On sluicing and island repair: sluicing is neither a ferry nor a bridge

Franc Marušič – Lanko*, Rok Žaucer**

Abstract

Sluicing, which is typically understood as a process that involves wh-movement followed by TP ellipsis, is widely assumed to fix island violations. Languages that allow multiple wh--fronting typically also allow multiple sluicing, but multiple sluicing – even though readily available – fails to preserve all properties otherwise associated with sluicing. Specifically, repair of island violations turns out to be very restricted in multiple sluicing constructions. In this paper we present a series of cases where multiple sluicing fails to fix island violations and argue that this is best explained if we simply discard the idea that island violations can be fixed in sluicing. We claim that the deleted TP does not need to be an exact copy of the antecedent clause and discuss some of the ideas that have been proposed to explain various atypical sluicing phenomena.

Odprava kršitev skladenjskih otokov je pri odplakanju morda zgolj navidezna

Za odplakanje, ki ga običajno razumemo kot proces, ki vključuje k-premike z naknadnim brisanjem časovne zveze, se na splošno domneva, da odpravlja kršitve skladenjskih otokov. Jeziki, ki omogočajo večkratno prednjenje k-zvez, običajno omogočajo tudi večkratno odplakanje, vendar večkratno odplakanje – čeprav je široko dostopno – ne ohrani vseh lastnosti, ki se jih sicer pripisuje odplakanju. Konkretno, popravilo kršitev otokov se izkaže za zelo omejeno pri zgradbah z večkratnim odplakanjem. V članku predstavljava vrsto primerov, kjer večkratno odplakanje ne odpravi kršitev otokov, in trdiva, da je to najlaže razložiti, če preprosto zavržemo idejo, da odplakanje odpravi kršitve skladenjskih otokov. Trdiva, da izbrisana časovna zveza ni nujno natančna kopija predhodnega stavka, in pregledava nekaj idej, ki so bile predlagane za razlago različnih netipičnih pojavov odplakanja.

*   Univerza v Novi Gorici, franc.marusic@ung.si

** Univerza v Novi Gorici, rok.zaucer@ung.si

1   Introduction

Sluicing is standardly understood to be an instance of TP ellipsis preceded by wh-move-ment (Ross 1969; Merchant 2001 among others).[1] As the phenomenon is linked to a number of interesting properties, sluicing turns up in many theoretical discussions. We will be looking more closely at its widely assumed property that it can fix various is-land violations (Ross 1969; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001; Fox & Lasnik 2003 etc.). It is not completely clear whether this is a consequence of ellipsis more generally (Fox & Lasnik 2003 argue that there is some island repair also in VP ellipsis, and Bošković 2011 tries to derive this property from some more basic property linked to ellipsis) or whether it is restricted only to a subtype of ellipsis constructions, but it is generally accepted that many unavailable movements become available if they are followed by TP ellipsis, as in sluicing constructions and its variants (with which we mean swiping, spading, etc.). An example of this is shown in (1). Whereas a wh-word cannot move out from a relative clause to the beginning of the entire sentence in regular questions, as in (1a), such movement is apparently possible in sluicing in (1b) if we assume structural identity between the deleted TP in the ellipsis site and the antecedent clause.[2]

(1)
a.   *Who did John ride the horse that kicked ___?
b.   John rode the horse that kicked someone, but I don't know who [John rode the horse [that kicked ___]]

This approach has many supporters, but it is not universally accepted. Chung, Ladusaw and McCloskey (1995, 2011) argued that sluicing does not really involve deletion as the construction actually does not involve any syntactic structure. This approach easily explains the apparent island-violations data, because on such a view

---

2   We are using the following terms for the various parts of the sentence that involves sluicing:
      [John kissed [some girl]], but I don't know [[which girl] ~~John kissed ___~~]
                      [correlate]   [remnant]   ellipsis site   ]
      [antecedent   ]   [sluice   ]

this data simply does not involve any island violations. No syntactic structure means that there are no movements, and thus no movement could have been illicit. This approach, however, faces problems with things like case matching, which is observed to hold cross-linguistically in sluicing (see Merchant 2001 for many similar arguments in favour of this view). As shown in the Slovenian examples in (2), the wh-word that survives sluicing carries the case of the underlying argument it replaces.[3] If sluicing involves wh-movement followed by TP deletion, this falls out naturally; but as we pointed out, apparent island violations then remain mysterious.

(2)
a. Nekdo   je Petru   pokazal Micko,   ampak ne vem kdo.
    someone.NOM AUX Peter.DAT showed Micka.ACC but   not know who.NOM
    'Someone showed Micka to Peter, but I don't know who.'
b. Janez   je nekomu   pokazal Micko,   ampak ne vem   komu.
    Janez.NOM AUX someone.DAT showed Micka.ACC but   not know who.DAT
    'Janez showed Micka to someone, but I don't know who.'
c. Janez   je Petru   pokazal nekoga,   ampak ne vem   koga.
    Janez.NOM AUX Peter.DAT showed someone.ACC but   not know who.ACC
    'Janez showed someone to Peter, but I don't know who.'

Alternatively, it can also be hypothesized that sluicing does not involve the deletion of an entire sentence that is structurally identical to the antecedent, but that the ellipsis site rather contains either some smaller portion of the structure, possibly one where no islands are violated, or else a syntactically somewhat differently construed semantically identical structure. The latter option is suggested by Merchant (2001, p. 209), who proposes that propositional islands, i.e. relative clauses, adjuncts, and basically anything clausal, are not fixed by sluicing since in these cases the deleted material does not involve the entire antecedent clause but only a subpart of it, namely, just the clause that created the propositional island, (3). Following this logic, propositional islands are not fixed by sluicing as they have never been violated in the first place (cf. Baker & Brame 1972, among others, for a similar proposal).

(3) Merchant (2001) suggests that the structure for examples like
    (1b)   *John rode the horse that kicked someone, but I don't know who.*
    is not: … who [John rode the horse [that kicked ____]]
    but rather: … who [the horse kicked ____]

---

3   Unless stated otherwise, non-English examples in this paper are Slovenian.

In what follows, we will go through a series of Slovenian examples and show how the predominant view that sluicing repairs (all) islands cannot be fully correct. The data suggest that sluicing does not rescue island violations, but rather that sluicing does not involve the deletion of the entire antecedent clause and that the deleted TP inside the sluice is not necessarily structurally identical to the antecedent clause. We will ultimately claim that sluicing never repairs island violations. We thus support the recent claims by Abels (2011), Barros (2012), Barros, Elliott and Thoms (2014), who argue that island insensitivity is just apparent as the identity condition between the sluice and the antecedent is semantic rather than syntactic (cf. also Szczegielniak 2006; Szczegielniak et al. 2008; Abels & Dayal 2017).

Non-English examples in this paper are Slovenian; as far as we were able to determine when presenting this work, however, the same arguments could be made with Bosnian/Croatian/Montenegrin/Serbian [BCMS] (Boban Arsenijević p.c., Martina Gračanin Yuksek p.c.), Russian (Jacopo Garzonio p.c.), Czech (Mojmir Dočekal p.c.), and also Lithuanian (Adline 2014).

In section 2, we present the basic question concerning multiple sluicing constructions. In section 3, we go through a series of different types of islands and show how in multiple sluicing constructions the expected sluicing-facilitated amelioration vanishes for all of them. In section 4 we look at how pied-piping and other island-ameliorating strategies interact with island violations in sluicing, section 5 suggests a solution, and section 6 discusses some of the consequences.

2   Multiple sluicing

Slovenian is a multiple wh-movement language, (4). In this respect it patterns with BCMS (see Golden 1997; Mišmaš 2015 and references therein for further information and for the specifics of Slovenian wh-movement). It is therefore not surprising that it also readily allows multiple sluicing constructions, as in (5).

(4) Koga   je   komu   Janez predstavil?
     who.ACC AUX   who.DAT Janez introduced
     'Who did Janez introduce to who?'

(5) Nekoga   je predstavil nekomu,   pa ne vem koga   komu.
     Someone.ACC AUX introduce someone.DAT but not know who.ACC who.DAT
     'He introduced someone to someone, but I don't know who to who.'

Slovenian, like BCMS and unlike Bulgarian and Macedonian, does not allow multiple long-distance wh-movement. So as shown in (6), while a single wh-word can front from an embedded declarative clause, two wh-words cannot.

(6)

a.   Koga$_1$ je   Vid rekel, da je   Črt predstavil Micki   t$_1$?
     Who.ACC AUX   Vid said   that AUX Črt introduced Micka.DAT
     'Who did Vid say that Črt introduced to Micka?'

b.   *Komu$_1$ je   koga$_2$ Vid rekel, da je   Črt predstavil t$_1$ t$_2$?
      Who.DAT AUX   who.ACC Vid said   that AUX   Črt introduced

c.   *Koga$_2$ je   komu$_1$ Vid rekel, da je   Črt predstavil   t$_1$ t$_2$?
      Who.ACC AUX   who.DAT Vid said   that AUX   Črt introduced

Example (6) contrasts multiple-sluicing examples with comparable sentential structure, given that sluicing constructions with multiple remnants from an embedded clause are possible, as shown in (7).[4]

(7)

a.   Vid je   rekel, da je Črt predstavil enmu   enga,   pa ne vem
     Vid AUX   said   that AUX Črt introduce one.DAT one.ACC, but not know
     komu   koga.
     who.DAT who.ACC
     'Vid said that Črt introduced someone to someone, but I don't know who to who.'

b.   … who.DAT who.ACC [Vid said [that Črt introduced ___ ___]]

Assuming the standard view that sluicing (or ellipsis in general) fixes improper movement violations, this difference is easily explained. Movement of the second wh-word violates some grammatical constraint, which, in Lasnik's (2001) terms, results in syntactic structure (or some specific node) being marked with * or # (cf. Chomsky 1972). This marking is erased when the TP is sluiced, which means that it disappears from the derivation; so given that the structure no longer contains any such ungrammatical marking, the sentence becomes fine.

---

4   Some of the examples are written in partially nonstandard Slovenian in order to make sure they are judged in their most natural version.

The same mechanism is often invoked for explaining how sluicing fixes island violations (Ross 1969; Lasnik 2001; Merchant 2001; Fox & Lasnik 2003; Boeckx & Lasnik 2006 etc.). As shown in (8), for example, wh-extraction from a relative clause is not possible in regular wh-questions, as in (8a) (Ross 1969), but it immediately becomes possible if it is followed by sluicing, as in (8b).[5]

(8)
a. *Koga   je Črt razlagal o   konju, ki   je   brcnil?
     who.ACC AUX Črt explained about horse which AUX kicked
     'Whom was Črt explaining about a horse that kicked?'
b. Črt je razlagal o   konju, ki   je brcnil nekoga, pa ne vem   koga.
     Črt AUX talked   about horse which AUX kicked someone but not know who.ACC
     'Črt was explaining about a horse that kicked someone, but I don't know whom.'
c. … who.ACC ~~[Črt was explaining about a horse [that kicked ____]]~~

There is, nevertheless, another way of looking at this. If sluicing is able to repair illicit steps in the syntactic derivation, it should be able to fix everything, not just island violations. Any violation that is not "marked" on the moving element itself should in principle be voidable by sluicing. This is, naturally, not that easy to test as the only element surviving sluicing is the remnant, which means that we have no way of knowing what is being deleted and what kind of violations may have occurred during the derivation that got deleted. But assuming that the sluice is parallel to the antecedent, we can construct sentences that test this prediction. For example, as shown in (9), a regular sentence like (9a) is ungrammatical because the dative/prepositional argument is not selected. Assuming that this ungrammaticality is marked on the attachment site rather than on the argument itself, it is predicted (given the logic just explained) that this ungrammaticality should be voided in sluicing; but as shown in (9b), the constructed sluicing structure is clearly out. Of course, there might be other reasons why (9b) is ungrammatical, as the ungrammaticality might also result from one of the two interfaces (e.g. the introduced argument cannot be interpreted as LF, etc.). So we do not take this as an argument against the view that sluicing deletes ungrammaticality, but it is nevertheless suggestive that not everything can be fixed by simple deletion of the syntactic structure.

_____

5   English translations may ignore grammaticality to mirror the original examples as closely as possible. To maximize clarity, we also provide English translations for ungrammatical Slovenian examples (without explicitly marking them as intended translations).

(9)

a.   *Peter kissed John to Mary.

b.   *Peter kissed John, but I don't know to who.

Similarly, one can ask whether an argument should even be made from examples in (2) at all. How do we know these cases were really grammatical in their base position? Could this not result from an ungrammatical structure that ultimately got deleted? Why can we not use some default case on these wh-words, something that would be ungrammatical in a sentence where the sluice was not deleted?

An alternative approach could be to claim that sluicing does not save island violations. This is not a new proposal, as the claim that the ellipsis site does not contain the deleted antecedent clause is very old (cf. Baker & Brame 1972; Chung et al. 1995, etc.). A middle way was suggested in Merchant (2001). He notes that propositional islands could have an alternative source for sluicing so that the ellipsis would not target the entire antecedent clause but only the embedded clause where the wh-words originate. This is sketched in (10), where (10a) gives the alternative source of (7) and (10b) the alternative source of (8b).

(10)

a.   … who.DAT who.ACC [Janez introduced ___ ___]

b.   … who.ACC [a horse kicked ___]

Following this idea, examples like (7) and (8b) are available because they have a possible source that does not violate any constraints on movement. If we take this view to the extreme and claim that sluicing never saves island violations, then sluicing will only be available if there exists an acceptable overt version of the entire construction. As a result, only those apparent violations will be possible that have a possible overt source. But if there is no possible overt source, then sluicing should be equally impossible.

This view seems to be supported by the paradigm presented in Lasnik (2014), who cites the BCMS example in (11), where the sluice consists of two wh-words that originate in two different clauses.

(11)

a.   Neko   misli da   je Ivan nešto   pojeo.
       Someone.NOM thinks that AUX Ivan something.ACC ate
       'Someone thinks that Ivan ate something.'   (BCMS)

b. Pitam se   ko   šta.
    ask   SELF   who.NOM what.ACC
    'I wonder who what.'   (BCMS)
c. … who what [̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶t̶h̶i̶n̶k̶s̶ ̶[̶t̶h̶a̶t̶ ̶I̶v̶a̶n̶ ̶a̶t̶e̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶]̶]̶

According to Lasnik (2014) judgments for (11b) correlate with the judgments
for comparable wh-extraction. One out of seven speakers rejected (11b). The same
speaker was also the only speaker that rejected (12).

(12) Ko   šta   misli da je Petar pojeo?
     Who.NOM   what.ACC thinks that AUX Petar ate
     'Who thinks that Petar ate what?'   (BCMS)

We made a quick online questionnaire with four pairs of sentences where each
pair consisted of a sluicing sentence and a regular wh-question that corresponded to
the non-elided sluice, the same as (11) and (12). All 13 speakers of BCMS judged
the wh-question sentence as better than the sluicing sentence of the same pair. Even
though this does not fully confirm Lasnik's (2014) report on BCMS data (note also
that Georgieva, Marušič, Mišmaš & Žaucer 2025 most recently argue that the Lasnik
data in (11) and (12) feature a confound), it does confirm our prediction given above,
i.e., that sluicing will only be available if the overt version of the entire construction
is acceptable. It thus also disproves the standard approach to sluicing, which should
predict sluicing to be more permissible and therefore judged as better than the overt
versions of the same clause.

The Lasnik (2014) type of examples are ungrammatical in Slovenian, both sluic-
ing and regular wh-questions:[6]

(13)
a. *Nekdo   misli, da je Črt nekaj   pojedel, ampak ne vem kdo kaj.
    Someone thinks that AUX Črt something ate   but   not know who what
    'Someone thinks that Črt ate something, but I don't know who what.'
b. … who what [̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶t̶h̶i̶n̶k̶s̶ ̶[̶t̶h̶a̶t̶ ̶Č̶r̶t̶ ̶a̶t̶e̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶]̶]̶

6   In ungrammatical sluicing examples such as (13) the reported ungrammaticality originates in the sluice
    part of the sentence; the antecedent part of such examples is always unproblematic. This also applies
    to all subsequent examples where the sluice part is expressed as an independent sentence, so that the
    ungrammatical judgement reported by the asterisk preceding such two-sentence examples really only
    applies to the sluice part of the example.

(14) *Kdo   kaj   misli, da je Črt pojedel?
     Who.NOM what.ACC   thinks that AUX Črt ate
     'Who thinks that Črt ate what?'

In fact, any version of simultaneous extraction of one wh-word from an embedded clause and the other one from the matrix clause is ungrammatical in Slovenian. Example (15) shows that this is the case for simultaneous extraction of the matrix subject and an embedded adjunct.

(15)
a. *Nekdo   je rekel, da je Črt nekam   šel, pa ne vem   kdo kam.
   someone AUX said   that AUX Črt somewhere gone but not know who where
   'Somebody mentioned that Črt went somewhere, but I don't know who where.'
b. … who where [___ mentioned [that Črt went ___]]

(16) *Kdo je   kam omenil,   da je   Črt šel?
     Who AUX   where mentioned that AUX Črt went
     'Who mentioned that Črt went where?'

The unavailability of examples like (15) and (13) could be attributed to the more general ban on multiple extractions from two different clauses if it was not the case that for many speakers, the BCMS example in (11) is acceptable. If multiple extraction from different clauses is bad, then why is it allowed in BCMS precisely for those speakers who allow multiple wh-fronting from different clauses?

The importance of these examples is that they show that the condition for accepting a sluicing construction is the acceptability of regular overt wh-movement in comparable wh-questions. Sluicing is fine only if such extraction is acceptable in simple questions. In short, sluicing is available only in cases where the non-elided sluice is also grammatical.

This means that in these cases, sluicing cannot fix movement violations. Taking this to the extreme, we could say this is because sluicing never fixes improper-movement violations, and that perhaps even island repair is just an illusion. The illusion is achieved because there is no violation of any syntactic constraints in the sluice in the first place (cf. Szczegielniak 2006; Abels 2011; Barros et al. 2014 etc.). We will now go through a series of examples that all seem to suggest the same thing, namely, that

sluicing does not rescue any island violations and that, consequently, all instances of island repair are just apparent.

3   Extraction from an island + another extraction

Merchant (2001) differentiates between two types of islands, propositional and non-propositional islands. We follow Merchant and group the data in the following sections according to these two groups: section 3.1 presents data with propositional islands, while sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 discuss data with non-propositional islands, even though, as we will see at the end, this distinction might not really be needed. We will systematically look at island violations that seem to be repaired by sluicing, and try to combine them with another extraction. We will see that extractions from islands are truly acceptable only in single sluicing constructions. As soon as they are combined with another extraction that does not originate in the same island, the availability of sluicing disappears.

3.1   Propositional islands

3.1.1   *Relative clauses*

As shown above in (8), we can easily extract a wh-word from a relative clause in sluicing. But notice that we cannot combine such a violation with another wh-extraction that does not originate in the same clause. For example, we cannot extract two wh-words from two different relative clauses, as shown in (17a).[7]

---

7   An anonymous reviewer points out that in example (17a) single extraction from the first relative clause (the one further away from the right edge of the sentence) is also impossible, as shown in example (i). This makes the argument based on (17a) appear weaker, but we think that this is related to the information structure of the antecedent clause rather than with the syntactic structure of the antecedent clause. Similar examples become possible (or easier to process) if we use d-linked wh-words, as in (ii).

(i)
a. *Črt je dal konju, ki   je nekoga brcnil, podkev, ki   jo je kupil v Celju, ampak ne vem, koga.
   Črt AUX gave horse which AUX someone kicked horseshoe which it AUX bought in Celje but   not know whom
   'Črt gave the horse that kicked someone a horseshoe that he bought in Celje, but I don't know whom.'
b. … whom [Črt gave the horse [that kicked ____] a horseshoe [that he bought in Celje]]

(ii)
a. *Črt je dal konju, ki   je brcnil nekega otroka, podkev, ki   jo je   kupil v Celju,
   Črt AUX gave horse which AUX kicked some   child horseshoe which it AUX   bought in Celje
   ampak ne vem, katerega otroka.
   but   not know which   child
   'Črt gave the horse that kicked some child a horseshoe that he bought in Celje, but I don't know which child.'
b. … whom [Črt gave the horse [that kicked ____] a horseshoe [that he bought in Celje]]

(17)

a. *Črt je dal konju, ki   je nekoga brcnil, podkev, ki   jo je
   Črt AUX gave horse which AUX someone kicked horseshoe which it AUX
   nekje   kupil, ampak ne vem, koga   kje.
   somewhere bought but   not know whom where
   'Črt gave the horse that kicked someone a horseshoe that he bought some-
   where, but I don't know whom where.'

b.   … whom where [Črt gave the horse [that kicked ____] a horseshoe [that he
   bought ____]]

Combinations of a single island violation and another extraction from the matrix clause are similarly ungrammatical. So even when the other extraction does not violate anything, the combination of the two is ungrammatical. Again, there is a clause boundary between the two extraction sites, which we will comment on in section 3.1.5.

(18)

a. *Nekdo   je govoril o   konju, ki je brcnil nekoga, ampak ne vem
   someone AUX talked about horse that AUX kicked someone, but   not know
   kdo   koga.
   who   whom
   'Someone talked about a horse that kicked someone, but I don't know who whom.'

b.   … who whom [____ talked about a horse [that kicked ____]]

3.1.2   Complex NP – complement clauses

Another type of propositional island is constituted by complement clauses to nouns (Ross 1967). Whereas wh-extraction from embedded clausal complements to nouns is bad, as shown in (19), this extraction is fine in sluicing constructions, as shown in (20).

(19) *Koga je Črt povedal novico, da   je Vid zaprosil?
     who AUX Črt told   news   that AUX Vid proposed
     'Who did Črt tell the news that Vid proposed to?'

(20)

a. Črt je povedal novico, da je Vid zaprosil nekoga, ampak ne vem   koga.
    Črt AUX told   news   that AUX Vid proposed someone but   not know who
    'Črt told the news that Vid proposed to someone, but I don't know to who.'
b. … who ~~[Črt told news [that Vid proposed to ____]]~~

Again, as observed above, island repair is only possible in case the extraction that violates the island does not combine with an extraction from the matrix clause, as in (21), or with another extraction from another island, as in (22).

(21)

a. *Nekdo   je povedal novico, da je   Vid zaprosil nekoga, ampak
     Someone AUX told   news   that AUX Vid proposed someone but
     ne vem   kdo koga.
     not know who who
     'Someone told the news that Vid proposed to someone, but I don't know
     who to who.'
2. … who whom ~~[____ told news [that Vid proposed to ____]]~~

(22)

a. *Črt je novico, da je Vid opisal   nekoga, povedal punci, ki
     Črt AUX news   that AUX Vid described someone told   girl   which
     jo je   nekje   srečal, ampak ne vem   koga kje.
     her AUX somewhere met   but   not know who where
     'Črt told the news that Vid described someone to a girl that he met some-
     where but I don't know who where.'
b. … who where ~~[Črt news [that Vid proposed to ____] told the girl [that he met ____]]~~

Just like in the case of relative clause islands above, there is a finite clause boundary separating the two extraction sites.

3.1.3   Sentential subject island

Wh-extraction from sentential subjects is impossible (Ross 1967), as shown in (23). But such extraction appears to become possible if it is followed by sluicing, as in (24).

(23) *Koga je, da   je   Peter udaril, presenetilo Micko?
      who AUX that AUX Peter hit   surprised Micka
      'Who did it surprise Micka that Peter hit?'

(24)
a. Da je   Peter odšel nekam   v Afriko, je   presenetilo vse. Ugani kam.
     that AUX Peter went somewhere to Africa AUX surprised   all guess where
     'That Peter went somewhere to Africa surprised everyone. Guess where.'
b. … where [[that Peter went ____] surprised all]

Island amelioration vanishes, however, once we add another extraction from out-
side this island.

(25)
a. *Da je   nekdo   udaril Petra, je   nekoga presenetilo. Ugani kdo koga.
     that AUX someone hit   Peter AUX one   surprised   guess who who
     'That someone hit Peter surprised someone. Guess who who.'
b. … who whom [[that ____ hit Peter] surprised ____]

As in the two preceding sections, the pattern is the same – island violation is
voided only when there is a single extraction, and it applies again as soon as this
single extraction is coupled with another extraction from outside the island. Addi-
tionally, here too there is a finite clause boundary between the two extraction sites.

3.1.4   Adjuncts

Wh-extraction is impossible from adjuncts (Ross 1967). If adjunct clauses are just
free relative clauses, as argued by Geis (1970), adjunct islands may be just a subtype
of the relative clause islands.

(26) *Koga je   Črt kihnil, ravno ko   je   Marta poljubila?
      who AUX Črt sneezed just   when AUX   Marta kissed
      'Whom did Črt sneeze just when Marta kissed?'

In sluicing, such extraction is fine:

(27)

a. Črt je padel, ravno ko je   Kim brcnila nekoga, a ne vem koga.
    Črt AUX fell   just as AUX Kim kicked someone but not know whom
    'Črt fell just when Kim kicked someone, but I don't know whom.'
b. … whom ~~[Črt fell [just when Kim kicked ____]]~~

However, combining a wh-extraction from a clausal adjunct with a matrix-clause extraction is impossible even in sluicing, as in (28), just as it is impossible to combine two such extractions from two different adjuncts, as in (29).

(28)

a. *Nekdo   je   padel, ravno ko je   Kim brcnila nekoga, a ne vem
     someone AUX fell   just   as AUX Kim kissed someone but not know
     kdo koga.
     who who
     'Someone fell just when Kim kicked someone, but I don't know who whom.'
b. … who whom ~~[____ fell [just when Kim kicked ____]]~~

(29)

a. *Črt je padel pod neko mizo, ravno ko je nekdo   dal gol.
     Črt AUX fell   under some table just   as AUX someone gave goal
     Ugani pod katero kdo.
     guess under which who
     'Črt fell under some table just as someone scored a goal. Guess which table who.'
b. … under which who ~~[Črt fell under ____ [just as ____ scored a goal]]~~

3.1.5   Propositional island recap

We have established that island violating extraction cannot be combined with another extraction that does not come from inside the same island. Notice that it is *not* the case that sluicing can only fix one island violation at a time (which – if it were the case – would be an extremely difficult constraint to motivate and make sense of anyway). We can extract two wh-words from the same island in sluicing, as shown in (30):

(30)

a. Razlagal je o   konju, ki   je nekje   nekoga brcnil,
    explained AUX about horse which AUX somewhere someone kicked
    pa ne vem kje   koga.
    but not know where who
    'He was explaining about a horse that kicked someone somewhere, but
    I don't know whom where.'

b. … who where [he was explaining about a horse [that kicked ___ ___]]

We can also extract a wh-phrase from a double island, for instance when we have one island inside another island, as in (31), where the extracted wh-word gets out of an adjunct clause that is inside a relative clause.

(31)

a. Razlagal je o   konju, ki   je brcnil Črta, ko se je ta
    explained AUX about horse   which AUX kicked Črt   when REFL AUX this
    z   nekom   pogovarjal, ampak ne vem s   kom.
    with someone talk   but   not know with whom
    'He was explaining about a horse that kicked Črt when he was talking to
    someone, but I don't know to who.'

b. … to who [he was explaining about a horse [that kicked Črt [when he talked
    ___]]]

Moreover, such cases even allow multiple sluicing, as long as both wh-words originate in the same island, as in (32), where the two wh-words come from inside a relative clause that is inside a clausal complement to a noun.

(32)

a. Razpredal je o   govorici, da je Črt kupil konja, ki   je
    talked   AUX about rumour   that AUX Črt bought horse which AUX
    enkrat nekoga brcnil, ne vem pa kdaj koga.
    once   someone kicked not know but when who
    'He talked about the rumour that Črt bought a horse that once kicked some-
    one, but I don't know whom when.'

b. … who when [he talked of a rumour [that Črt bought a horse [that kicked
    ___ ___]]]

The problem that the examples in the preceding sections all share seems to be that whenever extraction crosses a finite clause boundary it cannot combine with another extraction that comes from another clause. This could perhaps be explained with a generalization stated in Takahashi (1994, p. 287: (54b)) "The remnants in multiple Sluicing must be interpreted as clause mates". Note that, as we have shown above in section 2 with the BCMS examples discussed in Lasnik (2014), this does not seem to be an absolute restriction (though see Georgieva et al. 2025 for a different view, claiming that Lasnik's data in (11) and (12) contain a confound, and that the Clause-Mate Condition does hold as a constraint on multiple sluicing in BCMS as well). Merchant (2001, p. 113, fn. 4) also notes that this is not an absolute ban, as examples such as (33b) are reported to be fine (cf. Nishigauchi 1998; Bhattacharya & Simpson 2012; Abels & Dayal 2017 for more examples, but see also Cortés Rodríguez 2022; Cortés Rodríguez & Griffiths 2024 for a different view).

(33)
a.   *Someone thinks Jon brought something. I don't know who what.
b.   Everybody said they'll bring something. I don't know who what.

Furthermore, this ban is really only relevant for finite-clause boundaries. Remnants originating from different sides of a non-finite clause boundary are easily interpretable, as shown in (34). But then again, multiple questions with a similar configuration are also fine in Slovenian, as shown in (35).

(34)
a.   Nekdo   je   pozabil poklicati nekoga, ampak ne vem kdo koga.
     someone AUX forgot   call   someone but   not know who who
     'Someone forgot to call someone, but I forgot who who.'
b.   … who who [___ forgot [to call ___]]

(35) Kdo je   koga pozabil poklicat?
     who AUX who forgot   call
     'Who forgot to call who?'

This suggests that it does not seem possible to blame the impossibility of multiple wh-remnants originating from different islands exclusively on the Clause-Mate

Condition on multiple sluicing. See Abels and Dayal (2017) for a much longer discussion and an explanation of the clause-mate restriction on multiple sluicing.

In the next section we will show that the ban on multiple sluicing observed with propositional islands is really much more general, which further suggests that this ban cannot be reduced simply to the Clause-Mate Condition on multiple sluicing.

3.2 Coordinate Structure Constraint

Another constraint discussed by Ross (1967) is the Coordinate Structure Constraint [CSC], which bans movement from inside coordination. Grosu (1972) identifies two different movement restrictions: (i) Coordinate Constraint [CC], which bans movement of entire conjuncts; and (ii) Element Constraint [EC], which bans movement of elements from inside conjuncts. There is some debate whether CSC is really an island constraint, e.g. Kehler (1996). Our purpose here is not to discuss the potential workings of CSC, we really only want to draw a parallel between multiple sluicing and regular non-elliptical sentences (but see Zhang 2009 for a thorough discussion of CSC). In Slovenian simple wh-fronting cannot violate CSC; neither CC, (36a), nor EC, (36b):

(36)
a. *Koga je Peter videl ___ in Janeza?
     who AUX Peter saw   and Janez
    'Who and Janez did Peter see?'
b. *Koga je Vid mislil, da bo srečal ___ in da bo kupil pivo?
     Who AUX Vid think that AUX met   and that AUX bought beer

Now, sluicing has often been cited as an operation that fixes CSC violations (cf. Ross 1969; Merchant 2001; Fox & Lasnik 2003 a.o.), and this claim can be extended to Slovenian, too. Sluicing fixes island violations regardless of what kind of subpart of CSC we are looking at and regardless of the conjunct that the wh-phrase originates from: whether it is from the second conjunct, (37) and (38), or from the first conjunct, (39) and (40).

(37)
a. Vid je povabil Črta in še   nekoga, ampak ne vem koga.
    Vid AUX invited Črt and also someone but   not know who
    'Vid invited Črt and someone else, but I don't know whom.'
b. … whom [Vid invited Črt and ___]

(38)

a. Vid je mislil, da bo srečal Črta in da bo nekaj kupil,
Vid AUX think that AUX met Črt and that AUX something bought
ampak se zdaj ne spomnim kaj.
but REFL now neg remember what
'Vid thought he would meet Črt and buy something, but I cannot remember
what.'

b. … what [Peter thought [[he would meet Črt] and [buy ___]]]

(39)

a. Vid je povabil nekoga in še Črta, ampak ne vem koga.
Vid AUX invited some and also Črt but not know who
'Vid invited someone and also Črt, but I don't know whom.'

b. … whom [Vid invited ___ and Črt]

(40)

a. Črt je mislil, da bo srečal nekoga in da bo kupil neke knjige,
Črt AUX think that AUX met someone and that AUX bought some books
pozabil pa sem koga.
forgot PRT AUX who
'Črt thought he would meet someone and buy books, but I forgot who.'

b. … who [Črt thought [[he would meet ___] and [buy books]]]

In (38) and (40), sluicing apparently fixed an EC violation, and in (37) and (39)
a CC violation. But combining a CSC violation with another extraction of the same
type is again impossible, as shown in (41), where both conjuncts of the coordination
are extracted, and in (42) and (43), where two wh-words are extracted from inside
the two conjuncts.

(41)

a. *Vid je povabil enega fanta in eno punco, pa ne vem katerega katero.
Vid AUX invited one boy and one girl but not know which which
'Vid invited some boy and some girl, but I don't know which one which one.'

b. … which one which one [Vid invited ___ and ___]

(42)

a.   *Črt je mislil, da bo nekoga srečal in nekaj   kupil, ampak
     Črt AUX think that AUX someone met   and something bought but
     ne vem   koga kaj.
     not know who what
     'Črt thought he would meet someone and buy something, but I don't know
     who what.'

b.   … who what [Črt thought [[he would meet ___] and [buy ___]]]

(43)

a.   *Črt je želel   nekoga srečati in nekaj   kupiti, ampak ne vem
     Črt AUX wished someone meet   and something buy   but   not know
     koga kaj.
     who what
     'Črt wanted to meet someone and to buy something, but I don't know who
     what.'

b.   … who what [Črt wanted [[to meet ___] and [to buy ___]]]

Extraction of both conjuncts is possible only when the two wh-words are con-joined, as in (44) and (45). But when this is the case we have not violated the CSC, as we have either fronted the entire coordination, or perhaps conjoined two single sluicings (we will come back to this in the last section of this paper).

(44) Vid je   povabil enega fanta in   eno punco, pa ne vem   katerega
     Vid AUX invited one   boy and one girl   but not know which
     fanta *(in) katero punco.
     guy   and which girl
     'Vid invited some boy and some girl, but I don't know which boy and which
     girl.'

(45) Vid je   mislil, da bo nekoga srečal in nekaj   kupil, ampak ne
     Vid AUX thought that AUX someone met   and something bought but   not
     vem ne koga ne kaj.
     know not who not what
     'Vid thought he would meet someone and buy some books, but I don't know
     either who or how many.'

Note that the unacceptability of (41) is not due to a distinctness condition violation of the kind Richards (2010) mentions. As shown by Mišmaš (2011), different gender features are enough to make wh-words count as distinct in Slovenian. This is also shown in (46), a regular multiple sluicing example with two dative wh-words (one is the dative subject of the matrix clause and the other the dative internal object of the embedded non-final clause) and the two wh-words share everything but gender features, and the example is acceptable.

(46) Nekemu fantu   se   ni   pomagalo neki punci,   ampak ne vem
     some   boy.DAT REFL NEG-AUX helped   some girl.DAT but   not know
     kateremu   kateri.
     which.DAT.M which.DAT.F
     'Some boy didn't feel like helping some girl, but I don't know which which.'

Sentences become unacceptable even when we combine a CSC violation with another CSC violation.

(47)
a. *Vid in še nekdo   sta kupila vsak po štruco kruha in   še
   Vid and also someone AUX bought each at loaf   bread and also
   nekaj,   ampak ne vem   kdo kaj.
   something but   not know who what
b. … who what [Vid and ___ each bought a loaf of bread and ___]

The only option for multiple sluicing is to have two extractions from the same conjunct, that is, to have two EC violations form the same conjunct, as in (48).

(48)
a. Vid je včeraj   v trafiki   kupil novo Mladino in   nekje
   Vid AUX yesterday in tobacconist bought new Mladina and somewhere
   drugje nekaj   drugega prodal, ampak ne vem   kje   kaj.
   else   something else   sold   but   not know where what
   'Vid bought the new issue of Mladina yesterday at the tobacco-shop and sold somewhere else something else, but I don't know where what.'
b. … where what [Vid […] and [___ sold ___]

3.3   DP internal islands

3.3.1   *Subject islands*

As shown in (49), extraction from a DP in subject position is impossible.

(49)
a.   Teorija o   skladenjskih otokih je   zapletena.
       theory about syntactic   islands AUX complicated
       'The theory about syntactic islands is complicated.'
b.   *O   čem je [teorija ____] zapletena?
        about what AUX theory   complicated
       'What is the theory about complicated?'

And as shown in (50), this extraction becomes available in sluicing:

(50)
a.   Teorija o   nečem   je bila slavnostno   predstavljena. Ampak
       theory about something AUX been ceremonially presented   but
       o   čem?
       about what
       'The theory about something was presented. But about what?'
b.   … about-what PRT ~~[[the theory ____] was presented]~~

However, when such extraction from a subject island is combined with another ex-
traction that is not from the same island, the result of such multiple sluicing is bad. This
is shown in (51) and (52), of which (51) shows extraction from a subject island combined
with an extraction of a dative argument from the main clause, and (52) shows subject-is-
land extraction combined with an extraction of an adjunct from the main clause.

(51)
a.   *Teorija o   nečem   je bila nekomu predstavljena. Mogoče veš
       theory about something AUX been someone presented   maybe   know
       o   čem komu?
       about what who
       'The theory about something was presented to someone. Maybe you know
       about what to whom?'
b.   … about-what to-whom ~~[[the theory ____] was presented ____]~~

(52)

a. *Teorija o   nečem   je bila enkrat   predstavljena. Ampak ne
     theory about something AUX been someone presented   but   not

    vem o   čem kdaj?
    know about what when

    'The theory about something was presented to someone. But I don't know
    about what when?'

b.   … about-what when PRT ~~[[the theory ____] was presented ____]~~

In fact, even multiple sluicing where both remnants come from the same subject
is bad, (53):

(53)

a. *Knjiga o   nekih dinozavrih s   precej   trdimi platnicam je
    book   about some dinosaurs with somewhat hard   covers   AUX

    ležala na mizi, ampak ne vem, o   katerih dinozavrih s   kako
    lay   on table but   not know about which   dinosaurs with how

    trdimi platnicami.
    hard   covers

    'A book about dinosaurs with somewhat hard covers was lying on the
    table, but I don't know about which dinosaurs with how hard covers.'

b.   … about-which-dinosaurs with-how-hard-covers PRT ~~[[a book ___ ___] was
    lying on the table]~~

3.3.2   DP complements of nouns

Slovenian does not allow wh-extraction of a DP embedded inside a DP regardless
of whether these DPs are adjuncts or arguments. (54) shows a case of unacceptable
wh-extraction of a DP from inside a DP that is not a subject.

(54)

a. Črt je   razložil   teorijo relativnosti.
    Črt AUX explained theory relativity.GEN
    'Črt explained the theory of relativity.'

b. *Česa   je Črt razložil   teorijo
    what.GEN AUX Črt explained theory
    'What did Črt explain the theory of?'

As shown in (55), such extractions are possible in sluicing.

(55)

a.   Črt je   razložil   teorijo nečesa,   samo ne vem, česa.
     Črt AUX explained theory something.GEN just   not know what.GEN
     'Črt explained the theory of something, I just don't know of what.'

b.   … what [Črt explained [the theory ___]]

But again, as soon as we try to combine it with some other extraction, such extraction becomes impossible. (56) shows the ungrammaticality of combining an extraction of a DP embedded inside a DP with an extraction from the rest of the clause, and (57) shows the ungrammaticality of two extractions of a DP from within two different DPs.

(56)

a.   *Nekdo   je   razložil   teorijo nečesa,   samo ne vem, kdo česa
      someone AUX explained theory something.GEN just   not know who what.GEN
      'Somebody explained the theory of something, I just don't know who of
      what.'

b.   … who what [___ explained [the theory ___]]

(57)

a.   *Črt je   prijatelju neke sošolke   razložil   teorijo nečesa,
      Črt AUX friend   some classmate.GEN explained theory something.GEN
      samo ne vem katere   (sošolke)   česa.
      just   not know which.GEN classmate.GEN what.GEN
      'Črt explained the theory of something to a friend of one of his classmates,
      I just don't know of what of which classmate.'

b.   … what of-which-classmate [Črt explained [the theory ___] [to a friend ___]]

As soon as we combine an extraction from a DP with an extraction from outside that DP, sluicing becomes impossible.

3.3.3   *Left-branch extraction – LBE*

Generally speaking Slovenian does not allow LBE, at least the type of LBE discussed by Merchant (2001). (58) demonstrates ungrammaticality of LBE in wh-extraction.[8]

> (58) *Kako visoko je   Vid preplezal steno?
>   how   tall   AUX Vid climbed cliff
>   'How tall did Vid climb a cliff?'

As shown in (59), sluicing again makes such extractions possible, so that 'how tall' – the same kind of wh-AP that cannot get wh-extracted in regular questions – can be the remnants in sluicing without problems.

> (59)
> a.   Vid je   preplezal eno visoko steno, ampak ne vem   kako visoko.
>   Vid AUX climbed a   tall cliff but   not know how tall
>   'Vid climbed a tall cliff, but I don't know, how tall.'
> b.   … how tall [Vid climbed [___ cliff]]

But when we try to combine such an LBE-exhibiting extraction with some other extraction from the rest of the clause, as in (60), sluicing can no longer rescue LBE.

> (60)
> a.   *Vid je   enkrat preplezal eno visoko steno, ampak ne vem   kdaj
>   Vid AUX once climbed a   tall   cliff but   not know when
>   kako visoko.
>   how tall
>   'Vid climbed a tall cliff once, but I don't know, how tall when.'
> b.   … how tall when [Vid climbed [___ cliff] ___]

---

8   There may be some subtypes of LBE that are also available in Slovenian (cf. Bošković 2008; Mišmaš 2017), but overall, LBE is clearly not as freely available as, say, in BCMS. So unlike (58), cases like (1) are possible or at least much better than (58). As we have no intention of explaining the difference between various types of LBE, we simply make a contrast between sluicing and regular wh-questions using the same type of extracted elements.

(i)   Koliko misliš, da je Črt visok?
      how   think   that AUX Črt tall
      'How tall do you think Črt is?'

Similarly, LBE is incompatible with other types of extractions from inside the same DP, as shown in (61) for DP-inside-DP extraction and in (62) for another LBE from inside a PP inside the same DP.

(61)

a. *Črt je   zahteval podroben seznam nečesa,   ampak ne vem,
    Črt AUX requested detailed   list   something.GEN but   not know
    kako podroben česa.
    how detailed   what.GEN
    'Črt requested a detailed list of something, but I don't know how detailed of what.'

b.   … how detailed of what [Črt requested [___ list [___]]]

(62)

a.   *Vid je   preplezal eno visoko steno nad neko grapo, ampak ne vem
    Vid AUX climbed   a   tall   cliff   over some gully but   not know
    kako visoko katero.
    how tall   which
    'Vid climbed a tall cliff over some gully, but I don't know, how tall which.'

b.   … how tall which [Vid climbed [___ cliff over ___ gully]]

Moreover, sluicing can also not save multiple LBEs (cf. Grebenyova 2005), regardless of whether both LBEs are from the same noun phrase, as in (63), or if they are from different noun phrases, as in (64).

(63)

a.   *Kupil   si   je   nov avto. Ugani katere barve katere znamke.
    bought REFL AUX new car   guess which colour which brand
    'He bought a new car. Guess what colour what brand.'

b.   … what colour what brand [he bought [___ ___ car]]

(64)

a.   *Črt je   precej otrokom podaril precej čudne balone, ampak ne vem
    Črt AUX many children gave   fairly strange balloons but   not know
    kolikim   kako čudne.
    how-many how strange
    'Črt gave many children fairly weird balloons, but I don't know to how many how strange.'

b.   … how many how strange [Črt gave [___ kids] [___ balloons]]

3.3.4   Comitatives

Much like LBE and extraction from DPs, comitatives like *vidva s Črtom* (you-dual with Črt) "you and Črt" or *mi trije z Ano in Ido* "me, Ana and Ida", where the pronoun+with-PP act and agree as a dual/plural subject, (65a), do not allow anything to be extracted out of them. As shown in (65b), regular wh-extraction is impossible, while sluicing is fine, as in (65c).

(65)

a.   Vidva   z   Micko sta   zelo pametna.
     you.DU with Micka AUX very smart
     'You and Micka are very smart.'

b.   *S   kom sta vidva ___ zelo pametna?
     with who AUX you.DU   very smart
     'You and who are very smart?'

c.   Slišal sem, da sta vidva   z   enim tvojim prijateljem super ekipa,
     heard AUX that AUX you.DU with one   your   friend   great team
     ampak ne vem   s   kom.
     but   not know with who
     'I heard that you and a friend of yours make a good team, but I don't know who?'

And just like we have been systematically seeing up to now, combining an extraction from a comitative construction with any other extraction is impossible. This is shown in (66), where an extraction from a comitative is combined with an extraction from another noun phrase, and in (67), where an extraction from a comitative is combined with an extraction of a noun phrase from the rest of the clause that does not violate any island.

(66)

a.   *Vidva z   enim z   Iga sta skupaj spila nekaj piv, ne vem
     you.DU with one from Ig AUX together drank some beers not know
     pa   s   kom koliko.
     PRT with who how many
     'You and someone from Ig drank some beers together, but I don't know who how many.'

b.   … with who how many [[you ___] drank ___ beers together]

(67)

a.   *Onadva z   enim iz   Grgarja sta skupaj nekam   odšla, ne vem
they.DU with one from Grgar AUX together someplace went not know
pa s   kom kam.
PRT with who where
'He and someone from Grgar went someplace together, but I don't know
who where.'

b.   … with who where [[They ⎯⎯] went ⎯⎯]

3.4   Other (strong) islands

Not every island can be tested in the way employed above. We have avoided weak-is-
lands since these typically allow extraction of arguments, which represent typical
participants in sluicing; consequently we are not considering, for instance, negative
islands and wh-islands (see Szabolcsi & Den Dikken 1999 and Szabolcsi 2006 for a
discussion and distinctions between various types of islands). Similarly, it is impos-
sible to test derived positions, as the deletion obscures the actual source of extraction.

Preposition stranding is typically not called an island constraint (also because
it is not universal), but Merchant (2001) proposed a generalization stating that only
languages that allow preposition stranding under wh-movement allow preposition
stranding under sluicing.[9] In other words sluicing apparently does not rescue prepo-
sition stranding violations, which is again unexpected if sluicing simply deletes the
asterisk on the syntactic structure where the ungrammatical move was made. But as
we will see, preposition stranding is actually a somewhat more complicated case.

Certain languages were claimed to go – at least apparently – against the Merchant
(2001) P-stranding generalization (cf. Potsdam 2003; Sato 2007; Rodrigues, Nevins
& Vicente 2007), so that this generalization is probably not very strong. On the other
hand, some apparent counterarguments seem to suggest that these data should be
looked at more carefully. As shown in Stjepanović (2008), the apparent preposition
stranding under sluicing in BCMS is clearly not a result of sluicing alone. To some
degree, Slovenian, like BCMS, also allows preposition stranding under sluicing, as in
(68), and could actually be used to replicate Stjepanović's (2008) argument showing
that in cases where sluicing allows preposition stranding (and thus apparently "saves"
ungrammatical preposition stranding) it is actually not the sluicing that is exclusively

---

9   Note that LBE and CSC, which are considered islands in discussions of languages like English, are supposedly
     violable in some other languages, such as in BCMS (cf. Franks & Progovac 1994; Stjepanović 1998; Bošković
     2005 etc.).

responsible for the acceptability of preposition stranding since preposition stranding is also possible with sluiced coordinated PPs which do not involve pseudosluicing or base-generated fragments, (69) (cf. Rodrigues et al. 2007, who also claim that sluicing does not save preposition-stranding violations in Brazilian Portuguese and Spanish).

(68)
a. ᶦČrt je   na zabavo prišel z   nekom, ampak ne vem kom.
   Črt AUX to party   came with someone but   not know who
   'Črt came to the party with someone, but I don't know who.'
b. … who [Črt came [to party] [with ___]]

(69)
Vid je   skril igračko za   eno omaro   in pod   eno blazino, ampak ne
Vid AUX hid   toy   behind one cupboard and under one pillow   but   not
vem   prav dobro ᶦ(za)   katero omaro   in ᶦ(pod) katero blazino.
know quite well   behind which cupboard and under which pillow
'Vid hid the toy behind a cupboard and under a pillow, but I don't know which cupboard and which pillow.'

But regardless of the actual nature of preposition stranding in sluicing constructions, as soon as we combine preposition stranding with some other extraction, either another preposition stranding, as in (70), or simply with an extraction that does not violate anything, as in (71), the sentence is completely out.[10]

(70)
a. *Črt je   prišel na neko zabavo z   nekom ampak ne vem   katero
   Črt AUX came to some party   with someone but   not know which
   zabavo kom.
   party   who
   'Črt came to some party with someone, but I don't know which party who.'
b. … which party who [Črt came [to ___] [with ___]]

---

10   Note that (69) above, which had two instances of preposition stranding inside the same sentence, had the two wh-words coordinated. This actually suggests that (69) may be an instance of two independent sluicing constructions, which Stjepanović (2008) argues against. Given that it is irrelevant for our purposes here what exactly it is that allows (69), we leave this question aside.

(71)

a. *Nekdo   je   prišel na zabavo z   nekom, ampak ne vem   kdo kom.
Someone AUX came to party   with someone but   not know who who
'Someone came to the party with someone, but I'm not sure who who.'

b.   … who who [̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶c̶a̶m̶e̶ ̶[̶t̶o̶ ̶t̶h̶e̶ ̶p̶a̶r̶t̶y̶ ̶]̶ ̶[̶w̶i̶t̶h̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶]̶]̶

3.5   Recap

As we have seen in this section, sluicing cannot save every type of violation of a certain sentence. It can save single island violations and it can save multiple violations if they originate from a single island. Combining an island violation with a violation of a different island, though, results in ungrammaticality. Similarly, combining an extraction from an island with an extraction from the main clause that does not violate anything is also impossible. At this point, this leads us to the following generalization:

(72) **Generalization on multiple sluicing** – take 1:
Multiple sluicing can only rescue improper movement violations if all wh-remnants originate inside the same island.

This generalization is stated in a way that assumes that sluicing can save island violations. As we mentioned above, though, this is not so obviously true. Anticipating what we will discuss next, we also present here a slightly stronger generalization that also covers examples (11)–(15), though this one, crucially, assumes that sluicing does *not* rescue island violations.

(73) **Generalization on multiple sluicing** – stronger version:
Multiple sluicing is possible only when multiple wh-movement of the remnants is possible without subsequent TP-ellipsis.

4   Island repair

For certain islands it has also been claimed that they can be – at least apparently – saved by other means as well. Ross (1967) identifies three such environments in addition to sluicing: resumption, wh-in-situ and pied-piping (see also Cable 2010; Boeckx 2012 among others). Truswell (2007) notes that adjunct islands can be

violated in certain cases and Bošković (2011) proposes that elements can extract from island-phrases that are headed by a trace (see also Stepanov 2012).[11]

We will now look at some of these environments. The idea is that if there is something about multiple sluicing that blocks island amelioration, then island amelioration should be impossible regardless of what kind of multiple-sluicing construction we test. That is, if it is multiple sluicing that blocks island amelioration, trying to save island violations through another mechanism should be just as unsuccessful as the failed rescue attempts that we have seen in the examples so far. But on the other hand, if the problem is really in sluicing (not in the fact that it is applied multiply), then trying to save island violations with another mechanism should be successful and the constructions that were ungrammatical above should become grammatical.

Of course, not everything can be modulated in sluicing. Two island-voiding processes fall out as irrelevant right away: resumption and wh-in-situ strategies are incompatible with sluicing, which requires wh-movement and deletes the rest of the clause where a resumptive pronoun would be placed, so we can put these aside and have a look at pied-piping instead.[12]

4.1   Pied-piping

4.1.1   *LBE*

Not all islands seem to be sensitive to pied-piping, but one that typically *is* claimed to be is LBE. In Slovenian, fronting the entire DP is most certainly also possible in regular wh-questions, as in (74).

(74)
a.   Kako podroben spisek je   Črt zahteval?
     how detailed   list   AUX Črt requested
     'How detailed a list did Črt request?'
b.   Kako visoko steno je   Vid preplezal?
     how   tall   cliff AUX Vid climbed
     'How tall a cliff did Vid climbed?'

---

11   Related to this are also the proposals by Den Dikken (2007) and Gallego (2010) – Phase-Extension and Phase-Sliding respectively – but as these are limited or focused on phases rather than islands, we will not discuss them at length.

12   Note that as argued by Heestand, Xiang and Polinsky (2011), resumption does not save islands anyway.

And given that pied-piping also avoids LBE violations in embedded questions, as in (75), we can assume that this indeed involves proper wh-movement. And obviously, as this is an available strategy in wh-questions, pied-piping of the entire DP is also available in sluicing, (76).

(75) Črt je   vprašal, kako visoko steno je   preplezal Vid?
      Črt AUX asked   how tall   clif AUX climbed Vid
      'Črt asked how tall a cliff did Vid climbed?'

(76) Črt je   preplezal eno kar   visoko steno, ne vem   pa, kako visoko steno.
      Črt AUX climbed   a   fairly tall   cliff not know PRT how tall   cliff
      'Črt climber a fairly tall cliff, but I don't know how tall a cliff.'

Quite expectedly, when an LBE violation is voided with pied-piping and pied-piping fronts/pied-pipes another remnant from the same DP, the result is clearly grammatical, as in (77) and (78). Even though this is an instance of multiple sluicing it cannot be used as an argument to show that it is not a multiplicity of wh-remnants that blocked multiple island ameliorations, since it is a single pied-piping moving two wh-words.

(77)
a.   Črt je   zahteval podroben seznam nečesa,   ampak ne vem, kako
     Črt AUX requested detailed   list   something.GEN but   not know how
     podroben seznam česa.
     detailed   list   what.GEN
     'Črt requested a detailed list of something, but I don't know how detailed of what.'
b.   … how detailed list of what [Črt requested ____]

(78)
a.   ?Vid je   preplezal eno kar   visoko steno nad neko grapo, ampak ne
      Vid AUX climbed   a   fairly tall   cliff over some gully but   not
      vem   kako visoko steno nad katero grapo.
      know how   tall   cliff over which gully
      'Vid climbed a fairly tall cliff over some gully, but I don't know, how tall a cliff over which gully.'
b.   … how tall a cliff over which gully [Vid climbed ____]

But if the two wh-words originate in two different noun phrases, pied-piping needs to front two separate noun phrases. If such an example is grammatical, it would suggest that multiple island violations can be saved with multiple applications of the same ameliorating process. As shown in (79), such examples are indeed grammatical. Similarly, it is also possible to combine a pied-piped DP with another remnant if it comes from the same clause, as in (80), which is also something that was not available with sluicing alone.

(79)

a.   Vid je   nekaterim otrokom dal   nekakšna darila, ampak ne vem katerim
     Vid AUX some   kids   gave some   gifts   but   not know which
     otrokom kakšna darila.
     kids   which gifts
     'Vid gave some gifts to some kids, but I don't know which gifts to which kids.'

b.   … which gifts to which kids [Vid gave ___ ___]

(80)

a.   Nek plezalec iz   Tolmina je nekaj   preplezal, ne vem pa, kateri
     some climber from Tolmin AUX something climbed   not know PRT which
     plezalec iz   Tolmina kaj.
     climber from Tolmin   what
     'Some climber from Tolmin climbed something, but I don't know who
     which climber from Tolmin what.'

b.   … which climber from Tolmin what [___ climbed ___]

Note that in both of these situations, the non-elided version of the construction is also available, as proven by the simple wh-questions with the same internal structure in (81) and (82).

(81) Katerim otrokom je   kakšna darila dal   Vid včeraj?
       which   children AUX which gifts gave Vid yesterday
       'Which children did Vid give which gifts yesterday?'

(82) Kateri plezalec iz   Tolmina je kaj   preplezal?
       which climber from Tolmin AUX what climbed
       'Which climber from Tolmin climbed what?'

Pied-piping of the entire DP cannot save ungrammatical combinations of LBE with a remnant from a different clause or from different types of islands, as shown, for example, in (83) with a combination of a fronted DP and a remnant from an embedded clause. As shown in (84), this combination of movements is also impossible outside sluicing.

(83)

a. *Nek plezalec iz   Tolmina je povedal, da   je Vid nekaj
     some climber from Tolmin AUX told   that AUX Vid something
     preplezal, ne vem   pa, kateri plezalec iz   Tolmina kaj.
     climbed   not know PRT which climber from Tolmin   what
     'Some climber from Tolmin climbed something, but I don't know which climber from Tolmin what.'

b.   … which climber from Tolmin what [—— told [that Vid climbed ——]]

(84) *Kateri plezalec iz   Tolmina je kaj povedal, da je Vid preplezal?
      which climber from Tolmin AUX what told   that AUX Vid climbed
      'Which climber from Tolmin said that Vid climbed what?'

Therefore we can conclude that pied-piping can void LBE island violations, but only to the degree that it can also do so outside sluicing constructions. And as the ungrammatical multiple sluicing examples above, in which sluicing alone could not save multiple island violations, are fine with pied-piping, as in (79) and (80), we have another argument to suggest that it is something about sluicing that blocks amelioration of multiple island violations.

4.1.2   CSC

Just as is the case with LBE, it seems possible to avoid a violation of CSC by fronting the entire coordination as in (85), regardless of the position of the wh-word.

(85)

a. Koga in   Janeza je   povabil Peter?
    who and Janez AUX invited Peter
    'Who and Janez did Peter invite?'

b. Janeza in   koga še   je povabil Peter?
    Janez and who else AUX invited Peter
    'Janez and who else did Peter invite?'

But fronting of the entire coordination is not possible in sluicing constructions, as in (86).

(86) Peter je povabil Janeza in   še nekoga, pa ne vem …
     Peter AUX invited Janez   and also someone but not know
     'Peter invited Janez and someone else, but I don't know …'
     A. *Janeza in   še   koga.
          Janez   and also who
     B. *Janeza in   koga še.
          Janez   and who also
     C. *Janeza in   koga.
          Janez   and who
          'Janez and who (else).'

At first sight this is surprising. So far we have only seen cases where a sluicing construction was more permissive than regular questions, so how is it possible that sluicing does not allow something that regular questions seem to allow? As it turns out, this strategy is not available in embedded contexts, as in (87), which suggests that what we have in (85) is not an instance of regular wh-movement, and since sluicing does involve wh-movement, the two things simply do not go together. The coordination containing the wh-phrase in (85) has perhaps just been scrambled to the front of the sentence, or it has moved to a lower wh-position that is not part of the left periphery (as in Mišmaš 2015).

(87)
a. *Žodor se   sprašuje, kdo in   Peter sta povabila Janeza na zabavo?
     Žodor REFL ask   who and Peter AUX invited   Janez   to party
     'Žodor is wondering who and Peter invited Janez to the party?'
b. *Ilija bi   rad vedel, koga in   Janeza je povabil Peter?
     Ilija COND like know who and Janez AUX invite   Peter
     'Ilija wants to know whom and Janez Peter invited.'
c. *Meliso zanima, Janeza in   koga je   povabil Peter?
     Melisa interests Janez and who AUX invite   Peter
     'Melisa is curious Janez and whom Peter invited.'

So we have determined that pied-piping does not really help CSC violations as pied-piping of the entire coordination is apparently not an instance of regular wh-movement to the left periphery.

A reviewer points out that our claim predicts that pied-piping of the entire coordination should be okay in matrix sluicing. This prediction is borne out, as shown in (88).

(88)
a.   Peter je   povabil Janeza in   še   nekoga.
     Peter AUX invited Janez   and also someone
     'Peter invited Janez and someone else.'
b.   Janeza in   koga pa?
     Janez   and who PRT
     'Janez and who?'

4.1.3   Other islands

All other islands seem to behave similarly: even though they seem to allow pied-piping to avoid island violations, the process most likely does not involve proper wh-movement and is thus incompatible with sluicing. See (89) for comitatives, (90) for adjunct islands, and (91) for complex DP islands.

(89)
a.   *Janez hoče zvedeti, midva s   kom iz   Bat sva dobra ekipa?
      Janez wants know   we.DU with who from Bate AUX good team
      'Janez wants to know me and who from Bate make a good team?'
b.   *Onadva z   nekom iz   Bat sta dobra ekipa, ampak ne vem
      they.DU with someone from Bate AUX good team   but   not know
      več   onadva s   kom iz   Bat.
      anymore they.DU with whom from Bate
      'He and someone from Bate make up a good team, but I no longer know he
      and who.'

(90)
a.   *Janeza zanima, ko   je Peter videl koga, se   je Micka usedla?
      Janez interests when AUX Peter see   who REFL AUX Micka sit-down
      'Janez wonders when Peter saw whom that Micka sat down?'

b.   *Micka se   je usedla,   ker   je Peter videl nekoga, ampak ne
     Micka REFL AUX sit-down because AUX Peter see   someone but   not
     vem   več   ker   je videl koga?
     know anymore because AUX see   who
     'Micka sat down because Peter saw someone, but I don't know anymore
     because Peter saw who.'

(91)
a.   *Janez se   sprašuje, konja, ki   je brcnil koga, je Peter včeraj   videl?
     Janez REFL asks   horse which AUX kick who AUX Peter yesterday saw
     'Janez wonders the horse that kicked whom did Peter see yesterday?'
b.   *Peter je včeraj   videl konja, ki   je brcnil nekoga, ne vem
     Peter AUX yesterday saw horse which AUX kick   someone not know
     pa konja, ki   je brcnil koga.
     PRT horse which AUX kicked who
     'Yesterday Peter saw a horse that kicked someone, but I don't know a horse
     that kicked who.'

4.2   Island/Phase Expansion

Bošković (2011) argues that traces do not head islands, in other words, that phrases
which typically act as islands stop acting like islands once their head moves out and
they consequently get to be headed by traces. This seems like another untestable situ-
ation for sluicing, since everything gets deleted, including the head of the potentially
violated island. But if we construct the sentence in such a way that the antecedent
clause also contains the island whose head got moved out of the island, we would
also expect the overt version of the sluicing construction to be okay, so here too we
are not testing anything specific to sluicing. In effect the sluicing construction of this
particular setup in (92a) is just as ungrammatical as the regular wh-question in (93).

(92)
a.   *En nekoliko pomemben neumen bogataš je včeraj   kupil
     one somewhat important stupid   rich-man AUX yesterday bought
     TikTok. Ampak ne vem   kateri bogataš koliko   pomemben.
     TikTok but   not know   which rich-man how-much important
     'Some stupid somewhat important rich man bought TikTok yesterday,
     but I don't know which rich man how important.'
b.   … which rich man how important [[___ stupid ___] bought TikTok]

(93) *Kateri bogataš je koliko   pomemben včeraj   neumen kupil
       which rich-man AUX how-much important   yesterday stupid   bought
       TikTok?
       TikTok
       'Which rich man how important did yesterday stupid buy TikTok?'

Notice that both (92a) and (93) become grammatical if the two wh-words move as one constituent, where the second wh-word pied-pipe the first one, as in (94) and (95).

(94)

a. En nekoliko pomemben neumen bogataš je včeraj   kupil
    one somewhat important   stupid   rich-man AUX yesterday bought
    TikTok. Ampak ne vem   kateri koliko   pomemben neumen bogataš.
    TikTok but   not know which how-much important   stupid   rich-man
    'Some stupid somewhat important rich man bought TikTok yesterday, but I
    don't know which how important rich man.'
b. … which how important stupid rich man [[___] bought TikTok]

(95) Kateri koliko   pomemben neumen bogataš je včeraj   kupil
      which how-much important   stupid   rich-man AUX yesterday bought
      TikTok?
      TikTok
      'Which how important stupid rich man did yesterday buy TikTok?'

4.3   Transparent islands

Truswell (2007) notes that certain islands sometimes cease to act like islands. Specifically, he notes that, "if the event denoted by the adjunct occupies an event position in the argument structure encoded in the matrix verb, then extraction of the complement from within that adjunct is possible." (Truswell 2007, p. 3). So for example, the English example in (96) and the Slovenian examples in (97–98) are acceptable even though the wh-word comes from inside the adjunct, as indicated by the trace inside the square brackets.

(96) What did John drive Mary crazy [trying to fix *t*]?

(97) Katero pesem je   Črt prišel domov [pojoč *t*]?
      which song   AUX Črt came home   singing
      'Which song did Črt come home singing?'

(98) Koga je   Zdravko prišel domov [opevajoč *t*]?
      who AUX Zdravko came home   singing-about
      'Who did Zdravko came home singing about?'

According to Truswell (2007), in these examples it is the relation between the embedded and the matrix predicate that makes the adjunct transparent for movement. Irrespective of the reason behind this transparency, it is a fact that with the correct choice of embedded and matrix predicate, adjuncts will not act as islands. So according to our reasoning above, this is not really a process that makes an island transparent but simply a type of construction that does not behave on a par with constructions that appear to be syntactically similar. Whereas this tells us something about the nature of islands, about what the true causes of islandhood are, this is not our focus here.

If adjuncts of this type are not really islands, we would not expect them to behave like proper islands and would also not expect multiple sluicing to exhibit any unusual behaviour. This is indeed what we find. Multiple sluicing examples where one of the wh-remnants comes from such an adjunct and the other one from the matrix clause are acceptable, just like multiple wh-questions with the same predicates.

(99)
a. Nekdo   je prišel domov opevajoč   nekoga, ampak ne vem
    someone AUX came home   singing-about someone but   not know
    kdo   koga.
    who.NOM who.ACC
    'Someone came home singing about someone, but I don't know who about whom.'
b. … who whom [̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶singing-about̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶ ̶]

(100)   Kdo   je koga   prišel domov opevajoč?
         who.NOM AUX who.ACC came home   singing-about
         'Who came home singing about who?'

So here too we come to the same conclusion confirming the generalization stated above, whereby multiple sluicing is allowed only when multiple wh-movement is possible, which means that sluicing does not rescue any island violations as it is only allowed when the overt version of the sluicing construction is also possible.

5   Towards an account

5.1   An old proposal

Merchant (2001, p.209) proposes that it is not the case that propositional islands (relative clauses, adjuncts, anything clausal) are fixed by sluicing, since they are never even violated. The idea is that the ellipsis site in these cases does not include the entire antecedent but rather just the embedded propositional phrase, i.e. the relative clause, the adjunct, etc. Something along these lines was already proposed by Baker and Brame (1972), and seems to be confirmed by the data above.

(101) Merchant (2001):
         not: … who [John rode the horse [that kicked ____]]
         but rather: … who [horse kicked ____]

This proposal makes some testable predictions. If the sluiced part of the sentence only consists of the embedded clause, then any element that is present in the matrix clause inside the antecedent should not have any effect. We can try testing this prediction with the binding theory, specifically, with Principle C.

As shown by (102), regular sluicing examples exhibit Principle C violations, which further suggests that Principle C violations are not subject to island repair.

(102)
a. Vid_i je   brcnil enega $svojega_i$ prijatelja.
      Vid AUX kicked one   his   friend
      'Vid kicked a friend of his.'
b.   Sprašujem se   katerega *$Vidovega_i$/ $svojega_i$ prijatelja.
      ask   REFL which   Vid's   his   friend
      'I wonder which friend of his.'
c.   … which friend of Vid's/his [Vid kicked ____]

But if we place the referring expression inside the matrix clause of the antecedent and the correlate inside an island, there is no principle C effect in the sluicing construction. The prediction made by this proposal is thus confirmed.[13]

(103)

a.   Vid$_i$ je kupil   konja, ki   je brcnil enega njegovega$_i$ prijatelja.
    Vid AUX bought horse, that AUX kicked one   his   friend
    'Vid bought a horse that kicked a friend of his.'

b.   Sprašujem se   katerega Vidovega$_i$ prijatelja.
    ask   REFL which   Vid's   friend
    'I wonder which friend of Vid's.'

c.   … which friend of Vid's ~~[Vid bought~~ [a horse kicked ____]

(104)

a.   Vid$_i$ je odšel, ravno ko   je Črt$_k$ brcnil enega njegovega$_i$ prijatelja.
    Vid AUX left, just when AUX Črt kicked one   his   friend
    'Vid left just when Črt kicked a friend of his.'

b.   Sprašujem se   katerega Vidovega$_i$ prijatelja.
    ask   REFL which   Vid's   friend
    'I wonder which friend of Vid's.'

c.   … which friend of Vid's ~~[Vid left just as~~ [Črt kicked ____]

5.2   Another prediction

If sluicing always uses a short construal to avoid island violations, then if the matrix predicate is something that affects a "presupposition projection" like *deny*, the overt short construal (without *deny*) should become impossible. That is, the English example in (105) is bad as the overt short construal makes the wrong presupposition that Vid actually bought the car even though, given the antecedent, he did not buy a car. Without the matrix predicate the short construal alone presupposes the truth of the proposition, but in the antecedent, this proposition is actually false as the clause that it expresses is inside the scope of the presupposition altering predicate (Boban Arsenijević p.c.).

---

13   We mark the portion of the elided TP that is assumed to be present on the standard analysis but not according to our proposal in the last line of each sluicing example with ~~text~~.

(105)   #John denied that Vid bought a car, but I forgot which car Vid bought.

If we place an island in the scope of such a presupposition-altering predicate, the standard approach to sluicing makes different predictions from the one we are suggesting here. If the ellipsis site contains the entire antecedent, (106) and (107a) should be permissible, but if the ellipsis site only contains the short construal without the island, (106) and (107a) should be on par with (105). This is because in order to avoid island violations inside the ellipsis site, a short construal is invoked and as the short construal does not include the presupposition-altering predicate, the sluice presupposes something the antecedent does not.

(106)
a.   #Črt je včeraj   povedal laž, da je enkrat lani   preplezal Jugov
        Črt AUX yesterday told   lie that AUX once   last-year climbed Jug's
        steber, ampak ne vem   kdaj.
        pillar, but   not know when
        'Yesterday Črt told a lie that he climbed Jug's pillar sometime last year,
        but I don't know when.'
b.   … when ~~Črt told a lie that~~ [he climbed Jug's pillar ____]

(107)
a.   #Da sta Žodor in Ilija nekoga   povabila na žur, je laž, ampak ne
        that AUX Žodor and Ilija someone invited   on party AUX lie but   not
        vem   koga.
        know who
        'That Žodor and Ilija invited someone to the party is a lie, but I don't
        know whom.'
b.   … who ~~[that Žodor and Ilija invited ____ to the party]~~ ~~is a lie.]~~

As shown in (106) and (107a) this prediction is borne out. So indeed, in these cases the sluice does not contain the entire antecedent.

6   Extension of the old proposal

So far we have seen that regardless of the type of island, multiple sluicing constructions, as schematized in (108), were permissible only when the corresponding wh-question, as schematized in (109), was also permissible.

(108)   … wh_1 wh_2 ~~[t_1 V [$_{WP}$ X Y t_2]]~~.

(109) wh_1 wh_2 [t_1 V [$_{WP}$ X Y t_2]]?

This suggests that sluicing does not rescue island violations. One take on this would be that the elided part of the sluice need not include the entire antecedent (e.g. Merchant 2001). Specifically, if island violations cannot be rescued, then the only way to have the remnant from inside an island as part of the sluice is not to have the island in the sluice, i.e., in the ellipsis site. So multiple sluicing that combines a wh-remnant from inside an island with a wh-remnant from outside this island cannot exist as the ellipsis site does not contain the entire antecedent, and this is sketched in (111). But when both remnants originate inside the same island, as in (112), both can front and the example is grammatical.

(110)   *… wh_1 wh_2 ~~[t_1 V [$_{island}$ X Y t_2]]~~.

(111)   …~~wh_1~~ wh_2 [~~t_1 V~~ [$_{island}$ ~~X Y~~ t_2].

(112)   … wh_1 wh_2 [~~X V~~ [$_{island}$ t_1 Y t_2].

Merchant (2001) advances his suggestion that the sluiced part is not the entire antecedent only for cases where a propositional island is violated; but given that all islands seem to behave alike when it comes to combinations of two extractions not originating from the same island, we suggest that whenever we have an apparent extraction out of an island, the ellipsis site does not contain the entire antecedent clause but that what is deleted is instead a short source that avoids island violation. In case a clear short source is unavailable, the requirement for identity between the antecedent and the sluice needs to be relaxed or understood differently, e.g., semantically, as argued by Abels (2017) and Abels and Dayal (2017). See also Cortés Rodríguez

(2022); Cortés Rodríguez & Griffiths (2024) for experimental evidence showing that short sources are preferred in sluicing.

Something similar has already been proposed for certain islands in various languages. In Dutch and German, for example, the adjective that apparently violates LBE in sluicing constructions carries the morphology of predicative adjectives (Merchant 2001). Thus, the ellipsis site cannot contain the proper antecedent clause, but it instead contains only a simple predicative structure. This also seems to be true in Slovenian. The adjectives that participate in sluicing receive predicative semantics (p.c. Erik Schoorlemmer, Klaus Abels), as shown in (113), which is also the only reading available with null nouns.[14]

(113)   Srečal je   enega starega prijatelja, ampak ne vem   kako starega.
         met   AUX one   old   friend   but   not know how old
         'He met an old friend, but I don't know how old.' = how old he is / ≠
         how long they have been friends

At this point we do not have a ready analysis for each individual type of island. Nevertheless, we want to suggest the following. PP-inside-DP islands may involve a cleft, as in (114).

(114)   Vid je razlagal teorijo o   nečem,   pa ne vem, o   čem
         Vid AUX explained theory about something but not know about what
         (je   bila teorija).
         AUX was theory
         'Vid was explaining a theory about something, but I don't know about
         what (the theory was).'

The same cannot hold for DP-inside-DP islands, for which a cleft source is impossible (54), but in these cases the remnant most likely involves a null N, as exemplified in (116).

---

14   Interestingly, case is also preserved when the remnant adjective is in a case that does not typically participate in simple predication, e.g., the dative or the instrumental. We do not have an answer for this at this point, but note that Slovenian secondary predicates agree in case, number and gender with the noun they are associated with, and that they are possible with all types of arguments (cf. Marušič, Marvin & Žaucer 2003).

(115)   Vid je   razlagal   teorijo nečesa,   pa ne vem, česa
        Vid AUX explained theory something.GEN but not know what.GEN
        (*je bila teorija).
        AUX was theory
        'Vid was explaining the theory of something, but I don't know what (it
        was about).'

(116)   …, pa ne vem, (teorijo) česa   (je razlagal Vid).
          but not know theory what.GEN AUX explain Vid
        '…, but I don't know (the theory of) what (Vid was explaining).'

And violations of the Coordinate Structure Constraint could be avoided simply
with the use of a single conjunct:

(117)   not: … who [Vid invited Peter and ___]
        but rather: … who [Vid invited ___]

This seems to be confirmed also by the fact that if we control for the collective
reading, CSC violations turn out to be much more restricted (p.c. Klaus Abels).

(118)
*Asterix in   nek Rimljan sta se   pogledala izpod   čela,   si
 Asterix and some Roman AUX REFL looked   from-under forehead, REFL.DAT
 popravila brke   in se   spoprijela, ampak ne vem   kateri Rimljan.
 fixed   moustache and REFL grabbed   but   non know which Roman
 'Asterix and some Roman looked at each other angrily, fixed their moustache
 and started a fight, but I don't know which Roman.'

(119)
*Osem in nekaj   je petindvajset, ampak ne vem   kaj / koliko.
 eight and something AUX 25   but   not know what / how-much
 'Eight and something make 25, but I don't know what / how much.'

That is, if we compare two comparable antecedent clauses that differ only in one getting the collective reading and the other one not, then the one in which the collective reading is forced is considerably worse.[15]

(120)

a. Peter in   en visok rdečelasec sta prišla na obisk. Kdo to?
    Peter and one tall   red-haired AUX came on visit   Who that
    'Peter and some redhead came for a visit. Really, who?'

b. *Peter in   en visok rdečelasec sta se   srečala. Kdo to?
    Peter   and one tall   red-haired AUX REFL met   who that
    'Peter and some redhead met. Really, who?'

7   Conclusion

We hope to have contributed to the debate regarding the question of island repair, identified by Sailor and Schütze (2014) as one of the major problems in current theoretical syntax. We argued against the very existence of island repair, presenting a novel argument in this direction (cf. Abels 2011; Barros 2012; Barros et al. 2014). If sluicing does not repair improper movement, then it clear why the availability of sluicing depends on the availability of wh-movement. More work needs to be done to better understand what truly happens in sluicing, but as island repair has been such a prominent topic in the literature, we believe that by avoiding discussion of it we can make good progress in this area.

There does seem to be a syntactic structure in the ellipsis site, but the identity requirement between the sluice and antecedent cannot be strictly syntactic. Our discussion, as presented above, suggests that the sluice sometimes only contains a subset of the antecedent. We see this paper as supporting the claim that the identity condition is a semantic condition, as also suggested by Abels (2017) and Abels and Dayal (2017), among others.

There are many questions and observations that we have left untouched in this paper, including observations that support the idea that the identity requirement is really syntactic and island repair consequently real, as well as observations that suggest the opposite. We leave a discussion of all of these issues for future research.

---

15   The particle appearing after the remnant in the sluiced part is presumably a left-periphery particle that survives sluicing in Slovenian, as argued by Marušič, Mišmaš, Plesničar, Razboršek and Šuligoj (2015) and Marušič, Mišmaš, Plesničar and Šuligoj (2018). While the example sounds most natural with it, the particle is not obligatory, and its presence/absence does not have any direct effect on the availability of this extraction.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2011. Don't repair that island! It ain't broke. *Islands in the Contemporary Theory, University of Basque Country, Victoria-Gasteiz*. November 18, 2011.

Abels, Klaus. 2017. Movement and islands. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck & Tanja Temmerman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*, 389–424. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198712398.013.17.

Abels, Klaus & Veneeta Dayal. 2017. On the syntax of multiple sluicing. In *Proceedings of NELS 47*, GLSA publications.

Adline, Egle. 2014. *Multiple Sluicing in Lithuanian*. UCL, London MA thesis.

Baker, Carl L & Michael K Brame. 1972. 'Global rules': a rejoinder. *Language* 51–75.

Barros, Matthew. 2012. A non-repair approach to island sensitivity in contrastive TP ellipsis. In *Proceedings from the annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society 48*, 61–75. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Barros, Matthew, Patrick Elliott & Gary Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Ms. Rutgers/ UCL/University of Edinburgh.

Bhattacharya, Tanmoy & Andrew Simpson. 2012. Sluicing in Indo-Aryan: an investigation of Bangla and Hindi. In Jason Merchant & Andrew Simpson (eds.), *Sluicing: CrossLinguisitic Perspectives*, 183–218. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boeckx, Cedric. 2012. *Syntactic Islands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boeckx, Cedric & Howard Lasnik. 2006. Intervention and repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37(1). 150–155.

Bošković, Željko. 2011. Rescue by PF deletion, traces as (non) interveners, and the that-trace effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(1). 1–44.

Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia linguistica* 59(1). 1–45.

Bošković, Željko. 2008. The NP/DP analysis and Slovenian. In *Proceeding of the University of Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Syntax*, vol. 1, 53–73.

Cable, Seth. 2010. *The Grammar of Q: Q-particles, wh-movement, and pied-piping*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1972. Some Empirical Issues in the Theory of Transformational Grammar. In Stanley Peters (ed.), *The Goals of Linguistic Theory*, 63–130. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw & James McCloskey. 2011. Sluicing(:) Between structure and inference. In R. Gutiérrez-Bravo, L. Mikkelsen & E. Potsdam (eds.), *Representing Language: Essays in honor of Judith Aissen*. Santa Cruz, CA: University of California Santa Cruz. 31–50.

Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw & James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural language semantics* 3(3). 239–282.

Cortés Rodríguez, Álvaro & James Griffiths. 2024. Short sources, islandhood, and pronominal correlates: New experimental support from German and Spanish for a short source approach to apparent exceptions to the clausemate condition on multiple sluicing. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 9(1).

Cortés Rodríguez, Álvaro. 2022. Multiple sluicing and islands: a cross-linguistic experimental investigation of the clausemate condition. *The Linguistic Review* 39(3). 425–455. doi:10.1515/tlr-2022-2093.

Den Dikken, Marcel. 2007. Phase extension contours of a theory of the role of head movement in phrasal extraction. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33(1). 1–41.

Fox, Danny & Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(1). 143–154.

Franks, Steven & Ljiljana Progovac. 1994. On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics. *Indiana Linguistic Studies* 7. 69–78.

Gallego, Ángel J. 2010. *Phase Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Geis, Michael Lorenz. 1970. *Adverbial Subordinate Clauses in English*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Georgieva, Ekaterina, Franc Marušič, Petra Mišmaš & Rok Žaucer. 2025. Clause mates matter. Paper presented at GLOW 47. Ms. HUN-REN, University of Nova Gorica. https://www2.ung.si/~fmarusic/pub/Georgieva_et_al-2025-07_CMC_squib.pdf

Golden, Marija. 1997. Multiple wh-questions in Slovene. In W.Browne, E. Dornisch, N. Kondrashova & D. Zec (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting 1995*. 240–266. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Grebenyova, Lydia. 2005. Sluicing and Left-branch Extraction out of Islands. In J. Alderete, C. Han & A. Kochetov (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 164–172. Somerville: Cascadilla.

Grosu, Alexander. 1972. *The Strategic Content of Island Constraints*: The Ohio State University dissertation.

Heestand, Dustin, Ming Xiang & Maria Polinsky. 2011. Resumption still does not rescue islands. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(1). 138–152.

Kehler, Andrew. 1996. Coherence and the coordinate structure constraint. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 22*, 220–231. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of NELS 31, vol. 2*, 301–320. Amherst, MA: GSLA.

Lasnik, Howard. 2014. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax* 17(1). 1–20.

Marušič, Franc, Tatjana Marvin & Rok Žaucer. 2003. Depictive secondary predication in Slovenian. In W. Browne, J. Kim, B. Partee & R. Rothstein (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Amherst Meeting 2002*. 373–392. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Marušič, Franc, Petra Mišmaš, Vesna Plesničar, Tina Razboršek & Tina Šuligoj. 2015. On a potential counter-example to Merchant' Sluicing-COMP generalization. *Grazer linguistische Studien* 83(1). 47–65.

Marušič, Franc, Petra Mišmaš, Vesna Plesničar & Tina Šuligoj. 2018. Surviving sluicing. In Denisa Lenertová, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík & Luka Szucsich (eds.), *Advances in Formal Slavic Linguistics 2016*, 193–215. Berlin: Language Science Press. doi:10.5281/zenodo.2545523.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mišmaš, Petra. 2011. *Distinctness and Slovenian*. Ms. University of Nova Gorica.

Mišmaš, Petra. 2015. *On the optionality of wh-fronting in a multiple wh-fronting language*: Univerza v Novi Gorici dissertation.

Mišmaš, Petra. 2017. Restricting Left Branch Extraction in Slovenian. Talk presented at RCAB & SinFonIJA X, Dubrovnik, Oct. 2017.

Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1998. 'Multiple Sluicing' in Japanese and the Functional Nature of wh-phrases. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 7(2). 121–152.

Potsdam, Eric. 2003. Evidence for semantic identity under ellipsis from Malagasy sluicing. In M. Kadowaki & S. Kawahara (eds.), *NELS 33: Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society, GLSA Publications*, 285–302. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Richards, Norvin. 2010. *Uttering trees*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins & Luis Vicente. 2007. Preposition stranding under sluicing. In D. Torck & L. Wetzels (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006, Selected papers from "Going Romance"*, vol. 20. 175–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ross, John R. 1969. Guess who? In Robert I. Binnick (ed.), *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252–286. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Sailor, Craig & Carson T. Schütze. 2014. *Is there repair by ellipsis?* Ms UCLA. (https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002181)

Sato, Yosuke. 2007. P-stranding generalization and Bahasa Indonesia: A myth. *Snippets* 16. 17–18.

Stepanov, Arthur. 2012. Voiding island effects via head movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 43(4). 680–693.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 1998. *Scrambling in Serbo-Croatian*. Ms. University of Connecticut.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 2008. P-stranding under sluicing in a non-P-stranding language? *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(1). 179–190.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 2006. Strong vs. weak islands. In Martin Everaert & Henk Van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, 479–531. Oxford: Blackwell.

Szabolcsi, Anna & Marcel Den Dikken. 1999. Islands. *Glot International* 4. 3–9.

Szczegielniak, Adam. 2006. *All sluiced up, but no alleviation in sight ...* Ms. Boston College.

Szczegielniak, Adam. 2008. Islands in sluicing in Polish. In N. Abner & J. Bishop (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 404–412. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Takahashi, Daiko. 1994. Sluicing in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3(3). 265–300.

Truswell, Robert. 2007. Extraction from adjuncts and the structure of events. *Lingua* 117(8). 1355–1377.

Zhang, Niina Ning. 2009. *Coordination in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.