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While non-wh-material can survive some varieties of sluicing, such as spading and swiping, it was observed that crosslinguistically in sluicing constructions only the wh-word survives ellipsis, i.e. “no non-operator material may appear in COMP” (Merchant 2001: 62, (71)). However, we consider examples from Slovenian, shown in (1), which show that in Slovenian sluicing sentences the wh-word can be followed by a discourse particle that is standardly understood as the head of some left peripheral phrase. We discuss such examples to show that in multiple wh-fronting languages, in which wh-phrases move to various positions in the left periphery, the left periphery (wh-phrases excluded) is not elided as a whole in sluicing.

(1) a. Peter je videl nekoga. Koga pa?
Peter AUX saw someone. Who PTCL
‘Peter saw someone. Who <did he see>?’
b. Peter je videl nekoga. Koga že?
Peter AUX saw someone. Who PTCL
‘Peter saw someone. Please tell me again, who <did he see>?’
c. Peter je videl Janeza. Koga še?
Peter AUX saw Janez. Who PTCL
‘Peter saw someone. Who else <did he see>?’

These cases are interesting because (i) none of these particles are operators, i.e. operators, as Merchant uses the term, are wh-elements, which are morphologically complex and contain the wh-morpheme k-/č- in Slovenian, which is not the case with particles in (1), and (ii) these particles are not DP internal particles comparable to the English else. This can be supported with the fact that these particles can be positioned after the clitic cluster, which in Slovenian does not break syntactic constituents (Golden & Milojević Sheppard 2000), (2a) and (3a), and by the fact that particles cannot follow wh-phrases when these appear in situ, (3c). In addition, even še ‘even’, as in (1c), can be rephrased in a way, where še does not seem to be part of the nominal phrase containing the wh-word, (4). Slovenian particles also behave differently from German modal particles, which cannot appear before the verb in a V2 clause (Ott & Struckmeier 2016), cf. (2b) and (3b). It is therefore puzzling why these particles survive sluicing in Slovenian.

(2) a. Koga je pa Peter videl? who AUX PTCL Peter see
‘Who it is that Peter saw?’

(3) a. Koga je še včeraj komu Peter predstavil?
who AUX PTCL yesterday who Peter introduce
‘Who else did Peter yesterday introduce to who?’
b. *Koga še je včeraj komu Peter predstavil?
c. *Koga je Peter včeraj komu še predstavil?

(4) a. Peter je videl Janeza. Koga druža *(še)?
Peter AUX saw Janez. Who else PTCL
‘Peter saw someone. Who else?’
b. *Peter je videl Janeza. Koga še druža?

We take these particles to be discourse particles that express different meanings: še expresses addition, (1c), že a reprise question, (5), pa topic, (6), and contrastive focus (pa-contr.), (7).
These particles can co-occur, but appear in a fixed word order, as shown in (8). Further, in multiple sluicing in Slovenian, the particles need to appear after the first wh-phrase, (9).

(5) Vem, da sem nekoga videl. Skušam se spomniti koga že.
    I know that is somebody see try refl remember who PTCL
    ‘I know I saw somebody. I’m trying to remember who.’
(6) Janeza pa danes še nisem videl.
    Janez PTCL today yet not see
    ‘As for Janez, I haven’t seen him today yet.’
(7) Jaz bom gledal fuzbal, ti pa košarko.
    I will watch soccer you PTCL basketball
    ‘While I will watch soccer, you’ll be watching basketball.’
(8) a. Koga že še pogrešam?
    who PTCL PTCL miss
    ‘Who else am I missing?’
b. # Koga še že pogrešam.
    who PTCL PTCL who
    ‘Somebody hates someone?’ Please tell me again, who whom?’

Based on this and the similarities between these particles and other topics and foci in wh-questions in Slovenian, we argue that these discourse particles appear in the extended left periphery in the sense of Rizzi (1997). The word order (i.e. hierarchy in the left periphery) of the particles is shown in (10).

(10) \[\text{INTERROGATIVE} \text{wh-phrase} \text{FOCP }\text{že/pa-new} \text{TOPP }\text{še} \text{FOCP pa-contr.}[\text{WHP wh-phrase …}]]

Assuming (only) the IP gets deleted in sluicing, both wh-phrases in a multiple sluice have to move higher than IP, (9), the first one to INTERROGATIVEP, the lower one to WHP (Mišmaš 2015). With this in mind, we propose that if a language only exhibits single wh-fronting to a single projection in the left periphery, only the material in this projection will survive sluicing (which is what Merchant’s (2001) “Sluicing-COMP generalization” predicts). But, crucially, if a language exhibits multiple wh-fronting to several projections, both these projections and any additional material in the left periphery of a (multiple) wh-question can survive sluicing. If multiple wh-fronting languages move wh-words to various landing sites within the left periphery and if left periphery (wh-phrases excluded) is not elided as a whole in sluicing in these languages, then we should find similar particles also in other multiple wh-fronting languages. This prediction is borne out in Serbo-Croatian, (11).

(11) Ivan je došao. Ko još? / Ko to? Serbo-Croatian
    Ivan aux came who else who this
    ‘Ivan came.’ ‘Who else?’ ‘Who?’

Additionally, if our proposal is on the right track, then we can make a further prediction: Just as discourse particles can survive sluicing, so can the Topic or Focus Phrases from the specifiers of the same projections. This is confirmed with examples in which a focused phrase appears in a sluice in addition to a wh-phrase:

(13) Vem, kdo ne mara Jakata, ampak ne vem, kdo TONETA.
    know who not like Jaka.GEN but not know who Tone.GEN
    ‘I know who doesn’t like Jaka, but I don’t know who <doesn’t like> Tone.’