(1) As noted earlier, P-stranding violations evidently cannot be
      repaired by ellipsis. This is rather mysterious, in fact
      paradoxical if the P-stranding constraint is an "island
      constraint".
(2) Abels (2003) shows that in one crucial respect, the P-stranding
      prohibition (in languages that exhibit it) diverges from standard
      island constraints: While the complement of the P cannot move,
      subextraction out of the PP is (sometimes possible).

(3) Some Russian examples:

(4) Ot čego sleduet otkazaťsja
        Of what follows give up-self
        'What should one give up?'
(5) *Čego sleduet otkazaťsja ot
         what follows give up-self
(6) ?Na čto sleudet otkazaťsja   ot vsjačeskih pretenzij *t*
        on what follows give up-self of whatsoever hopes
        'What should one rid oneself of any kind of hope for?'

(7) *Kakih argumentah protiv ehtoj točki zrenija ty ešče ne slyšal o
        which arguments against this point view   you yet not heard about
        'Which arguments against this point of view haven't you heard about?'
(8) ?Protiv kakov točki zrenija ty ešče ne slyšal ob   argumentah
        against which point view you yet not heard about arguments
        'Against which point of view haven't you heard about arguments?'

(9) "The existence of examples like [(6)] shows that PPs are not
      inherently barriers to movement. Moreover, the sharp contrast
      between [(5)] and [(6)] shows that subextraction out of PP and P-
      stranding are clearly different phenomena."   p. 160

(10) Standard island violations (at least most of them) do not show
      this pattern. Rather, extraction from deeper in the island is
      still bad.

(11) *That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who
      that he'll hire is possible [Sentential Subject Constraint]
(12) *That Mary thinks he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't
      divulge who that Mary thinks he'll hire is possible

(13)a *She kissed a man who one of my friends, but Tom doesn't realize
      which one of my friends she kissed a man who bit   [Complex NP
      Constraint, relative clause]
(14)a *She kissed a man who Bill said bit one of my friends, but Tom
      doesn't realize which one of my friends she kissed a man who Bill
      said bit   [Complex NP Constraint, relative clause]

(15) So why can't P-Stranding violations be repaired? I conjecture (roughly following a suggestion of
      Merchant (2001) for another phenomenon - Superiority) that there is a distinction between
      constraints whose violations are marked in the output and those that are more strictly properties
      of derivations. (See, in this connection, Lasnik (2001) and Boeckx and Lasnik (2006).)

(16) 'Derivational' constraints can't be repaired (Merchant's suggestion about Superiority).

(17) Suppose now that the P-stranding constraint is derivational: the A-over-A.
(18) Chomsky (1973) proposed this in anticipation of Postal's argument against successive cyclic wh-movement (Postal (1972)).

(19) a To whom do you think (that) John talked
     b Who do you think (that) John talked to
     c *Who do you think to (that) John talked

(20) To allow (22)a and (22)b, Chomsky proposes that the wh-feature on *who*(*m*) can 'percolate' to the PP *to whom*.
(21) (22)c is still not possible, since the initial move of the PP means the feature has percolated, so the second step is impossible, by the A-over-A condition.

(22) Suppose then that the difference (or one of the differences) between languages that do and don't allow P-stranding in initial position is whether the wh-feature **can** or **must** percolate from DP to immediately dominating PP.

(23) In the latter type of language, even the first P-stranding step would violate the A-over-A. And if we continue to take that as a constraint on the operation of the transformation, P simply couldn't be stranded, so repair would never be a possibility.

(24) As Ross (1969) observes, even in English, pied piping is sometimes required:
(25) a Under what circumstances will the moon implode
     b *What circumstances will the moon implode under
(26) Ross does not point out, though, that this English violation can be repaired by Sluicing:
(27) The moon will implode under certain circumstances, but I'm not sure exactly what circumstances
(28) Thus, the English effect does pattern with island constraints. In fact, the CED (which bars extraction out of adjuncts) seems like the relevant island constraint, at least for this example.

References
Abels, Klaus. 2003. *Successive-cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.
Boeckx, Cedric and Howard Lasnik. 2006. Intervention and repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37: 143-154.
Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Lasnik, Howard. 2001. Derivation and representation in modern transformational syntax. In *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 62-88. Oxford: Blackwell.
Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Postal, Paul M. 1972. On some rules that are not successive cyclic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 211-222.
Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, 252-286. Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.