Section 6
More Sluicing Repairs

I. Multiple Sluicing

(560) Not surprisingly, in languages with multiple wh-fronting (such
       as Bulgarian), multiple Sluicing (Sluicing with multiple
       survivors) is possible:

(561) Njakoj vidja njakogo, no ne   znam   koj   kogo   ~~[vidja]~~
      someone saw   someone but not I-know who   whom   (saw)
                                   Bulgarian   Richards (1997)

(562) Neko je vidio nekog, ali ne   znam   ko   koga   ~~[je vidio]~~
       someone is seen someone but not I-know who whom   (is seen)
                              Serbo-Croatian   Stjepanovic (2003)

(563) Surprisingly, at least some multiple Sluicing is allowed in at
       least some **non**- multiple wh-fronting languages:

(564) I know that in each instance one of the girls got something from
      one of the boys.
       ?But which from which   Bolinger (1978)

(565) I know that in each instance one of the girls got something from
      one of the boys.
       ?But they didn't tell me which from which   Nishigauchi (1998)

(566) *They didn't tell me which from which got something

(567) ?One of the students spoke to one of the professors, but I don't
      know which to which
(568) *One of the students spoke to one of the professors, but I don't
      know which to which spoke

(569) Is this, as suggested by Richards (1997) and by Merchant
       (2001), another instance of 'repair by ellipsis', this time where
       a normally impossible movement is rendered permissible by
       deletion of a portion of the structure containing the origin site
       of the illicitly moving item?

(570) Which one of the professors did the students say that Mary spoke
      to
(571) One of the students said that Mary spoke to one of the
       professors
       *But I don't know which to which

(572) */✔ Ko   sta   misli da je Petar pojeo?
         who what   thinks that is Petar eaten
           'Who thinks that Petar ate what?'   Serbo-Croatian

(573)a Neko   misli da je Ivan nesto   pojeo
       someone   thinks that is Ivan something eaten
        'Someone thinks that Ivan ate something.'
     b */? Pitam se   ko sta
           Ask   self who what
           'I wonder who what.'

-44-

(574)   John was talking, but I don't know about what
                                            what about   'Swiping'
                                      Merchant (2002); Ross (1969)

(575)   John was talking, but I don't know to who
                                            who to

(576)   John was talking, but I don't know to who about what
(577)   who to about what
(578)*   who to what about
(579)*   to who what about
                                            cf. Richards (1997)

(580)   Some students spoke yesterday to some professors
(581)   Which students spoke yesterday to which professors

(582)   *Some students said that Mary will speak yesterday to some
        professors
(583)   *Which students said that Mary will speak yesterday to which
        professors

(584)   Conjecture: In English apparent multiple Sluicing, only the
         first *wh* undergoes normal *wh*-fronting; the second undergoes
         extraposition (rightwards movement).

(585)a Who was talking yesterday to who
     b Someone was talking (yesterday) to someone, but I don't know
        who to who
(586)a ?*Who bought yesterday what
     b ?*Someone bought something, but I don't know who what

(587) Rightwards movement is constrained by the Right Roof Constraint
      Ross (1967).

(588) ?Mary wanted to go until yesterday to the public lecture on
      transformational grammar
(589) ?Some of the students wanted to go to some of the lectures,
      but I'm not sure which to which

(590) *Mary wanted John to go until yesterday to the public lecture on
      transformational grammar
(591) *Some of the students wanted John to go to some of the
      lectures, but I'm not sure which to which

(592)   There is clear evidence that deletion can repair island
        violations. There is also evidence that deletion can repair a
        derivation where a normally obligatory movement fails to take
        place. Lasnik (1995b), Lasnik (1999b), Lasnik (2001d). It remains
        an open question whether moving a normally non-movable item can
        be so remedied.

(593) Big remaining question: Why can't Right Roof violations be
      repaired by ellipsis?

II. Swiping   (Sluiced Wh-word Inversion with Preposition In Northern
      Germanic)   Merchant (2002)

(594) Peter went to the movies, but I don't know who with

(595) Ross analyzed these as deletion of a discontinuous portion of
      the structure.
(596) All existing alternatives (Kim (1997), Richards (1997), Merchant
      (2002), Craenenbroeck (2004), etc.) eschew this and have the PP
      move.

(597) Merchant is especially concerned to capture two major properties
      of Swiping.
(598) First, only very light wh's, X^0's, participate in the
      construction (the 'Minimality Condition'):

(599) Acceptable   Unacceptable
       who   which
       what   which one
       when   which composer
       where   whose
                                    how rich
                                    how rich of a guy
                                    what kind
                                    what time
                                    what town
                                    etc.

(600) Second, Swiping only shows up under Sluicing (the 'Sluicing
      Condition'):

(601) *Peter went to the movies, but I don't know who with he went to
      the movies

(602) Swiping involves head movement. The Minimality Condition falls
      out from Structure Preservation.

(603) The Sluicing Condition is more problematic. Merchant does show
      that to state it at all, head movement should be a PF operation
      (as also argued by Boeckx and Stjepanovic (2001) for other
      reasons). But as far as I can tell, the Condition itself doesn't
      actually follow.
(604) Proposed extension of Merchant's account, incorporating some
      aspects of that of Richards (1997):

(605) Given that head movement is a PF process, it cannot precede wh-
      movement.
(606) Movement leaves a copy (or copies). All but the highest copy
      usually must delete.
(607) This deletion is under strict identity: If one copy is altered
      and another is not, deletion fails. (Takahashi (1994)).
      Linearization thus fails.

(608)   ... [with who] [he went to the movies [with who]]

(609)   ... [who+with] [$_{IP}$ he went to the movies [with who]]

(610)   Deletion of [with who] fails, hence linearization does.

(611)   But if Sluicing takes place, [with who] is eliminated along
        with the entire IP, so the linearization problem is 'repaired by
        ellipsis'.

(612)   One remaining problem, discovered by Craenenbroeck (2004):

(613)   Mary is talking.
        Who do you think to?

(614) I'll have to leave that one for future research.