973: 107f.) and defined by Merchant (1998: 91) as follows:

(9) Pseudo-sluice $=_{def}$ An elliptical construction that resembles a sluice in having only a *wh*-XP as remnant, but has the structure of a cleft, not of a regular embedded question.

Merchant argues that Japanese permits pseudo-sluicing due to the availability of null arguments and copulas, so that a case of (apparent) sluicing as in (10a) is analyzed as shown in (10b).

(10) a. Dareka-ga   sono hon-o   yon-da   ga watashi-wa dare ka
        someone-NOM that book-ACC read-PAST but I-TOP   who Q
        wakaranai.
        know.not
        'Someone read that book, but I don't know who.'

     b. [CP [IP *pro* dare ∅   ] ka].
                who BE   Q
        '…who it is.'

Merchant (1998) goes on to show that Japanese (pseudo-)sluicing constructions share distinctive properties of clefts, such as the pivot's resistance to case morphology and island sensitivity of the construction. For non-P-stranding languages that permit omission of prepositions in sluicing remnants with PP correlates, such as Brazilian Portuguese in (11) (Rodrigues et al. 2009) and Libyan Arabic in (12) (Algryani 2012), the proposed analysis is that they permit a limited form of pseudo-sluicing over non-isomorphic but semantically

equivalent cleft sources.[2]

(11) a.   *Quem que a   Maria dançou com?
             who   that the Maria danced with
             'Who did Maria dance with?'

      b.   A Maria dançou com alguém, mas eu não sei   quem.
           the Maria danced with someone but I   not know who
           'Maria danced with someone, but I don't know who.

(12) a.   *man təkəllem   Sami mʕa?
             who talked.3sm Sami with
             'Who did Sami talk with?'

      b.   Sami təkəllem   mʕa waħəd, lakən mish ʕarəf   (mʕa) man.
           Sami talked.3sm with someone but   NEG know.1sm with who
           'Sami talked with someone, but I don't know (with) who(m).'

It is interesting to note that Libyan Arabic allows P-stranding in clefted *wh*-questions owing to the presence of a resumptive pronoun that serves as the host of the stranded preposition:

(13) man (hu)   illi Yasin ʔedda   mʕə-h?
      who he.COP that Yasin went.3sm with-him
      'Who is it that Yasin went with?'   (Algryani 2012: 93)

Based on this observation, Algryani (2012) argues that resumptive cleft *wh*-questions constitute the source of sluicing with apparent P-stranding in this language. More specifically, he argues that sluicing can in principle have either an isomorphic, non-cleft source (*wh*-fronting) or a cleft source, giving rise to 'true' sluicing and pseudo-sluicing, respectively; where apparent P-stranding is observed, the sluice is a pseudo-sluice. An example like (14a) is thus analyzed as a (pseudo-)sluice deriving from the source in (14b).

(14) a.   Ali ʔedda   mʕə waħəd   lakən mish ʕaref   man.
           Ali went.3sm with someone but   NEG know.1s who
           'Ali went with someone, but I don't know who.'

      b.   … lakən mish ʕaref   man (hu)   illi Ali ʔedda   mʕə-h.
             but   NEG know.1s who he.COP that Ali went.3sm with-him
           '… but I don't know who it is that Ali went with.'   (Algryani 2012: 96)

In Libyan Arabic, *wh*-clefts cannot have PP pivots, but only DP pivots (as in (13)). Hence, P-omission in sluicing in Libyan Arabic does not render the language an exception to the PSG; it is merely the superficial expression of the availability of cleft sources. We turn next to sluicing in LA, which, as we will show, supports analogous conclusions.

---

[2]Languages such as Brazilian Portuguese do not permit null elements to the extent that Japanese does; consequently, the proposal is that the underlying cleft/copular clause is reduced by deletion.

3. Sluicing in Lebanese Arabic

3.1 *Wh*-questions in LA

Since sluices derive from *wh*-questions, we will first illustrate the two strategies of question formation available in LA. This variety has two main strategies of question formation: *wh*-fronting (15a) and *wh*-clefting (15b) (see Shlonsky 1997, Choueiri 2019).

(15) a. shu$_i$ jebet t$_i$?
　　　 what got.2sm
　　　 'What did you get?'

　　 b. shu$_i$ **(huwwe) illi** jebt-**o**$_i$?
　　　 what it.COP　 that got.2sm-it
　　　 'What is it that you got?'

In *wh*-fronting, the fronted *wh*-phrase is linked to a gap. In *wh*-clefting, there is an optional pronominal copula (*huwwe*), and two obligatory components: a complementizer (*illi*) and a resumptive pronoun (RP; here: *-o* 'it') bound by the *wh*-phrase in the left periphery.

　　 RPs can give rise to configurations resembling P-stranding in *wh*-clefts, but not in *wh*-fronting, such that the bare-nominal *wh*-phrase appears in the left periphery and a preposition with a (cliticized) RP lower down:[3]

(16) a. meen illi raʕas　　 Adam maʕ-**o**?
　　　 who　that danced.3sm Adam with-him
　　　 'Who is it that Adam danced with?'

　　 b. *meen raʕas　　 Adam maʕ-**o**?
　　　 who　danced.3sm Adam with-him
　　　 'Who did Adam dance with?'

This is the first important indication that the underlying source of sluicing with P-stranding in LA is *wh*-clefts, not simple questions with *wh*-fronting.

　　 Wh-fronting in LA applies equally to arguments and adjuncts:

(17) a. **ayya computer** jebet?
　　　 which computer　got.2sm
　　　 'Which computer did you get?'

　　 b. **keef** sallaħt　 l-computer?
　　　 how fixed.2sm the-computer
　　　 'How did you fix the computer?'

---

[3]It should be noted that for Saudi Arabic, Alshaalan and Abels (2020) draw a distinction between cleft questions, as in (16a), which have a complementizer and an RP, and resumptive *wh*-questions, such as in (16b), which have an RP only. In this paper, we do not make this distinction because in LA, even though we have resumptive wh-questions, when it comes to P-stranding, resumption alone, without the complementizer that is characteristic of clefts, cannot rescue the stranded preposition, as shown in (16b).

    c.   **min wein** jebt   l-computer?
         from where got.2sm the-computer
         'From where did you get the computer?'

Wh-clefts are more restricted regarding the type of *wh*-phrases that can appear as a pivot. While argument *wh*-phrases can be clefted (18), *wh*-adjuncts cannot be clefted, but only when there is an implicit correlate (19) (Aoun et al. 2010: 136).

(18) **ayya kteb** (huwwe) illi ʔarayt-o mberiħ?
      which book it.COP that read.2sm-it yesterday
      'Which book did you read yesterday?'

(19) a.   *keef **(huwwe) illi** sallaħt-**o**   l-computer?
         how it.COP   that fixed.2sm-it the-computer
         'How did you fix the computer?'

      b.   *min wein **(huwwe) illi** jebt-**o**   l-computer?
         from where it.COP   that got.2sm-it the-computer
         'Where did you get the computer from?'

      c.   *ʔaddeh   **(huwwe) illi** dafaʕt-**o**   ʕa l-computer?
         how-much it.COP   that paid.2sm-it on the-computer
         'How much did you pay for the computer?'

(19b) illustrates the general point that pivots of clefted questions must be nominal and cannot be PPs; the preposition in such cases must be 'stranded' inside the cleft relative, where it cliticizes onto the RP:

(20) a. **ayya maħal** (huwwe) illi jebet   l-computer **min-o**?
         which store   it.COP   that got.2sm the-computer from-it?
         'Which store is it that you got the computer from?'

      b. **wein** (huwwe) l-maħal illi jebt   l-computer **min-o**?
         where it.COP the-store that got.2sm the-computer from-it
         'Where is the store that you got the computer from?'

      c. **wein** (huwwe) l-balad   illi rayeħ   **ʕl-eh**?
         where it.COP the-country that going.2sm to-it
         'Where is the country that you are going to?'

      d. **ʔaddeh**   (huwwe) s-seʕr   illi beʕt   l-computer **fi-h**?
         how-much it.COP   the-price that sold.2sm the-computer in-it
         'How much did you sell the computer for?'

In the following subsection, we argue that this pattern of a nominal *wh*-phrase associating with an RP inside a PP is what yields apparent P-stranding under sluicing.

3.2 Proposal

In the previous section, we saw that there are two main strategies of question formation in LA: *wh*-fronting and *wh*-clefting, the latter including an obligatory complementizer and an RP. We saw that the cleft strategy can give rise to a P-stranding-like configuration in which the bare *wh*-nominal associates with an RP that is the complement of a preposition, while no such resumptive strategy is available in simple, non-clefted questions, as we saw in (16b). While arguments and adjuncts can generally be fronted, clefting is more selective in not allowing PPs and adjuncts with implicit correlates to appear as pivots.

Based on these observations, and in line with previous works (e.g., Rodrigues et al. 2009, van Craenenbroeck 2010, Algryani 2012, Barros 2014, Abels 2017), we propose that apparent P-stranding under sluicing in LA is the result of deletion in a cleft source. To illustrate, we claim that the sluice in (21a)—where the remnant of sluicing is a nominal *wh*-phrase while its correlate is a PP—derives from the (acceptable) cleft in (21b) rather than the isomorphic (unacceptable) simple question in (21c).

(21) a.   sh-shabeb ħako   maʕ ħada,   bas ma baʕref meen.
       the-guys talked.3p to   someone but NEG know.1s who
       'The guys talked to someone, but I don't know who.'

     b.   . . . bas ma   baʕref   meen (huwwe) illi   ħako   maʕ-o.
         but NEG know.1s who   he.COP that talked.3p to-him
       '. . . but I don't know who it is that they talked to.'

     c.   *. . . bas ma   baʕref   meen ħako   maʕ-o.
         but NEG know.1s who   talked.3p to-him
       intended: '. . . but I don't know who they talked to.'

The simple question in (21c) requires *wh*-fronting with illegitimate P-stranding, hence is ruled out as a source for the sluice. The cleft source in (21b), by contrast, involves no *bona fide* P-stranding but merely the standard resumptive pattern where the 'stranded' preposition takes the RP as its complement, the latter anteceded by the bare-nominal *wh*-phrase that surfaces as the remnant of sluicing in (21a).

Some further cases and their analysis according to our proposal are given below:

(22) a.   Adam ħaka   ʕan shi,   bas ma baʕref shu [(huwwe) illi
       Adam talked.3sm about something but NEG know.1s what   it.COP   that
       ħaka   ʕan-o].
       talked.3sm about-it
       'Adam talked about something, but I don't know what it is that he talked about.'

     b.   Adam rayeħ   ʕala balad, bas ma   baʕref ayya balad   [(huwwe) illi
       Adam going.3sm to   country but NEG know.1s which country   it.COP   that
       rayeħ   ʕl-eh].
       going.3sm to-it
       'A. is going to a country, but I don't know which one it is that he is going to.'

c. Adam rayeħ   ʕala balad, bas ma   baʕref   wein   [(huwwe) l-balad
   Adam going.3sm to   country but NEG know.1s where   it.COP   the-country
   illi   rayeħ   ʕl-eh].
   that going.3sm to-it
   'Adam is going to a country, but I don't know where the country is that he is
   going to.'

d. Adam beʕ   l-laptop   tabaʕo bi seʕr mʕayyan, bas ma   baʕref
   Adam sold.3sm the-laptop of-him for price certain   but NEG know.1s
   ʔaddeh   [(huwwe) s-seʕer   illi   beʕo   fi-h].
   how-much   it.COP   the-price that sold.3sm-it for-it
   'Adam sold his laptop for a certain price, but I don't know how much it is that
   he sold it for.'

In summary, we propose that P-stranding effects in LA sluicing are the result of pseudo-sluicing, i.e. sluicing over an underlying semantically identical cleft source (cf. Potsdam 2007). In the next section, we will see that, as expected on this analysis, P-less remnants become impossible when cleft sources are excluded by independent constraints.[4]

3.3 Predictions

Our analysis of P-stranding effects in LA sluicing makes one central prediction: when cleft sources are ruled out by independent factors, P-less remnants become impossible. In this section, we show this prediction to be borne out, using several diagnostics in turn.

3.3.1 *Else*-modification

Clefts in LA have an exhaustivity presupposition, rendering *else*-modification of pivots odd (examples adapted from Merchant 2001: 122):

(23) a. *Adam ken   honik, bas ma   baʕref   meen kamen (huwwe) illi   ken
      Adam was.3sm there   but NEG know.1s who   also   he   that was.3sm
      honik.
      there
      'Adam was there, but I don't know else it is that was there.'

    b. … bas ma   baʕref   meen kamen ken   honik.
      but NEG know.1s who   also   was.3sm there
      '… but I don't know who else was there.'

---

[4]It should be noted that the pro-form analysis suggested by Adams and Tomioka (2012) for pseudo-sluicing in Mandarin Chinese and proposed for Turkish by Palaz (to appear) is not applicable to LA. In their analysis, Adams and Tomioka suggest that there is a null pronoun in the pseudo-sluice which refers to an indefinite in the antecedent clause. In LA, P-stranding is rescued only with a cleft source, which includes an optional pronoun *huwwe* 'he,' a complementizer *illi* 'that' and a resumptive pronoun.

For LA sluicing, this observation generates the expectation that *else*-modified sluicing remnants should not allow P-stranding, since a cleft source is independently excluded. This is indeed the case:

(24) a. Adam dahar   maʕ Tala, bas ma   baʕref   *(maʕ) meen kamen.
         Adam went.3sm with Tala but NEG know.1s   with who also
         'Adam went out with Tala, but I don't know with who else.'

    b. *ma   baʕref   meen kamen (hiyye) illi Adam dahar   maʕ-a.
        NEG know.1s who also   she   that Adam went.3sm with-her
        'I don't know who else it is that Adam went out with.'

    c. maʕ meen kamen dahar   Adam?
        with who also   went.3sm Adam
        'Who else did Adam go out with?'

The source of the sluice here must be the simple *wh*-question in (24c), and consequently the remnant must include the preposition. This supports our claim that P-less remnants derive from cleft sources.[5]

The same effect is found in stripping constructions, where a modifier indicating a non-exhaustive reading precludes the absence of a preposition in the remnant:

(25) Adam byeqtereħ   nʔaddem l-cake   maʕ mashroub sekhen, masalan, *(maʕ) shay.
     Adam suggest.3sm serve.1p the-cake with drink   hot   e.g.   with tea
     'Adam suggests to serve the cake with a hot drink, for example, with tea.'

A cleft source for the example above is not possible:

(26)*l-mashroub s-sekhen illi Adam byeqtereħ   nʔaddem l-cake   maʕ-o huwwe
     the-drink   the-hot   that Adam suggests.3sm serve.1p the-cake with-it it.COP
     shay, masalan.
     tea   for.example
     'The hot drink with which Adam suggests to serve the cake is tea, for example.'

Negated stripping fragments likewise exclude cleft sources, resulting in the obligatory presence of the preposition in the following:

---

[5]Alshaalan and Abels (2020) argue against a cleft source for sluicing with P-stranding in Saudi Arabic, which is a non-P-stranding variety. They report that Saudi Arabic speakers accept P-less remnants with *else*-modification, unlike in LA. Because in Saudi Arabic clefts are not compatible with *else*-modification, Alshaalan and Abels suggest that a cleft is not the source for sluicing with P-less remnants. Rather, a resumptive *wh*-question, as in (16b), is a possible underlying source for sluicing with P-stranding in Saudi Arabic because resumptive *wh*-questions with P-stranding are possible in this variety. Such type of questions in LA do not allow P-stranding, as we saw in (16b). Instead, only cleft *wh*-questions, with a resumptive pronoun *and* a complementizer, allow P-stranding in LA, as in (16a), hence our argument that sluicing with P-stranding has an underlying cleft structure.

(27) a.   Adam ħaka   maʕ Tala, mish *(maʕ) Rami.
           Adam talked.3sm with Tala not   with Rami
           'Adam talked with Tala, not with Rami.'

     b. *. . . mish Rami (huwwe) illi Adam ħaka   maʕ-o.
           not   Rami   he.COP that Adam talked.3sm with-him
           '. . . not Rami is the one that Adam talked with.'

Overall, we see that the availability of P-less remnants in LA, in sluicing and stripping alike, goes hand in hand with the availability of clefts.

3.3.2 Multiple Sluicing

Another diagnostic to distiguish between *wh*-fronting (sluicing) and clefts (pseudo-sluicing) is multiple sluicing. Multiple sluicing in LA requires the remnants to be conjoined:

(28) fi   telmeez ʔara   kteb la Chomsky, bas ma baʕref ayya telmeez *(w)
     there.is student read.3sm book by Chomsky but NEG know.1s which student   and
     ayya   kteb.
     which book
     'There is a student who read a book by Chomsky, but I don't know which student and
     which book.'   (adapted from Rodrigues et al. 2009: 179)

In this kind of 'multiple sluicing' construction, P-omission is impossible for either remnant:

(29) Adam ħaka   ʕan shi   maʕ ħada,   bas ma baʕref *(ʕan) shou
     Adam talked.3sm about something with someone but NEG know.1s   about what
     w   *(maʕ) meen.
     and   with who
     'Adam talked about something with someone, but I don't know about what and with
     whom.'

Again, the unavailability of P-stranding under 'multiple sluicing' is due to the fact that there is no licit cleft source in these cases. Multiple pivots of a single cleft are generally impossible in LA.

3.3.3 Contrast Sluicing

In contrast sluicing, the remnant or a subpart thereof is in an explicit contrastive relation with the quantified or definite correlate (Merchant 2001). In LA contrast sluicing, P-less remnants are not allowed:

(30) Adam ħaka   maʕ khams banet, bas ma   baʕref *(maʕ) kam   sabe.
     Adam talked.3sm with five   girls, but NEG know.1s   with how-many boy
     'Adam talked with five girls, but I don't know with how many boys.'

As before, this follows from the unavailability of a cleft source which would admit the contrastive remnant as a pivot:

(31) *... bas ma baʕref kam   sabe (henne) illi ħaka   maʕ-on.
        but NEG know.1s how-many boy they.COP that talked.3sm with-them
     '... but I don't know how many boys it is that he talked with.'

Some further examples of contrast sluices and corresponding illicit cleft sources are given below:

(32) a.   Adam raħ   ʕala arbaʕ bled   ʕarabiyye, bas ma   baʕref   *(ʕala)
           Adam went.3sm to four countries Arab   but NEG know.1s   to
           kam   balad   urupiyye.
           how-many country European
           'Adam went to four Arab countries, but I don't know to how many European countries.'

     b.   *... kam   balad   urupiyye (henne) illi raħ   ʕlay-on.
              how-many country European they.COP that went.3sm to-them
           '... how many European countries it is that he went to.'

(33) a.   ana baʕref   bi ayya majalle Adam katab   maqal, bas ma   baʕref
           I   know.1s in which magazine Adam wrote.3sm article but NEG know.1s
           *(bi) ayya   jareede.
             in which newspaper
           'I know in which magazine Adam wrote an article, but I don't know in which newspaper.'

     b.   *... bas ma baʕref ayya jareede   (hiyye) illi katab   maqal fi-ya.
              but NEG know.1s which newspaper it.COP that wrote.3sm article in-it
           '... but I don't know which newspaper it is that he wrote an article in.'

Once again, we see that the availability of 'P-stranding' in LA sluicing correlates directly with the availability of cleft sources.

3.3.4 ʔemta 'when' within a PP

In the case of *ʔemta* 'when' within a PP, P-stranding in sluicing cannot be salvaged:

(34) Adam rejeʕ   yelʕab bi g-gym, bas ma   baʕef   *(min) ʔemta.
     Adam returned.3sm play.3sm in the-gym but NEG know.1s   since when
     'Adam went back to playing at the gym, but I don't know since when.'

For some reason that remains to be elucidated, no cleft source is available for the *wh*-phrase *ʔemta* 'when' as a remnant:

(35) *Adam rejeʕ   yelʕab bi g-gym, bas ma baʕref ʔemta (huwwe)
    Adam returned.3sm play.3sm in the-gym, but NEG know.1s when it.COP
    l-waʔet illi rejeʕ   yelʕab min-o.
    the-time that returned.3sm play.3sm since-it
    'Adam went back to playing at the gym, but I don't know when is the time since
    Adam went back to playing at the gym.'

This is the case even when the antecedent contains an overt correlate:

(36) *Adam rejeʕ   yelʕab bi g-gym min waʔet mʕayyan, bas ma   baʕref
    Adam returned.3sm play.3sm in the-gym since time   certain,   but NEG know.1s
    ʔemta (huwwe) l-waʔet illi rejeʕ   yelʕab min-o.
    when it.COP   the-time that returned.3sm play.3sm since-it
    'Adam went back to playing at the gym a while ago, but I don't know when is the
    time since Adam went back to playing at the gym.'

In summary, this section presented several diagnostics—else-modification, multiple sluicing, contrast sluicing, *ʔemta* within a PP—that converge on the same conclusion: when cleft sources are ruled out, P-omission is not allowed since only the *wh*-fronting strategy remains as a source, showing that apparent P-stranding in LA sluicing is really an effect of pseudo-sluicing.

4.   Conclusion

This paper examined apparent P-stranding under sluicing in Lebanese Arabic. We have shown that LA exhibits both sluicing (*wh*-fronting) and pseudo-sluicing (clefts), with certain restrictions. In LA, *wh*-fronting can occur with *wh*-phrases like *wh*-arguments and *wh*-adjuncts, while clefts are more restricted regarding the type of *wh*-phrase they can appear with. Crucially for this paper, it was established that clefts can occur when the preposition is stranded. We proposed that the source of sluicing with P-stranding cannot be *wh*-fronting. Rather, sluicing with P-less remnants must have a cleft source, with a complementizer and a resumptive pronoun cliticized to the preposition, which satisfies the semantic identity condition. Because pivots of clefts are not headed by a preposition, the elided material does not in actuality involve a stranded preposition, and the PSG is not violated in LA. The predictions of this proposal are borne out: several diagnostics, such as *else*-modification, stripping, and contrast sluicing show that when cleft sources are ruled out, P-less remnants become impossible. These findings for LA converge with those based on other languages, such as Brazilian Portuguese and Libyan Arabic.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2017. On the interaction of P-stranding and sluicing in Bulgarian. In *Aspects of Slavic linguistics*, ed. Olav Mueller-Reichau and Marcel Guhl. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 1–28.

Adams, Perng Wang and Satoshi Tomioka. 2012. Sluicing in Mandarin Chinese: an instance of pseudo-sluicing. In *Sluicing: cross-linguistic perspectives*, ed. Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 219–247.

Algryani, Ali. 2012. *The syntax of ellipsis in Libyan Arabic: a generative analysis of sluicing, VP-ellipsis, stripping and negative contrast*. Ph.D. thesis, Newcastle University.

Alshaalan, Yara and Klaus Abels. 2020. Resumption as a sluicing source in Saudi Arabic: evidence from sluicing with prepositional phrases. *Glossa* 5(1): 1–36.

Aoun, Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun, and Lina Choueiri. 2010. *The syntax of Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barros, Matthew. 2014. *Sluicing and identity in ellipsis*. Ph.D. thesis, Rutgers University.

Choueiri, Lina. 2019. Syntactic variation. In *The Routledge handbook of Arabic sociolinguistics*, ed. Enam Al-Wer and Uri Horesh. London/New York: Routledge, 185–200.

Chung, Sandra. 2013. Syntactic identity in sluicing: how much and why. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(1): 1–44.

Chung, Sandra, William A. Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3: 239–282.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010. *The syntax of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1973. *On the nature of island constraints*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.

Merchant, Jason. 1998. 'Pseudosluicing:' elliptical clefts in Japanese and English. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 10: 88–112.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palaz, Bilge. to appear. Towards a unified account of clausal ellipsis in Turkish: a non-movement analysis. In *Proceedings of PLC 54*. Chicago: CLS.

Potsdam, Eric. 2007. Malagasy sluicing and its consequences for the identity requirement on ellipsis. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25(3): 577–613.

Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins, and Luis Vicente. 2009. Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and P-stranding. In *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2006*, ed. Danièle Torck and W. Leo Wetzels. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175–198.

Ross, John R. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the chicago linguistic society*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan. Chicago: CLS, 252–286.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.

Shlonsky, Ur. 1997. *Clause structure and word order in Hebrew and Arabic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.