The unbearable lightness of WHAT?: A clausal ellipsis analysis of English reprise fragments

James Griffiths   Güliz Güneş   Anikó Lipták
University of Tübingen   Leiden University   Leiden University

1.   Introduction

- *Reprise fragments* (RFs) (1B-3B) form a subclass of *clarification requests*   (Ginzburg 2012)

(1) A: Is John a neurophysiologist?   B: NEURO?
(2) A: Did Bo finagle a raise?   B: WHO? / BO? / FINAGLE?
              (Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:299)

(3) A: John's bought a red car.   B: A {RED / WHAT} car?

- RFs and *reprise questions* (RQs) function identically: both can either be *confirmational* or *information-seeking*   (Ginzburg 2012)

  Confirmational:
  o When the requestor considers herself to have complete knowledge of the content, form, phonology, register, discursive impact, (etc.) of the reprised utterance.
  o RF serves to articulate the requestor's surprise (pleasant or otherwise) about the content of, the delivery of, or perlocutionary intention behind the reprised utterance.

(4) A: Did Dracula attend the party?
     B: Did a VAMPIRE attend the party? C'mon, they don't exist!   (RQ)
     B′: A VAMPIRE? C'mon, they don't exist!   (RF)

(5) A: Has Bill stopped smoking yet?
     B: Has he STOPPED smoking? I didn't know he'd started!   (RQ)
     B′: STOPPED? I didn't know he'd started!   (RF)

  Information-seeking:
  o When the requestor is not confident that she has complete knowledge of the content, form, phonology, register, or discursive impact, (etc.) of the reprised utterance.

(6) A: John was cozened by the conman.
     B: He was COZENED by the conman? What does that mean?   (RF)
     B′: COZENED? What does that mean?   (RQ)

(7) B1: How many euros is this?
     A1: Three.
     B2: It's FREE?   (RF)
     B2′: FREE?   (RQ)
     A2: No, it's THREE euros.

(8) A: For John and me, the plan is infeasible.
     B: For John and ME it's infeasible? Are you sure it's not 'for John and I'? (RQ)
     B′: For John and ME? Are you sure it's not 'for John and I'? (RF)

o RFs have received substantial attention in nontransformational circles (Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Ginzburg & Cooper 2004, Kempson et al. 2007, Ginzburg 2012)

o RFs have received only passing mention in Minimalism: Merchant (2004:709) refers to them as "a kind of metalinguistic conjunction"

Our intuition: the functional equivalence between RFs and RQs exemplified in (4) to (8) is instructive → **RFs are RQs to which clausal ellipsis applies**.

[§2] Show that RQs and RFs are not quotative or beyond the "core grammar"

[§3] Show that RFs show exactly the same (anti-)connectivity effects as *standard* (i.e. non-reprise) fragments (SFs), which motivates a clausal ellipsis analysis of RFs

[§4] Outline Griffiths's (2019) *Syntactic Question* (SQ) approach to clausal ellipsis

[§5] Show how the SQ approach provides a natural account of both SFs and RFs

[§6] Show how the orthodox 'move-and-delete' (M&D) approach to clausal ellipsis (Merchant 2001, 2004) cannot be easily extended to capture both SFs and RFs

Empirical contribution → Introduce RFs to Minimalist researchers
→ Present data not reported in any previous study of RFs

Theoretical contribution → Provide new evidence to favour an in-situ, Q-equivalence approach to clausal ellipsis over the standard M&D approach

2.   Reprise questions and fragments <u>are</u> "core" grammatical phenomena

• RQs and RFs are **not** simply *mentioned* (Davidson 1979) / *quoted* repetitions of a previous utterance in which a subelement is focus-marked or substituted for a wh-phrase.

• RQs and RFs can deviate from the reprised utterance through a change in clause-type (9), deixis-shift (10), synonym, hypernym, and pronominal substitution ((11) to (14)), dative alternation (15), and the application of VP-ellipsis (16).

(9)   A: Pass me the monkey wrench!   B: You want me to pass you the WHAT?

(10) A: Scratch <u>my</u> little toe!   B: Scratch <u>your</u> little TOE?
                                             B′: <u>Your</u> little TOE?

(11) A: Did you go to <u>New York</u> recently?   B: Did I go to <u>the BIG APPLE</u> recently?
                                             B′: To <u>the BIG APPLE</u>?

(12) A: Do you want an <u>Alsatian</u>?   B: Do I want a <u>DOG</u>?
                                             B′: A <u>DOG</u>?

(13) A: I want <u>John</u> to kiss me.   B: You want <u>HIM</u> to kiss you?
                                             B′: <u>HIM</u>?

(14) A: I want <u>him</u> to kiss me. B: You want John to kiss you?
                                        B′: John?

(15) A: I should've given <u>Bo your room</u>. B: You should've given <u>my room to Bo</u>?
                                                 B′: Given <u>my room to Bo</u>?

(16) A: The rumour that Dracula came to   B: The rumour that WHO did Δvp is surely
        brunch is surely false.   false?
                                                 B′: That WHO did Δvp?

- Wh-substitution in RQs and RFs must obey morphological and/or syntactic constituency (Beck & Reis 2018, *contra* Bolinger 1978, Janda 1985, Sudo 2010) ((17) and (18)). This is only expected if RQs and RFs are grammatical phenomena.

(17) A: This is unbelievable!
     B: * This is WHAT-lievable?
     B′: * WHAT-leivable?   (where *what* replaces the linguistic string *unbe-*)

(18) A: Has John given the painting by Klimt to someone undeserving of it?
     B: * Has John given the painting WHAT of it?
     B′: * Given the painting WHAT of it?
                    (where *what* replaces the linguistic string *by Klimt to someone undeserving*)

- Wh-substitution in RQs and RFs has grammatical repercussions. This is unexpected if this process were merely string-substitution
  o *In Hungarian*: wh-phrases that replace plural DP must display plural morphology (19)
            definite agreement on the verb changes when a wh-phrase replaces a definite DP (20)

(19) A: János megette   a   carambolát.
         János PV.eat.PST.3SG.**DEF** the starfruit.ACC
         'János ate the starfruit.'

     B: Mit   {evett   / * ette}   meg?   (focus-fronting reprise Q)
         what.ACC   eat.PST.3SG.**INDEF**   eat.PST.3SG.**DEF** PV

     B′: {Megevett   / * Megette}   mit?   (in-situ reprise Q)
          PV.eat.PST.3SG.**INDEF**   PV.eat.PST.3SG.**DEF** what.ACC
         '(János) ate WHAT?'

(20) A: János eladott   húsz   Cupuaçut.
         János PV.sell.PST.3SG twenty   Cupuaçu.ACC
         'János sold twenty Cupuaçus.'

     B: Miket   adott   el?   B′: Eladott   miket?
         what.**PL**.ACC sell.PST.3SG PV   PV.sell.PST.3SG   what.**PL**.ACC
         '(János) sold WHAT?'   '(János) sold WHAT?'

3

- Locality restrictions are observed in RFs in Hungarian and Japanese. The RF is unacceptable if its correlate is contained in a syntactic island ((20) and (21))

(21) *Hungarian*
    A: Eladtam [ISLAND   a **húsz** kilós   dinnyét].   (the correlate is **boldfaced**)
        PV.sell.PST.1SG.DEF   the twenty kilo.ADJ melon.ACC
        'I have sold the twenty-kilo melon.'
    B: * HÚSZ? ('TWENTY?')

(22) *Japanese* (Wataru Uegaki, pers. comm.)
    A: John-wa [ISLAND okusan-ni **datyoo-o** katta   hito]-o   sagasite iru.
        John-TOP   wife-for ostrich ACC bought person-ACC looking-for
        'John is looking for the person that bought an ostrich for his wife.'
    B: * Datyoo-o da-tte?
        ostrich-ACC COP-COMP
        'An OSTRICH?'

- RFs must be morphological or syntactic constituents ((23) and (24)). Again, this is unexpected if RFs are merely verbatim repetitions of phonological strings.

(23) A: John's a neurophysiologist now.   ([neuro [[physi] ologist]])
      B: NEURO? / NEUROphysiologist? / * NEUROphysi?

(24) A: Will the boss fire [&P Dracula [&′ and Cthulhu]] on Monday?
      B: [&′ and CTHULHU]? / * [&P DRACULA [&′ and ?

3. Reprise fragments show the same (anti-)connectivity effects as standard fragments

[I]   *RFs and their correlates must match in morphological case*

(25) A: Did **he** phone you?   B: HE? / * HIM?   (Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:302)

(26) A: Ist **dieser**   Platz noch frei?
        Is this.NOM place still   free?
      B: {DIESER / * DIESEN   / * DIESEM} Platz?
        This.NOM / this.ACC /   this.DAT place   (ibid.)

[I]   *RFs and their correlates must obey the same Binding Theory principles*

(27) A: John$_i$ will arrive in his$_i$ car.   B: * In JOHN$_i$'s car?   [Principle C violation]

(28) A: John$_i$ thinks that he$_i$ is being spied on.
      B: * That the bastard$_i$ is being SPIED on?   [Principle C violation]

(29) A: Does John$_i$ think that Mary will kiss him$_i$?

B: *   That Mary will KISS himself$_i$?   [Principle A]

[III]   *RFs and their correlates must display morphological parallelism between functional morphemes*

(30) A: Did he adore the book?   B: ADORE? / * ADORED?   (Ginzburg 2012:152)

A: Is John hugging Pete?   B: HUGGING? / * HUGGED?

A: Were you cycling yesterday?   B: CYCLING / BIKING? / * BIKED?   (ibid.)

[IV]   *Quantifier-binding relations established in the reprised utterance are retained in the RF*

(31) A: [Every Englishman]$_i$ admires his$_i$ mother.

B: His$_i$ MOTHER?   [bound-variable reading possible]

[V]   *RFs and their correlates must match in argument-structural properties*

(32) A: **Dracula** asked John on a date.   B: He was asked on a date by DRACULA?

B′: *   By DRACULA?

(33) A: They loaded **hobnobs** into the van.   B: They loaded the van with WHAT?

B′: *   With WHAT?

[VI]   *RFs and SFs show the same <u>anti</u>-connectivity effects*

(34) A: I hate Star Wars.   B: <u>I</u> hate Star Wars, too.   (standard assertion)

B′:   {<u>Me</u> /* <u>I</u>}, too.   (standard fragment)

(35) A: You're banned from the bar.   B: <u>I</u>'m banned? What for?   (reprise question)

B′:   {<u>ME</u> / * <u>I</u>}? What for?   (reprise fragment)

Conclusion   →   Standard and reprise fragments show identical (anti-)connectivity effects.
            →   If one pursues a clausal ellipsis analysis of SFs, it should extend to RFs.

4.   *Syntactic Question* (SQ) *approach to clausal ellipsis (Griffiths 2019)*

- Clausal ellipsis occurs around FOC-marked (X$_{FOC}$) constituents   *(see §5.3 for further details)*

> X$_{FOC}$ →   the maximal extent of pointwise function application from a lexical source that introduces semantic alternatives (i.e. an F-marked item or a wh-phrase)
>
>   →   corresponds to Selkirk's (1984) notion of *FOC-marked* constituents and Drubig's (1994) and Krifka's (2006) notion of *Focus Phrases*
>
> i.e.   [… [$_{XP-FOC}$ … {X$_F$ / wh}] …]   ◄⋯⋯ = pointwise function application)

5

- Clausal ellipsis targets Force in English (i.e. direct and indirect questions and declarative clauses with assertoric force; Griffiths 2011, Weir 2014)

(36) a. A: Joanna went swimming with someone.
  B: [ForceP [CP [DP-FOC who]₁ did [TP she go swimming with t_1]]]?   (standard frag Q)

  b. A: Joanna went swimming with someone.
  B: Yeah, [ForceP [TP she went swimming [PP-FOC with Toby]]].   (standard frag A)

(37) **Syntactic identity condition on clausal ellipsis**
  Let E be the complement of Force in an elliptic clause and let Q be a salient question that precedes E in the discourse.

  Clausal ellipsis is licit in E iff E and Q (or a phrase in Q) have identical syntactic phrase markers, *modulo* X_FOC.

(38) A: Who will Sue fire?   B: Yeah, who?
                            B′: Bob.

(39) A: [ForceP [CP [DP-FOC who] [C′ will [TP Sue [T′ <will> [VP fire <[DP-FOC who]>]]]]]]?
  B: [ForceP [CP [DP-FOC who] [C′ will [TP Sue [T′ <will> [VP fire <[DP-FOC who]>]]]]]]?
  B′: [ForceP   [TP Sue [T′ <will> [VP fire   [DP-FOC Bob]   ]]]].

- Clausal ellipsis must be licensed by a <u>**salient question**</u> (as specified in (37))

  o *Salient* = the closest, unanswered *Discourse Unit* (Asher & Lascaradis 2003)

(40) A: What will John sing?   B: * Whatever it is, he will sing it TWICE.
                              B′: * Whatever it is, WHEN will he sing it?

  (A in (40) is answered (albeit dismissively) by *whatever it is* = A is not a salient Q)

- If the explicit antecedent utterance is not a question, a wh-question must be **pragmatically accommodated**   (Larsson et al. 2000, Barros 2014)

Accommodating a licensing Q

- Although accommodation is pragmatic, it makes reference to syntax:
  o Only syntactically well-formed Qs can be accommodated
  o The process of accommodation makes reference to the syntax of the explicit antecedent utterance (ANT)
       (Fox 1999, van Craenenbroeck 2012, Johnson 2012, Thoms 2013, 2015, Barros 2014)

The process of accommodation

- When the hearer encounters a fragment F without an explicit Q antecedent, she treats F as (the answer to) a wh-question that she must pragmatically accommodate, using ANT as her syntactic resource

(41) *Accommodation algorithm*   (Griffiths 2019: Appendix)

Let W be an X$_{FOC}$ containing a wh-item.

Step 1: [a] *To create a merger-type elliptic clause*: Ensure that ⟦W⟧ equals the alternative semantic value (⟦X⟧^{f}) for some syntactic constituent X in ANT.[1]

[b] *To create a sprouting-type elliptic clause*: Do nothing additional with W at this step.

Step 2: Obeying the constraints in (42), generate a syntactically well-formed wh-question containing W.

(42) *Constraints on accommodation*   (Griffiths 2019: Appendix)

a. **No new morphological roots**
Aside from W (see (41)), an implicit *wh*-question cannot contain any morphosyntactic roots that are not also present in ANT.

b. **No disjoint pronouns**
Any pronoun contained in the implicit *wh*-question must co-refer with an entity in ANT.

c. **Lexical V comes with its argument-structure baggage**
(i) If a lexical verb V is syntactically accommodated from ANT, so are the interpretable morphosyntactic features of the EVENTIVE CORE associated with V in the antecedent.[2]
(ii) If a lexical verb V is syntactically accommodated from ANT, and if an argument or event-modifying adjunct XP associated with V in the antecedent is also syntactically accommodated, then the argument-structure relation between V and XP must also be accommodated.

- **Main upshot of the accommodation procedure in (41) and (42):**
  - The phrase marker of an accommodated Q may differ from the phrase marker of the explicit antecedent utterance from which it is accommodated
  - This allows elliptic clauses to syntactically "mismatch" with their explicit antecedents while satisfying the syntactic identity condition in (37)
  - The conditions in (42) are formulated such that they account for attested mismatches (see Rudin 2019 and references in there) without overgenerating anisomorphic elliptic clauses

(43) **Concrete example 1:** the accommodation procedure generates isomorphic and anisomorphic cleft-like licensing Qs

---

[1] Step 1[a] captures the observation that merger-type fragments inherit the content of their correlates (see Chung et al. 1995, Romero 1998, Barros 2014, Weir 2014, Jacobson 2016, and Messick et al. 2016 for various perspectives on this idea). Note that ⟦X⟧^{f} can be coerced: in the case of *exceptive sluices* such as (i), the presence of *else* in the sluiced wh-phrase indicates that, for the sake of accommodating a suitable antecedent question, the set of individuals corresponding to ⟦Karen⟧^{f} is updated to exclude Karen herself (cf. Barros 2014).

(i)   Karen has applied for the position, but I don't know who else.

[2] The EVENTIVE CORE of a clause is its highest *v*P that is associated with an event-introducing predicate (Rudin 2019:271).

A: Someone fired Bill$_i$.   B: Yeah, Sue.

Accommodable Qs: a.   *who fired {Bill / him$_i$}?*
                              b.   *who was it that fired {Bill / him$_i$}?*
                              c.   *who was it*$_{E\text{-type}}$?

Possible elliptic clauses: Sue fired {Bill / him$_i$}.   (licensed by (43a))
                                         It was Sue that fired {Bill / him$_i$}.   (licensed by (43b))
                                         It was Sue.   (licensed by (43c))

(44) **Concrete example 2**: the accommodation procedure generates a licensing Q that mismatches in tense with the explicit antecedent

   A: Your favourite plant is still alive.
   B: Yeah, but for how long?   (adapted from Rudin 2019: ex. 22)

         Accommodable Q: *for how long will it be alive?*
         Elliptic clause: for how long will it be alive?

NB: Like explicit Qs, accommodated Qs must be <u>salient</u> to license clausal ellipsis:

   o Q must be accommodated from the "at-issue" discourse unit   (*usually the most recent DU*)

(45) A: [$_α$ Mary kissed a dancer last night.] [$_β$ John's always doing stuff like that, too.] [$_γ$ His behavior at parties is very unpredictable.]   (where α, β, γ = discourse units)

   B: * But d'you know who Mary kissed last night?

   o Q must be unanswered when the fragment is encountered   (Barker's 2013 'Answer Ban')

(46) * Mary will forgive Paul, but I don't know WHO Mary will forgive.
        (accommodated Q "*who will Mary forgive?*" already answered by ANT)

(47) * Mary will forgive Paul, but I don't know WHO she is.
        (accommodated Q "*who is she$_{(the\ woman\ who\ will\ forgive\ Paul)}$*" already answered by ANT)

NB: An additional restriction on fragment answers (but not fragment questions):

   o If ANT of fragment answer is a Q, then the fragment answer must answer that Q (or some accommodated Q′, where Q and Q′ pick out the same set of propositions)
        (Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Reich 2002, 2007, Krifka 2006, Weir 2014, Jacobson 2016, Griffiths 2019)

(48) A: Who will see Frank?   B: * S/he will see Frank at 10pm.
(49) A: What will he sing?   B: And when will he sing it?

5. Capturing the distribution of standard and reprise fragments in the SQ approach

5.1. *Standard fragments*

- According to the SQ approach, SFs with assertoric or wh-question ANTs are licensed by syntactically well-formed (accommodated) standard wh-questions

- This gives rise to a number of correct predictions (CPs):

CP1: SFs of this type must be XPs

Why? Such fragments must correspond in size to the X_{FOC} of an (accommodated) licensing Q, and X_{FOC}s must undergo phrasal movement well-formed standard wh-questions
(Griffiths 2019)

(50) a.   A: Lisa will TILT the image.
     B: * No, REVOLVE.   * [$_V$ *what*]$_1$ *will Lisa* [$_{VP}$ t_1 *the image*]?

   b.   A: UNDER the bed is the best hiding place.
     B: * No, IN.   * [$_V$ *what*]$_1$ [$_{PP}$ t_1 *the bed*] *is the best HP*?

   c.   A: A PSYCHOlinguist just passed by.
     B: * No, NEURO.   * [$_V$ *what*]$_1$ *a* [$_N$ t_1 *-linguist*] *just passed by*?

CP2: SFs of this type cannot be XPs selected by a lexical head

Why? Such fragments must correspond to the X_{FOC} of a well-formed (accommodated) licensing Q, and X_{FOC}s selected by lexical heads cannot undergo overt wh-movement
(Cable 2010)

(51) A: Boris just ate with someone important.
   B: Yeah, [$_{DP}$ Donald Trump].   [$_{DP}$ *who*] *did Boris just eat with?*
   B′:   Yeah, [$_{PP}$ with Donald Trump].   [$_{PP}$ *with whom*] *did Boris just eat?*
   B″: * Yeah, [$_{VP}$ ate with Donald Trump].   * [$_{vP/VP}$ *eat with whom*] *did Boris just?*

(52) A: Who did Boris just eat with?
   B: [$_{DP}$ Donald Trump].   [$_{DP}$ *who*] *did Boris just eat with?*
   B′: ? [$_{PP}$ with Donald Trump].   [$_{PP}$ *with whom*] *did Boris just eat?*
   B″: * [$_{vP}$ ate with Donald Trump].   * [$_{vP/VP}$ *eat with whom*] *did Boris just?*

CP3: The F-marked item in an SF of this type cannot be too deeply embedded inside the SF, e.g. inside a Spell-Out domain (AP, NP, PP, VP) (Cable 2010)

Why? No well-formed (accommodated) licensing Q can be generated to license the ellipsis that yields such fragments. Such a Q would require massive wh-pied-piping, which is (generally) banned in English standard wh-questions.

(53) [*Topic-setting*]   C: Most big companies have bosses from places that are unexciting, such as Swindon or Milton Keynes. How dull!

   A: I heard recently that Macrosaft will merge with a company with a boss from *somewhere exotic*.

B: Yeah, [PP from VANUATU].
B′: * Yeah, [DP a company [PP with [DP a boss from VANUATU]]].

(54) a. *From where does s/he come?*   (for (53B))
  b. * [DP-*FOC* *A company with a boss from where*]₁ *will Macrosaft merge with t₁?* (for (53B′))

CP4: SFs of this type cannot have island-bound correlates in ANT when no well-formed isomorphic or "island-evading" anisomorphic licensing Q can be accommodated

(55) A: [ISLAND A drink during **the intermission**] will help to lessen one's anger.
  B: * Yeah, (and) the second act, too.

(56) a. * [What else]₁ will a drink during t₁ help to lessen one's anger?   *isomorphic Q*
  b. * [What else]₁ is a drink during t₁?   *anisomorphic Q*

(57) A: I heard that Frank is a **somniferously** hopeless yoga instructor.
  B: * Yeah, (and) extremely, too.

(58) a. * [AdvP How else]₁ is he [ISLAND a t₁ hopeless yoga instructor]?   *isomorphic Q*
  b. * [AdvP How else]₁ is he t₁?   *anisomorphic Q*

(59) [*Context*: Tony, the local blacksmith, is known for his flamboyant methods of welding.]
  A: There are rumours going around that Tony's been wondering what to weld **in some bizarre new way** since Saturday.
  B: * Really? *How?*   [intended embedded reading of *how*]

(60) a. * How₁ has Tony been wondering [ISLAND what to weld t₁]?   *isomorphic Q*
  b. * How₁ is it t₁?   *anisomorphic Q*

- According to the SQ approach, a SFs with an alternative question (AltQ) ANT is licensed by that ANT
- This gives rise to a number of correct predictions:

CP1: SFs of this type need not be XPs
Why? In an AltQ ANT, the FOC-marked constituent (X_FOC) that contains the queried alternatives does not undergo phrasal movement, and therefore need not be phrasal. Because the SF corresponds to this X_FOC in ANT, it need not be phrasal either.

(61) a. A: Will Lisa [v TILT or REVOLVE] the image?   B: REVOLVE.
  b. A: Is [P UNDER or IN] the bed is the best hiding place? B: IN.
  c. A: Did a [Prefix PSYCHO- or NEURO]-linguist or just pass by? B: NEURO.

(62) *For (61a):*
  A: [ForceP [CP should [TP she <should> [VP [v-FOC [v REVOLVE] or [v TILT]] [DP the image]]]]]?
  B: [ForceP   [TP she   should   [VP [v-FOC REVOLVE]   [DP the image]]]].

CP2: SFs of this type can be XPs selected by a lexical head

Why? In an AltQ ANT, the FOC-marked constituent (X$_{FOC}$) that contains the queried alternatives does not undergo A′-movement, and therefore need not be an A′-movement phrase. Because the SF corresponds to this X$_{FOC}$ in ANT, it need not be A′-movable either.

(63) A: Will John [$_{vP/VP}$ [BUY a cake] or [COOK one]]?
      B: [$_{vP/VP}$ COOK one].   * [$_{vP/VP}$ *what*] *will John*?

5.2. *Reprise fragments*

(64) **Licensing According to Function (LAF) conjecture**   (cf. Ginzburg & Cooper 2004)
      Standard fragments must be licensed by standard questions, whereas reprise fragments must be licensed by reprise questions.

      [*Assuming a particular syntax for reprise questions, this conjecture is straightforwardly derived under the SQ approach, see Appendix 1*]

- English reprise questions (RQs) are not formed by overt or covert movement
- In RQs, the X$_{FOC}$ containing the echo-focus is bound from the left-periphery
                                                        (Sobin 2010, Chernova 2014)

(65) a. Pass you the {WHAT / SPANNER}?
      b. [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [pass you [$_{DP-FOCi}$ the {WHAT / SPANNER}]]]]?   (*simplified*)

- RFs must correspond to X$_{FOCS}$ in (accommodated) reprise questions
- Because these X$_{FOCS}$ do not undergo wh-movement, they need not obey the constraints that X$_{FOCS}$ in standard wh-questions must
- Consequently, the SQ approach predicts that RFs have a freer distribution than SFs. This is borne out:

CP1: RFs need not correspond to XPs: they can be Xs, X′s, and subwords

Why? Well-formed licensing RQs can be accommodated whose X$_{FOC}$ is not phrasal, as no phrasal movement is required to these RQs

(66) a. A. Did she bebother the children?
          B: [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [did she [$_{v-FOCi}$ {BEBOTHER / be-WHAT-er}$_F$] the children]]]]?

          Accommodated licensing RQ:
              [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [did she [$_{v-FOCi}$ {BEBOTHER / be-WHAT-er}$_F$] the children]]]]?

      b. A: Will the boss fire Dracula and Cthulhu on Monday?
          B: [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [will the boss fire [$_{\&P}$ Dracula [$_{\&'-FOCi}$ and {CTHULHU / Cth-WHO-lhu}$_F$]] on Monday]]]]?

Accommodated licensing RQ:
        [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [will the boss fire [$_{\&P}$ Dracula [$_{\&'\text{-}FOCi}$ and {CTHULHU / Cth-WHO-lhu}$_F$]] on Monday]]]]?

    c.   A: John's a neurophysiologist now.
        B: [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [he's a [[$_{Prefix\text{-}FOCi}$ NEURO] [[physi] ologist]]]]]?

Accommodated licensing RQ:
        [C$_{Ri}$ [$_{ForceP}$ [he's a [[$_{Prefix\text{-}FOCi}$ NEURO] [[physi] ologist]]]]]?

CP2: XPs that are selected by functional heads can be RFs

Why? The ban on X$_{FOCS}$ that are complements of functional heads undergoing A′-movement is irrelevant to generating well-formed accommodated RQs, as RQs are formed without recourse to A′-movement

(67) A: Boris just ate with Dracula.
      B: [$_{DP}$ {WHO / DRACULA}]?   *Boris just ate with* [$_{DP\text{-}FOC}$ {*WHO/DRACULA*}]?
      B′:   [$_{PP}$ with {WHO / DRACULA}]?   *Boris just ate* [$_{PP\text{-}FOC}$ *with* {*WHO/DRACULA*}]?
      B″:   [$_{VP}$ ate with {WHO / DRACULA}]?   *Boris just* [$_{vP\text{-}FOC}$ *ate with* {*WHO/DRACULA*}]?

(68)   A: John often thinks that Pete introduced him to Dracula.
    a.   B: John often thinks that Pete introduced him to [$_{DP\text{-}FOC}$ {WHO / DRACULA}]?
    b.   B: John often thinks that Pete introduced him [$_{PP\text{-}FOC}$ to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
    c.   B: John often thinks that Pete [$_{VP\text{-}FOC}$ introduced him to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
    d.   B: John often thinks [$_{CP\text{-}FOC}$ that Pete introduced him to {WHO / DRACULA}]?
    e.   B: John often [$_{vP\text{-}FOC}$ thinks that Pete introduced him to {WHO / DRACULA}]?

CP3: The echo-focused item can be deeply embedded inside the RF, e.g. inside a Spell-Out domain (AP, NP, PP, VP)   (Cable 2010)

Why? No massive pied-piping is required to generate well-formed accommodated RQs

(69) [*Topic setting*] C: Most big companies have bosses from places that are unexciting, such as Swindon or Milton Keynes. How dull!
    A: I heard recently that Macrosaft will merge with a company with a boss from Vanuatu.
    B: [$_{DP}$ A company [$_{PP}$ with [$_{DP}$ a boss from {VANUATU/WHERE}]]]?

CP3: RFs can have island-bound correlates, even when no well-formed island-evading RQ can be accommodated (compare the examples in (70) to (72) with those in (55) to (60))

Why? Syntactic islands are irrelevant to generating well-formed licensing RQs, as RQs are formed without recourse to movement

(70) A: [ISLAND A drink during **the intermission**] will help to lessen one's anger.
     B: The INTERMISSION? No way!
     B′: The (inter-)WHAT?

(71) A: I heard that Frank is a **somniferously** hopeless yoga instructor.
     B: SOMNIFEROUSLY? Surely not!
     B′: Somni-WHAT-ously?

(72) A: Tony's been wondering what to weld **blindfolded** for some time now.
     B: Weld BLINDFOLDED? Is he crazy?
     B′: Weld HOW?

5.3. *No headless fragments*

- The only morphosyntactic restriction on English RFs reported so far is that they must be *constituents*.
- Another important restriction not mentioned so far is that RFs cannot be phrases whose head has vacated via head-movement (i.e. RFs cannot be *headless*)

(73) A: Will you go to the party tomorrow? I think I'll give it a miss.
     B: [You'll [$_{vP}$ give$_1$ [$_{VP}$ it t_1 a {MISS / WHAT}]]]?
     B′: * [You'll [$_{vP}$ give$_1$ [$_{VP}$ it t_1 a {MISS / WHAT}]]]?

(74) A: Falafel makes me liverish.
     B: [It [$_{vP}$ makes$_1$ [$_{VP}$ you t_1 {LIVERISH / WHAT}]]]?
     B′: * [It [$_{vP}$ makes$_1$ [$_{VP}$ you t_1 {LIVERISH / WHAT}]]]?

(75) A: Will she kiss Dracula, d'you think?
     B: [Will$_1$ [$_{TP}$ she t_1 kiss {DRACULA / WHO}]]?   *no ellipsis*
     B′: * [Will$_1$ [$_{TP}$ she t_1 kiss {DRACULA / WHO}]]?

- This restriction applies to SFs, too:

(76) a. A: Will Lucy give him CHOCOLATE or will she give him CAKE?
         B: * [She will give$_1$ [$_{vP}$ him t_1 cake]].
     b. A: Does alcohol make him happy or make him sad?
         B: * [It makes$_1$ [$_{VP}$ him t_1 sad].

- The formal licensing mechanisms of the SQ approach provide a natural explanation for this restriction:

- ***Formal licensing of clausal ellipsis in the SQ approach***
  - [E]-feature borne by designated functional head H, instructs PF to delete HP
  - Lexical source of alternatives (F-marked item or wh-word) optionally bears an [R]-feature, which demands pronunciation of nodes bearing [R]   (Landau 2019)

- o [R] percolates upwards, coinciding with (or being parasitic on) FOC-percolation
- o [E] and [R] have conflicting demands. Optimal solution = ellipsis around X_{FOC}

(77) $[_{HP} H_{[E]} ... X_{FOC[R]} ...] \rightarrow [_{HP}\emptyset ... X_{FOC\varphi} ...]$,   where φ = phonological realisation

$\emptyset$ = nonpronunciation

- A PF-feature on XP (or X′) such as [R] is active at PF only if X is **PF-VISIBLE** (i.e. not deleted)   (Landau 2019)
- Because both copies of $X_{[R]}$ are PF-invisible in "headless fragment" configurations, [R] cannot be active (78). Thus, the headless XP cannot survive ellipsis.

(78) *Generalized schema for headless fragments*
$[... [_{YP} Y+X_{[R]} [_{XP} ... X_{[R]} ...]] ...]$

ellipsis   copy-deletion

6.   The M&D approach cannot be easily extended to capture both SFs and RFs

- The orthodox "move-and-delete" (M&D) approach (see Merchant 2001, 2004)
  - o The deletion that yields clausal ellipsis applies unselectively within a clause, requiring remnants to escape that clause via movement (74B)

(79) A: I heard that Mary spoke to someone important.
B: Yes, [Francis₁ [she spoke to t₁]].
B′: * Yes, [Francis₁ [she spoke to t₁]].

- o Because this movement is often unacceptable in non-elliptical contexts (e.g. (74B′)), it is *exceptional*, fed by ellipsis itself   (Weir 2014, 2015)
- o Some syntactic constraints can be overcome
  - ➢ Some syntactic islands   (Merchant 2001, 2004, 2008)
  - ➢ Ban on overt focus-fronting   (Radford & Iwasaki 2015 and references in there)
  - ➢ Ban on overt wh-movement   (Richards 2001, Abels & Dayal 2017)
- o Other syntactic constraints cannot be overcome
  - ➢ Ban on P-stranding   (Merchant 2001, 2004)
  - ➢ Ban on massive-pied-piping (??)
- o Clausal ellipsis is licensed under semantic identity with ANT

(80) $\cup [\![CP_A]\!]^f \Leftrightarrow \cup [\![CP_E]\!]^f$ (Barros & Kotek 2019)

Shortcomings of the M&D approach
- Unable to explain why SFs and RFs with the same ANT show distinct properties
- Unable to explain why RFs and SFs with AltQ ants can be X′ and X constituents

Required extensions

- The notion of *exceptional movement* must be extended to Xs and X′s to account for RFs and SFs with AltQ ANTs

    Problems: → stretches notion of 'ellipsis-repair' beyond plausibility

    → Independent explanation required for why some X and X′ fragments are acceptable, whereas others are not

- Supplementary theory required for why SFs and RFs display dissimilar properties

    Problems: → if this supplementary theory adopts aspects of the SQ approach, it is likely to undermine original motivations for adopting the M&D approach in the first place

6.   Conclusion

- Reprise fragments are core grammatical phenomena, and are therefore worthy of attention from mainstream generative linguists   **[§1]**

- Because reprise fragments and non-reprise (i.e. standard) fragments display the same (anti-)connectivity effects, both classes of fragments should receive a uniform analysis as remnants of clausal ellipsis   **[§2]**

- A theory of clausal ellipsis that can natural capture the differing properties of reprise and standard fragments must:

    (i)   Assume that clausal ellipsis can be licensed from **accommodated** antecedents
    (ii)   Assume that clausal ellipsis must be licensed by a **syntactic question**
    (iii)   Adopt an **in-situ approach** to clausal ellipsis itself   **[§3-4]**

- English reprise fragments therefore provide new and compelling reasons to abandon the predominant M&D approach, which does not adopt (i) to (iii)   **[§5]**

References

Abels, Klaus and Venetta Dayal. 2017. On the syntax of multiple sluicing. *Proceedings of the 47th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, ed. by Andrew Lamont and Katerina Tetzloff, 1–21. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

Asher, Nicholas and Alex Lascarides. 2003. *Logics of conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, Chris. 2013. Scopability and sluicing. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 36.187–223.

Barros, Matthew. 2014. *Sluicing and identity in ellipsis*. New Brunswick, NY: Rutgers University dissertation.

Barros, Matthew and Hadas Kotek. 2019. Ellipsis licensing and redundancy reduction: A focus-based approach. *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics*, to appear. Online: https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004210.

Beck, Sigrid and Marga Reis. 2018. On the form and interpretation of echo wh-questions. *Journal of Semantics* 35.369–408.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1978. Asking more than one thing at a time. *Questions*, ed. by Henry Hiz, 107–150. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Cable, Seth. 2010. *The grammar of Q: Q-particles, wh-movement, and pied-piping* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chernova, Ekaterina. 2014. *The syntax of wh-movement in multiple (true and echo) questions: A Q-particle approach*. Girona: University of Girona dissertation.

Chung, Sandra; William A. Ladusaw; and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3.239–282.

Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van. 2012. Ellipsis, identity, and accommodation. Manuscript, Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel. http://jeroenvancraenenbroeck.net/publications

Davidson, Donald. 1979. Quotation. *Theory and Decision* 11.27–40.

Drubig, Hans Bernhard. 1994. Island Constraints and the Syntactic Nature of Focus and Association with Focus. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, 51, University of Tübingen.

Fox, Danny. 1999. Focus, parallelism and accommodation. *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Semantics and Linguistic Theory conference*, ed. by Tanya Matthews and Devon Strolovitch, 70–90. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. Online: https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v9i0.2819.

Ginzburg, Jonathan. 2012. *The interactive stance: Meaning for conversation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ginzburg, Jonathan and Robin Cooper. 2004. Clarification, ellipsis, and the nature of contextual updates in dialogue. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27.297–365.

Ginzburg, Jonathan and Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning and use of English interrogatives*. Stanford: CSLI.

Griffiths, James. 2011. An analysis of embedded declarative fragments and their implications for the theory of sluicing, manuscript, University of Groningen.

Griffiths, James. 2019. A Q-based approach to clausal ellipsis: Deriving the preposition stranding and island sensitivity generalisations without movement. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4:12.1–41.

Jacobson, Pauline. 2016. The short answer: Implications for direct compositionality (and viceversa). *Language* 92.331–75.

Janda, Richard D. 1985. Echo-questions are evidence for what? *Proceedings of the 21st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by William H. Eilfort, Paul D. Kroeber and Karen L. Peterson, 71–88. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Johnson, Kyle. 2012. Towards a better E-givenness. Handouts for a lecture series at Leiden University, March 19-22, 2012.

Kempson, Ruth; Andrew Gargett; and Eleni Gregoromichelaki. 2007. Clarification requests: An incremental account. *Decalog 2007: Proceedings of the 11th Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue*, ed. by Ron Artstein and Laure Vieu, 65–72. Online: http://events.illc.uva.nl/semdial/proceedings/semdial2007_decalog_proceedings.pdf.

Krifka, Manfred. 2006. Association with focus phrases. *The architecture of focus* (Studies in Generative Grammar 82), ed. by Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, 105–36. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Landau, Idan. 2019. Constraining head-stranding ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry*, to appear. Online: https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004630.

Larsson, Staffan, Peter Ljunglöf, Robin Cooper, Elisabet Engdahl, Stina Ericsson. 2000. GoDis – An accommodating Dialogue System. Proceedings of *ANLP/NAACL 2000 Workshop: Conversational Systems*. Online: https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W00-0302.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27.661–738.

Merchant, Jason. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. *Topics in ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson, 132-153. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Messick, Troy; Andrés Saab and Luis Vicente. 2016. *Deep properties of a surface anaphor: On the contextual restrictions of sluicing sites*. Storrs, CT; Buenos Aires; Potsdam: University of Connecticut, CONICOT/Buenos Aires, University of Potsdam, MS. Online: http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002507.

Radford, Andrew and Eiichi Iwasaki. 2015. On Swiping in English. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33.703–744.

Reich, Ingo. 2002. Question/answer congruence and the semantics of wh-phrases. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28.73–94.

Reich, Ingo. 2007. Towards a uniform analysis of short answers and gapping. *On information structure, meaning and form* (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 100), ed. by Kirsten Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 467–484. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in language: Interactions and architectures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Romero, Maribel. 1998. Focus and Reconstruction Effects in Wh-Phrases. PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Rudin, Deniz. 2018. Head-based syntactic identity in sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50.253–83.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sobin, Nicholas. 2010. Echo questions in the Minimalist Program. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41.131–148.

Sudo, Yasutada. 2010. *Metalinguistic semantics for echo questions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, MS. Online: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/~ucjtudo/pdf/echo-questions4.pdf.

Thoms, Gary. 2013. Lexical mismatches in ellipsis and the identity condition. *Proceedings of 42nd Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, ed. by Stefan Keine and Shayne Sloggett, 559–572. Amherst, MA: Graduate Linguistics Student Association of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Thoms, Gary. 2015. Syntactic identity, parallelism, and accommodated antecedents. *Lingua* 166.172–98.

Weir, Andrew. 2014. *Fragments and clausal ellipsis*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Amherst dissertation.

Weir, Andrew. 2015. Fragment answers and exceptional movement under ellipsis: A PF-movement account. In *Proceedings of the 45th meeting of the North East Linguistic*

Society, ed. by Thuy Bui and Deniz Özyıldız, 175–88. Amherst, MA: Graduate Linguistics Student Association of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Appendix 1: Deriving the LAF conjecture in (64)

- Reprise questions contain an additional clause-typing layer.
- This layer contains an interrogative head C_R, which is unique to reprise questions

  (see Sobin 2010, Sudo 2010 Chernova 2014 for evidence from Spanish and Japanese)

(81)   [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{CP}$ **C_{Ri}** [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{CP}$ C [$_{TP}$ Polly hired [$_{DP\text{-}FOCi}$ {WHO/DRACULA}]]]]]]?

- The identity condition in (37) (repeated below) states that an explicit or accommodated question Q that serves as an antecedent to an elliptic clause E can only license clausal ellipsis if Q is (or contains) an identical phrase marker to the sister of Force in E.

(82)   **Syntactic identity condition on clausal ellipsis**
       Let E be the complement of Force in an elliptic clause and let Q be a salient question that precedes E in the discourse.

       Clausal ellipsis is licit in E iff E and Q (or a phrase in Q) have identical syntactic phrase markers, *modulo* X_{FOC}.

- Assuming that the higher, non-echoed Force head in an elliptic reprise question R bears the [E]-feature (see §5.3), this means that a licit antecedent for ellipsis in R must contain C_R, as the sister of Force$_{[E]}$ in R contains C_R.
- Because only reprise questions contain C_R, our analysis therefore predicts that only reprise questions can serve as licensors for clausal ellipsis in reprise questions, hence deriving the LAF generalization.