Modal Mismatches

(1) The baseball player went public with [his desire to be traded]. He doesn’t care where <he {would be} traded>. (Rudin 2018, 21(b)).

(2) Sally knows that there is always the potential for [awful things to happen], but she doesn’t know when <awful things { might} happen>. (Rudin 2018, 23(a)).

(677 examples of Modal Mismatch in Santa Cruz Ellipsis Dataset)

Syntactic Identity of Eventive Core

Mismatches outside the “Eventive Core” are permitted in sluicing.

Lexical material within EC (≠ the vP of the elided TP) is subject to a condition relating it to its “correlates” in the antecedent TP (p 11):
• (a) correlates must be lexically identical or
• (b) they must be coindexed

(Rudin 2018)

Anaphora Condition

(3) Someone ate at [five burger restaurants], but I don’t know who <ate at them>.

them is not lexically identical to five burger restaurants, they are coindexed.

(4) [Many prominent congressmen still have not endorsed the candidate], though he would not say when <a presidential race might be>

they not coindexed with Many prominent congressman


Modals are Anaphoric

(5) Sally knows that there is always the potential<for awful things to happen>, but she doesn’t know when <awful things might happen>. ▷ might is an anaphoric (Stone 1997) – index w indicates set of possible worlds in which awful things happen.

▷ tense mismatch is similar (Merchant 2001, Rudin 2018).

Same Discourse Referents

(6) Jill asked where someone had committed a crime, and Jack asked when <someone had committed a crime>.

two distinct discourse referents

(7) Jill asked where someone had committed a crime, and Jack asked when <someone had committed a crime>.

same discourse referent (Chung et al. 2011)

(8) A girl said she was smart. Another girl did <say she was smart> too.

Sloppy readings very natural for VP ellipsis – (nearly) impossible for sluicing (Merchant 2001).

Proposal: No New Eventualities

Sluicing cannot introduce a new eventuality into the discourse context.

▷ Mismatches only possible when necessary to enforce same-eventuality.

▷ Modal mismatch, pronominal mismatches, and also categorical mismatches.

(9) Bradley said that he has not shut the door to [a presidential race], though he would not say when <a presidential race might be>

Same eventuality – hypothetical presidential race.

Other Mismatches

(10) (Gerund) “As a teacher,” he once explained, “[I] was interested in [tutoring], and it didn’t matter what subject <I WAS tutoring>.

▷ in p ∨ q, not p is presupposed when q is evaluated. (Kroll 2018)

▷ Sluicing can negate antecedent event only if context requires it.

Polarity Mismatch

(13) Have those documents on my desk by 8am or explain why <you don’t have them on my desk by 8am>!

▷ in p ∨ q, not p is presupposed when q is evaluated. (Kroll 2018)

Chung’s Generalization

(14) They’re jealous but it’s unclear of who <they’re jealous>

(15) * They’re jealous but it’s unclear who <they’re jealous of>

Is some form of syntactic identity still required? Or is eventuality-identity sufficiently fine-grained to account for this?