

**V. Appendix: Speculations on P-stranding**

- (265) 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".
- (266) 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).
- (267) Some Russian examples:
- (268) Ot čego sleduet otkazaťsja  
Of what follows give up-self  
'What should one give up?'
- (269) \*Čego sleduet otkazaťsja ot  
what follows give up-self
- (270) ?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?'
- (271) \*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?'
- (272) ?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?'
- (273) "The existence of examples like [(270)] shows that PPs are not inherently barriers to movement. Moreover, the sharp contrast between [(269)] and [(270)] shows that subextraction out of PP and P-stranding are clearly different phenomena." p. 160
- (274) Standard island violations (at least most of them) do not show this pattern. Rather, extraction from deeper in the island is still bad.
- (275) \*That he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who that he'll hire is possible [Sentential Subject Constraint]
- (276) \*That Mary thinks he'll hire someone is possible, but I won't divulge who that Mary thinks he'll hire is possible
- (277)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]
- (278)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]
- (279) **DIGRESSION** 'Deeper' Coordinate Structure Constraint violations do improve. I won't have anything to say about that here.
- (280) \*\*Who was John dancing with Mary and

- (281) \*Who was John dancing with Mary and a student of  
**END OF DIGRESSION**
- (282) So why can't P-Stranding violations be repaired? I conjecture (roughly following a suggestion of Merchant (2001) for another phenomenon) 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 (2001a) and Boeckx and Lasnik (in press).)
- (283) 'Derivational' constraints can't be repaired (Merchant's suggestion about Superiority).
- (284) Suppose now that the P-stranding constraint is derivational: the A-over-A.
- (285) Chomsky (1973) proposed this in anticipation of Postal's argument against successive cyclic wh-movement (Postal (1972)).
- (286)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
- (287) To allow (286)a and (286)b, Chomsky proposes that the wh-feature on *who(m)* can 'percolate' to the PP *to whom*.
- (288) (286)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.
- (289) 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.
- (290) 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.
- (291) As Ross (1969) observes, even in English, pied piping is sometimes required:
- (292)a Under what circumstances will the moon implode  
b \*What circumstances will the moon implode under
- (293) Ross does not point out, though, that this English violation can be repaired by Sluicing:
- (294) The moon will implode under certain circumstances, but I'm not sure exactly what circumstances
- (295) 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.

- (296) **PROBLEM (OR MYSTERY?)** Almeida (2005) observes that Brazilian Portuguese is a strongly non-P-stranding language, yet Sluicing seems to repair violations, unlike the situation in the languages documented by Merchant (2001):
- (297) A Maria dançou com alguém  
the Maria danced with someone
- (298) Com quem que a Maria dançou t  
with whom that the Maria danced
- (299) \*Quem que a Maria dançou com t  
who that the Maria danced with
- (300) A Maria dançou com alguém, mas eu não lembro com quem  
the Maria danced with someone but I NEG remember with who
- (301) A Maria dançou com alguém, mas eu não lembro quem  
the Maria danced with someone but I NEG remember who