

Prepositions Stranded under Sluicing in a Language without Preposition Stranding?

Merchant (2001) formulates the generalization in (1). In this paper I present data from Serbo-Croatian (SC), a non-P-stranding language, which, on the face of it, seem to be counterexamples to it. Merchant (2001) gives the example in (2b) to show that SC is well-behaved with respect to (1). According to him, sluicing involves syntactic movement of the *wh*-remnant out of IP, followed by PF deletion of IP. (2b) is then impossible because the loss of P under sluicing would involve the stranding of P in the target IP, but P-stranding is not allowed in SC, as in (3). While (2b) is certainly ungrammatical, I show that its ungrammaticality is not caused by the ban on P-stranding; rather P in the case of the *wh*-PP *sa kim* ‘with whom’ is non-strandable for independent reasons. When all other *wh*-PP’s are plugged into the sluicing construction, their P’s can go missing, as in (4). Thus, the data in (4) seem to be counterexamples to (1). There are two situations in which they would not be counterexamples: (a) they do not involve sluicing, or (b) they do not involve P-stranding. Plenty of data indicate that they involve sluicing. They are not cases of pseudo-sluicing (products of a cleft clause strategy), since eliding a cleft clause is not possible, as in (5a). But, even if it were possible, the case marking on the *wh*-remnant would be wrong in comparison to what really obtains in examples with P-less *wh*-remnants, as in (5b). (6) shows that they are not any kind of directly basegenerated sentence fragments, due to the existence of connectivity effects. Even though the relevant examples involve sluicing, (7) shows that they are not counterexamples to (1), because they do not involve P-stranding. In (7), the antecedents of sluicing contain a coordinate phrase with two PP conjuncts. Note that the two PP conjuncts are headed by two different P’s. Observe next that the remnant of sluicing in the target IP contains a coordinate phrase consisting of two *wh*-NP conjuncts corresponding to the indefinite complements of P’s in the antecedent coordinate phrase. Both P’s are missing in the remnant. Now, it is clear that the target clause cannot involve P-stranding in the standard sense, with the complement of P moving out of PP. Under no current theory of movement can the coordinate remnant move as a constituent, while stranding P’s in the target IP. For this reason, (7) also cannot be analyzed in terms of island repair strategies in sluicing discussed in Lasnik (2001), Fox and Lasnik (2003). Therefore, the loss of P in P-less sluices is not due to the stranding of P in the target IP. But, what is it due to? (7) shows that the loss of P is not syntactic. There are two possibilities as to how P ends up missing. One possibility is based on the theory of sluicing proposed in Lobeck (1995) and Chung, Ladusaw and McCloskey (CLM) (1995), among others. On the face of it, this approach can easily take care of cases like (4). A P-less NP remnant is basegenerated in the SpecCP, and the complement of C is a null IP. At LF, this null IP is replaced by copying the antecedent IP, as illustrated in (8). However, although successful at first sight, this account faces problems. It predicts that all non-stranding languages would allow P-omission under sluicing, which is not the case (see Merchant 2001). Also, SC itself may be a problem, since P’s cannot be omitted under sluicing in all situations in this language either; for example, in cases where there is no correlate PP in the antecedent (9a), in multiple sluicing (9b), or in cases where the remnant is a counterweight of pseudo-cleft clauses (9c). Then, the only other possibility is that the loss of P is postsyntactic, i.e., it occurs at PF. To account for cases like (7), we must assume that the whole PP is either moved (under movement theories of sluicing such as Merchant (2001), Lasnik (1999)), or basegenerated in SpecCP in non-movement theories such as CLM (1995). P is then deleted at PF, independently of sluicing, although the result of sluicing conditions it. I confirm that this is the case by comparing the contexts in which P omission is not possible (some of them are mentioned above), and those in which it is. In all non-P-elision contexts the remnant is either contrastively focused or does not have a correlate PP in the antecedent, i.e., it is new information. In cases where P can be omitted, it is given (in the sense of Merchant 2001). Given this fact, I show that the reason for P omission under sluicing in SC is the same as the one for swiping in English (10) proposed in Merchant (2002): it is based on prosodic prominence assignment considerations. In this sense, swiping in English and P-loss under sluicing in SC are different sides of the same coin – a PF phenomenon produced by either deletion of P (P-loss) or head movement of the *wh*-word to P (swiping, as analyzed in Merchant 2002).

- (1) A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff L allows preposition stranding under regular *wh*-movement.
- (2)a. Ana je govorila sa nekim, ali ne znam sa kim.
Ana is spoken with somebody but not I-know with whom

- ‘Ana spoke with somebody, but I don’t know with who.’
- b. *Ana je govorila sa nekim, ali ne znam kim.
Ana is spoken with somebody but not I-know who
- (3)a. Sa kim je Ana govorila? b. *Kim je govorila Ana sa?
with whom is Ana spoken who is spoken Ana with
‘Who did Ana speak with?’ ‘Who did Ana speak with?’
- (4)a. Petar je glasao za nekoga, ali nisam sigurna (za) koga
Petar is voted for someone but am-not sure for who
‘Petar voted for someone, but I am not sure who.’
- b. Znam da je Petar glasao protiv nečega, ali ne znam (protiv) čega.
I-know that is Petar voted against something but not I-know against what
‘I know that Petar voted against something, but I don’t know what.’
- c. Ona je umrla od nečega, ali ne znam (od) čega.
she is died of something, but not I-know (of) what
‘I know that she died of something, but I don’t know what.’
- d. Petar sjedi ispod nekog drveta, ali ne znam (ispod) kojeg.
Petar sits under some tree but not I-know under which
‘Petar is sitting under some tree, but I don’t know which tree.’
- (5)a. Petar je glasao protiv nečega, ali ne znam šta *(je to bilo
Petar is voted against something, but not know what-nom is that been
protiv čega je on glasao).
against what-gen is he voted
‘Peter voted against something, but I don’t know what it was against Peter voted.’
- b. Petar je glasao protiv nečega, ali ne znam čega.
Petar is voted against something, but not know what-gen
‘Peter voted against something, but I don’t know what.’
- (6) Svaki doctor_i je mislio na nekog svog_i pacijenta, ali ne znam kojeg svog_i pacijenta.
every doctor_i is thought on some self’s_i patient but not know which self’s_i patient
‘Every doctor thought about one of his patients, but I don’t know which of his patients.’
- (7) Petar je sakrio blago **ispod nekog stola i iza nekog kreveta**,
Petar is hidden treasure under some table and behind some bed
ali ne znam **kojeg stola i kojeg kreveta**.
but not I-know which table and which bed
‘Petar hid the treasure under some table and behind some bed, but I don’t know under which table and behind which bed.’
- b. Petar je stao **pored neke žene i ispred nekog čovjeka**,
Petar is stood beside some woman and in-front-of some man
ali ne znam **koje žene i kojeg čovjeka**.
but not know which woman and which man
‘Petar stood beside some woman and in front of some man, but I don’t know beside which woman and in front of which man.’
- (8)a. Petar je glasao protiv nekoga, ali ne znam [CP koga C [IP e]] at Spell-Out
Petar is voted against somebody but not I-know who
- b. Petar je glasao protiv nekoga, ali ne znam [CP koga^x C [IP Petar je glasao protiv nekoga^x]] at LF
- (9)a. Petar je glasao, ali ne znam *(protiv) koga.
Petar is voted but not know against whom
‘Peter voted but I don’t know against whom.’
- b. Neko je glasao za nekoga, ali ne znam ko *(za) koga.
someone is voted for someone but not I-know who for whom
‘Someone voted for somebody, but I don’t know who for whom.’
- c. Petar je glasao za nekoga. Ono što nismo znali je *(za) koga.
Petar is voted for someone that what we-aren’t known is for whom
‘Petar voted for someone. What we didn’t know is for whom.’
- (10) Peter went to the movies, but I don’t know who with.

