A Non-repair Approach to Island Sensitivity in Contrastive TP Ellipsis[*]

Matthew Barros
Rutgers University

1 Introduction

Sluicing is TP ellipsis (TPE) in a Wh-question leaving a Wh-phrase overt (the *remnant*). Since Ross (1969), it is standardly assumed that sluicing repairs island violations (cf. e.g. Fox & Lasnik 2003, Merchant 2008 for more recent treatments). For instance, in (1), as shown in (2), the remnant is thought to have been extracted from a relative clause (a frownie marks the left edge of an island).

(1)   ✓ They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language, guess which![1]

(2)   * guess which$_i$ they hired someone ☺ who speaks t_i

Recently, Griffiths & Lipták (2011) show that the same is true for fragment utterances, so that island repair is a general property of TPE (3).

(3)   A: Did they hire someone who speaks a Balkan language?
      B: ✓ Yes, Albanian.

(4)   * Albanian$_i$ they hired someone ☺ who speaks t_i

Some authors have proposed, instead, that island repair is only apparent, and examples like (1) stem from shorter non-island containing sources (e.g. Szczegielniak 2008, Merchant 2001, Fukaya 2007). Under this non-repair approach, the structures in (1), (3), are as in (5), (6), respectively.

(5)   Guess which$_i$ s/he speaks t_i

(6)   Albanian$_i$ s/he speaks t_i

In this paper, I present an argument against repair approaches. Typically, in TPE, the remnant corresponds to some XP in the antecedent, called its *correlate*. In (1), (3), the correlate is '*a Balkan langauge*'. As Merchant (2008) notes, when the correlate and remnant are contrastively focused in sluicing, island sensitivity resurfaces (7). As Griffiths & Lipták (2011) show, the same is true for fragments (8), so that island sensitivity is a general property of contrast TPE (italics = contrastive focus).

(7)   * They hired someone who speaks *Greek*, but I don't know which *other* language.

---

[1]From Merchant (2001), example (129a), pg. 209.

(8)   A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that *Ben* speaks?

            B: * No, *Charlie*.

I argue that island sensitivity in contrast TPE is an instance of the rule rather than an exception. From a non-repair perspective, repair is only apparent in examples like (1), (3), and the elided structure does not contain an island, as in (5), (6). Non-repair approaches seem forced to conclude that such short sources are unavailable in contrast TPE contexts. This allows for the conclusion that the reason contrast TPE shows island sensitivity is because we can be sure there is an island violation in the ellipsis site in these cases. I show is that this is indeed the case and that the pattern follows from information structure constraints on focus licensing.

    In section 2, I show how information structure principles interact with focus licensing to ensure that short sources are unavailable in contrast TPE contexts and discuss how the system allows for short sources in non-contrast TPE, predicting the illusion of repair. In section 3, I discuss how challenges to non-repair approaches posed in Lasnik (2001) can be met, and touch on the consequences the possibility of *pseudosluicing* (TPE involving clefts and copula clauses) has for theories of repair and non-repair under ellipsis. In section 4, I compare the non-repair approach defended here to repair approaches and highlight shortcomings in repair approaches that this account avoids. In section 5, I conclude.

2   Information structure, focus, and the availability of short sources

For islands that contain TP's, the question of whether a short source is available can be restated as whether the island-bound TP counts as the antecedent, or the island-containing TP does; the former corresponds to a short source. We will see that short sources in contrast TPE are infelicitous, with the result that, from a non-repair standpoint, neither the short source nor the full constitutes a grammatical outcome (shown schematically in (9)). Indices on TPE show which TP is the antecedent.

(9)   a.   * $[_{\text{TP}_1} \dots \odot [_{\text{TP}_2} \dots correlate\,]] \dots remnant_i\, [_{\text{TPE}_1} \dots \odot \dots t_i\,]$

        b.   # $[_{\text{TP}_1} \dots \odot [_{\text{TP}_2} \dots correlate\,]] \dots remnant_i\, [_{\text{TPE}_2} \dots t_i\,]$

On the other hand, I will show that short sources are felicitous in non-contrast cases, so we predict such examples to be grammatical, schematically shown in (10).

(10) $\checkmark\, [_{\text{TP}_1} \dots \odot [_{\text{TP}_2} \dots correlate\,]] \dots remnant_i\, [_{\text{TPE}_2} \dots t_i\,]$

The infelicity of short sources in contrast TPE stems from constraints on focus licensing; short source construals (henceforth 'SS construals') in contrast TPE give rise to 'incongruent' discourses (in the sense of Roberts 1996, Büring 2003). A relevant observation is that fragment answers to Wh-questions in general require an non-short source (NSS) construal; this follows from Question/Answer congruence.

(11)   A: Who does Jack think Sally hates? B: Christine.

        = He thinks she hates Christine. (NSS)

        $\neq$ She hates Christine. (SS)

I adopt the characterization of Q/A congruence in Roberts (1996), in (12). Adopting the analysis of focus in Rooth (1992), $[\![U]\!]^f$ is a 'focus value' for U, in the way it is usually understood, i.e. a set of alternative meanings differing with respect to different values substituted for a variable replacing the F(ocus)-marked element.[2] $[\![U]\!]^o$ constitutes the 'regular semantic value' of an utterance.[3]

(12) **Congruence (Roberts 1996):**
An utterance, U, is *congruent* to a question, Q, iff $[\![U]\!]^f = [\![Q]\!]^o$

    a. $[\![U]\!]^f$ = a set of interpretations varying with respect to values for variables replacing F-marked parts of U.[4]

    b. $[\![Q]\!]^o$ = a set of possible answers to Q (as in e.g. Hamblin 1973).

In (11), the answer corresponding to the NSS construal, (13b), is congruent. An SS construal for the answer, (13c), is not (subscript 'F' shows F-marking).

(13)   a. $[\![$Who does Jack think Sally hates?$]\!]^o =$
        {Jack thinks Sally hates $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$}

    b. $[\![$Jack thinks Sally hates Christine$_F]\!]^f =$
        {Jack thinks Sally hates $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$}   (NSS) = (13a)

    c. $[\![$Sally hates Christine$_F]\!]^f =$ {Sally hates $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$} (SS) $\neq$ (13a)

The SS construal for the fragment in (11) is ruled out by conditions on focus licensing in answers; the same considerations force NSS parses in contrast TPE.

    In the theory of information structure in Roberts (1996), F-marking presupposes congruence with a Question under Discussion ('QuD' for short).

(14) **Presupposition of prosodic focus in an utterance, U**:
U is congruent to the QuD at the time of utterance.

In (11), the QuD is speaker A's (explicit) Wh-question, which licenses F-marking on 'Christine'. Thus, an NSS construal for TPE satisfies (14).

2.1 Contrast fragments and short sources

In contrast TPE, the antecedent contains a focused correlate; therefore, by (14), it must be congruent to some QuD. For the Yes/No question antecedent in (15), we can identify such a QuD by taking the focus value of the antecedent. This is so because congruence is equivalence, so by (14): $[\![\text{QuD}]\!]^o = [\![\text{Antecedent}]\!]^f$.

(15)   A: Did Ben leave the party because *Sally* didn't dance with him?

        B: * No, *Christine*

---

[2] e.g. for 'Jack$_F$ left', this would be a set of propositions of the form { x left : $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ }, where '$D_{\langle e \rangle}$' = the domain of individuals in a given model. Basically a set like { Bill left, Jack left, Sally left, ... }, with an additional proposition in the set for each distinct value for x in the domain.

[3] In Rooth (1992), Q/A congruence is a subset relation; $[\![Q]\!]^o \subseteq [\![A]\!]^f$. In Roberts's (1996), congruence is equivalence. As far as I can tell nothing crucial hinges on the choice.

[4] Importantly, Roberts (1996) assumes Wh-phrases are F-marked for the purposes of calculating $[\![U]\!]^f$ when U is a question.

(16) $[\![$Ben left the party because Sally$_F$ didn't dance with him$]\!]^f=$
{Ben left the party because x didn't dance with him: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$}
$= [\![$QuD$]\!]^o$

The QuD that licenses focus in speaker A's Yes/No question is an implicit Wh-question, roughly paraphraseable in (15) as 'Who is such that Ben left the party because they wouldn't dance with him?'; Merchant (2004) used such Yes/No questions with focus as a way to test island sensitivity in fragments, since a corresponding overt Wh-question would be ungrammatical due to an island violation.

(17)   * Who$_i$ did Ben leave the party ☺ because t_i didn't dance with him?

Speaker B's fragment is an answer to this implicit QuD, the 'no' response, intuitively, answers the overt Yes/No question. The F-marking in (18) shows that an SS construal for B's fragment is not congruent with (16).

(18) $[\![$Christine$_F$ didn't dance with him$]\!]^f=\{x$ didn't dance with him: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}\}$

The same holds for fragments where the antecedent is not a Yes/No question; the QuD that licenses F-marking in the antecedent is the salient QuD, so that the fragment must also be congruent with this QuD.

(19)   A: Ben left the party early because *Christine* didn't dance with him.
       B: * No, *Sandra*.

In short, both the elliptical utterance and the antecedent must be congruent with the same QuD in contrast TPE contexts, with the result that SS construals for TPE will be infelicitous. An NSS construal, on the other hand, would be congruent with the QuD, but would necessarily involve an island violation in the ellipsis site; if ellipsis cannot repair islands, this option is also ruled out. The result is that contrast TPE will inevitably fail to yield an illusion of island repair.

2.2   Contrast sluicing and short sources

Contrast sluices are also sensitive to the same QuD as the antecedent. In (20), for instance, F-marking on *Ben* is licensed by a QuD with the value in (20b), the interpretation of the sluice is also congruent with this QuD.[5,6]

(20)   a. Abby called *Ben* a republican, but I don't know who *else*.
       b. $[\![$Abby called Ben$_F$ a republican$]\!]^f =$
           { Abby called x a republican: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ } $= [\![$QuD$]\!]^o$

       $=$ who *else* Abby called a republican.
           $[\![[$ who else $]_{i,F}$ Abby called t_i a republican$]\!]^f=$
           { Abby called x a republican: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ }

       $\neq$ who *else* called Ben a republican.
           $[\![[$ who else $]_{i,F}$ t_i called Ben a republican$]\!]^f=$
           { x called Ben a republican: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ }

---

[5]From Merchant (2001), examples (78a,b), pg. 35.
[6]I assume F-marking is on the entire Wh-phrase *who else*, allowing the focus value to vary on entities of type $\langle e \rangle$, I assume the same goes for 'which/what *other* NP'. See Culicover & Jackendoff (1995), Sato (2001) for treatments of 'else' and 'other'.

Alternatively, F-marking on *Abby* in (21) triggers a different interpretation for the sluice, one that is congruent with the QuD that licenses F-marking on *Abby*.

(21)   a.   *Abby* called Ben a republican, but I don't know who *else*.

   b. $[\![$Abby$_F$ called Ben a republican$]\!]^f =$
       $\{$ x called Ben a republican: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ $\}$ = $[\![$QuD$]\!]^o$

   $\neq$ who *else* Abby called a republican.
       $[\![[$ who else $]_{i,F}$ Abby called t_i a republican$]\!]^f =$
       $\{$ Abby called x a republican: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ $\}$

   $=$ who *else* called Ben a republican.
       $[\![[$ who else $]_{i,F}$ t_i called Ben a republican$]\!]^f =$
       $\{$ x called Ben a republican: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ $\}$

Given a contrast sluice where the correlate is contained in an island in the antecedent, we run into the same trouble that we did with fragments; in (22), the QuD licensing F-marking on *Greek* in the antecedent is as in (22b).

(22)   a.   * Bill is impressed because Sally speaks *Greek*, but I don't know which *other* languages.

   b. $[\![$Bill is impressed because Sally speaks Greek$_F]\!]^f =$
       $\{$Bill is impressed because Sally speaks x: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}\} = [\![QuD]\!]^o$

An SS construal for the sluice will be incongruent with (22b), resulting in an infelicitous sluice; an NSS construal entails an island violation in the ellipsis site.

(23)   # SS construal:
       [Which *other* languages $]_{i,F}$ Sally speaks t_i.
       $[\![[$ Which other languages $]_{i,F}$ Sally speaks $t_i]\!]^f =$
       $\{$Sally speaks x: $x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}\} \neq$ (22b)

(24)   * NSS construal:
       Which *other* languages$_i$ Bill is impressed ☺ because Sally speaks t_i

Under the assumption that ellipsis cannot fix island violations, we correctly predict contrast sluicing to not show island repair effects.

2.3   Non-contrast TPE and short sources

Unfocused correlates in non-contrast TPE entail that the ellipsis clause and the antecedent are congruent to distinct QuDs. In order for both to be congruent to the same QuD, F-marking must be identical on both. Example (25) shows a sluice where the correlate *someone* is not focused (correlates in non-contrast TPE are typically indefinites). We can idealize and assume there is broad focus on the antecedent (any proper super-constituent containing the correlate will get us the same result).

(25)   (A: what's up?) B: $[_{TP}$ Jack is dating someone $]_F$ but I don't know who.

Broad focus on an entire assertion can be seen as being congruent to something close to Roberts's (1996) 'Big Question': 'What is the way things are?'. Which we can equate roughly with the meaning of 'what's up?' in (25).

(26) $\llbracket U_{\langle s,t\rangle,F}\rrbracket^f$ = the set of all propositions
By (14), $\llbracket U_{\langle s,t\rangle,F}\rrbracket^f = \llbracket QuD\rrbracket^o$

Clearly, the sluiced question in (25) will not be congruent with a QuD licensing broad focus on the antecedent, since:

(27) $\llbracket$who is Jack dating?$\rrbracket^f \neq \llbracket QuD\rrbracket^o$ (the set of all propositions.)

This motivates the generalization in (28):

(28) In Non-contrast TPE, the antecedent and elliptical utterance are congruent to separate QuD's.

This frees non-contrast TPE from the restriction to NSS construals. In (29), either the matrix TP or the embedded TP may serve as the antecedent for the sluice, as evidenced by the intuitively available construals for the elliptical utterance.[7]

(29) Jack heard that Sally is dating someone, I wonder who.
  = I wonder who Jack heard she is dating. (NSS)
  = I wonder who she is dating. (SS)

This raises the question of which QuD is responsible for satisfaction of (14) in non-contrast TPE. There must be another QuD the sluice is congruent with in (25); we can, as usual, figure this out by calculating $\llbracket Q\rrbracket^f$; for the sluice in (25), this is:

(30) { Jack is dating $x : x \in D_{\langle e\rangle}$ }.

This is, of course, a QuD with the same denotation as the sluiced question itself.

Where does this QuD come from? I assume the antecedent introduces the QuD. In (25), the antecedent arguably makes salient the issue of 'who Jack is dating'. This is similar to the proposal in Anderbois (2011), couched in terms of Inquisitive Semantics (cf. Groenendijk & Roelofsen 2009), where antecedents with indefinite correlates introduce 'issues', the values for which are sets of alternatives, much like QuD's in Roberts's (1996) system. For our purposes, I adopt the generalization in (31).[8] I refrain from providing a full theory of QuD introduction by an antecedent, the algorithm in (32) will do for our purposes.

(31) In non-contrast TPE, the antecedent introduces the QuD that satisfies (14) for the elliptical utterance.

(32) QuD introduction in non-contrastive TPE.
  a. Given a candidate antecedent TP, α, F-mark the correlate.
  b. The QuD introduced by $\alpha = \llbracket\alpha\rrbracket^f$

By (32), given a non-contrast TPE with more than one potential antecedent, such as (33), either the QuD in (33a) or (33b) are introduced by the preceding utterance; either can satisfy (14) for TPE, depending on whether the SS or NSS parse obtains.

(33) $[_{TP_1}$ Jack heard $[_{TP_2}$ Sally likes someone$]]$, I wonder who.

---

[7]The fact that which TP in an antecedent counts as the actual antecedent may be ambiguous is noted and discussed in Chung *et al.* (1995).

[8]See Ginzburg & Sag (2000) for an account of sluicing that also makes reference to QuD's.

a. QuD introduced by TP_1: {Jack heard that Sally likes $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$} (NSS)

b. QuD introduced by TP_2: { Sally likes $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$ }   (SS)

The algorithm in (32) allows for SS construals in island cases as well.

(34) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan langauge, guess which!

a. NSS QuD:{they hired someone who speaks $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$}

b. SS QuD:{s/he speaks $x : x \in D_{\langle e \rangle}$}

The inability of ellipsis to repair islands blocks an NSS parse for TPE, since it would entail that the remnant was extracted from an island. In allowing the island bound TP to introduce a QuD, Non-contrast TPE licenses a SS parse for TPE. Finally, since F-marked constituents and Wh-phrases are treated identically for the purposes of generating a f-value for an utterance in Roberts's (1996) system, the same analysis given above applies to fragment assertions.

(35) A: They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language.

B: Yes, Albanian, in fact.

= Yes, they speak Albanian, in fact. (SS)

2.4 Interim summary

So far, an appeal to information structure allows us to understand why SS construals are unavailable in contrast TPE. If ellipsis cannot fix islands, we also understand why contrast TPE fails to show repair effects. Contrast TPE is the relevant control in addressing the repair question. In the next section, I show how some challenges for non-repair approaches posed in Lasnik (2001) can be met.

Before proceeding, it is worth noting that in my own informal investigations, English speakers do not consistently reject some of the island violating contrast TPE examples in the literature; (36), (37) fare better than those in (38), (39) ('%' represents cross speaker variation).[9]

(36) A: Did they hire someone who speaks *Bulgarian* fluently?

B: % No, *Serbo-Croatian*.

(37) % They hired someone who speaks *Greek*, but I don't know which *other* languages.

(38) A: Is the book that *Ringo* wrote on Sale? B: *No, *Lennon*.

(39) A: Were Irv and *John* dancing last night? B: *No, *Bill*.

I find variability in judgements encouraging for my pragmatic account. If the explanation for island sensitivity in contrast TPE were purely syntactic, we might expect such cases to be as bad as their overt counterparts. It is possible to manipulate the context so that an SS parse is felicitous for examples like (36). In the TPE literature, examples are usually one or two-utterance discourses, consisting of the antecedent and elliptical utterance. With more context, the QuD can be manipulated so an SS parse for TPE is congruent instead of an NSS parse. For instance, in (40), the context makes salient the issue of which language the new hire speaks.

---

[9](36), (38), (39) are from Griffiths & Lipták (2011), (37) from Merchant (2008).

(40) Context: The linguistics department just hired a new faculty member, part of the requirements for the job is that the applicants be bilingual, not including English, this is common knowledge in the department. Jack is looking for a Chamorro consultant. Tom knows Jack would be interested in hearing about the new hire, since Paluan and Chamorro are related.[10]

Jack to Tom: What's up?
Tom: They hired someone who speaks Palauan! But I don't know what other language.

Repair also appears to be sensitive to lexical choice:

(41) They hired a multilingual person who speaks *Greek*, though I don't know what *other* languages.

Speakers who accept examples like (36) might be accommodating such contexts. I leave exploring this possibility aside, though an account of these facts should also explain why such contextual amelioration is unavailable in examples like (38).[11]

3 Addressing some Challenges

Lasnik (2001) highlights evidence from binding and anaphora that challenges non-repair approaches. In this section, I discuss how such challenges can be met. In section 3.1, I show that the binding data can be accounted for by appealing to short sources. In section 3.2, I discuss cases where short sources are unavailable, and discuss alternative non-island containing parses for TPE.

3.1 Apparent reconstruction into islands under ellipsis

Strong evidence for repair is provided in Lasnik (2001). In arguing specifically against non-repair approaches, Lasnik (2001) provides examples such as that in (42), where a bound reading is available for the pronoun in the remnant.

(42) Every linguist$_i$ met a philosopher ☺ who criticized some of his$_i$ work, but I don't know how much of his$_i$ work.

It seems, in order to get the bound reading, we must assume the quantificational subject in the antecedent is contained in TPE, suggesting there must be an NSS parse available. If so, we have an island violation that is repaired in (42).

(43) how much of his work$_j$ every linguist met a philosopher ☺ who criticized t_j

Through reconstruction of the remnant, the same binding relation that obtains in the antecedent will obtain in TPE.

However, the bound reading in (42) is also available in the non-elided follow-up in (44); this is strange since there is no obvious binder for the pronoun.

---

[10]Thanks to Luis Vicente for suggesting this kind of context (p.c.).

[11]Note that there is no candidate antecedent TP corresponding to an SS parse for the Coordinate Structure Constraint violation in (39), so that an island violation in the ellipsis site is inevitable.

(44) Every linguist$_i$ met a philosopher who criticized some of his$_i$ work, but I
don't recall how much of his$_i$ work the philosopher criticized.

Lasnik (2001) reports that the bound reading is missing in (44). In my own informal
investigations, the picture is less clear; I asked seven consultants (linguists) whether
they could get the bound reading in (42), and (44). Four of the seven consultants
found no difference in the availability of the bound reading in (42) and (44), finding
the bound reading acceptable but degraded in both. Two consultants preferred (44)
over (42) with the bound reading, and one preferred (42) over (44). Importantly,
the non-elided TP in (44) corresponds to a viable SS parse, which picks up the TP
contained in the relative clause as its antecedent.[12]

Given the possibility of a bound reading in (44), there is no reason to conclude
that TPE in (42) hides an island violation. As for the bound reading in (42), what-
ever account is given for its availability in (44) should extend straightforwardly to
a corresponding parse for TPE in (42).

3.2 Pseudo-TPE: Even shorter sources

A bigger challenge for non-repair proposals involves examples like (45) (from Las-
nik 2001). In Merchant's (2001) proposal, the availability of short sources when TP
is contained in a relative clause rests on the capacity of a Wh-trace to license E-type
anaphora in the elided TP. Lasnik controls for this with an NPI as a relative clause
head, so an E-type subject in the short source is not licensed. Since no short source
is available, non-repair approaches wrongly predict (45) to be unacceptable.

(45) They won't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I can't
remember which one$_i$ (#s/he speaks t_i).

There is reason to believe SS construals are not the only alternative. Many have
proposed that TPE may be a cleft or copula clause (an option dubbed 'pseudosluic-
ing' in Merchant 1998; cf. van Craenenbroeck 2010, Rodrigues *et al.* 2009, Vicente
2008). So we are still not forced to adopt repair in (45):

(46) They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I can't
remember which (it was).

Some evidence in support of pseudosluicing in these cases comes from con-
straints on the specificity of the correlate, constraints which are also present in cleft
continuations. As Lasnik (2001) notes, sluicing in (45) is sensitive to the presence
of 'certain' in the antecedent, so that sluicing in these cases only works with specific
indefinite correlates (47). Clefting is similarly sensitive (48).

(47) * They didn't hire anyone who speaks a Balkan language, but I can't re-
member which.

---

[12]The bound reading in (44) appears to depend on an anaphoric relationship between 'the philoso-
pher' and the corresponding narrow scope indefinite in the antecedent; a phenomenon I do not ad-
dress here, but which has been noted, for instance, in Sells (1985), who provides (i), where a similar
co-varying interpretation for the referential expressions in the second sentence is available:

(i) Every chess set came equipped with a spare pawn. It was taped to the outside of the box.

(48)   * They didn't hire anyone who speaks a Balkan language, but I can't re-
        member which it was.

The sensitivity of sluicing to the specificity of the correlate in these cases is reminis-
cent of the licensing conditions on cross sentential anaphora (cf. Karttunen 1976).
It is well known that specific indefinites license pronouns cross sententially, note
that the availability of pronominal reference in (49) matches the sluicing pattern.

(49)   a.   * Bill doesn't own a car. It's black.
        b.   ✓ Bill doesn't own a certain car. It's black.

As noted in Hedberg (2000), due to the existential presuppositions associated with
clefts, the same considerations seem to determine when clefts are licensed.

(50)   a.   * Bill couldn't find a lawyer. It was Jack.
        b.   ✓ Bill couldn't find a certain lawyer. It was Jack.

   To summarize, controlling for short sources is not enough to decide between
repair and non-repair approaches given the availability of pseudosluicing. The
'Balkan language' example is, from an analytical standpoint, three ways ambiguous
between the following parses:

(51)   They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know . . .
        a.   **parse 1:** which one$_i$ [$_{\text{TPE}}$ they hired someone ☺ who speaks t_i]. (NSS)
        b.   **parse 2:** which one$_i$ [$_{\text{TPE}}$ they speak t_i].   (SS)
        c.   **parse 3:** which one$_i$ [$_{\text{TPE}}$ it was t_i].   (pseudosluice)

If ellipsis cannot repair islands, (51) is only two ways ambiguous (SS construal and
pseudosluice), and Lasnik's (2001) example (45) only has the pseudosluice parse.
In the next section, I highlight some evidence that shows that pseudosluicing is not
available in contrast TPE contexts.

3.3   Pseudo-TPE and contrast
If we are to assume pseudosluicing can be behind island repair, we must assume
that pseudosluicing is unavailable in contrast TPE; if it were available, we would
expect contrast TPE to show repair effects. In this section I show that contrast TPE
contexts involving islands block cleft continuations.

3.3.1   Pseudosluicing and contrast
As Vicente (2008) points out for Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese, Bulgarian, French,
and Italian, pseudosluicing *is* ruled out in contrast TPE. The same is true for En-
glish. Merchant (2001) provides several diagnostics for pseudosluicing. One di-
agnostic involves the incompatibility of clefts with *else*-modification, illustrated in
(52). Sluicing is possible with *else*-modification, (52a), but impossible with clefting
in the same context, (52b) ((52c) shows it is possible in non-contrast sluicing).

(52)   a.   ✓ Jack speaks *Greek*, but I don't know what *else*.
        b.   * Jack speaks *Greek*, but I don't know what *else* it is.

    c.   ✓ Jack speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language it is.

However, it is hasty to conclude that the data in (52) are sufficient to rule out pseudosluicing in contrast TPE. The cleft in (52b) is a *truncated* cleft, which corresponds to the full cleft in (53). Else-modification is acceptable with full clefts.

(53)   ✓ Jack speaks *Greek*, but I don't know what *else* it is that he speaks.

Even if full clefts are possible with contrast, non-repair approaches remain intact; Wh-movement in the cleft relative clause is island sensitive and a full cleft corresponding to an NSS parse involves an island violation in the ellipsis site (54).

(54)   * Bill left the party because *Sally* didn't dance with him, but I don't know who *else*$_i$ it was that he left the party ☹ because t_i didn't dance with him.

An SS parse for the cleft relative clause should also be ruled out, given our reasoning in section 2 (the cleft should be incongruent with the QuD that licenses focus in the antecedent). However, as (55) shows, this prediction is not borne out, as an SS parse is better than the corresponding sluice.

(55)   Bill left the party because *Sally* didn't dance with him, but I don't know who *else*$_i$ *(it was that t_i didn't dance with him.)

Since the sluice is bad, we have to conclude that the full cleft with an SS-parse is unavailable; if it were, it should yield an acceptable sluice. From a non-repair perspective, if a continuation is felicitous and grammatical, it should be available as a source for TPE, so the unavailability of the full cleft in (55) must have something to do with how ellipsis interacts with clefting.

The fact that the cleft in (55) is felicitous is more than just a challenge to non-repair approaches, it is also unexpected given theories of focus licensing and congruence. Rooth (1995) notes that theories of focus undergenerate and fail to predict that certain cases of deaccenting should be felicitous, but assumes that this is not a challenge to theories of focus once the possibility of accommodation is considered. I assume (55) is better than the corresponding sluice because of accommodation.

Rooth (1995), Fox (1999) note that ellipsis has non-trivial consequences for the possibility of accommodation. In Fox (1999), in the absence of an antecedent capable of licensing deaccenting on an utterance, an appropriate antecedent can be accommodated provided there is *overt* 'accommodation seeking material.' Accommodation seeking material cannot be F-marked, and must be absent in the actual antecedent. The sequence '*it was that*' meets these criteria in (55).

In terms of Roberts's (1996) theory, I assume what is accommodated is an appropriate QuD for the cleft (in (55), this is a QuD with the same value as the cleft question itself). In the corresponding sluice, there is no overt accommodation seeking material, accommodation fails and a cleft corresponding to an SS parse is incongruent with the only available QuD at the time of utterance, that with which the antecedent is congruent. This much rules out full clefts as contrast pseudosluices.

3.3.2 Pseudofragments and contrast

The preceding discussion shows that pseudo-*sluicing* can be ruled out in contrast sluices with islands. Cleft and copula sources for contrast fragments (call them

'*pseudofragments*') can also be ruled out. First, unlike with pseudosluicing, truncated clefts are possible continuations for contrast fragments (56).

(56)   A: Is *Jack* dating Sandra?   B: No, (it's) *Bill*

Just like contrast fragments, clefts are unacceptable with island-bound correlates.

(57)   A: Is Chris jealous because *Jack* is dating Sandra?   B: *No, (it's) *Bill*

The correlation in (57) is encouraging for non-repair approaches, though it is mysterious why clefting should be ruled out in these cases.

That clefting in (57) involves island-violating Wh-movement is doubtful, as there is no island structure in the cleft.[13] In keeping with this view, the unacceptability of clefting in (58) suggests that the unacceptability of clefting in (57) has nothing to do with islands, but with whether the correlate is contained in an embedded clause. In (58), a fragment is possible, but not a cleft continuation.

(58)   A: Does Chris think that *Jack* is dating Sandra?
       B: No, (*It's) *Bill*. (cf. (56))

This shows that clefts and contrast fragments are subject to distinct licensing conditions, both violated in (57). I lack an explanation for the unacceptability of clefts in examples like (58), but assume that what blocks clefting here is also active in (57); in both these cases the correlate is contained in a non-matrix TP in the antecedent.

To summarize, the challenges posed for non-repair approaches in Lasnik (2001) can be met, but only by making appeal to alternatives to short sources, namely pseudosluicing and pseudofragments. In the next section, I provide a conceptual argument against extant repair approaches to island sensitivity in contrast TPE.

4   A final note on the viability of repair approaches to lack of repair

The proposal defended here provides non-repair approaches with an answer to the question of why contrast-TPE is island sensitive; the problem is in the elided TP, which hides an island violation. Repair approaches must assume the problem lies elsewhere. The proposals in Merchant (2008), Griffiths & Lipták (2011) assume the problem is with the antecedent. These approaches take advantage of the observation that remnants and correlates must have parallel scope at LF (cf. Chung *et al.* 1995). Indefinite correlates are known to have exceptional scope properties, so parallelism may be achieved in non-contrast TPE regardless of islands. LF movement of focused correlates, on the other hand, is argued to be island sensitive, so that parallelism cannot be achieved when the correlate is contained in an island (59).

(59)   A: Did they hire someone who speaks *Greek*? B: *No, Albanian.
       LF for antecedent:
       $*\text{Greek}_i \ \lambda x_i \ [_{\text{TP}} \text{ they hired someone} \odot \text{who}_k \ t_k \text{ speaks } x_i]$

---

[13]One possibility is that truncated clefts involve something like CP-ellipsis of the cleft relative clause. If this is true, we could appeal to an island violation in the elided truncation to explain the deviance of clefting in (57). However, see Merchant (2001) for convincing arguments that cleft truncation does not constitute an ellipsis process, i.e. there is no silent structure corresponding to the cleft relative clause in truncated clefts (pgs. 115-120).

LF for fragment:
✓Albanian$_i$ λx_i [$_{TP}$ they hired someone ☺ who$_k$ t_k speaks x_i]

There is some reason to doubt that covert focus movement exists; Association with Focus is known to be insensitive to islands (see Rooth 1996 for discussion). This has motivated many treatments of focus in-situ (e.g. Kratzer 1991, Reich 2002). Furthermore, the evidence from Association with Focus indicates that if LF-focus movement exists, it should be island insensitive, but in order for repair approaches to work, LF-focus movement must be island sensitive. This bears on the issue of how many different kinds of LF movement we should believe in. QR is known to be (finite) clause-bound (Farkas 1981), and there have been arguments that covert Wh-movement is also (Dayal 1996, Boskovic 1997).

Krifka (2006) shows that the strongest evidence for island-sensitive LF-focus movement comes from island sensitivity in fragments. Alongside the usual pattern where contrast TPE fails to repair islands, he provides evidence from multiple Wh-questions with a Wh-in-situ contained in an island. In these cases, fragment answers must correspond to the pied piped island.

(60) A: *Who* recommended [$_☺$ the author of *which* novel] to Sue?
      B: * *John, Ulysses* B':✓*John*, the author of *Ulysses*

As Krifka (2006) points out, in-situ theories of focus fail to predict that any particular constituent besides the focused XP should be privileged. The fact that pied piping the island yields a grammatical output strongly implies movement. He concludes there is LF movement of the correlate with pied piping, and develops a focus semantics where only a pied piped island fragment would be congruent.

Under the assumption that there is 'structure in the silence', however, we are not forced to modify our semantics for focus in order to account for island sensitivity. I assume Krifka (2006) is correct in assuming that constraints on movement are at work in constraining the space of possible remnants, but from a non-repair perspective, this is precisely what we would expect if movement under ellipsis had to obey the same constraints as overt movement. It is not necessary to appeal to LF-focus movement of the correlate to capture the pattern in (60).

There is some evidence against the notion that LF movement of the correlate is required in fragments. Assuming LF movement is clause bound, we would expect the maximal scope for a correlate to be its minimal containing tensed clause. The correlate in (61) is in an embedded tensed clause, so it should not be capable of taking matrix scope. Importantly, the interpretation for TPE in (61) corresponds to an NSS parse, indicating that ellipsis takes the matrix clause as its antecedent. Since the remnant and correlate have non-parallel scope, we should expect (61) to be ungrammatical, but it is not.

(61) A: Does Bill think that Sally fired *Jack*?   B: No, *Christopher*.
      = No, he thinks she fired *Christopher*.

Granted, it is possible that LF-focus movement is different from other more well established kinds of LF-movement such as QR, but the data are leading us in a very clear direction. Repair proponents are led to appeal to covert focus movement by extrapolating from visible constraints on remnants (the XP we already believe

actually does undergo $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement in the ellipsis clause). The kind of LF-focus movement required to make repair approaches work looks just like regular overt Wh-movement (it is not clause bound, and is island sensitive). In fact, it is suspiciously sensitive to exactly the same sorts of islands as overt movement. I find it more parsimonious to assume that it is constraints on overt movement in the ellipsis clause that are responsible for the data, than to adopt a new kind of LF movement.

5 Conclusion

It is strange that sluicing should repair islands; from the standpoint that there is 'structure in the silence', island sensitivity in ellipsis would provide strong evidence for silent structure. The proposal herein defended takes this expectation seriously, and shows that in tandem with standard assumptions about focus licensing, it is possible to force an island violating parse for TPE. This gives us two results; we have a viable non-repair account of island sensitivity in contrast TPE, and we have an answer to the repair question. Finally, in light of Lasnik's (2001) observation that short sources are not always available, it was shown that a non-repair approach must also appeal to 'pseudo-TPE' in accounting for the full range of repair facts.

References

Anderbois, Scott, 2011. *Issues and Alternatives*. UC Santa Cruz dissertation.

Boskovic, Zeljko. 1997. LF movement and the Minimalist Program. In *Proceedings of NELS 28*.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26.511–545.

Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw, & Jim McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3.239–282.

Culicover, Peter, & Ray Jackendoff. 1995. Something else for the binding theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26.249–275.

Dayal, Veneeta. 1996. *Locality in Wh Quantification: Questions and Relative Clauses in Hindi*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Farkas, Donka. 1981. Quantifier scope and syntactic islands. In *Proceedings of CLS 17*.

Fox, Danny. 1999. Focus, parallelism and accommodation. In *Proceedings of SALT 9*, ed. by Tanya Matthews & Devon Strolovitch, 70–90, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. CLC Publications.

——, & Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive cyclic movement and island repair: the difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.143–154.

Fukaya, Teruhiko, 2007. *Sluicing and Stripping in Japanese and some Implications*. University of Southern California dissertation.

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

Griffiths, James, & Anikó Lipták, 2011. Contrast and island sensitivity in fragments. to appear in *Syntax*.

Groenendijk, Jeroen, & Floris Roelofsen. 2009. Inquisitive semantics and pragmatics. In *Proceedings of SPR 09*.

Hamblin, C. L. 1973. Questions in montague english. *Foundations of Language* 10.41–53.

Hedberg, Nancy. 2000. The referential status of clefts. *Language* 76.891–920.

Karttunen, L. 1976. Discourse referents. In *Syntax and Semantics: Notes from the Linguistic Underground*, ed. by J. McCawley, volume 7, 363–386. New York: Academic Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. The representation of focus. In *Semantik/Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, ed. by A. Stechow & D. Wunderlich, 804–825. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Krifka, Manfred. 2006. Association with focus phrases. In *The architecture of focus*, ed. by Valerie Molnár & Susanne Winkler, 105–136. Mouton de Gruyter.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society 31*, ed. by M. Kim & U. Strauss, volume 2, 301–320. GLSA.

Merchant, Jason. 1998. Pseudosluicing: Elliptical clefts in Japanese and English. In *ZAS Working Papers in Linguistics*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Nanna Fuhrhop, Paul Law, & Ursula Kleinhenz, volume 10, 88–112, Berlin. ZAS.

——, 2001. *The Syntax of Silence*. UC Santa Cruz dissertation.

——. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27.661–738.

——. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reich, Ingo. 2002. Association with focus, islands and choice functions: A binding approach. In *Proceedings of the workshop choice functions and natural langauge semantics*, ed. by K. von Heusinger, R. Kempson, & W. Meyer-Viol, 1–15.

Roberts, Craige. 1996. *Information Structure: Towards an integrated theory of formal pragmatics*, volume 49 of *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics*. OSU: The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics.

Rodrigues, Cilene, Andrew Nevins, & Luis Vicente. 2009. Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and preposition stranding. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by L Wetzels & J. van der Weijer, 175–198. John Benjamins.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1.75–116.

——, 1995. Ellipsis redundancy and reduction redundancy. Paper presented at *Prague workshop on Context*, Prague.

——. 1996. Focus. In *Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, ed. by S. Lappin, 271–297. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ross, John. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by R. Binnick, A. Davison, G. Green, & J. Morgan, 252–286, Chicago. Chicago Linguistic Society.

Sato. 2001. What else to quantify? In *Proceedings of the 15th Pacific Asia Conference on Language Information and Computation*, ed. by Benjamin T'sou, Olivia Kwong, & Tom Lai.

Sells, Peter. 1985. Restrictive and non-restrictive modification. Technical report, CSLI-85-28 Stanford University.

Szczegielniak, Adam. 2008. Islands in sluicing in Polish. In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Natasha Abner & Jason Bishop, 404–412, Somerville, MA. Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2010. Invisible last resort: A note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120.1714–1726.

Vicente, Luis, 2008. Syntactic isomorphism and non-isomorphism under ellipsis. under review for publication in Lingua.