semantics interface: Evidence from gapping. In *The interfaces: Deriving and interpreting omitted structures*, ed. by Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 227–248. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27:661–738.

Miller, Philip. 1991. Clitics and constituents in phrase structure grammar. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University.

Potsdam, Eric. To appear. Malagasy sluicing and its consequences for the identity requirement on ellipsis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.

Prüst, Hub, Martin van den Berg, and Remko Scha. 1994. Discourse grammar and verb phrase anaphora. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 17:261–327.

Sag, Ivan. 1976. Deletion and Logical Form. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA. Published, New York: Garland (1979).

Stump, Gregory. 1977. Pseudogapping. Ms., Ohio State University, Columbus.

Takahashi, Shoichi. 2004. Pseudogapping and cyclic linearization. In *NELS 34*, ed. by Keir Moulton and Matthew Wolf, 571–585. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.

Winkler, Susanne. 2005. *Ellipsis and focus in generative grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

P-STRANDING UNDER SLUICING
IN A NON-P-STRANDING
LANGUAGE?
Sandra Stjepanović
  West Virginia University

Merchant (2001) formulates the following generalization, based on a survey of twenty languages:

(1) A language L will allow preposition stranding under sluicing iff L allows preposition stranding under regular *wh*-movement. (p. 92)

One language included in his survey is Serbo-Croatian (SC). The SC data he provides as evidence for the generalization in (1) are these (p. 97):

(2) a. Sa kim   je Ana govorila?
       with whom.INST is Ana spoken
       'Who did Ana speak with?'
    b. *Kim   je govorila Ana sa?
       whom.INST is spoken   Ana with

    c. Ana je govorila sa   nekim,   ali ne znam
       Ana is spoken   with someone.INST but not I.know
      *(sa)   kim.
        with whom.INST
      'Ana spoke with someone, but I don't know who with.'

However, in what follows I first show that on the basis of these data, we cannot establish whether sluicing gives rise to P-stranding in SC or not. I then show that SC, surprisingly, does seem to allow P-stranding under sluicing, unlike under *wh*-movement. Upon closer scrutiny, however, such facts do not necessarily threaten Merchant's generalization in (1). This is because there are data indicating that the loss of the P under sluicing may not be due to P-stranding.

1 *Sa Kim* 'with whom.INST' versus **Kim* 'whom.INST'

As mentioned above, the data in (2) seem to support the generalization in (1). However, we cannot rely on those data in making conclusions about P-stranding in SC. Consider (3)–(5).

  (3) Marko se   ponosi   Marijom   / nekom djevojkom /
     Marko REFL takes.pride Marija.INST / some   girl.INST /
     nečim.
     something.INST
     'Marko is proud of Marija / some girl / something.'

  (4) *(Sa) kim   se   Marko ponosi?
      with whom.INST REFL Marko takes.pride
     'Who is Marko proud of?'

  (5) (?*Sa) kojom djevojkom / (?*Sa) čim   se   Marko
      with which girl.INST   /   with what.INST REFL Marko
     ponosi?
     takes.pride
     'Which girl / What is Marko proud of?'

The example in (3) shows that the verb *ponositi se* 'to take pride' selects an instrumental object without the P *sa* 'with'. The examples in (4) and (5) show that the instrumental animate *wh*-phrase *kim* has to appear with *sa* 'with' even when *sa* is not required by the syntactic selectional properties of the verb, while other instrumental *wh*-phrases, such as *čim* 'what' or *kojom djevojkom* 'which girl' in (5) do not.[1] This state of affairs suggests that there is simply no bare form *kim*;[2]

---

   [1] Some speakers allow examples like (5) to emerge both with the P and without it. However, this has no effect on the point I am making: no speakers I have questioned (including myself) accept dropping the P in examples with *sa kim* such as (4). They judge them as unacceptable as the sluicing example in (2c).
   [2] An anonymous reviewer wonders whether it is possible to test the claim that there is no form *kim* independent of *wh*-movement. Unfortunately, it is not, because SC is a multiple *wh*-fronting language and requires all *wh*-phrases (except D-linked ones) to front (see, e.g., Bošković 2002).

kim always occurs with a P.[3] Since Ps with *kim* seem to be ''unstrandable'' for independent reasons, we should not make conclusions regarding P-stranding based on examples involving this *wh*-phrase. When we look at how PPs not involving *kim* behave with respect to P-stranding under *wh*-movement and under sluicing, the results are surprising. Some examples are given in (6).

(6) a. Protiv čega   je Petar glasao?
    against what.GEN is Petar voted
    'What did Petar vote against?'

   b. *Čega   je Petar glasao protiv?
    what.GEN is Petar voted against

   c. Petar je glasao protiv nečega,   ali ne znam
    Petar is voted against something.GEN but not I.know
    (protiv) čega.
     against what.GEN
    'Petar voted against something, but I don't know what.'

   d. Sa   kojom djevojkom je Ana govorila?
    with which girl.INST   is Ana spoken
    'Which girl did Ana speak with?'

   e. *Kojom djevojkom je Ana govorila sa?
    which girl.INST   is Ana spoken   with

   f. Ana je govorila sa   nekom djevojkom, ali ne
    Ana is spoken with some girl.INST   but not
    znam (sa) kojom djevojkom.
    I.know with which girl.INST
    'Ana spoke with some girl, but I don't know with which girl.'

In these examples, Ps cannot be stranded under *wh*-movement, but they can go missing under sluicing. Note that this type of behavior is limited to simple sluicing contexts. It does not occur in other types of ellipsis such as VP-ellipsis (7), comparative ellipsis (8), or gapping (9), or in some constructions that do involve sluicing such as sluicing under sprouting (10) or multiple sluicing (11).

(7) Protiv koga   će oni glasati, a   *(protiv)
   against whom.GEN will they vote   and   against
   koga   / čega   ćete vi?
   whom.GEN / what.GEN will you
   'Against whom will they vote, and against whom / against what will you?'

---

[3] *Kim* can occur as complement of a few other Ps (e.g., *za* 'for', *pred* 'in front of'). The P is unstrandable in these cases, too, as illustrated in (i) for *za*.

(i) Petar je plakao za nekim,   ali ne znam *(za) kim.
  Petar is cried   for someone.INST but not I.know   for whom.INST
  'Petar cried for someone, but I don't know for whom.'

(8) O   kojoj djevojci je on više mislio nego što je
    about which girl.LOC is he more thought than what is
    *(o)   kojem momku?
      about which guy.LOC
    'About which girl did he think more than he did about which
    guy?'

(9) a. Protiv koga   će oni glasati, a ?*(protiv)
       against whom.GEN will they vote   and   against
       koga   vi?
       whom.GEN you
       'Against whom will they vote, and against whom will
       you?'
   b. Protiv koga   će oni glasati, a *(protiv)
       against whom.GEN will they vote   and   against
       čega   vi?
       what.GEN you
       'Against whom will they vote, and against what will
       you?'

(10) Petar je glasao, ali ne znam *(protiv) čega.[4]
     Petar is voted   but not I.know   against what.GEN
     'Petar voted, but I don't know against what.'

(11) Neko   je glasao protiv nečega,   ali ne znam
     someone is voted against something but not I.know
     ko   *(protiv) čega.[5]
     who.NOM   against what.GEN
     'Someone voted against something, but I don't know who
     against what.'

Thus, on the face of it, examples like (6a–f) seem to be counterex-
amples to the generalization in (1). But are they necessarily? They
would not be if it could be shown that they do not involve P-stranding,
that is, the syntactic movement of the *wh*-complement of P out of PP
(see, e.g., Hornstein and Weinberg 1981, Kayne 1984, Koopman 1997,
Abels 2003, Bošković 2004a), followed by elision of P due to sluicing.
In the next section, I present data arguing that P is in fact lost in
sluicing for other reasons.

[4] For evidence that P-stranding under sprouting is also not allowed in
English and the reasons why, see Chung, to appear.
[5] For evidence that cases like (11) involve multiple sluicing rather than
gapping, see Stjepanović 2003.

2 No P-Stranding?

Consider the following SC examples:

(12) a. Petar je sakrio igračku ispod jedne stolice   i
Petar is hidden toy   under one chair.GEN and
pored jednog zida,   ali ne znam (ispod)
beside one   wall.GEN but not I.know under
koje stolice i (pored) kojeg zida.
which chair.GEN and beside which wall.GEN
'Petar hid the toy under a chair and beside a wall, but I
don't know which chair and which wall.'

b. Petar je glasao za nešto   i   protiv
Petar is voted for something.ACC and against
nečega,   ali ne znam (za) šta   i
something.GEN but not I.know for what.ACC and
(protiv) čega.
 against what.GEN
'Petar voted for something and against something, but I
don't know for what and against what.'

In (12), the antecedent of sluicing is a coordinated phrase with two
PP conjuncts headed by two different Ps. Furthermore, the remnant
in the target clause is a coordinated phrase consisting of what on
the surface look like two coordinated *wh*-NPs that correspond to the
indefinite complements of Ps in the antecedent. Note also that the NPs
in the remnant do not need to have the same morphological case.
Now, if the remnants in (12) are remnants of sluicing, and if they are
coordinated PPs that have lost their Ps at some point in the derivation,
as one would expect given their antecedents, then we would have a
strong argument that the P-loss in the remnants is not due to P-
stranding. This is because under no current theory of movement can
the coordinated remnant phrase move as a constituent, while stranding
the two Ps.[6] The question, then, is how this coordinated remnant is
derived and what its structure is.

There are three ways the remnant could be derived: either it is a
base-generated fragment (along the lines proposed in Van Riemsdijk
1978), or it involves pseudosluicing (a cleft clause strategy), or it is
a result of sluicing.

It is easy to show that the remnants in (12) are not base-generated
fragments. The data involving A- and variable binding lead us to this
conclusion. Consider (13).

---

[6] Note that for this reason, (12a–b) also cannot be analyzed in terms of
the island repair strategies in sluicing discussed in Lasnik 2001, Fox and Lasnik
2003, and Boeckx and Lasnik 2006, among others.

(13) a. Petar$_i$ je sjeo pored nekog svog$_i$ prijatelja i   ispod
       Petar is sat   beside some self   friend.GEN and under
       nekog drveta, ali ne znam (pored) kojeg svog$_i$
       some tree.GEN but not I.know beside which self
       prijatelja i   (ispod) kojeg drveta.
       friend.GEN and under which tree.GEN
       'Petar$_i$ sat beside a friend of his$_i$ and under a tree, but I
       don't know beside which friend of his$_i$ and under which
       tree.'[7]

 b. Petar$_i$ je sjeo pored nekog Petrovog$_{*i/j}$ / njegovog$_{*i/j}$
    Petar is sat   beside some Petar's   / his
    prijatelja i   ispod nekog drveta. (Pored) kojeg
    friend.GEN and under some tree.GEN beside which
    Petrovog$_{*i/j}$ / njegovog$_{*i/j}$ prijatelja i   (ispod)
    Petar's   / his   friend.GEN and under
    kojeg drveta?[8]
    which tree.GEN
    'Petar$_i$ sat beside a friend of Petar's$_{*i/j}$ / his$_{*i/j}$ and under
    a tree. Which friend of Petar's$_{*i/j}$ / his$_{*i/j}$ and which tree?'

 c. Svako$_i$ je sjeo pored nekog svog$_i$ prijatelja i
    everyone is sat   beside some self   friend.GEN and
    ispod nekog drveta, ali ne znam (pored) kojeg
    under some tree.GEN but not I.know beside which
    svog$_i$ prijatelja i   (ispod) kojeg drveta.
    self   friend.GEN and under which tree.GEN
    'Everyone$_i$ sat beside a friend of his$_i$ and under a tree,
    but I don't know beside which friend of his$_i$ and under
    which tree.'

These data show that the remnants exhibit A-binding connectivity
effects for Conditions A, B, and C (13a–b), as well as bound variable
connectivity effects (13c). However, the only way the remnants can
be bound in these examples is if we posit that they are part of a full
IP at some point, with the subjects *Petar* and *svako* 'everyone' c-
commanding the reflexive, the pronoun, the R-expression, and the
variable. Under the base-generated-fragment approach, it would be
difficult to account for how binding occurs here. This approach would
at best require either a rather novel view of binding or a novel and
elaborate way of generating the necessary structure and integrating

---

[7] For evidence that reflexives in SC need a clausemate antecedent, see
Zlatić 1996.
[8] Notice that these examples involve matrix sluicing. The loss of P is
possible under matrix sluicing as well.

the fragment into it.[9] Given this, I conclude that it is not the right approach.[10]

The remnants in (12) are also not derived by pseudosluicing of the type illustrated in (14) and discussed in Merchant 2001:116.

(14) Someone just left—guess who (it was _____ that just left).

There are several reasons why. Consider (15) from SC.

(15) Petar je sakrio igračku ispod jedne stolice   i   pored
     Petar is hidden toy   under one   chair.GEN and beside
     jednog zida,   ali ne znam koja   stolica   i
     one   wall.GEN but not I.know which chair.NOM and
     koji zid   *(su to bili   ispod koje
     which wall.NOM   are that been.PL under which.GEN.FEM
     i   pored kojeg   je on sakrio igračku).
     and beside which.GEN.MASC is he hidden toy
     'Petar hid the toy under a chair and beside a wall, but I
     don't know which chair and which wall it was under which
     and beside which he hid the toy.'

First, sluicing the cleft clause in SC is not possible. While the second conjunct in (15) sounds awkward when it contains a full cleft clause, it is much better than when the cleft clause is sluiced, as indicated. Second, even if sluicing the cleft clause were possible, we would still

---

[9] A base-generation approach that has the potential to account for the binding connectivity effects includes the ''nonmovement'' theories of sluicing proposed in Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995 and Lobeck 1995, among others. Under this account, a P-less NP remnant is base-generated in Spec,CP, and the complement of C is a null IP. At LF, this null IP is replaced by copying the antecedent IP, with the remnant binding a variable provided by the indefinite in the copied IP, as in (i).

(i) a. Petar je glasao protiv nekoga,   ali ne znam
       Petar is voted against someone.GEN but not I.know
       $[_{CP}$ koga   C $[_{IP}$ e]] → at Spell-Out
            who.GEN
       'Petar voted against someone, but I don't know who.'
    b. Petar je glasao protiv nekoga, ali ne znam $[_{CP}$ koga^x C $[_{IP}$ ~~Petar je glasao protiv nekoga^x~~]] → at LF

However, although successful at first sight, this account faces problems. It predicts that all non-P-stranding languages allow P-omission under sluicing, which is not the case (see Merchant 2001). Also, SC itself may cause a problem for the account, since Ps cannot be omitted under sluicing in all situations in this language either, as shown in (7)–(11). Given that it overgenerates, I conclude that it is not the right account.

[10] Note that examples with simple rather than coordinated remnants exhibit the same behavior with respect to these connectivity effects. Space constraints prevent me from providing such examples, but they can be obtained by omitting the second conjunct in the correlate and the remnant in (13a–c).

have evidence that cases like (12a–b) do not involve pseudosluicing. The evidence is based on case and binding connectivity effects. P-less remnants display case connectivity effects, having exactly the case that is assigned by the missing Ps, while the pivots of cleft clauses, which would be remnants of pseudosluicing, do not. The remnants in (12a), for instance, are genitive, because these cases are assigned by *ispod* 'under' and *pored* 'beside'. However, cleft clause pivots, such as those in (15), are always nominative. Thus, there is a clear case contrast between the remnants in (12a) and the pivots in (15). Similarly, P-less remnants behave very differently from cleft clause pivots with respect to binding. As illustrated in (13), P-less remnants exhibit A-binding connectivity effects. However, as illustrated in (16), a cleft clause pivot in SC does not (unlike its English counterpart). A reflexive pronoun is not permitted in the pivot, while a coindexed pronoun or an R-expression is.

(16) Petar$_i$ je sjeo pored neke svoje$_i$ prijateljice, ali ne
     Petar is sat   beside some self friend.GEN but not
     znam koja   *svoja / njegova$_i$ / Petrova$_i$ prijateljica
     I.know which self / his   / Petar's friend.NOM
     *(je to bila pored koje je on sjeo).
       is it been beside which is he sat
     'Petar$_i$ sat beside a friend of his$_i$, but I don't know which friend of his$_i$ it was beside which he sat.'

Given these facts, I am forced to conclude that the remnants in (12) are not instances of pseudosluicing. On the other hand, if we say that they are remnants of regular sluicing, we straightforwardly account for both types of connectivity effects.

   Now that we have seen that the remnants in (12) are sluices, the question is what their structures are. Given that their correlates are coordinated PPs, one expects the remnants to be coordinated PPs, whose Ps have been lost in the course of derivation. However, an anonymous reviewer suggests that they might also be coordinated CPs, with each PP undergoing *wh*-movement within its CP and losing its P at some point in the derivation. Note that this state of affairs would not exclude the possibility that P-loss could be due to P-stranding under sluicing. However, if the data are sufficiently controlled, we can show that P-loss under sluicing is possible in coordinated PPs. Consider first the meaning of (12a). This sentence can be understood as involving a single place (under a chair and beside a wall) where Petar hid the toy. This is confirmed by the fact that the sentence *E, da mi je znati gdje je to mjesto!* 'Eh, I'd really like to know where that place is!' can naturally follow (12a). The availability of this interpretation indicates that the remnant in (12a) can consist of conjoined PPs. If the remnant is a coordinated CP (with sluicing occurring in both conjuncts), then the only interpretation that should be obtained is one where the remnant denotes two places; that is, its meaning should be equivalent to the meaning of its unsluiced counterpart.

(17) . . . ali ne znam ispod koje stolice   je on sakrio
           but not I.know under which chair.GEN is he hidden
      igračku i   pored kojeg zida   je on sakrio igračku.
      toy   and beside which wall.GEN is he hidden toy
      ' . . . but I don't know under which chair he hid the toy, and
      beside which wall he hid the toy.'

(17) clearly implies two places since a sentence like *E, da mi je znati
gdje su ta mjesta!* 'Eh, I'd really like to know where those places
are!', but not a sentence like *E, da mi je znati gdje je to mjesto!* 'Eh,
I'd really like to know where that place is!', is felicitous after it. Given
this, I conclude that (12a) involves conjoined PPs that have lost their
Ps.[11]

   The data in (12) thus show that it is possible for Ps to be missing
from the coordinate PP remnants of sluicing. In such cases, it is clear
that the target clause undergoing sluicing cannot involve syntactic
P-stranding in the standard sense, as discussed above. And, if it is

---

[11] The scope of the particle *još* 'else' can also help in teasing apart whether
the relevant examples involve coordinated CPs or PPs. Consider (i).

(i) a. Osim što je glasao za nju i   protiv toga, on je glasao
       besides that is he.voted for her and against that he is voted
       još za nekoga   i   protiv nečega . . .
       else for someone.ACC and against something.GEN
       'Besides voting for her and against it, he also voted for someone
       else and against something else . . . '
    b. . . . ali ne znam tačno (još) za koga   i   protiv
            but not I.know exactly else for who.ACC and against
       čega   (još).
       what.GEN else
       ' . . . but I don't know exactly for who else and against what else.'
    c. . . . ali ne znam tačno (još) koga i   čega   (još).
            but not I.know exactly else who.ACC and what.GEN else
       ' . . . but I don't know exactly for who else and against what else.'
    d. . . . ali ne znam tačno (još) za koga   je on glasao i
            but not I.know exactly else for who.ACC is he voted and
       protiv čega   je on glasao (??još).
       against what.GEN is he voted   else
       ' . . . but I don't know for who else he voted, and against what he
       voted / for whom he voted, and against what else he voted.'

In (ia), which is an antecedent for (ib), (ic), and (id), the particle *još* 'else'
occurs before the coordinated phrase and can take scope over both conjuncts,
as indicated in the English translation. When sluicing applies in the target
clause, as in (ib) and (ic), the particle can occur either before the coordinated
wh-remnant or after it. In either case, it can take scope over both conjuncts.
Crucially, in the case of coordinated CPs in (id), the particle cannot take scope
over both conjuncts. It takes scope over the PP in the first conjunct only if it
precedes the conjuncts. The version of the sentence in which the particle follows
both conjuncts is awkward, but to the extent that the sentence is acceptable,
the particle takes scope only over the PP in the second conjunct. Given these
facts, I conclude that in (ib) and (ic), the remnant involves coordinated PPs,
their Ps being lost in the course of derivation in (ic).

possible to delete Ps in cases like (12a–b) without P-stranding occurring first, then it is possible that the P-loss in (6a–f) is not conditioned by P-stranding either.[12] This means that such data do not necessarily provide counterevidence to Merchant's generalization in (1).

To sum up, in this squib I have shown that SC is a language that generally does not allow P-stranding,[13] but it does allow Ps to delete under sluicing. However, I have also shown that the P-loss in such examples may not be due to P-stranding as currently understood. I also ruled out various base-generation accounts of P-less remnants, as well as the pseudosluicing account. This exhausts the possibilities for a syntactic account of P-loss under sluicing in SC and suggests that it is a postsyntactic phenomenon, occurring possibly at PF. Exactly how it occurs is a question I leave for future research.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2003. Successive cyclicity, anti-locality, and adposition stranding. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Boeckx, Cedric, and Howard Lasnik. 2006. Intervention and repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:150–155.

Bošković, Željko. 2002. On multiple *wh*-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:351–383.

Bošković, Željko. 2004a. Be careful where you float your quantifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:681–742.

Bošković, Željko. 2004b. Two notes on right node raising. In *Cranberry linguistics 2*, ed. by Miguel Rodríguez-Mondoñedo and

---

[12] Note that English counterparts of (6a–f) are also acceptable, indicating that the same strategy for deriving P-less remnants (without P-stranding) may be available in English as well. Note also that English does have cases where Ps cannot be stranded, as shown by Ross (1969).

(i) Under what circumstances will the moon implode?

(ii) *What circumstances will the moon implode under?

And as Lasnik (2005) shows, these violations can be repaired by sluicing.

(iii) The moon will implode under certain circumstances, but I'm not sure exactly what circumstances.

[13] Abels (2003) shows that SC allows stranding of nonclitic Ps in one context, namely, under right node raising.

(i) Jovan je stao iza,   a   Petar ispred, Marijnih kola.
     Jovan is stood beside and Petar in.front Marij's   car
     'Jovan stood behind, and Petar in front of, Marij's car.'

However, if right node raising involves deletion of a constituent in the first conjunct (as argued by, e.g., Wexler and Culicover (1980), Kayne (1994), and Bošković (2004b)), rather than across-the-board movement of the relevant constituent, then (i) need not involve P-stranding as currently understood.

M. Emma Ticio, 13–24. University of Connecticut Working Papers in Linguistics 12. Cambridge, MA: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.

Chung, Sandra. To appear. Sluicing and the lexicon: The point of no return. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. by Rebecca T. Cover and Yuni Kim. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3: 239–282.

Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:143–154.

Hornstein, Norbert, and Amy Weinberg. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12:55–91.

Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Koopman, Hilda. 1997. Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions and particles: The structure of Dutch PPs. Ms., UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *NELS 31*, ed. by Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, 301–320. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.

Lasnik, Howard. 2005. Speculations on P-stranding. Class lecture handout, Linguistic Society of America Summer Institute, MIT, June–August 2005. Available at http://www.umd.edu/lasnik/LSA%20course/Lasnik%20LSA%20HO%20Sect%202%20Appendix%20P-stranding.pdf.

Lobeck, Anne. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing, and identification*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1978. *A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Ross, John R. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, 252–286. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 2003. Multiple *wh*-fronting in Serbo-Croatian matrix questions and the matrix sluicing construction. In *Multiple* wh-*fronting*, ed. by Cedric Boeckx and Kleanthes K. Grohmann, 255–284. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wexler, Kenneth, and Peter Culicover. 1980. *Formal principles of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Zlatić, Larisa. 1996. Syntactico-semantic approach to binding: Evidence from Serbian. Paper presented at First LINGUIST Electronic Conference on Geometric and Thematic Structure in Binding. Available at http://www.linguistlist.org/linconf/zlatic.