Background: Russian allows left branch extraction from PPs in sluicing like (1a) which has no grammatical variant without ellipsis (1b). This poses a problem for move-and-delete analyses of sluicing (Merchant 2001) since the movement in question is illicit.

(1) a. *Ja pročital Rembo v otličnom perevode, no ne pomnju čjom*
I read Rimbaud in great translation but not remember whose
'I've read Rimbaud in a great translation, but I don't remember in whose translation.'

b. **ne pomnju čjom ja pročital Rembo v ____ perevode*
not remember whose I read Rimbaud in translation

Claim: We propose the derivation for (1) in (2): movement of the whole prepositional phrase (pied-piping) combined with scattered deletion of non-wh material in the higher copy (Bondarenko and Davis 2023). The advantage is that no illicit movement is posited, thus circumventing the problem.

(2) ne pomnju, PP[~~v~~ čjom ~~perevode~~] ja pročital Rembo [v ~~čjom~~ perevode].

Our derivation raises the following questions: (i) why is the same derivation unavailable for the non-elliptical variant (1b); (ii) why cannot the same derivation result in P-stranding under ellipsis (P-omission).

Ellipsis and deletion of linearization statements: To answer the question (i), we build upon the generalization of Sekerina (1997) that split scrambling of PPs in Russian cannot result in any PP-internal material preceding the P and the generalization of Davis (2020) that left branch extraction is only available for the leftmost modifier(s) of the NP.

(3) a. *{vperedi kakovo /* kakovo vperedi} oni priparkovalis doma?*
in.front which which in.front they parked house
'In front of which house did they park?'

b. *novuju Petja pročital (*každuju) ____ statju*
new P. read every paper
'Petja read (every) NEW paper.'

Both generalizations can be attributed to the role of Cyclic Linearization (Fox and Pesetsky 2005): idea that linear order is established at each phase (CP, PP, NP) and that newer linearizations should not contradict older ones. Let's focus on the LBE example. Fox and Pesetsky derive the ungrammaticality via conflict of linearization statements. In the NP phase, the linearization statements are as in (4). However, illicit left branch extraction of *novuju* results in conflicting linearization statements on the NP and CP levels (see 4).

(4) NP phase: každuju » novuju » statju
CP phase: novuju » každuju » statju

If the linearization statements are responsible for ungrammatical nature of (3a-b), removing them should result in a grammatical structure. One way to remove them is not to pronounce problematic members of the NP phase, i.e., elide them: the ungrammaticality of the non-elliptical variant in (1b) stems from the fact that it requires satisfying contradictory linearization statements.

Broadening the coverage: The Cyclic Linearization + Distributed Deletion approach predicts that other immovable NP subconstituents should be licit sluices in Russian, not only LBE of non-initial modifiers. This prediction is borne out: genitive arguments cannot move without pied-piping but are still possible sluices.

(5) a. **Kogo Anton vyučil stixotvorenie?*
who.GEN Anton learned poem
Int.:'Whose poem did Anton learn?'

b. *Anton vyučil stixotvorenie odnogo iz klassikov, no ja ne znaju kogo*
Anton learned poem one.GEN of classic.poets.GEN but I not know who.GEN
'Anton learned a poem of a classic poet but I don't remember who.'

P-omission and prosody: As it stands, our analysis is able to derive P-stranding configurations under sluicing (in violation of Merchant's P-stranding generalization): movement of the whole PP and subsequent deletion of preposition in the higher copy should be possible if the lower copy is fully elided (6a). It seems, however, that the prediction is false. However, Philippova (2014) and Ionova (2019) show that the acceptability of P-omission in Russian sluicing is correlated with the prosodic independence of the preposition (6b-c), suggesting that the P-omission derivation should not be ruled out on its own but rather regulated by prosodic considerations.

(6) a. Prosodically deficient preposition

*On ženilsja na kom-to, no nikto ne znaet, *(na) kom*
he married on someone but no.one not knows on whom

'He married someone but no one remembers.'

b. Embedded ω-preposition

Ona sidela okolo čego-to, no ja ne videla, ?(okolo) čego
She sat near something but I not saw near what

'She sat near something but I haven't seen near what.'

c. Independent ω-preposition

Oni sovetovalis' po povodu čego-to, no ja ne znaju (po povodu) čego
they consulted concerning something but I not know concerning what

'They consulted about something, but I don't know what.'

Notably, one phenomenon that is possible with prosodically deficient prepositions but is impossible with prosodically independent preposition concerns preposition doubling in split scrambling of PPs (Goncharov 2015).

(7) a. *v sinem ja pridu v platje*
in blue I come in dress

'I will come in blue dress'

b. **vperedi sinevo ja stojal vperedi doma*
in.front blue I stood in.front house

'I stood in front of the blue house.'

This pattern independently suggests that prosodic integration constrains Distributed Deletion, supporting our claim that P-omission derivations should not be ruled out fully but should rather be filtered based on prosodic well-formedness.

Conclusion: We have proposed a scattered deletion analysis for illicit left branch extraction out of a prepositional phrase that results in examples like (1). All the components of the analysis are required for in Russian: movement of the whole PP when the NP has a wh-modifier is attested (pied-piping), while scattered deletion is well-motivated for Russian left branch extraction (Bondarenko and Davis 2023). The rescue-by-deletion mechanism seems to be required for certain Russian fragment answers (see Davis 2020, Mendes and Kandybowicz 2023 for similar effects) while the unwanted consequence of P-omission across the board is curbed by prosodic factors.

References: • Bondarenko, T. and Davis, C. (2023). Concealed pied-piping in Russian: On left-branch extraction, parasitic gaps, and the nature of discontinuous nominal phrases. *Syntax*, 26(1):1–40. • Davis, C. (2020). *The linear limitations of syntactic derivations*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. • Fox, D. and Pesetsky, D. (2005). Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. • Goncharov, J. (2015). P-doubling in split PPs and information structure. *Linguistic inquiry*, 46(4):731–742. • Ionova, A. (2019). *The unbearable lightness of clitics*. PhD thesis, Leiden University. • Mendes, G. and Kandybowicz, J. (2023). Salvation by deletion in Nupe. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 54(2):299–325. • Merchant, J. (2001). *The syntax of silence:*

Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis. Oxford University Press. • Philippova, T. (2014). P-omission under sluicing, [P clitic] and the nature of P-stranding. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XXII*, 1:22. • Sekerina, I. (1997). *The syntax and processing of scrambling constructions in Russian*. PhD thesis, City University of New York.