In this talk I argue that ACD type ellipsis in Polish and Russian is licensed via VP topicalization (Johnson 2001), and subsequent de-stressing up to deletion (Rooth 1992, Fox 1995). I show that relative clauses in both languages allow ACD type ellipsis only in cases when the topicalized VP does not raise above the relative marker/operator of the relative clause it is situated in. Otherwise, a condition on remnant movement is violated (as shown in example 1). Remnant Movement Constraint (informal): 

A. The movement of an XP containing the trace/copy of YP to a position c-commanding YP is prohibited, provided YP and XP undergo the same type of movement.  

* \([\text{XP } t_1]_2 [\text{YP}]_1 \ldots ZP \ldots [t_2])\)

Following Müller (1998), I assume the condition can be reduced to a condition on minimality.

Relative clauses in Polish and Russian have two types of relative markers: a marker that is inflected for case/gender/number (ktory/kotoryi, shown in 2a), which I assume to be an operator, and a complementizer marker co/cto that is uninflected (2). Condition-C violations in co/cto relatives (3a) as compared to ktory/kotoryi relatives (3b) indicate that there are no phonetically null operators in Polish (same contrast holds for Russian).

There is evidence that the uninflected marker is localized above the inflected one (4). Adopting Rizzi (1997), I propose the following localization of relative markers:

\([\text{Force co/cto Topic TOPIC finiteness ktory/kotoryi}]\)

The proposed above structure correctly predicts the position of topicalized elements to be below Force and above Finiteness (5). Examples in (6) show that de-stressing in Polish and Russian is carried out in Topic position.

ACD type ellipsis in Polish and Russian is only possible when the VP raises to Spec-Topic (in order to be de-stressed). When the relative marker is co/cto, ellipsis is possible since the constraint in A is not violated. \([\text{Force co/cto Topic VP2 finiteness (ktory/kotoryi)}_1 \ldots [\text{VP } t_2] t_1]\)

In cases when the marker is ktory/kotoryi, the prohibition on remnant movement (as stated in A) is violated (examples 7a, b). \(\star [\text{Force Topic VP } t_1]_2 [\text{finiteness (ktory/kotoryi)}_1 ] \ldots [\text{VP } t_2] \]

The above analysis of relative clause ellipsis makes two predictions.

1. Ellipsis is possible in cases where the trace of relative marker ktory/kotory is not contained in the topicalized VP. For example, ellipsis is possible with either marker when the operator inside the relative is an adjunct (8). \([\text{Force Topic VP2 finiteness (ktory/kotoryi)}_1 \ldots [\text{VP } t_2] t_1]\)

2. Ellipsis with relatives having embedded clauses and a ktory/kotoryi marker (provided the operator inside is an adjunct) should be possible only with a narrow scope reading (9a).

\([\text{Force Topic finiteness (ktory/kotoryi)}_1 ] \ldots [\text{VP2 VP2 Force} \ldots \text{[Top VP1 finiteness t1 [VP1 [VP1 t12] t1]]}]\)

Otherwise, topicalization of the matrix VP (giving wide scope) would place the trace/copy of the ktory/kotoryi marker in a position c-commanding that marker (9b), thus violating A.

\(\star [\text{Force Topic VP2 finiteness (ktory/kotoryi)}_1 ] \ldots t_2 \quad \text{where } t_2 = [\text{VP2} \ldots [\text{Force} \ldots [\text{VP1 [VP1 t1]]}]\]

In comparison, relatives marked by co/cto allow both narrow and wide scope (9c).

ACD type ellipsis in Polish and Russian is licensed via topicalization of the VP, de-stressing and subsequent deletion. Restrictions on remnant movement (reducible to minimality) permit ACD ellipsis in cases when the trace/copy of the relative marker does not c-command the marker. The current analysis predicts that languages that have relative markers occupying opposite ends of the Left Periphery will allow ACD ellipsis only when the operator is higher than the required for de-stressing position.

Examples:

1. a. Ja wiem ze [o Reaganie]$_1$ ty kupiles nowa ksiazke t$_1$ (POL)
   I know that about Reagan you bought new book
   ‘I know that you bought a new book about Reagan’

   ??b. [Nowa ksiazke t$_1$]$_2$ ja wiem ze [o Reaganie]$_1$ ty kupiles t$_2$
   New book I know that about Reagan you bought
   ‘I know that you bought a new book about Reagan’

2. [Nowa ksiazke o Reaganie]$_1$ ja wiem ze ty kupiles t$_1$
   New book about Reagan I know that you bought
   ‘I know that you bought a new book about Reagan’
2. a. Marysia zna [co/ktorych_1 Ania lubi t_1/t_2] (POL) (slash indicates ‘or’) Mary knows boys that/who-acc.pl Anne likes
   ‘Mary knows some boys who Ann likes’

b. Masha znaet malchikov [cto/kotorych_1 Anna ljubit t_1/t_2] (RUS) Mary knows boys that/who-acc.pl Anne loves
   ‘Mary knows some boys who Ann loves’

3. a. Znam [kolezanke Janka_1 [co on, powiedzal ze chce polubic t_1]] (POL)
   Know friend(fem) John that he said that wants like
   ‘I know a friend of John that he said that he wants to like’

b. Znam [kolezanke Janka_1 [ktora_1 powiedzial ze chce polubic t_1]] (POL)
   Know friend(fem) John who he said that wants like
   ‘I know a friend of John that he said that he wants to like’

4. a. Marysia zna chlopców [ko/ktorych_1 Ania lubi] (POL)
   Mary knows boys that/who-acc,pl Anne likes
   ‘Mary knows some boys who Ann likes’

b. Marysia zna chlopców [ktorych co Ania lubi] (POL)
   Mary knows boys who-acc,pl that Anne likes
   ‘Mary knows some boys who Ann likes’

5. a. Jan kupi ksiazke [(co) on, nie przeczyta ale przekartkuje] (POL)
   Jan buy book (that) he which not read but browse
   Jan will buy a book that he will not read but browse

b. Misha prochital knigu [Vania, *cto/kotoryj_1 ne prochital] (RUS)
   Misha read book Vania that/which not read
   ‘Misha read a book which Vania did not read’

6. a. Jan kupuje ksiazki czesciej [niz kupuje ksiazki, Maria t_1] (POL)
   Jan purchases books often than purchases books Mary
   ‘Jan purchases books more often than Mary purchases books’

b. Jan kupuje ksiazki czesciej [niz Maria kupuje ksiazki] (POL)
   Jan purchases books often than Mary purchases books
   ‘Jan purchases books more often than Mary purchases books’

7. a. Ja odwiedze kazde miasto [co/*kto _ty] (POL)
   I will-visit every city that/which you
   ‘I will visit every city that you will’

b. Ja posetil kazhdyj gorod [chtot/*kotoryj_ _ty] (RUS)
   I visited every city that/which you
   ‘I visited every city that you did’

8. a. Ja zagram w kazdym barze [co/w _ktorym _ty] (POL)
   I play in every bar that/in which you
   ‘I will play in every bar in which you will’

b. Ja spoju v kazhdom bare [cto/v _kotorym _ty] (RUS)
   I sing in every bar that/in which you
   ‘I will sing in every bar in which you will’

9. a. Ja wiem ze Jurek spal pod kazdym mostem [pod _ktorym _ty spales ](POL)
   I know that Jurek slept under every bridge under which you slept
   ‘I know that Jurek slept under every bridge under which you did (sleep)’

b. Ja wiem ze Jurek spal pod kazdym mostem [pod _ktorym _ty wiesz ze Jurek spal] (POL)
   I know that Jurek slept under every bridge under which you know that Jurek slept
   ‘I know that Jurek slept under every bridge under which you did (know that Jurek slept)’

c. Ja wiem ze Jurek spal pod kazdym mostem [co _ty]
   I know that Jurek slept under every bridge that you
   ‘I know that Jurek slept under every bridge that you did (know that Jurek slept/sleep)’