Reprise fragments in English and Hungarian:
Further support for an in-situ Q-equivalence approach to clausal ellipsis

James Griffiths
University of Tübingen
james.griffiths@uni-tuebingen.de

Güliz Güneş
University of Tübingen
gunesguliz@gmail.com

Anikó Lipták
Leiden University
A.Liptak@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

We present a comparative analysis of English and Hungarian REPRISE FRAGMENTS. We argue that reprise fragments should be afforded the same theoretical treatment as STANDARD (i.e. nonreprise) fragments. Assuming that standard fragmentary answers and questions are remnants of an ellipsis operation that applies to a clause, this entails that reprise fragments are also remnants of clausal ellipsis. We show that the prevailing approach to standard fragments, which assumes that the remnant of ellipsis always undergoes movement (Merchant 2001, 2004), cannot be plausibly extended to explain the crosslinguistic reprise fragment data. We argue that a theory is required that restricts antecedents to interrogatives and which allows – but crucially does not *require* – movement of the remnant. Under this account, the differences observed between English and Hungarian reprise and standard fragments follow from independent syntactic differences in how standard and reprise questions are formed in these languages. We therefore provide new evidence to support theories of ellipsis identity that state that only questions make for suitable antecedents for clausal ellipsis (so-called Q-EQUIVALENCE approaches) and to support sententialist analyses of clausal ellipsis that permit ellipsis to occur around designated constituents (so-called IN-SITU approaches).[*]

Keywords

clausal ellipsis, echo questions, ellipsis identity, fragments, in-situ ellipsis, reprise fragments, reprise questions, sluicing

---

1. INTRODUCTION. REPRISE FRAGMENTS (Bolinger 1978, Ginzburg 2012:148) are seemingly non-sentential questions that involve the repetition of a morpheme, word, or syntactic phrase from the most recent utterance in a discourse (1B-3B).[1]

(1) A: Is Theo a neurophysiologist?   B: NEURO?[2]
(2) A: Did Bo finagle a raise?   B: BO? / FINAGLE?

(Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:299)

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

The previous literature on reprise fragments is centered around English data extracted from corpora (Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Ginzburg & Cooper 2004, Purver 2004, Fernández 2006, Ginzburg 2012). In this paper, we broaden the empirical perspective by undertaking the first study of reprise fragments that compares their properties across two languages from different language families, namely English (Germanic, Indo-European) and Hungarian (Uralic). It is also the first study to use acceptability judgment data as its primary data source.

In addition to comparing reprise fragments across English and Hungarian, we also compare reprise fragments to their STANDARD (i.e. nonreprise) counterparts in both languages. Based on the observation that reprise and standard fragments display nontrivial similarities, we pursue a uniform analysis of the two fragment types. Assuming that standard fragments are remnants of elliptic clauses (the sententialist SILENT STRUCTURE analysis; Ross 1969, Merchant 2001, 2004), this entails extending the silent structure analysis to reprise fragments. Having motivated a silent structure analysis for both standard and reprise fragments, we then outline an account of ellipsis that does not require movement of the remnant (the so-called IN-SITU approach). This analysis readily captures the entire dataset, but only once it is supplemented with a theory of ellipsis identity that states that only syntactically generated questions (i.e. interrogatives) make for suitable antecedents for clausal ellipsis (a so-called Q-EQUIVALENCE approach).

---

[1] In this article, we group together seemingly nonsentential queries such as those in 1B-3B and their wh-phrase counterparts (see (iB) and *a WHAT car* in 3B) under the label *reprise fragments*. This contrasts with terminology used in Ginzburg & Sag 2000 and Ginzburg 2012:148, in which wh-queries such as (iB) are called *reprise sluices*.

(i) A: Did Bo finagle a raise?   B: WHO?

[2] In reprise utterance examples, the position of the nuclear accent is represented by small caps on the word or morpheme bearing it. In nonreprise (i.e. STANDARD) utterance examples, the position of the nuclear accent is represented by a circumflex on the stressed vowel of the word or morpheme bearing it. Note that this notation system is sometimes used on the English translations of examples, rather than on the examples themselves. Until we reach the analysis section (section 3), the position of the remnant relative to the ellipsis site is irrelevant. To avoid notational clutter, we represent non-wh remnants as remaining in-situ. Strikethrough represents ellipsis. Uncommon glossing abbreviations used are: ABL = ablative, AD = argument domain, CAU = causalis, ILL = illative; INE = inessive; INST = instrumental; MP = modal particle, PRT = preverbal particle, RF = reprise fragment, SF = standard fragment, SUB = sublative; SUP = superessive. The judgments reported for the novel English reprise fragments data come from five nonlinguist native speakers (all British) and from native speaking audience members of BICLCE 2017, GLOW 41 (2018), DGfS 40 (2018), and NYU's *You're on Mute* ellipsis seminar (2022), where this research was presented. Our description of the Hungarian data in section 2.3 and section 3 is based on informal consultation with four nonlinguist native speakers and a small-scale anonymous online questionnaire study with nineteen participants.

This paper therefore makes three contributions. First, it provides the first comparative study of reprise fragments that uses acceptability judgment data as the primary data source. Second, it motivates a silent structure analysis of reprise fragments. Third, it provides new and – we believe – decisive evidence for a silent structure approach that allows for remnants to stay in-situ, as opposed to the prevailing approach developed in Merchant 2001, 2004, according to which the remnant must undergo movement to the clausal left-periphery before ellipsis can apply (the so-called MOVE-AND-DELETE approach).

Broadly speaking then, this paper functions to demonstrate that fragmentary utterances vary in their formal properties to a greater extent, both within and across languages, than previously thought. It also shows that simply attributing this variation to radically different syntactic origins (a tactic justifiably adopted by Merchant 2004, 2010, 2016 for some fragment types that are not relevant here) is sometimes misguided, and that one should instead strive to develop a unified analysis that displays sufficient flexibility to capture the surprisingly large amount of formal variation observed.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 lists the similarities and differences across English and Hungarian between the fragment types under investigation. Section 3 presents our silent structure analysis. Section 4 briefly presents 'extensions', namely new data on English reprise fragments that go unmentioned in sections 2 and 3, despite being interesting in their own right. Section 5 discusses alternative analyses. In that section, we provide critical remarks about potential alternative 'silent structure' analyses and Merchant's (2004, 2016) passing suggestion that reprise fragments are METALINGUISTIC CONJUNCTS, and we provide a short comment on how our results connect with extant nonsententialist analyses of reprise fragments from the nontransformational literature (Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Ginzburg & Cooper 2004, Purver 2004, Ginzburg 2012, Kempson et al. 2007). Section 6 concludes our study.

2. THE DATA. In this section, we present the similarities and differences between standard and reprise fragments in English and Hungarian. We present the formal properties of English standard and reprise fragments in sections 2.1 and 2.2 respectively. An overview of Hungarian standard and reprise questions is offered in section 2.3. In section 2.4, we show that standard and reprise fragments exhibit identical connectivity and anti-connectivity effects, and then summarize the discussion in section 2.5. We begin our exploration by more accurately delimiting the two fragment-types under investigation, namely standard and reprise fragments.

Firstly, what counts as a STANDARD FRAGMENT? Among the varied classes of fragments identified in the prior literature, standard fragments stand out as the 'elsewhere' or 'default' case. Because of this, they are most straightforwardly delimited by what they are not: they are not conventionalized expressions (these are SCRIPTS; Merchant 2004, 2010) (4a), they are not fragments restricted to informal spoken registers (such as fragments derived from LEFT EDGE DELETION; see Weir 2012 and references in there) and particular abbreviated written registers such as diaries and recipes (4b), and they are not metalinguistic elaborations or requests for clarification. The label 'standard fragments' thus denotes a heterogenous group that includes, among others, prototypical

fragmentary answers/responses and questions (5a-c), contrastive/corrective fragments (5d), and additive fragments (5e-f).

(4) a. Two côffees, please.
     b. 'Fêssor arrived yet?
         Interpretation: Has the professor arrived yet?   (Weir 2012:109)

(5) a. A: What did Taylor eat?   B: (I think) a fruit sâlad.
     b. A: Someone left.   B: Yeah, (I think) Sâlly.
     c. A: Someone left.   B: (Do you know) whô?
     d. A: Chris left.   B: No, Bîll.
     e. A: Chris left.   B: And Bîll, too.
     f. A: Chris left.   B: Yeah, with Sâlly.

As mentioned already, we will adopt a sententialist, SILENT STRUCTURE approach to standard fragments, according to which fragments are derived by generating a clause-sized phrase marker in the usual manner and then suppressing phonological realization in all but one or more subconstituents of that clause. We will refer to this phonological suppression operation as ELLIPSIS (see Merchant 2001 and references in there). Fragments are the subconstituents that survive clausal ellipsis: they are the REMNANTS of ellipsis (6). We rehearse the conceptual motivations behind the clausal ellipsis analysis of standard fragments in section 2.5, before we outline our clausal ellipsis analysis of reprise fragments in section 3.

(6) A clausal ellipsis analysis of the standard fragments in 5a-c, where strikethrough represents ellipsis:
     a. (I think) ~~she ate~~ a fruit sâlad.
     b. Yeah, (I think) Sâlly ~~left~~.
     c. (Do you know) whó ~~left~~?

Next, we must remark on our empirical remit regarding reprise fragments. Because our focus is the syntactic distribution of reprise fragments, we will not discuss their varied communicative functions. (We direct the interested reader to Ginzburg 2012.) For our purposes, it will suffice to make the simplifying assumption that a reprise utterance functions to request clarification about (a subpart of) the utterance that immediately precedes it in the discourse, and that this request can be CONFIRMATIONAL or INFORMATION-SEEKING (see Ginzburg & Cooper 2004 and Ginzburg 2012 for a similar distinction). A reprise utterance is confirmational whenever the requestor considers herself to have complete knowledge of the content, form, phonology, register, discursive impact (etc.) of the preceding utterance. Such confirmational requests therefore serve to articulate the requestor's surprise – pleasant or otherwise – about the content of, the delivery of, or perlocutionary intention behind the preceding utterance. Conversely, a reprise utterance is information-seeking

whenever the requestor is not confident that they have complete knowledge of the content, form, phonology, register, or discursive impact (etc.) of the preceding utterance. Usually, the confirmational or information-seeking interpretation is disambiguated from extraneous cues, such as a follow-up remark (boldfaced in 7).

(7)   A: Pat was cozened by a conman.
            Reprise question
       B: He was COZENED by a conman?   … **That's hilarious!**   (confirmational)
                                                 … **What does 'cozen' mean?**   (info-seeking)
            Reprise question fragment
       B′:   COZENED?   … **That's hilarious!**   (confirmational)
                             … **What does that mean?**   (information-seeking)

Note that, unlike reprise questions such as 7B, so-called EXPLICIT CLARIFICATION REQUESTS (ECRs, Ginzburg 2012:148) such as 8B can only be interpreted as genuine information-seeking questions.

(8)   A: Did Bo finagle a raise?   B: What's 'FINAGLE'?

As mentioned already in section 1, we will develop a silent structure analysis of reprise fragments in this paper, according to which a reprise fragment is the only pronounced phrase in a reprise utterance whose phonological realization has otherwise been entirely suppressed by ellipsis. Preempting the conclusions drawn at the end of this section, let us momentarily assume that pursuing a silent structure analysis of reprise fragments is indeed well-motivated. The existence of ECRs represents a complicating factor in stating such an analysis. This is because, along with reprise questions, ECRs represent a viable reprise SOURCE for clausal ellipsis. In other words, it is feasible that, in the absence of disambiguating markers, a reprise fragment could underlyingly be a reprise question **or** an ECR:

(9)   A: Did Bo finagle a raise?   B: FINAGLE?

            Possible elliptic sources for (9B):
       a.   ~~Did Bo~~ FINAGLE ~~a raise~~?   b.   ~~What's~~ FINAGLE?

To keep our discussion manageable and because they are not especially informative for ellipsis research, we henceforth exclude ECRs – both elliptic and fully pronounced – from our study. To successfully do this, one must be certain that a given reprise fragment cannot be derived from an elliptic ECR. Luckily, there are a few ways to obtain this certainty.

    First, if a reprise fragment has only an information-seeking reading (see 10B), one can be certain that it must be derived from an ECR (see 11a). This is because, in such cases, no grammatical reprise question source is available with the same verb-form in all cases (11b).

(10)   A: Dana has been confusticating Mary again.   B: CONFUSTICATE?

Interpretation of (10B):   What does 'confusticate' mean?   *information-seeking*
                    * He's been CONFUSTICATING her? No way!   *confirmational*

(11)   a.   What is 'CONFUSTICATE'?   b. * He's been CONFUSTICATE her again?

Second, ECRs are more restricted in their form than typical reprise wh-questions: hypernym-replacement is prohibited in ECRs yet permitted in reprise wh-questions (see 12, where *Alsatian* in 12A is reprised in 12B using its hypernym *dog*), and ECRs cannot host a focused wh-phrase, whereas reprise wh-questions can (13).

(12)   [*Context*: speaker B is allergic to dogs, and speaker A knows this.]
       A: Do you want an Alsatian?
       B: Do I want A DOG? Are you joking?
       B′: # What is 'a DOG?'

(13)   A: Do you want an Alsatian?
       B: Do I want a WHAT?
       B′: # What is 'a WHAT'?

By exploiting these restrictions, one can control for potential structural ambiguity when examining the properties of reprise fragments. More concretely, one can be certain that a reprise fragment is not derived from an elliptic ECR if (i) it allows for a confirmational interpretation, (ii) it is a hypernym of its correlate, or (iii) it contains an expression-focused wh-phrase. We assure the reader that, when stating our empirical generalizations and advancing theories based on them in the following sections, these controls are in place.

2.1. STANDARD FRAGMENTS IN ENGLISH. We begin by listing the formal (syntactic) distributional properties of English standard fragments. To be judged as fully acceptable, standard fragments that are anteceded by a declarative assertion or a wh-question must be A′-movable syntactic phrases (AdvP, AP, CP, DP, PP) — the so-called Major Constituent constraint (Hankamer 1979, Morgan 1989, Merchant 2004:675). If they are not, they are judged as degraded or unacceptable, as a comparison of the B-examples in 14 and 15 show.

(14)   a.   A: How often does she swim?   B: [AdvP frêquently].
       b.   A: He is rich.   B: No, [AP pôor].
       c.   A: What does she believe?   B: [CP That the election was rîgged].
       d.   A: Who arrived late?   B: [DP Bîll].

e.   A: She went home.   B: Yes, [PP with Bîll].

(15) a.   A: This policy benefits the poor.   B: * No, [NP rîch].
     b.   A: It's crucial that something happens.   B: * Yes, [TP Sue lêaves].
     c.   A: Sue just met with Trump.   B: ?? No, [VP met with Bîden].[3]
     d.   A: Lisa will tilt the image.   B: ?? No, [v revôlve].
     e.   A: Under the bed is the best hiding place. B: * No, [P în].
     f.   A: A psycholinguist just passed by.   B: * No, [Pref nêuro].

Standard fragments with declarative assertion or wh-question antecedent are also sensitive to a language's (in)ability to strand its adpositions under A′-movement. The generalization in 16, which was first proposed by Merchant (2001), describes the manner of this sensitivity.[4]

(16) Adposition-stranding generalisation (adapted from Griffiths 2019:4)
      Native speakers of a language L will judge 'bare' DP fragments that are interpreted as complements of adpositions as fully acceptable only if L allows P-stranding under regular A′-movement.

The examples in 17 to 18 show that this generalization is accurate. Example 17 shows that a P-stranding language such as English allows 'bare' DP fragments that are interpreted as complements of prepositions. Example 18 shows the converse, namely that a non-P-stranding language such as German disallows such DP fragments.

(17) A: Ashley spoke with the blonde girl.
      B: Yes, and anôther girl.   (adapted from Merchant 2001:122)

---

[3] Verb phrases are judged as acceptable responses to questions containing the verbal anaphor *do*, as (i) shows (see Merchant 2004:696 for similar examples). Such fragmentary responses are likely to be the remnants of anisomorphic elliptic pseudoclefts (see (ii)). This analysis is supported by the observation that the fragment cannot be a tensed lexical verb, just as the predicate phrase of a pseudocleft cannot.

(i)   A: What did Kim do?
      B: Wash*(ed) the car.

(ii)   [What Kim did was] [wash*(ed) the car]].

[4] Under well-defined conditions, ellipsis can be licensed in clauses whose syntactic phrase marker differs from the phrase marker of the elliptic clause's antecedent. Such elliptical clauses are ANISOMORPHIC SOURCES for ellipsis. To maintain simplicity, we henceforth avoid discussing anisomorphic sources. We control for them throughout, however. For a more accurate representation of the adposition-stranding and island-sensitivity generalizations in 16 and 19, see this paper's supplementary document, where the possible availability of anisomorphic sources is factored back in.

(18) *German* (adapted from Merchant 2004: 685–686)

    A: Mit   wem   hat Anna gesprochen?
           with whom has Anna spoken
           'With whom has Anna spoken?'

    B: * Ihrem   Vater.
           her.DAT father
           'Her fâther.'

Standard fragments with declarative assertion or wh-question antecedents interact with syntactic islands in a manner encapsulated in the ISLAND-SENSITIVITY GENERALIZATION in 19.

(19) Island-Sensitivity Generalization (adapted from Griffiths 2019)
Fragments with island-bound correlates are judged by native speakers as degraded or unacceptable.

The examples in 20 show that this generalization is accurate. In each case, the fragment is judged as degraded / unacceptable on the intended interpretation because its correlate in the antecedent clause is contained within a strong island.

(20) A: They examined [ISLAND a (well) prepared student].
    B: * Yes, vêry well.   (adapted from Merchant 2001:181)
        [*Intended*: They examined a vêry well prepared student.]

(21) A: [ISLAND The fact that [ISLAND a **Labour** MP]] threatened John is comical.
    B: * And Consêrvative, too.
        [*Intended:* The fact that a Consêrvative MP threated J is comical, too.]

(22) A: Pete wonders [ISLAND who [ISLAND Sue's **father**] will fire].
    B: * And môther, too.
        [*Intended:* P wonders who Sue's môther will fire, too]

(23) A: [ISLAND A drink during **the intermission**] will help to lessen one's anger.
    B: * Yeah, (and) the second âct, too.[5]
        [*Intended:* A drink during the second âct will help, too]

---

[5] In a number of articles, Masaya Yoshida and colleagues have introduced new data on fragments that they present as evidence for the idea that clausal ellipsis 'repairs' syntactic islands (Rottman & Yoshida 2013, Yoshida et al. 2015, Potter 2017, Yoshida et al. 2018). In this context, ISLAND REPAIR refers to the theory that a node N that functions as an island boundary in a nonelliptical configuration will cease to function as an island boundary in the same configurations if N is contained in an elliptic clause. Although many of the arguments offered in these articles are compelling, they cannot be reconciled with the equally compelling arguments from Merchant 2001, 2004, Abels 2011, 2019, Barros et al. 2014, 2015, and Griffiths 2019 that island repair does not exist. Faced with this impasse, one must either (i) assume that island repair exists and that the 'unacceptable' or 'degraded' judgments obtained for certain standard

This interaction between standard fragments and their island-bound correlates is 'A′-like' insofar as standard A′-movement is sensitive to syntactic islands (i.e. A′-movement cannot proceed across an island boundary).

Note that not all standard fragments display the three A′-properties described above. The current empirical picture – which is preliminary and will therefore require future refinement – is that standard fragments that are anteceded by either a wh-question or a declarative assertion **do** display all three A′-properties described above, but that fragments with other antecedent-types do not necessarily display them. For instance, standard fragments anteceded by alternative questions can be A′-immovable constituents (24 and 25) and can be 'bare' DP fragments in languages that disallow P-stranding under regular A′-movement, such as Dutch, thus disobeying the adposition-stranding generalisation (25c).

(24) a.　A:　Should he revôlve or tîlt the gyroscope?
　　　　　B:　[v Revôlve], of course.
　　　b.　A:　Is în or ûnder the bed the best hiding place?
　　　　　B:　[P Ûnder], I reckon.
　　　c.　A:　Did a nêuro or psŷcholinguist just pass by?
　　　　　B:　[Pref Nêuro].　　　　　　　　　　　　　(24a-c come from Griffiths 2019:26)
　　　d.　A:　Are you travelling tô or frôm Africa?
　　　　　B:　[P Tô].　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Zwicky 1982:7)

(25) Dutch　　　　　　　　　　(Astrid van Alem, Rint Sybesma, Sybren Sybesma, pers. comm.)
　　　a.　A:　Moet ik de　was　　ôpvouwen of strîjken?
　　　　　　　must I the　washing fold.INF　or iron.INF
　　　　　　　'Do I have to fôld or îron the washed clothes?'
　　　　　B:　[v Ôpvouwen].
　　　　　　　fold.INF

　　　b.　A:　Is je　salaris ônder of　bôven　gemiddeld?
　　　　　　　Is your salary below or　above　average
　　　　　　　'Is your salary belôw or abôve average?'
　　　　　B:　[P Ônder].
　　　　　　　below

---

fragments with island-bound correlates are unrelated to island-violating movement or (ii) deny the existence of island repair and assume that an extraneous mechanism is responsible for the 'acceptable' judgments attributed to certain standard fragments with no island-evading isomorphic or anisomorphic elliptic source. Clearly, we have opted to pursue the second action here. Unfortunately, providing even cursory remarks about why we believe this to be the favored option requires significantly more space than available to us here. Importantly for the current discussion, the disparity in island-(in)sensitivity between English standard and reprise fragments (see 34, 35 and 36 for the relevant reprise fragment data) receives a natural explanation only under the assumption that island repair does not exist.

c. A: Staat   de plant naast   de   bânk   of de tâfel?
      stands the plant next.to the sofa   or the table
      'Is the plant next to the sôfa or the tâble?'

   B: [DP De bânk].
          the sôfa

d. A: Zal ik de modem vôor   of âchter je   scherm zetten?
      shall I the modem in.front or behind your screen place.INF
      'Shall I place the modem in frônt of or behînd your screen?'

   B: [P Âchter].
          behind

2.2. REPRISE FRAGMENTS IN ENGLISH. Turning to English reprise fragments, one observes that they pattern dissimilarly to their standard fragment counterparts with respect to each of the three properties listed above. Firstly, English reprise fragments are not restricted to being A′-movable phrases (unlike English standard fragments). The examples in 26 show that reprise fragments can reprise phrases of any syntactic category.[6] The examples in 27, 28 and 29 respectively show that, alongside phrases, reprise fragments can be X′-constituents (assuming the X′-theory approach to coordination; see Johannessen 1998, Zhang 2010), syntactic heads, and bound morphemes. The examples in 30 show that reprise fragments cannot be morphosyntactic nonconstituents, however.

(26)   A: John often thinks that Pete introduced him to Dracula.
   a. B: [DP {WHO / DRACULA}]?
   b. B: [PP *to* {WHO / DRACULA}]?
   c. B: [VP *introduced him to* {WHO / DRACULA}]?
   d. B: [CP *that Pete introduced him to* {WHO / DRACULA}]?
   e. B: [VP *thinks that Pete introduced him to* {WHO / DRACULA}]?

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

(28) A: Did Bo finagle a raise?   (repeated from 2)
     B: [V FINAGLE]?

---

[6] Comparing the reprise fragments in 26 to the standard fragments in (i) emphasizes the greater degree of categorial freedom enjoyed by reprise fragments.

(i)   A: John often thinks that Pete introduced him to a vampire.
   a. B: Yeah, [DP Drácula].
   b. B: Yeah, [PP *to* Drácula].
   c. B: * Yeah, [VP *introduced him to* Drácula].
   d. B: Yeah, [CP *that Pete introduced him to* Drácula].
   e. B: * Yeah, [VP *thinks that Pete introduced him to* Drácula].

(29) A: Is Theo a neurophysiologist?   (repeated from 1)
      B: [prefix NEURO]?

(30) a.   A: This is unbelievable!
            B: * UNBE-?
      b.   A: Will the boss fire Dracula and Cthulhu on Monday?
            B: * DRACULA and?

In English and its close relatives Dutch and German, reprise fragments disobey the adposition-stranding generalization (unlike English/Dutch/German standard fragments). One observes that reprise fragments that reprise DP complements of adpositions are acceptable in all three languages, regardless of the language's (in)ability to strand adpositions under A′-movement. Although, of these three languages, only English permits P-stranding under A′-movement (putting aside the complicating factor of R-pronominalization in Dutch and German; see Griffiths et al. 2021 and references in there), each permits DP reprise fragments that are interpreted as reprising the complement of a preposition in the preceding utterance.

(31) A: Bob spoke with Dracula on Saturday.   B: DRACULA?

(32) German
      A: Maria hat   mit   ihrem   Vater   gesprochen.   B: Ihrem   VATER?
            Maria has   with her.DAT father talked   her.DAT   father
            'Maria has spoken with her father.'   'Her FATHER?'

(33) Dutch
      A: Maria heeft met Jan   gesproken.   B: JAN?
            Maria has   with Jan   talked
            'Maria has spoken with Jan.'

In English, no degradation in acceptability is observed when a reprise fragment reprises a constituent that is island-bound in its antecedent. In other words, English reprise fragments are island-insensitive, unlike their standard fragment counterparts, which are island-sensitive (see 20 to 23).

(34) A: [ISLAND The fact that [ISLAND a **Labour** MP] threatened John] is comical.
      B: LABOUR?

(35) A: Pete wonders [ISLAND who [ISLAND Sue's **father**]] will fire.
      B: FATHER? / Sue's {WHAT/WHO}?

(36) A: [ISLAND A drink during **the intermission**] will help to lessen one's anger.

     B: The INTERMISSION / the WHAT?

This concludes our outline of the main differences between English standard and reprise fragments. Table 1 summarizes the data presented in this subsection and the preceding one.

Table 1: Properties of English reprise and standard fragments			
	reprise fragments	**standard fragments**	
		with alt-Q antecedents	**with decl or wh-Q antecedents**
Only A′-movable phrases?	no	no	yes
Obey P-stranding generalization?	no	no	yes
Island-sensitive?	no	*unknown*	yes

In the next section, we turn to Hungarian.

2.3. STANDARD AND REPRISE FRAGMENTS IN HUNGARIAN. In Hungarian, reprise and standard fragments behave uniformly regarding the three properties currently being discussed. Specifically, both Hungarian reprise and standard fragments show the hallmarks of being A′-moved items. In this respect, they pattern with English fragments that have declarative or wh-question antecedents. For example, both reprise and standard fragments in Hungarian must be A′-movable phrases, such as AdvP, AP, CP, DP, and PP. The examples in 37 present standard fragments that correspond to an AdvP, AP, CP, DP, or PP constituent.

(37) a.   A: Hogy   szerepelt   Misi   a   versenyen?
               how   do.PST.3SG Misi   the   competition.SUP
               'How did Misi do in the competion?'

        B: [AdvP Nagyon   jól].
               very   well
               'Very wêll.'

    b.   A: Ez   a   vakcina   hatástalan.
               this   the vaccine   ineffective
               'This vaccine is ineffective.'

        B: Nem, [AP hatásos].
               no   effective
               'No, effêctive.'

c.   A: Mitől   tartanak   az   emberek?
                what.ABL fear.3PL   the people
                'What are people concerned about?'

        B: (Attól) [CP hogy   ez   a   vakcina   mérgező].[7]
                that.ABL   that   this   the vaccine   poisonous
                'That this vaccine is pôisonous.'

d.   A: Kit   választottak   elnöknek?
                who.ACC elect.PST.3PL   president.DAT
                'Who did they elect president?'

        B: [DP Bident].
                   Biden.ACC
                'Bîden.'

e.   A: Az iskolák   zárva   lesznek.
                the school.PL   closed   be.FUT.3PL
                'The schools will be closed.'

        B: Igen, [PP egy hónapon   át].
                yes   a   month.SUP   through
                'Yes, for a mônth.'

The examples in 38 show that the same class of constituents can also be reprise fragments.

(38)   a.   A: Misi iszonyatosan   szerepelt   a   versenyen.
                Misi horribly   do.PST.3SG   the   competition.SUP
                'Misi did horribly in the competion.'

        B: [AdvP ISZONYATOSAN]?
                    horribly

   b.   A: Ez   a   vakcina   hatástalan.
                this   the vaccine   ineffective
                'This vaccine is ineffective.'

        B: [AP HATÁSTALAN]?
                   ineffective

   c.   A: Attól   tartanak   az   emberek,   hogy   ez   a   vakcina   mérgező.
                that.ABL   fear.3PL   the people   that   this   the vaccine   poisonous
                'People are concerned that this vaccine is poisonous.'

---

[7] CP-type fragments can be preceded by a case-marked pronominal that associates with the finite clause when the latter appears as an argument of a verb.

B: (Attól) [CP hogy ez a vakcina mérgező]?
   that.ABL   that this the vaccine.PL poisonous
   'That this vaccine is poisonous?'

d. A: Bident választották elnöknek.
      Biden.ACC elect.PST.3PL president.DAT
      'They elected Biden president.'

   B: [DP BIDENT]?
         Biden.ACC

e. A: Az iskolák egy hónapon át zárva lesznek.
      the school.PL a month through closed be.3PL
      'The schools will be closed for a month.'

   B: [PP Egy hónapon át]?
         a month through
      'For a MONTH?'

The examples in 39 provide proof that unacceptability is yielded when an immovable phrase is used as a standard fragment.

(39) a. A: Ez az engedmény a fiatal korosztálynak jár.
         this the allowance the young age.group.DAT benefit.3SG
         'This allowance benefits the young generation.'

      B: * Nem, [AP idős].
           No   old
           'No, ôld.'   [*Intended*: it benefits the ôld generation]

   b. A: Valamitől tartanak az emberek.
         something.ABL fear.3PL the people
         'People are concerned about something.'

      B: * Igen, [TP ez a vakcina mérgező].
           yes   this the vaccine poisonous
           'Yes, this vaccine is poisonous.'
                              [*Intended*: they are concerned that this vaccine is poisonous]

   c. A: Gabi meghívta [DP Misi [NP szüleit]]
         Gabi invite.PST.3SG Misi parent.POSS.PL.3SG.ACC
         'Gabi invited Misi's parents.'

      B: * Nem, Peti.
           no   Peti
           No, Pêti.'   [*Intended*: Gabi invited Pêti's parents]

  d. A: Mari vett   három könyvet.
          Mari buy.PST.3SG three book.ACC
          'Mari bought three books.'

      B: * Nem, kettő.
             no   two
             'No, twô.'   [*Intended*: Mari bought twô books]

  e. A: Ez a vaccina géntechnikával   készült.
          this the vaccine gene.technology.INST get.prepared.PST.3SG
          'This vaccine was made using gene technology.'

      B: * Nem, nano.
             no   nano
             'No, nâno.'   [*Intended*: it was made with nânotechnology]

The examples in 40 demonstrate that, just like standard fragments, immovable phrases do not make for suitable reprise questions, either.

(40) a. A: Ez az engedmény a   fiatal korosztálynak jár.
              this the allowance   the young age.group.DAT benefit.3SG
              'This allowance benefits the young generation.'

          B: * [AP FIATAL]?
                 young   [*Intended*: it benefits the YOUNG generation?]

      b. A: Attól   tartanak az emberek, hogy ez a   vakcina mérgező.
              that.ABL fear.3PL the people   that this the vaccine poisonous
              'People are concerned that this vaccine is poisonous.'

          B: * [TP Ez a   vakcina mérgező]?
                   this the vaccine poisonous
                 'This vaccine is POISONOUS?'
                            [*Intended*: they are concerned that this vaccine is POISONOUS?]

      c. A: Gabi meghívta [DP Misi [NP szüleit]].
              Gabi invite.PST.3SG Misi   parent.POSS.PL.3SG.ACC
              'Gabi invited Misi's parents.'

          B: * Misi?
                MISI   [*Intended*: Gabi invited MISI's parents?]

      d. A: Mari vett   tizenhat könyvet.
              Mari buy.PST.3SG sixteen book.ACC
              'Mari bought sixteen books.'

    B: * Tizenhat?

        sixteen   [*Intended*: Mari bought SIXTEEN books?]

        'SIXTEEN?'

e.   A: Ez a   vaccina   géntechnikával   készült.

        this the vaccine   gene.technology.INST   get.prepared.PST.3SG

        'This vaccine was made using gene technology.'

    B: * GÉN?

        gene   [*Intended*: it was made using GENEtechnology?]

Postposition-stranding under A′-movement is illicit in Hungarian for the majority of postpositions (Dékány & Hegedűs 2015) (41a). For these postpositions, standard fragments that are intended as DP complements of postpositions are unacceptable, as 41b shows. Reprise fragments are also unacceptable in the same syntactic context (41c). This demonstrates that both reprise and standard fragments obey the adposition-stranding generalization from 16 – another indication that both types of fragments show A′-like characteristics.

(41) a. A: Dani   megtalálta   a   tollat   a   szekrény   alatt.

        Dani   PRT.find.PST.3SG   the pen.ACC   the closet   under

        'Dani found the pen under the closet.'

    B: * Mi₁   találta   meg Dani a   tollat   [PP *t*₁ alatt]?

        what find.PST.3SG   PRT   Dani the pen.ACC   under

        lit. 'What did Dani find the pen under?'

    b. A: Dani   megtalálta   a   tollat   a   szekrény   alatt.

        Dani   PRT.find.PST.3SG   the pen.ACC   the closet   under

        'Dani found the pen under the closet.'

    B: * Nem,   a   zongora.

        no   the piano

        'No, the piâno.'

    c. A: Dani   megtalálta   a tollat   a   sifonér   alatt.

        Dani   PRT.find.PST.3SG   the pen.ACC   the closet   under

        'Dani found the pen under the closet.'

    B: * A   SIFONÉR?

        the closet

It should be mentioned that standard fragments anteceded by alternative questions in Hungarian are in no way different from standard fragments with other antecedent types, unlike such fragments in English and Dutch (see 24 and 25 above). Hungarian fragments responding to alternative questions can only be A′-movable constituents (42) and they cannot be bare DP fragments that are

interpreted as complements of postpositions (43).

(42) a. A: Az óra előtt vagy után lesz időd beszélgetni?
            the class before or after be.FUT.3SG time.POSS.2SG talk.INF
            'Will you have time to talk before or after class?'

      B: *[P Előtt].
            before

   b. A: Az idős vagy a fiatal korosztálynak jár az engedmény?
            the old or the young age.group.DAT benefit.3SG the allowance
            'Does this allowance benefit the young or the old generation?'

      B: *[AP Fiatal].
            young

(43) A: A zongora vagy a sifonér alatt volt a toll?
            the piano or the closet under be.PST.3SG the pen
            'Was the pen under the piano or the closet?'

      B: * [DP A zongora].
               the piano

Returning to reprise and standard fragments with assertoric or wh-question antecedents, both types conform to the island-sensitivity generalization in Hungarian (Lipták 2011, Griffiths & Lipták 2014). This is demonstrated for standard fragments in the next two examples in the B-responses and for reprise fragments in the B′-responses. The first example contains an island corresponding to a complex noun phrase, while the second contains an adverbial adjunct clause.

(44) a. A: Kidobtam [ISLAND egy **BPA-t** tartalmazó] palackot.
            away.throw.PST.1PL a BPA-ACC containing bottle.ACC
            'I threw away a bottle containing BPA.'

      B: * Nem, BPB-t.
            no BPB-ACC
            'No, BPB.'   [*Intended*: a bottle containing BPB]

      B′: * BPA-t?
            BPA-ACC
            'BPA?'

   b. A: Gabi azért mérges, [ISLAND mert **Mikivel** senki sem játszik].
            Gabi that.CAU angry because Miki nobody not play.3SG
            'Gabi is angry because nobody plays with Miki.'

B: ?* Nem,   Tibivel.
      no   Tîbivel   [*Intended*: She's angry because nobody plays with Tîbi]
B′:?* MIKIVEL?

As the following two examples illustrate, standard (45) and reprise fragments (46) also show the same distribution regarding fragments containing much deaccented material: standard and reprise fragments can correspond to larger phrases, but these phrases must be A′-movable, such as the embedded DP (the (a) examples) or the embedded CP (the (e) example). Note that Hungarian is a subject *pro*-drop language, which allows for nonpronunciation of the subject. Hungarian and English therefore differ regarding such cases: compare the examples below with the English cases in 26 and footnote 6.

(45) A: Peti azt   mondta,   hogy villával fogja enni   a   fagyit.
              Peti that.ACC say.PST.1SG   that   fork.with will   eat.INF the ice.cream.ACC
              'Peti said that he will eat the ice cream with a fork.'

    a.   B: Nem, a SALÁTÁT.
    b.   B: * Nem, *enni a* SALÁTÁT.
    c.   B: * Nem, *fogja enni a* SALÁTÁT.
    d.   B: * Nem, *villával fogja enni a* SALÁTÁT.
    e.   B: Nem, *hogy villával fogja enni a* SALÁTÁT.
    g.   B: * Nem, *mondta, hogy villával fogja enni a* SALÁTÁT.
    h.   B: Nem, (*Peti*) *azt*   *mondta,*   *hogy villával fogja enni* a   SALÁTÁT.
              No   Peti   that.ACC say.PST.1SG that fork.with will   eat.INF the salad.ACC

(46) A: Peti azt   mondta,   hogy villával fogja enni   a   fagyit.
              Peti that.ACC say.PST.1SG   that   fork.with will   eat.INF the ice.cream.ACC
              'Peti said that he will eat the ice cream with a fork.'

    a.   B: A FAGYIT?
    b.   B: * *Enni* a FAGYIT?
    c.   B: * *Fogja enni* a FAGYIT?
    d.   B: * *Villával fogja enni* a FAGYIT?
             (intended: *Peti said that he will eat the ice cream with a fork.*)
    e.   B: *Hogy villával fogja enni* a FAGYIT?
    g.   B: * *Mondta, hogy villával fogja enni* a FAGYIT?
    h.   B: (*Peti*) *azt mondta,* *hogy*   *villával*   *fogja enni* a   FAGYIT?
             Peti   that.ACC   say.PST.1SG that fork.with will   eat.INF the IC.ACC

2.4. IDENTICAL (ANTI-)CONNECTIVITY EFFECTS IN STANDARD AND REPRISE FRAGMENTS. A fragment displays CONNECTIVITY EFFECTS with its antecedent if it exhibits grammatical dependencies

on the missing material that are similar to its correlate's dependencies on nonelliptical material surrounding it. Connectivity effects comprise identical case or morphological marking on a fragment and its correlate, identical binding and bound-variable dependences, and identical scope. A fragment displays ANTI-CONNECTIVITY effects if it fails to exhibit such dependencies and there is therefore a discrepancy between the morphological form or meaning of a fragment and its correlate in the antecedent clause. In both English and Hungarian, standard and reprise fragments display identical morphological and syntacticosemantic (anti-)connectivity effects. To conserve space, we show this using only English examples (and two German examples, too).

We begin the discussion by observing that both standard and reprise nominal fragments and their correlates must match for morphological case (47) (the German examples in 48 confirm that case connectivity effects are also observed with nonpronominal DPs).

(47) a. A: **Whose** car did you take?   (SF – Merchant 2004:678)
      B: Jôhn's / * Jôhn.

  b. A: Did **he** phone you?   (RF – Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:302)
      B: HE? / # HIM?

(48) *German*
  a. A: **Wem**   folgt   Hans?   (SF – Merchant 2004:677)
          who.DAT   follows   Hans
      B: {Dem / * Den}   Lêhrer.
          the.DAT the.ACC   teacher

  b. A: Ist **dieser**   Platz noch frei?   (RF – Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:302)
          Is   this.NOM   place still   free?
      B: {DIESER   / * DIESEN   / * DIESEM} Platz?
          this.NOM   /   this.ACC /   this.DAT place

Regarding morphological case in English, reprise and standard fragments also display the same anti-connectivity effects for subject personal pronouns. Instead of bearing the expected nominative case of their counterparts in nonfragmentary utterances, both reprise and standard pronominal fragments that are interpreted as subjects must bear accusative case:

(49) A: I hate Star Wars.   B: Î *hate Star Wars*, too.   (standard assertion)
                                B′: {Mê / * Î}, too.   (standard fragment)

(50) A: He's banned from here.   B: HE*'s banned*? What for?   (reprise question)
                                B′: {HIM / * HE}? What for?   (reprise fragment)

Standard and reprise fragments must also match their correlates for verbal morphology:[8, 9]

(51) a. A: What is John **doing**? (SF – Merchant 2004:696)
          B: {Washing / * washed / * wash} his câr.

      b. (i)   A: Did he **adore** the book? (RF – Ginzburg 2012:152)
                B: ADORE? / * ADORED?
          (ii) A: Is John hugging Pete?
                B: HUGGING? / * HUGGED?

Nominal standard and reprise fragments must obey the same principles of the Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981, 1986) as their correlates. In other words, both reprise and standard fragments exhibit binding connectivity effects. To see this, consider the unacceptable standard fragment in 52aB. This fragment is unacceptable because, if it 'replaced' its correlate in the preceding utterance, *John* would generate a Principle C violation. The same connectivity effect is observed in reprise fragments, as 52b shows.[10]

(52) a. A: Where is **he**$_i$ staying? (SF – Merchant 2004:679)
          B: * In John$_i$'s apârtment.

---

[8] Because lexical morphemes (i.e. ROOTS) can be substituted for their synonyms in reprise fragments (i), morphological matching is only required between functional morphemes, as (ii) shows.

(i)   A: Did you go to New York recently?
      B: To the BIG APPLE?
(ii) A: Were you cycling yesterday?
      B: CYCLING / BIKING / * BIKED? (Ginzburg 2012:152)

[9] The morphological parallelism requirement exemplified in 51b can be obviated in English reprise fragments that are bare morphological roots (see i), thus yielding an anti-connectivity effect. In such cases, an INFORMATION-SEEKING interpretation of the reprise fragment is forced, thus disambiguating the fragment as derived from an ECR (see section 2). In Hungarian, however, the morphological constraint exemplified in 51 must always be satisfied, despite ECRs existing in this language, too. Uninflected verbal reprise fragments are unacceptable, as (ii) shows. Why this difference obtains, and how other languages pattern with regards to it, must remain open questions for now.

(i)   A: Dana has been confusticating Mary again.
      B: CONFUSTICATE?
      Interpretation of (iB): What does 'confusticate' mean? *information-seeking*
                             * He's been CONFUSTICATING her? No way! *confirmational*
(ii) A: A   szakemberek tavaly   progrosztizálták   ezeket a   jelenségeket.
          the   expert.PL   last.year predict.PST.DEF.3PL these   the phenomenon.PL.ACC
          'Experts predicted these phenomena last year.'
      B: { Progrosztizálták? /   * Progrosztizál?}
            predict.PST.DEF.3PL   predict

[10] Note that R-expressions in antecedents can ordinarily be substituted for pronouns in reprise fragments, as (i) and (ii) show.

(i)   A: I want **John** to kiss me.   B: HIM?
(ii) A: I want **him** to kiss me.   B: JOHN?

    b.   A: He$_i$ came in **his**$_i$ car.   (RF)
          B: * In JOHN$_i$'s car?

Principle C violations are observed in 53, in which the pronoun in the antecedent utterance is swapped for an epithet in the reprise fragment. Principle A violations are observed in 54.

(53) a.   A: **What** does John$_i$ think?   (SF – Merchant 2004:679)
           B: * That the bastard$_i$ is being spîed on.

    b.   A: John$_i$ thinks that **he**$_i$ is being spied on.   (RF)
          B: * That the bastard$_i$ is being SPIED on?

(54)   A: **Who** does John$_i$ think Sue will invite?   (SF – Merchant 2004:680)
          B: ?? Hîmself$_i$.

    b.   A.   Does John$_i$ think that Mary will kiss **him**$_i$?   (RF)
          B: * That Mary will KISS himself$_i$?

Furthermore, quantifier-binding relations established in the antecedent clause are retained in both standard and reprise fragments. In 55b, for instance, the pronoun in the reprise fragment has the same bound-variable interpretation as the pronoun in its antecedent. The same interpretation is obtained for the pronoun in the standard fragment in 55a.

(55) a.   A: **Who** does every Englishman$_i$ admire?   (SF – Merchant 2004:681)
           B: His$_i$ mother.

    b.   A: [Every Englishman]$_i$ admires his$_i$ mother.   (RF)
           B: His$_i$ MOTHER?

2.5. SUMMARY AND MOTIVATING A SILENT STRUCTURE ANALYSIS OF REPRISE FRAGMENTS. Table 2 below summarizes the observations presented in the previous two subsections, focusing on English and Hungarian. The pattern that emerges is that most fragment-types pattern identically, except for English reprise fragments and English standard fragments with alternative question antecedents, which differ from the other fragment-types regarding their distributional behavior (i.e. the grey-shaded cells in Table 2). As we have specified above, such fragments show (anti-)connectivity effects, but they do not necessarily correspond to / behave as A'-moving phrases, a feature that is shared by their counterparts in some other Germanic languages. As we have also shown, Hungarian standard fragments responding to alternative questions behave identically to other reprise and standard fragments in this language. For this reason, this type of Hungarian fragment is not afforded its own column in this table, unlike its English counterpart.

Table 2. Properties of English and Hungarian standard and reprise fragments					
	English			Hungarian	
	reprise frags	standard frags		reprise frags	standard frags
		with alt-Q antecedents	with decl or wh-Q antecedents		
Only A′-movable phrases?	No	no	yes	yes	yes
Obey P-stranding generalization?	No	no	yes	yes	yes
Island-sensitive?	No	*unknown*	yes	yes	yes
Same (anti-)connectivity effects?	Yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Recall that, in this paper, we are adopting as a foundational assumption the silent structure analysis of standard fragments, following Merchant 2001, 2004 for English and many other Indo-European languages, and following Lipták 2011 and Griffiths & Lipták 2014 for Hungarian, a Uralic language. A major motivation for treating standard fragments as elliptic clauses has been the observation that standard fragments display connectivity effects (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001, 2004). This observation is straightforwardly explained under the silent structure analysis: the morphosyntactic and semantic dependencies that are established (or must not be established) in nonelliptic sentences are also established (or must not be established) in elliptic sentences, the only difference being that elliptic sentences are only partially pronounced. For example, a Condition C violation is observed in 52a because it is c-commanded by an unpronounced pronoun with which it co-refers:

(56) A: Where is **he**$_i$ staying?
      B: * ~~He$_i$ is staying~~ in John$_i$'s apârtment.   *(underlying syntax for (52aB))*

The observation that reprise fragments display identical connectivity effects to standard fragments strongly suggests that these two fragment-types should receive the same analysis. Put differently, if one believes that the presence of connectivity effects in standard fragments is indicative of their status as elliptic clauses, then one should view the presence of connectivity effects in reprise fragments as indicative of **their** status as elliptic clauses, too.

3. A CLAUSAL ELLIPSIS ANALYSIS. In this section, we outline a clausal ellipsis analysis that captures the data summarized in Table 2. To conserve space, we avoid technical discussion whenever possible. Readers interested in the technical details are directed to the supplementary document that accompanies the main paper.

We first outline the 'basic' form of our theory (section 3.1), which consists of three simple assumptions. Although this basic theory provides good empirical coverage, it makes incorrect predictions about a subset of English standard fragments. We fix this in section 3.2 by supplementing the basic theory with Griffiths' (2019) theory of clausal ellipsis licensing, the so-called SYNTACTIC QUESTION APPROACH.

3.1. THE BASIC THEORY. Our starting assumptions are that:

(57) a.   Ellipsis applies selectively in the elliptic clause. Focus-marked constituents (henceforth, FOCs), and some use-conditional particles, are not elided.[11, 12]
     b.   Ordinarily, ellipsis does not bleed syntactic movement.
     c.   Ellipsis does not trigger exceptional syntactic movement.

Regarding 57a, we assume that, when ellipsis applies to clause-sized phrasal constituent XP, certain designated constituents in XP are shielded from ellipsis' effect. Regarding 57b, we adopt the position that, although ellipsis may indeed bleed a few types of syntactic movement (namely, some EPP-driven movement operations; see Merchant 2001, van Craenenbroeck & Den Dikken 2006, Griffiths et al. 2021 for specific cases), syntactic movement is ordinarily unaffected by ellipsis (*contra* Abe's 2015 view on sluicing in wh-movement languages). For current purposes, adopting 57b is tantamount to assuming that, if an item X undergoes overt syntactic movement in a clause YP, X also undergoes overt syntactic movement when clausal ellipsis applies to YP. Regarding 57c, we reject the proposal that instances of overt syntactic movement that are ordinarily illicit in nonelliptic environments become necessary under ellipsis (*contra* the MOVE AND DELETE approach to clausal ellipsis originating with Merchant 2001, 2004 and Richards 2001). By adopting 57a-c,

---

[11] Some readers may appreciate some technical clarification about the term 'FOC' in 57a. We adopt the uncontroversial position originating from Rooth (1985, 1992) that (i) Alternative Semantic (AS) values are introduced from lexical sources, two of which are wh-items (in wh-questions) and any F(ocus)-marked item (in declarative assertions, polar questions, and alternative questions) (Beck 2006, Beck & Kim 2006) and that (ii) AS-values may – and often *must* – 'percolate' upwards through a phrase marker via pointwise Function Application (Hamblin 1973). We refer to the constituent that represents the maximal extent of this AS-percolation process as 'FOC' and propose that FOCs are shielded from clausal ellipsis. Following Artstein (2004), we further assume that F-marking can apply to any morphosyntactic constituent, including subwords (i.e. morphemes).

[12] The phrase 'and some use-conditional particles' is included in 57a to reflect the fact that particles such as *ja*, *denn* and *wohl* in German (see the possible elliptical responses in (i), adapted from Ott & Struckmeier 2018) and *even* in English (see (ii)) can avoid ellipsis:

(i)   A: Peter   hat   ein   paar   Leute   eingeladen.
            Peter   has   a   couple people   invited
            'Peter invited a couple of people'.

      B: Wen denn?   B':   Seine   Freunde   wohl.
            who MP   his   friends   MP
            'Who?'   'Probably his friends.'

(ii) A: Sally's writing love songs again.
      B: Why? And who even fôr?

we therefore advocate an IN-SITU silent structure approach to clausal ellipsis (so-called because such analyses permit remnants to remain in their base-generated position in the narrow syntax).

APPLYING THE BASIC THEORY TO REPRISE FRAGMENTS. Under the silent structure approach, reprise fragments are viewed as reprise questions to which clausal ellipsis has applied.[13] The prevailing opinion about English reprise questions is that neither reprise wh-questions nor reprise polar questions are derived by A′-moving the phrase(s) containing an item that bears focus prominence; see Beck & Reis 2018 and references in there. Among other things, motivation for this position comes from the observation that the focused item can be island-bound (58a) and/or a subword (58b).

(58) a.　A:　The rumor that Kim finagled Karl is hard to believe.

　　　　B:　[ISLAND The rumor that she {FINAGLED / WHATed} him] is hard to believe?

　　 b.　A:　Why does he seem so discombobulated?

　　　　B:　Why does he seem so discom-{BOB/WHAT}-ulated?

If one further assumes that any node dominating an F-marked item can function as FOC in English reprise questions (*contra* Beck & Reis 2018; see the supplementary document for the technical details), then our basic in-situ approach straightforwardly captures the fact that English reprise fragments display no A′-properties. This is because the remnant(s) of ellipsis undergo no A′-movement in the elliptic utterance, and any node dominating an F-marked item can be a remnant. Thus, the underlying structure for the reprise fragments in 1 to 3 are as in 59a-c.

(59) a.　~~[Is he a [~~N~~ [neuroF]FOC [physiologist]]]~~?

　　 b.　~~[Did he [~~VP~~ [V finagleF]FOC a raise]~~?

　　 c.　~~[He's bought~~ [DP a whatF car]FOC ~~]~~?

Before we discuss the syntactic structure of Hungarian reprise questions, let us first outline the formal properties of Hungarian standard questions. In Hungarian standard wh-questions, the wh-phrase immediately precedes the main verb, and the verb and its lexical particle undergo inversion (when the latter is present) (É. Kiss 1987, Horvath 1986, Brody 1991, among others). This word order is obtained through wh-movement to Spec, FocP and head-movement of the verb to Foc:

(60) a.　Gabi MIT　　 kapott　　 a　 szülinapjára?

　　　　Gabi what.ACC　get.PST.3SG　the　birthday.POSS.3SG.SUB

　　　　'What did Gabi get for her birthday?'

　　 b.　Gabi [FocP mit₁ kapott₂ [TP *t₂* *t₁* a szülinapjára]]?

---

[13] Putting aside the complication with explicit clarification requests (ECRs) already discussed in section 2.

In polar questions containing a narrow-focused phrase, the focused phrase undergoes the same movement operation to FocP, accompanied by movement of the verb:

(61) a.   Gabi   GÖRDESZKÁT   kapott   a   szülinapjára?
          Gabi   skateboard.ACC   get.PST.3SG   the   birthday.POSS.3SG.SUB
          'Did Gabi get A SKATEBOARD for her birthday?'

     b.   Gabi [$_{FocP}$ gördeszkát$_1$ kapott$_2$ [$_{TP}$ t_2 t_1 a szülinapjára]]?

In Hungarian wh-questions that reprise sentence-sized utterances, the wh-phrase item must also undergo movement to the immediately preverbal focus position, as É. Kiss (1987), Kenesei et al (1998), Kálmán (2001) and Mycock (2019) report. As the B2 question responding to A's statement in 62 shows, the postverbal position of the wh-phrase is degraded.[14]

(62) A: Szeretnék   egy hódeszkát.
         like.COND.1SG a   snowboard.ACC
         'I'd like a snowboard.'

    B1: MIT   szeretnél?
         what.ACC   like.COND.2SG
         'What would you like?'

    B2: *? Szeretnél   MIT?
           like.COND.2SG what.ACC

The wh-movement observed in reprise questions displays the usual hallmarks of Hungarian A′-movement: it must observe islands (63), it can target only A′-movable phrases (64), and it cannot P-strand (65).

(63) A: Gabi   azért   mérges, [$_{ISLAND}$ mert   **Töhötöm** meghívta].
         Gabi   that.CAU angry   because   Töhötöm   PRT.invite.PST.3SG
         'Gabit is angry because Töhötöm invited her.'

---

[14] The postverbal position of the wh-phrase becomes acceptable for many speakers if the wh-phrase is embedded in a larger constituent, such as a DP (Kálmán 2001):

(i) A: Piri   megmutatta   az   új   hódeszkáját.
        Piri   PRT.show.PST.3SG   the   new   snowboard.POSS3SG.ACC
        'Piri showed her new snowboard.'

    B: Piri   megmutatta   az   új   MIJÉT?
        Piri   PRT.show.PST.3SG   the   new   what.pOSS3SG.ACC
        'Piri showed her new WHAT?'

The postverbal constituent in this case represents a FOCUS PHRASE, in Drubig's (1994) sense. See the main text below on reprise questions involving postverbal focus.

B: * Kicsoda₁ mérges   azért   Gabi, [ISLAND mert   *t₁* meghívta]?

who   angry   that.CAU Gabi   because   PRT.invite.PST.3SG

'WHO is Gabi angry because he did not invite her?'

(64) a. A: Gabi meghívta   [ISLAND **Misi**   szüleit].

Gabi PRT.invite.PST.3SG Misi   parent.POSS.PL.3SG.ACC

'Gabi invited Misi's parents.'

B: * Kicsoda₁ hívta   meg Gabi [ISLAND *t₁*   szüleit]?

who   invite.PST.3SG PRT Gabi   parent.POSS.PL.3SG.ACC

lit. 'WHOSE did Gabi invite parents?'

b. A: Mari vett [ISLAND **tizenhat** könyvet].

Mari buy.PST.3SG sixteen   book.ACC

'Mari bought sixteen books.'

B: * Hány₁   vett   [ISLAND *t₁* könyvet]?

how.many buy.PST.3SG   book.ACC

lit. 'HOW many did she buy books?'

(65)   A: Dani megtalálta   a tollat [PP a   sifonér alatt].

Dani PRT.find.PST.3SG the pen.ACC   the closet   under

'Dani found the pen under the closet.'

B. * Mi   találta   meg Dani a tollat [PP *t₁* alatt]?

what find.PST.3SG PRT Dani the pen.ACC   under

lit. 'WHAT did Dani find the pen under?'

Reprise polar questions seeking confirmation or information about a narrow focus constituent can be formed in two ways. One strategy involves movement of the narrow focus phrase to the pre-verbal focus position, see 66B. Alternatively, it is possible to leave the focused constituent in situ, as shown in 66B′.[15 / 16]

---

[15] The word order observed in 66B′ is also compatible with another reading (which is preferred by some speakers we consulted), according to which confirmation seeking is extended to the entire proposition. In this latter reading, all major constituents would carry equal stress.

[16] The preverbal focus strategy standardly exhibits the ordinary exhaustive reading of the preverbal focus constituent (Kenesei 2006, Horvath 2013), but the exhaustive requirement can be suspended under some discourse conditions, as in (i):

(i) A (judge): Ön   hol   volt   aznap   délután?

you.formal   where   be.PST.3SG   that.day   afternoon

'Where were you that day in the afternoon?'

B (accused): Voltam   a   munkahelyemen,   a   könyvtárban   és   az

be.PST.1SG   the   work.POSS1SG.SUP   the   library.INE   and   the

uszodában.

swimming.pool.INE

(66) A: János   vett   egy fekete   struccot   a   feleségének.
          János   buy.PST.3SG   a   black   ostrich.ACC the   wife.POSS3SG.DAT
          'János bought a black ostrich for his wife.'

      B: [FocP [Egy fekete STRUCCOT]₁ vett   [TP *t₁* a feleségének]]?
               a   black   ostrich.ACC buy.PST.3SG   the wife.POSS3SG.DAT
          'Was it a black OSTRICH that he bought for his wife?'

      B′: Vett   [egy fekete STRUCCOT] a   feleségének?
           buy.PST.3SG   a   black   ostrich.ACC the wife.POSS3SG.DAT
           'He bought a black OSTRICH for his wife?'

The overt focus-movement strategy is parallel in all respects to the movement of wh-constituents in wh-reprise questions: it involves an overt A′-movement operation that observes island restrictions and disallows P-stranding, yielding patterns like those in 64 and 65 above (we refrain from illustrating this to conserve space). We contend that the strategy in B′, in which the focused phrase appears in-situ, also involves A′-movement, but this movement is covert. At LF, the focused constituent takes scope in the preverbal focus position, which is evidenced using island configurations. To illustrate, first consider a context without an island, such as 67. In this dialogue, A2's reply delimits the size of the postverbal focused phrase in the reprise question. In this case, the focus phrase is the DP '*egy szkeget*' (*a skeg*), and not any larger phrase containing that DP.

(67) A1: Misi vett   egy szkeget   Gabi   szülinapjára.
           Misi buy.PST.3SG   a   skeg.ACC   Gabi   birthday.POSS.3SG.SUB
           'Misi bought a skeg for Gabi's birthday.'

      B: Vett   egy SZKEGET   Gabi   szülinapjára?
           buy.PST.3SG   a   skeg.ACC Gabi   birthday.POSS.3SG.SUB
           'She bought a SKEG for Gabi's birthday?'

      A2: Igen, egy SZKEGET. Az   egy stabilizáló dolog a   szörfdeszkára.
           yes   a   skeg.ACC that a   stabilizing thing the surfboard.SUB
           'Yes, he bought a skeg. That's a stabilizing thing for a surfboard.'

Using the same control, we see that, in 'postverbal' reprise questions, the focused phrase cannot be contained in an island, such as an adjunct island in 68 or a complex noun phrase in 69, which shows that these focused phrases are undergoing covert A′-movement to the specifier of FocP. For

---

'I was at work, in the library and in the swimming pool.'
A (judge):   Jól   értettem,   a   KÖNYVTÁRBAN   volt?
             well   understand.PST.1SG   the library.INE   be.PST.3SG
             'Did I understand it correctly, you were in the LIBRARY?'

some speakers we consulted, A2 in 68 and 69 are degraded continuations of B's response. (This judgement is shared by the third author of this article.)

(68) A1: Misi elment a boltba, [ISLAND hogy vegyen egy szkeget
Misi go.PST.3SG the shop.ILL that buy.SUBJ.3SG a skeg.ACC
Gabi szülinapjára].
Gabi the birthday.POSS.3SG.SUB
'Misi went to the shop to buy a skeg for Gabi's birthday.'

B: Misi elment a boltba, [ISLAND hogy vegyen egy SZKEGET
Misi go.PST.3SG the shop.ILL that buy.SUBJ.3SG a skeg.ACC
Gabi szülinapjára?
Gabi the birthday.POSS.3SG.SUB
'Misi went to the shop to buy a SKEG for Gabi's birthday?'

A2: ?* Igen, egy SZKEGET. Az egy stabilizáló dolog a szörfdeszkára.
yes a skeg.ACC that a stabilizing thing the surfboard.SUB
'Yes, a skeg. That's a stabilizing thing for a surfboard.'

(69) A1: Kidobtam [ISLAND a BPA-t tartalmazó palackot].
away.throw.PST.1SG the BPA-ACC containing bottle.ACC
'I threw away the bottle that contained BPA.'

B: Kidobtad [ISLAND a BPA-t tartalmazó palackot]?
away.throw.PST.2SG the BPA-ACC containing bottle.ACC
'Did you throw away the bottle that contained BPA?'

A2: *Igen, BPA-t. Biszfenol-A, egy kémiai anyag.
yes BPA-ACC bisphenol-A a chemical stuff
'Yes, BPA. That is bisphenol-A, chemical stuff.'

The examples presented in 60 to 69 have served to demonstrate that, in Hungarian, reprise questions of all types exhibit the same A′-properties that standard questions do: reprise wh-questions involve A′-movement to the preverbal focus position and reprise polar questions with narrow focus involve overt or covert A′-movement of the focused phrase to the same position.

Under the silent structure approach being entertained here, the fact that focused phrases in Hungarian reprise questions always undergo A′-movement to the preverbal focus position naturally explains why Hungarian reprise fragments show A′-properties: they are the aforementioned focused phrases that undergo A′-movement. Thus, the underlying phrase markers for the Hungarian reprise fragments from 38a-c are as follows:

(70) a. [CP [FocP [AdvP Iszonyatosan_F]FOC1 [Foc′ ~~szerepelt Misi~~ *t*1 ~~a versenyen~~]]]?
horribly do.PST.3SG Misi the competition.SUP
'HORRIBLY?'

b. [CP [FocP [AP Hatástalan_F]FOC1 [Foc′ ~~ez a vakcina~~ *t*1]]] ?
ineffective this the vaccine
'INEFFECTIVE?'

c. [CP [FocP (Attól) [CP hogy ez a vakcina mérgező_F]FOC2 [Foc′ ~~tartanak~~
that.ABL that this the vaccine.PL poisonous fear.3PL
~~az emberek~~ *t*2]]]?
the people
'That this vaccine is POISONOUS?'

APPLYING THE BASIC THEORY TO STANDARD FRAGMENTS. Our basic theory straightforwardly explains why both English and Hungarian standard wh-fragments (i.e. SLUICES) display A′-properties: these are A′-moved wh-phrases in matrix or embedded wh-clauses (for English sluicing, see Merchant 2001; for Hungarian, see Lipták 2011 and Griffiths & Lipták 2014):

(71) *English sluicing*
The teacher failed a student, but I don't know [CP [DP WHICH_F student]FOC1 ~~she failed~~ *t*1].

(72) *Hungarian sluicing*
Az oktató   megbuktatott   néhány   diákot,   de   nem emlékszem
the teacher   PRT.fail.PST.3SG some   student.ACC   but   not remember.1SG
[CP [FocP [DP HÁNY_F   diákot]FOC1   ~~buktatott meg az oktató~~ *t*1]]]
how.many student.ACC   fail.PST.3SG PRT   the teacher
'The teacher failed some students, but I don't know how many students.'

Our basic theory also applies straightforwardly to most of the standard non-wh fragments under consideration in this study. For Hungarian, strong evidence has already been offered in the previous literature for treating all standard non-wh fragments being preverbal foci (van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, Lipták 2011, Griffiths & Lipták 2014). Because preverbal foci are derived via A′-movement of the focused phrase to the specifier of FocP in the clausal left periphery, the fact that all standard non-wh fragments in Hungarian display A′-properties is unsurprising. Thus, a standard fragment such as 37d is contained in the following underlying phrase marker:

(73) [CP [FocP [DP Biden_F]FOC1 [Foc′ ~~választották elnöknek~~ *t*1]]].
Biden.ACC   elect.PST.3PL president.DAT
'Bîden.'

Our basic theory also captures the observation that English standard non-wh fragments with alternative question antecedents fail to display some A′-properties, such as obeying the Major Constituent constraint and conforming to the P-stranding generalization (in Dutch and German) (see the examples in 24 and 25 in section 2.1). This is because focused items typically do not undergo A′-movement in English (74B). Indeed, such items **cannot** undergo overt A′-movement to FocP in English (74B′).

(74) A. Will Bob eat pâsta or pîzza for dinner tomorrow?
    B: He'll eat pâsta for dinner tomorrow, I reckon.
    B′: # Pâsta, he'll eat for dinner tomorrow, I reckon.
        (*Pasta* cannot be interpreted as presentationally focused in this position)

The current analysis therefore treats the standard fragments in 24a-c as having the following underlying structure:

(75) a.   [~~CP he should~~ [$_V$ revôlve$_F$]$_{FOC}$ ~~it~~], of course.
    b.   [~~CP~~ [~~PP~~ [$_P$ Ûnder$_F$]$_{FOC}$ ~~the bed] is the best hiding place~~], I reckon.
    c.   [~~CP A~~ [~~N~~ [$_{Pref}$ Nêuro$_F$]$_{FOC}$- ~~psycholinguist] just passed by~~].

Note that this prohibition on focused items undergoing A′-movement in English also applies to foci in assertoric responses to wh-questions (76), to foci that function to identify a (set) of members denoted by a salient quantifier (77), to foci that perform an additive function (78), and to corrective foci (79). Problematically, not only can each instance of *John* in the B-responses in 76 to 79 function as a standard non-wh fragment, but each instance will display A′-movement properties, as already noted in section 2. Because our basic analysis would analyze such fragments as remaining in their base-generated positions with ellipsis occurring around them (80), it therefore incorrectly predicts that such fragments display no A′-movement properties.

(76) A: Who will Sally hire today?   B: She'll hire Jôhn today.
                                           B′: # Jôhn, she'll hire today.

(77) A: Sally will hire someone today.   B: Yeah, She'll hire Jôhn today.
                                           B′: # Yeah, Jôhn she'll hire today.

(78) A: Sally will hire Bob today.   B: and she'll hire Jôhn today, too.
                                           B′: # and Jôhn she'll hire today, too.

(79) A: Sally will hire Bob today.   B: No, she'll hire Jôhn today.
                                           B′: # No, Jôhn she'll hire today.

(80) *Fragmentary version of 76B, according to our basic in-situ theory*
    [~~CP she'll hire~~ [Jôhn$_F$]$_{FOC}$ ~~today~~].

In conclusion, we can state that, although our basic in-situ analysis provides good empirical coverage, it does not provide full coverage of all the data. It makes correct predictions about many but not all the observations listed in Table 2 (repeated here for convenience): it cannot account for the properties of English standard non-wh fragments listed in the shaded cells of the table. In particular, the current version of the theory predicts that no English standard non-wh fragment should display A′-properties whereas in reality **all** English standard non-wh fragments – aside from those with an alternative question antecedent – display A′-properties.

Table 2. Properties of English and Hungarian standard and reprise fragments					
	English			**Hungarian**	
	reprise frags	**standard frags**		**reprise frags**	**standard frags**
		with alt-Q antecedents	**with decl or wh-Q antecedents**		
Only A′-movable phrases?	No	no	yes	yes	yes
Obey P-stranding generalization?	No	no	yes	yes	yes
Island-sensitive?	No	*unknown*	yes	yes	yes
Same (anti-)connectivity effects?	Yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

We believe that any proposed solution to this problem should make recourse to how the IDENTITY CONDITION on clausal ellipsis is satisfied. This belief stems from (i) the observation that whether or not an English standard non-wh fragment displays A′-properties is dependent on the type of antecedent clause it has (i.e. an alternative question or a wh-question / assertion) and (ii) the fact that antecedent clauses are involved in the semantic licensing of ellipsis, but not the syntactic licensing of it. Put differently, we believe that our basic theory's shortcoming will disappear once the correct theory of semantic licensing of clausal ellipsis is adopted. The licensing theory we advocate is Griffiths's (2019) SYNTACTIC QUESTION APPROACH, which we outline in the next subsection.

3.2. THE SYNTACTIC QUESTION APPROACH. The syntactic question approach was developed as an attempt to reconcile two well-motivated yet seemingly incompatible claims made in the recent literature about the nature of the identity condition on clausal ellipsis. The first claim is that clausal ellipsis identity must – at least in part – be calculated over linguistic entities with some syntacticosemantic internal structure (i.e. over LOGICAL FORMS) as opposed to merely unstructured propositions (as assumed by Merchant 2001). This claim is motivated by the observation that, even when an elliptic clause E and its antecedent clause A are truth-conditionally equivalent, E is judged as unacceptable if its argument structure differs from A's argument structure (81). This suggests

that E and A must have similar argument structures for ellipsis to be licensed in E. If this is correct, then the identity condition must be stated over structured linguistic objects, in which information about argument structure is encoded, rather than over simple propositional meanings, in which no information about argument structure is encoded.[17]

(81) a. *Voice alternation*
        A: Someone has eaten my sandwich.
        B: * Yeah, [CP [your sandwich's been eaten] [by Bîll]].

     b. *Conative alternation*
        A: De   muis   heeft   ergens   van   gegeten.
              The   mouse   has   something of   eaten.
              'The mouse ate at something.'
        B: * [CP [Wât]₁ heeft de muis t₁ gegeten]?
              What   has   the   mouse   eaten
              'What (did the mouse eat)?'   (Dutch – Den Dikken 2020:23)

The second claim revolves around Roberts' (2012) theory of information structure. Roberts' theory conceives of discourse as a set of MOVES, where moves are modelled as information-states, that is, purely semantic entities. The QUESTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION (QUD) is the pushdown stack of those discourse moves that can be semantically represented as questions (we henceforth refer the questions that constitute the QUD as *Qs*). Importantly, the relation between Qs and erotetic speech acts is indirect: asking an explicit wh-question (i.e. an interrogative) triggers the addition of a corresponding Q to the QUD, but this wh-question utterance is itself not a Q.

 The second claim is that clausal ellipsis is licensed by a Q in the QUD, rather than by the explicitly uttered antecedent clause (Reich 2002, 2004, Krifka 2006, Barros 2014, Weir 2014, Barros & Kotek 2019). According to this claim, an elliptic clause that immediately follows an explicitly uttered interrogative is licensed by the Q invoked by that interrogative, and an elliptic clause that immediately follows an explicitly uttered assertion is licensed by the Q invoked by that

---

[17] The presence or absence of identity between syntactic phrase markers of some description (often identified as LOG-ICAL FORMS (LFs)) has been used not only to explain FIXED DIATHESIS effects (Chung 2006, 2013, Merchant 2005, Chung et al. 2011, Merchant 2013, Rudin 2019, Anand et al. 2021, Ranero 2021), but also to explain the sensitivity of ellipsis to scope variability in truth-conditionally equivalent sentences (Fox 1999, 2000), variable island repair (Fox & Lasnik 2003, Saab 2010), the interaction of island-sensitivity and information-structural contrast in clausal ellipsis environments (Griffiths & Lipták 2014), the Warner/Potsdam VP ellipsis dataset (Thoms 2015), and scopal parallel-ism effects that arise under VP-ellipsis (Messick & Thoms 2016). As far as we can tell, none of these phenomena are readily explainable under an approach to ellipsis identity that states identity over propositions (e.g. Merchant 2001's *e*-GIVENness condition, or the identity conditions offered in AnderBois 2014, Barros 2014, Weir 2014, and Barros & Kotek 2019). See Fox 1999, 2000, Reich 2002, 2004, Fox & Lasnik 2003, Takahashi & Fox 2005, Krifka 2006, Saab 2010, Griffiths & Lipták 2014, Thoms 2013, 2015, Messick & Thoms 2016, Weir 2017, Kotek & Barros 2018, Rudin 2019, Griffiths 2019, and Anand et al. 2021 for identity conditions stated over syntactically derived objects of some description or another.

assertion.[18] Two observations supporting the idea that clausal ellipsis is especially sensitive to questions are as follows: first, if a non-wh fragment's antecedent is an explicit wh-question, then ellipsis can only be licensed from the entire wh-question, and not from a declarative clausal subpart thereof (82). Considering that only the entire wh-question will invoke the addition of a Q to the QUD, this datum supports the idea that clausal ellipsis can only be licensed by the topmost Q in the QUD. Second, if an explicit wh-question or assertoric antecedent is addressed dismissively and therefore the Q that it invokes loses its status as 'topmost Q' by the point in conversational-time at which an elliptic clause is encountered, then this Q cannot be used to license ellipsis (83).

(82) A: [$_{CP1}$ Who$_x$ did Mary say [$_{CP2}$ x has the key to the liquor cabinet]]?

   a. *If CP$_2$ is used as the antecedent:*
   B: * ~~[[Frânk] has the key to the liquor cabinet]~~, (but I don't know what Mary said.)
   B$^:$ Frânk *has the key to the liquor cabinet*, (but I don't know what Mary said.)

   b. *If CP$_1$ is used as the antecedent:*
   B: ~~[She said that~~ [Frânk] ~~has the key to the liquor cabinet]~~. (Weir 2014:53)

(83) a.   A: Where did she gô?
     (i) B: I don't know. But I think *(*she went*) with Tîm.
     (ii) B: [Shrugs shoulders]. I only know whén ??(*she went*).
   b.   A: What will she sîng?
        B: Well whatever it is, *(*she'll sing it*) twîce.
   c.   A: She is going to sîng something.
     (i) B: Well whatever it is, *(*she'll sing it*) twîce, I bet.
     (ii) B: Well whatever it is, whên *(*will she sing it*)? (Griffiths 2022)

Recall that, in Robert's version of the QUD theory, Qs are unstructured, purely semantic, objects. Consequently, analyses that propose that the antecedent for all instances of clausal ellipsis is the topmost Q in the QUD are committed to saying that ellipsis identity is calculated over unstructured meanings. Such proposals are therefore incompatible with the first claim discussed in this subsection, namely that clausal ellipsis identity must be stated over linguistic objects derived via syntactic composition (i.e. phrase markers).

    As mentioned already, the theory of clausal ellipsis identity that we advocate here – the syntactic question approach – is an attempt to reconcile these two claims. Inspired by the QUD approaches, this approach stipulates not that clausal ellipsis can only be licensed by the topmost Q

---

[18] This aligns Weir's theory with Reich 2002, 2004, Krifka 2006 and AnderBois 2014, who also propose that ellipsis in typical discourse-medial elliptic clauses is licensed via equivalence with an object bearing a question-like meaning (such theories are known as Q-EQUIVALENCE approaches). It should be mentioned that the idea that all fragments (discourse-initial or not) are licensed by a Q in the QUD was first proposed by Jonathan Ginzburg (see, for instance, Ginzburg & Sag 2000), albeit in a nontransformational framework (HPSG) and employing a different QUD theory to Roberts' (see Ginzburg 1994).

in the QUD but rather that, at least in standard fragment answers and standard fragment questions, clausal ellipsis can only be licensed by an immediately preceding **syntactic question**, where 'syntactic question' here means 'a linguistic object with question-like semantics **and** interrogative syntax'. Stipulating this reconciles the two differing viewpoints outlined above, as it explains why clausal ellipsis is particularly sensitive to questions yet allows one to entertain an identity condition stated over LFs (namely, the LF of the elliptic clause and LF of its syntactic question antecedent).

The syntactic question approach supposes that, in dialogues in which the elliptic clause is not immediately preceded by an interrogative utterance, an implicit syntactic question is generated via Fox's (1999) ANTECEDENT ACCOMMODATION procedure, a process that generates implicit linguistic objects and which is independently motivated for ellipsis licensing (see Fox 1999, 2000, Thoms 2015, Griffiths 2019; see Barros 2014, Weir 2014, Kotek & Barros 2018, Barros & Kotek 2019 for weaker conceptions of antecedent accommodation). According to the syntactic question approach then, the impression that the topmost Q is the ellipsis licensor arises from the simple fact that any discourse involving a standard fragment will involve an explicit or implicit antecedent syntactic question, and the topmost Q in the QUD is invoked from, and is therefore identical in meaning to, this explicit or implicit syntactic question.

Because Qs are purely semantic objects, they need not obey grammatical rules on forming interrogatives. As a result, QUD approaches permit clausal ellipsis to be licensed from INEFFABLE Qs, that is, Qs whose meaning cannot be derived by linguistic means in a given language L. In contrast, because it posits that clausal ellipsis can only be licensed by a syntactic question, the syntactic question approach does not permit ineffable antecedent interrogatives, as, by definition, an accommodated interrogative in L is a grammatically well-formed interrogative in L.

This shift from Qs to syntactic questions has the welcome repercussion of explaining the A′-properties of English standard non-wh fragments with declarative or wh-question antecedents without needing to postulate that all remnants of clausal ellipsis undergo A′-movement. To see this, let us consider the concrete example in 84. To talk about this example properly, we must mention two technical details of the syntactic question approach, namely that it currently adopts as its identity condition Anand et al.'s (2021) formulation (see (85)), and that it permits the process described in 86 to occur, as part of the antecedent accommodation procedure (see the supplementary document for further details and more precise formulations).

(84) A: The best hiding place is under the bed.
  a. B: No, { în the bed / in the âttic }.
  b. B: * No, în.   [*Intended:* the best hiding place is în the bed]
  c. B: * No, the câr.   [*Intended:* the best hiding place is under the câr]

(85) Identity condition on clausal ellipsis (informal version)
Ellipsis of a head x in a given argument domain is permitted only if there is a head y in the argument domain of a discourse proximate utterance such that x and y are tokens of the same lexical item and occupy equivalent positions in their respective syntactic domains.[19, 20]

(86) Wh-substitution under antecedent accommodation
In order to generate an accommodated antecedent, the hearer may substitute the remnant of ellipsis with a wh-phrase W of the same syntactic category. $⟦W⟧$ must equal $⟦XP⟧^f$.

Although a grammatical syntactic question can be accommodated for 84a, resulting in the identity condition in 85 being satisfied (see 87), none can be accommodated for 84b or 84c. In the first case, accommodation fails because the substitution mechanism in 86 cannot be utilized, as there are no standard wh-counterparts to adpositions. In the second case, while the ellipsis remnant *the car* can be substituted for *what*, *which place*, or some similar wh-phrase, a grammatical wh-question (with the relevant intended interpretation) cannot be formed using this wh-phrase, as 88 shows. Consequently, accommodation fails here, too. The fragments in 84b-c are therefore judged as unacceptable because no suitable antecedent is available from which the ellipsis that generates them can be licensed.

(87) accommodated antecedent: [[where]$_1$ is$_2$ [[the BHP]$_3$ t_2 [$_{AD}$ t_3 t_1]]]
    fragment: [~~   [[the BHP]$_3$ is~~ [$_{AD}$ t_3 [în the bed]~~]]]

    (AD = argument domain; the BHP = *the best hiding place*)

(88) * [{What / which place}]$_1$ is the best hiding place under t_1?

The explanation for why 84b is unacceptable generalizes as an explanation for why all English non-wh standard fragments with wh-question or declarative explicit antecedents must be A′-movable phrases: if they are not, either the identity condition is straightforwardly unmet (in the case of fragments with wh-question antecedents) or accommodation fails (in the case of fragments with

---

[19] This approximates Anand et al.'s 2021 identity condition on sluicing, which is closely related to the condition proposed in Rudin 2019. See (A8) of the supplementary document for a more precise formulation.

[20] Because recovering the identity of an ellipsis site is fundamentally a pragmatic process, 85 should be understood as a formal restriction on pragmatic reasoning. Consequently, it applies to utterances in context, after all implicatures are calculated (Kotek & Barros 2019) and anaphors resolved (see Merchant 2001 for a discussion of VEHICLE CHANGE and E-type pronouns under ellipsis), and before the structural information exhibited by the antecedent decays (Fletcher 1994). As Anand et al. (2021) emphasize, 85 represents only the formal constraint on recovering ellipsis. As such, its purpose is merely to describe in formal terms the observation that strict structural identity must obtain between the argument domains of an elliptic/deaccented clause and its antecedent but not between their higher, inflectional domains. Intuitive pragmatic constraints such as 'mismatches must be minimal' (see Fox 1999, 2000, Thoms 2015) and 'mismatches must be motivated' also hold: these constraints are particularly important for restricting the extent to which mismatch is permitted above the argumental domains of an elliptic/ deaccented clause and its antecedent. In addition, recovering ellipsis is also affected by parsing preferences (Frazier & Clifton 2005).

declarative antecedents). The explanation of why 84c is unacceptable generalizes an explanation for why the same set of fragments obey the adposition-stranding and island-sensitivity generalizations. (For readers seeking a demonstration of how this reasoning extends to capture the adposition-stranding and island-sensitivity facts, concrete cases are presented in the supplementary document.)

Capturing the A′-properties of standard fragments without positing that remnants must undergo A′-movement has additional advantages. Unlike in the canonical version of the silent structure (namely, the MOVE-AND-DELETE approach, see section 5.1 for discussion), no appeals to ellipsis repair of transgressive movement operations are required, and linear word order is conserved in multiple fragment configurations by default. Furthermore, the syntactic question approach correctly predicts that no A′-movement effects are observed when the antecedent question is something other than an explicit or implicit wh-question, for instance, an explicit alternative question. In a dialogue such as 89a, the identity condition is satisfied straightforwardly, as the argument domains of the elliptic and antecedent clauses are structurally parallel (89b).

(89) a. A: Should he revôlve or tîlt the gyroscope?   (repeated from 24a)
          B: Revôlve, of course.

      b. *Syntactic representations for 89a:*
          A: [Should$_2$ [he$_1$ t$_2$ [$_{AD}$ t_1 [revôlve or tîlt]   the gyroscope]]]]
          B: [[~~he$_1$ should~~   [$_{AD}$ ~~t_1~~ [revôlve]~~   the gyroscope~~]]]]

Recall from section 3.1 that our basic analysis displayed one shortcoming: it incorrectly predicted that English standard non-wh fragments with wh-question or assertoric antecedents should display none of the hallmarks of A′-movement. One now sees that, once our basic theory is supplemented with the correct theory of clausal ellipsis licensing (namely, the syntactic question approach), this shortcoming disappears. The problem is resolved because the syntactic question approach provides an explanation for why all standard non-wh fragments with wh-question or assertoric antecedents display the hallmarks of A′-movement.

Recall that the syntactic question approach revolves around the idea that the clausal ellipsis operation that generates standard fragments must be licensed under identity with a discourse-salient question, where this question is either explicitly uttered or accommodated. However, in its current form, the syntactic question approach says nothing about whether the same restriction applies to the clausal ellipsis that generates reprise fragments. Consequently, one more open question must be answered: Must reprise fragments also be licensed by a discourse-salient question? In their HPSG analysis, Ginzburg & Cooper 2004 argue that, although the meanings of standard and reprise fragments are indeed both recovered by syntactically and semantically unifying the fragment with a discourse-salient question, the questions with which the fragment is unified is different in each case. For them, the meaning of a standard fragment is recovered by unifying it with a pragmatically salient standard question, whereas the meaning of a reprise fragment is obtained from a

question that asks about a particular CONTEXTUAL PARAMETER, where Ginzburg & Cooper's notion of a contextual parameter extends far beyond the traditional Kaplanian (1989) conception of a contextual parameter to include, for instance, the intended signifier for a linguistic sign in a given context of utterance. We believe that, when translated into the terminology of the syntactic question approach, this proposal amounts to claiming that the clausal ellipsis that generates standard fragments is licensed by standard explicit or implicit interrogatives, whereas the clausal ellipsis that generates reprise fragments is licensed by explicit or implicit interrogatives that can perform a clarificatory function, namely reprise questions. We assume that this claim is correct, and henceforth refer to it as the generalization presented in 90.

(90) Licensing According to Function generalization
      Standard fragments must be licensed by standard questions, whereas clarificatory (i.e. reprise) fragments must be licensed by reprise questions.

This generalization entails that clausal ellipsis is licensed in an elliptic reprise question E provided that an implicit reprise question E′ can be accommodated from the proximate discourse such that E and E′ have parallel argument domains and therefore satisfy the identity condition informally described in 85. Considering that E′ is always accommodable (as reprise questions usually repeat the reprised utterance verbatim), the identity condition is **always** satisfied in reprise fragment dialogues. In practical terms, this means that we can eliminate ellipsis licensing as a factor in explaining cross-linguistic differences in reprise fragments. The only remaining factor available for consideration, therefore, is the grammaticality of elliptic reprise question itself.

The upshot of this conclusion is this: when coupled with the syntactic question approach, the generalization in 90 yields the correct prediction that reprise fragments in a language L display A′-properties in L only if reprise questions in L are generated via an application of A′-movement. Put more succinctly, a reprise fragment is acceptable only if its underlying nonelliptic reprise question is grammatical in the first place.

3.3. SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS. Our analysis of standard and reprise fragments in English and Hungarian has three main ingredients, (i) a basic 'in-situ' silent structure analysis, (ii) the syntactic question approach to the identity condition on clausal ellipsis, and (iii) the generalization in 90. Precisely how these ingredients interact to correctly capture the dataset collated in Table 2 in sections 2.1-2.3 is summarized in Table 3 below. This table indicates which antecedent clause (AC, a discourse-salient question used to calculate ellipsis identity) licenses which type of fragment in English and Hungarian and explains why a given fragment-type has A'-properties or not.

Frag type	Underlying syntax of Elliptic Clause (EC)	Antecedent Clause (AC)	EC displays A′-properties?	Why are A′-properties (not) observed?
1	$\llbracket\ldots\ [\ldots X_F \ldots]_{FOC}\ \ldots\rrbracket$ (in-situ focus)	an explicit or implicit reprise question	no	No A′-movement of FOC in EC or in AC
2		an explicit alternative question	no[21]	No A′-movement of FOC in EC or in AC
3		explicit or implicit standard wh-question	yes	A′-movement of FOC in AC
4	$\llbracket\ [\ldots wh \ldots]_{FOC}\ \llbracket\ldots t_{wh}\ldots\rrbracket\rrbracket$ (ex-situ focus)	explicit or implicit standard wh-question	yes	A′-movement of FOC in EC and AC
5	$\llbracket\ldots\ [_{FocP}\ [\ldots\ \{X_F/wh\}\ \ldots]_{FOC}\ \llbracket\ldots t_{XP}\ldots\rrbracket\rrbracket$	explicit or implicit reprise question	yes	A′-movement of FOC in EC and AC
6		explicit or implicit wh-question	yes	A′-movement of FOC in EC and AC

Table 3. A summary of our analysis of each fragment type under investigation

Legend for Table 3

Type 1 = English reprise fragments

Type 2 = English standard non-wh fragments with explicit alternative question antecedents

Type 3 = English standard non-wh fragments with explicit wh-question or declarative assertoric antecedents

Type 4 = English standard wh-fragments

Type 5 = Hungarian reprise fragments

Type 6 = Hungarian standard fragments

4. ENGLISH REPRISE FRAGMENTS: EXTENSIONS. In this section, we discuss two hitherto unreported constraints on English reprise fragments, both of which we suggest are phonological in nature. First, English reprise fragments cannot be introduced by uninflected perfect *have* (91a) but can be introduced by inflected perfect, possessive, causative, and experiential *have* (91b-e).

(91) a.   A: John may have kissed Dracula last night.
          B: (*Have) kissed WHO last night?

---

[21] Recall that English fragments that respond to alternative questions disobey the Major Constituent constraint and the adposition-stranding generalization. Whether these fragments also disobey the island-sensitivity generalization is currently unknown. If future research shows that these fragments are indeed island-sensitive, this is straightforwardly captured under the syntactic question approach under the assumption that English alternative question formation involve island-sensitive covert movement of a Q-operator from a position adjoined to the coordinated phrases to the clausal left-periphery (Han & Romero 2004).

    b.   A: John has eaten his homework.
           B: Has EATEN it?

    c.   A: Mary wants to have a quiet vacation in Ibiza.
           B: Have a QUIET vacation?

    d.   A: We should have this portrait hung.
           B: Have it HUNG?

    e.   A: Jill will have a quiet vacation in Ibiza.
           B: Have a QUIET vacation in Ibiza?

Of the types of *have* listed in 91, only uninflected perfect *have* may undergo contraction in nonelliptical constructions (92). Furthermore, uninflected perfect *have* also resists being separated prosodically from the modal verb that precedes it (93). This suggests that, regardless of whether or not it undergoes phonological contraction, uninflected perfect *have* is an enclitic, which must cliticize leftwards. If there is no leftward item to cliticize onto, *have* cannot be prosodically licensed. This rules out uninflected perfect *have* introducing reprise fragments, as in 91a.

(92) a.   John should {have / –'ve} kissed Mary.
      b.   They might {have / * –'ve} students leaving their classes.
      c.   John will {have / * –'ve} them all fired.
      d.   Jill will {have / * –'ve} a quiet holiday in Ibiza.

(93) * John should, *I thought to myself*, have been arrested.

    English reprise fragments cannot be constituents whose head is, in contemporary terms, an unpronounced copy of head-movement. In other words, they cannot be HEADLESS. This fact is exemplified in 94 to 97, in which unpronounced copies of head-movement are struck-through. In these examples, the B-examples are headed and acceptable, whereas the B′-examples are headless and unacceptable.

(94) A: Will you go to the party tomorrow? I think I'll give it a miss.
      B: [~~You'll~~ [*v*P give₁ [VP it ~~give₁~~ a {MISS / WHAT}]]]?
      B′: * [~~You'll~~ [~~*v*P give₁~~ [VP it ~~give₁~~ a {MISS / WHAT}]]]?

(95) A: Falafel makes me liverish.
      B: [~~It~~ [*v*P makes₁ [VP you ~~makes₁~~ {LIVERISH / WHAT}]]]?
      B′: * [~~It~~ [~~*v*P makes₁~~ [VP you ~~makes₁~~ {LIVERISH / WHAT}]]]?

(96) A: Will Miranda kiss Dracula, d'you think?

B: [Will₁ [TP Miranda w̶i̶l̶l̶₁ kiss {DRACULA / WHO}]]?   *no ellipsis*

B′: * [̶W̶i̶l̶l̶₁ [TP Miranda w̶i̶l̶l̶₁ kiss {DRACULA / WHO}]̶]̶?

(97) A: He is jealous of those two boys.

B: [̶H̶e̶ ̶i̶s̶ ̶j̶e̶a̶l̶o̶u̶s̶ ̶o̶f̶ [DP those₁ [NP t̶h̶o̶s̶e̶₁ two {BOYS / WHAT}]]]?[22]

B′: * [̶H̶e̶ ̶i̶s̶ ̶j̶e̶a̶l̶o̶u̶s̶ ̶o̶f̶ ̶[̶DP ̶t̶h̶o̶s̶e̶₁ [NP t̶h̶o̶s̶e̶₁ two {BOYS / WHAT}]]]?[23]

Because some headless phrases cannot undergo A′-movement (see Landau 2020 for recent discussion and references), one might be tempted to view this constraint as evidence that the remnants of ellipsis in reprise questions do undergo A′-movement after all, which thus supports the move-and-delete approach (see section 5.1). Considering that English reprise fragments show no other A′-properties, we believe that pursuing this analytical option is mistaken, however. With no obvious syntactic explanation available for this restriction, we therefore conclude that headless reprise fragments are phonologically deviant.

Although pinpointing the source of phonological deviance in headless reprise fragments remains a task for future research, we wish to begin this venture here by mentioning two possible sources. The first concerns (non-)pronunciation. Based on a preliminary presentation of the current research (Griffiths et al. 2018), Landau (2020) proposes that headless reprise fragments are unacceptable because headless phrases cannot be 'shielded' from the phonological deletion operation that renders the rest of the elliptic clause unpronounced. Specifically, he proposes that, for an XP contained in an elliptic clause to avoid deletion, at least one copy of its head must be pronounced (PF-VISIBLE, in his terms). The second possible source of deviance concerns prosody. The syntax-prosody correspondence rule that maps subclausal phrases to PHONOLOGICAL PHRASES (φs) does not apply to a phrase whose head is unpronounced (Güneş 2015). This means that the headless phrases that avoid ellipsis in 94 to 97 are not mapped as φs. If there exists a requirement for the material that constitutes an English reprise fragment to be fully contained within the same φ, then this requirement is not satisfied in 94 to 97. Whether such a requirement obtains remains to be determined, however.

5. ALTERNATIVE ANALYSES

5.1. THE 'MOVE-AND-DELETE' SILENT STRUCTURE ANALYSIS OF REPRISE AND STANDARD FRAGMENTS. The prevailing view among advocates of silent structure analyses of fragments is that ellipsis is an unselective operation: it applies to a node X – typically identified as TP – and deletes

---

[22] We assume that English determiners are base-generated inside NP and then head-move into a position immediately dominating NP, following Chomsky (2007:25).

[23] The reprise fragment in 97B′ is acceptable on the indefinite reading of *two boys*. This is expected, as such a fragment is not headless:

(i) [̶H̶e̶ ̶i̶s̶ ̶j̶e̶a̶l̶o̶u̶s̶ ̶o̶f̶ [DP two {BOYS / WHAT}]]?

everything contained in X. Under this view, which is often referred to as the MOVE-AND-DELETE APPROACH, remnants of ellipsis must undergo A′-movement to a structural position above X to avoid deletion. Because English reprise fragments fail to exhibit A′-properties, incorporating reprise fragments under the move-and-delete approach necessitates appealing to the notion of ELLIPSIS REPAIR (see Weir 2014 for insightful discussion). Specifically, one must claim that, when ellipsis applies to generate an English reprise fragment, it confers on A′-movement the exceptional ability to target nonphrases, to allow for P-stranding even in languages where P-stranding is otherwise impossible (in the Dutch and German cases), and cross island boundaries. In our view, this extends the idea of ellipsis repair beyond its intended remit. Furthermore, one must confer this ability on a language-specific basis, linking it to independent properties of a particular language such that a plausible explanation is obtained for why some languages can wield this power (e.g. English) but others cannot (e.g. Hungarian). Although this can be formally implemented by, for example, adopting Merchant's (2008) system of *-marking and stipulating that only under English reprise fragments (and fragments responding to alternative questions) do remnants A′-move to a position that allows for all *-marks to be voided by ellipsis, doing so commits one to the conclusion that all constraints on overt A′-movement are PF-constraints, a conclusion that conflicts with other works, for instance, Cable's (2010) theory of A′-movement. Besides, Merchant's *-marking theory faces independent problems; see Griffiths & Lipták 2014 for clausal ellipsis and Sato 2011 for German P-stranding violations. This undergeneration problem can be circumvented entirely by simply jettisoning the assumption that ellipsis applies unselectively and by instead adopting an IN-SITU silent structure analysis of both reprise and standards fragments, as we did in section 3. We view the ease with which an in-situ approach captures our dataset as strong motivation for favoring it over the move-and-delete approach.

5.2. A 'MIXED' APPROACH. As mentioned already in section 2, Jason Merchant (2004, 2010, 2016) advocates a mixed approach to fragments, according to which standard fragments are remnants of clausal ellipsis yet other fragment types are genuine nonsentential utterances. In his brief and passing comments about reprise fragments, Merchant (2004:709, 2016:302) suggests that reprise fragments are best analyzed as genuine nonsentential utterances. In particular, he proposes to treat them as metalinguistic conjunctions, that is, as linguistic expressions of semantic type-*u* (Potts 2007) that are metalinguistically conjoined with a similar type-*u* unit in the antecedent. Because metalinguistic conjunction does not involve A′-movement, this analysis predicts that all reprise fragments will be devoid of A′-properties. We saw in section 2.3 that, although this is true for English reprise fragments, it is not true for their Hungarian counterparts. One could respond to this criticism by claiming that English reprise fragments are generated by metalinguistic conjunction whereas Hungarian reprise fragments are generated by clausal ellipsis. But this claim is conceptually unsatisfying: why should a linguistic phenomenon with an invariant semantic/pragmatic function across languages – namely, to request clarification about the content or form of some aspect of the most recent utterance in the discourse – arise from two radically different grammatical sources? And why can English utilize metalinguistic conjunction, but Hungarian cannot?

Another issue with this 'mixed' approach concerns conceptual redundancy in capturing (anti-)connectivity effects. Recall that, under the silent structure approach, standard fragment connectivity effects receive a natural explanation: these fragments and their correlates participate in the same grammatical dependencies, but in separate clauses, one of which is mostly unpronounced. Anti-connectivity effects concerning morphological mismatches are explained by appealing to how ellipsis and morphology interact.

Because anti-connectivity is forced on some occasions in reprise fragments (e.g. 50), one cannot appeal solely to pragmatic reasoning to explain why reprise fragments display (anti-)connectivity effects. In other words, one cannot argue that reprise fragments must resemble their correlates to some specific degree because this degree of semblance is required for the fragment to perform its discourse function of requesting clarification: if this were true, then the reprise fragment in 50, which is necessarily dissimilar to its correlate, would fail to perform its clarificatory function, contrary to observation. Thus, an advocate of a 'mixed' view must concede that there are (at least) two formal, grammatical means by which (anti-)connectivity effects arise, either via ordinary syntactic processes and their interaction with ellipsis or via a currently undetermined formal parallelism constraint on metalinguistic conjunction, the existence of which remains to be motivated. In our opinion, the fact that both routes to (anti-)connectivity generate the same effects should be regarded with suspicion: massive redundancy is being introduced into the theory, and this should be avoided.

The easiest way to avoid this conceptual redundancy is to suppose that the metalinguistic conjunction analysis of English reprise fragments is incorrect and that this class of fragments are actually derived via clausal ellipsis: they are elliptic reprise questions. Making this move not only circumvents the need to develop a parallelism constraint on metalinguistic conjunction (to account for the (anti-)connectivity effects displayed by reprise fragments), but also aligns English reprise fragments with their Hungarian counterparts, thus establishing the possibility of developing a universal theory of reprise fragments.

5.3. CONNECTIONS TO NONSENTENTIALIST ANALYSES. Both standard and reprise fragments in English have received significant attention by Jonathan Ginzburg and his colleagues (Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Ginzburg & Cooper 2004, Purver 2004, Fernández 2006, Ginzburg 2012). Here, we treat Ginzburg 2012 as representative of this work. In Ginzburg's HPSG-inspired framework, a QUD consists of two parts, a question (a purely semantic entity, analogous to the Qs that constitute the QUD in Roberts' 2012 framework) and a FOCUS ESTABLISHING CONSTITUENT (FEC), a datatype consisting of semanticosyntactic and/or phonological information. Fragments are constrained such that they must match with the FEC for either semanticosyntactic or phonological features, or both. In standard fragment dialogues, the FEC is associated with the antecedent's wh-phrase (if the antecedent is a wh-question) or a quantified nominal in the antecedent (if the antecedent is a declarative clause). In reprise fragments, the FEC is associated with the 'to-be-clarified sub-utterance, which can be *any* sub-utterance' (p. 283, our italics). Putting aside the fact that it undergenerates

English standard fragments, which can be of any A′-movable type (and not just quantified nominals),[24] this approach correctly captures the categorial freedom of English reprise fragments. However, as currently formulated, the analysis overgenerates Hungarian reprise fragments, which cannot be any sub-utterance. Because 'to-be-clarified' (sub-)utterances are determined in Ginzburg's theory via the application of certain CLARIFICATION CONTEXT UPDATE RULES, it is these rules that must be amended to capture the Hungarian data. Whether these rules can (or should) be altered in a nonstipulatory manner to account for the attested cross-linguistic variation remains for now an open question.

Couched in the Dynamic Syntax framework, Kempson et al.'s (2007) analysis of English reprise fragments treats them as (LATE)*ADJOINED to their correlates. This approach is roughly comparable to Merchant's metalinguistic conjunction analysis (see section 5.2), meaning that, although it captures the distribution of English reprise fragments, it fails to explain why Hungarian reprise fragments display A′-properties. To successfully account for the Hungarian facts, *ADJUNCTION needs to be restricted to A′-movable phrases in Hungarian but not English. How this can be built into the system in a nonstipulatory way also remains an open question.

6. CONCLUSION. In this paper, we undertook a comparative investigation (English and Hungarian) of how different types of fragments behave regarding the Major Constituent constraint, the adposition-stranding generalization, and the island-sensitivity generalization. Our main focus was REPRISE fragments, which have not previously received any crosslinguistic attention. Upon comparing reprise and STANDARD (i.e. nonreprise) fragments, one observes that: (i) Hungarian fragments of all types behave uniformly, conforming to each of the generalizations listed above, (ii) English fragments pattern disparately, with some types obeying these generalizations (namely, standard fragments with declarative or wh-question antecedents) and others disobeying them (namely, standard fragments with alternative question antecedents and all reprise fragments). Despite observing variation regarding the generalizations listed above, all fragment types in both languages show identical (anti-)connectivity effects, thus motivating a unified, 'silent structure' analysis, according to which all of the fragment types studied are analyzed as remnants of clausal ellipsis. We argued that only an IN-SITU clausal ellipsis analysis that is supplemented with Q-equivalence licensing condition (namely, Griffiths' 2019 SYNTACTIC QUESTION theory) is flexible enough to capture the across- and within-language variation observed. Alternative sentientialist analysis, such as the prevailing MOVE-AND-DELETE approach (Merchant 2001, 2014), display insufficient flexibility and extensibility to capture our dataset. Whether nonsentientialist analyses such as Ginzburg's (2012) or Kempson et al.'s (2007) can be extended to capture our dataset in a nonstipulatory manner remains to be determined.

---

[24] Because his focus is modelling meaning rather than form, Ginzburg (2012:234-252) purposefully restricts his account of standard fragments to nominal expressions, acknowledging that his analysis requires some tweaking to extend to fragments of other syntactic types.

REFERENCES

ABE, JUN. 2015. *The in-situ approach to sluicing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

ABELS, KLAUS. 2011. Don't repair that island! It ain't broke. Paper presented at Islands in Contemporary Linguistic Theory workshop, University of the Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz. Online: https://ehutb.ehu.eus/uploads/material/Video/1765/Handout-Abels.pdf.

ABELS, KLAUS. 2019. Movement and islands. *The Oxford handbook of ellipsis*, ed. by Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Tanja Temmerman, 389–424. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ANAND, PRANAV; DANIEL HARDT and JAMES MCCLOSKEY. 2021. The domain of matching in sluicing. Manuscript, University of California Santa Cruz and Copenhagen Business School. Online: https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005674.

ANDERBOIS, SCOTT. 2014. The semantics of sluicing: Beyond truth-conditions. *Language* 90.887–926.

ARTSTEIN, RON. 2004. Focus below the word level. *Natural language semantics* 12.1–22.

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

BARROS, MATTHEW; PATRICK D. ELLIOT; and GARY THOMS. 2014. There is no island repair. Manuscript, New Brunswick, NJ; London; Edinburgh: Rutgers University, University College London, Edinburgh University. Online: http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002100.

BARROS, MATTHEW; PATRICK D. ELLIOT; and GARY THOMS. 2015. More variation in island repair: The clausal/non-clausal distinction. *Proceedings of the 49th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, ed. by Helena Aparicio, Gallagher Flinn, Kathryn Franich, Joanna Pietraszko and Tamara Vardomskaya, 331–45. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistics Society.

BARROS, MATTHEW, and HADAS KOTEK. 2019. Ellipsis licensing and redundancy reduction: A focus-based approach. *Glossa: A journal of general linguistics* 4:1.1-36. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.811.

BECK, SIGRID. 2006. Intervention effects follow from focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 14.1–56. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-005-4532-y.

BECK, SIGRID, and SHIN-SHOOK KIM. 2006. Intervention effects in alternative questions. *Journal of Comparative German Linguistics* 9.165–208.

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, 107–50. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

BRODY, MICHAEL. 1991. Some remarks on the Focus field in Hungarian. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 2.* University College London, 201–26.

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

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1986. *Knowledge of Language*. New York: Praeger.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2007. Approaching UG from below. Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky's minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics (Studies in generative grammar 89), ed. by Hans-Martin Gartner and Uli Sauerland, 1–30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

CHUNG, SANDRA. 2006. Sluicing and the lexicon: The point of no return. *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, ed. by Rebecca T. Cover and Yuni Kim, 73–91. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

CHUNG, SANDRA. 2013. Syntactic identity in sluicing: How much and why. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.1–44.

CHUNG, SANDRA; WILLIAM A. LADUSAW; and JAMES MCCLOSKEY. 2011. Sluicing(:) Between structure and inference. *Representing language: Essays in honor of Judith Aissen*, ed. by Rodrigo Gútierrez-Bravo, Line Mikkelsen and Eric Potsdam, 31–50. Santa Cruz, CA: California Digital Library eScholarship Repository, University of California, Santa Cruz.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN, and MARCEL DEN DIKKEN. 2006. Ellipsis and EPP Repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37.653–64.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN, and ANIKÓ LIPTÁK. 2006. The cross-linguistic syntax of sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9.248–74.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN, and ANIKÓ LIPTÁK. 2008. On the interaction between verb movement and ellipsis: new evidence from Hungarian. *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 138–46. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

DEN DIKKEN, MARCEL. 2020. Unmatched and unparalleled: Voice mismatches in ellipsis – Analysis and theoretical implications. Ms, Eötvös Loránd University and Budapest Research Institute in Linguistics. Online: https://marceldendikken.files.wordpress.com/2020/12/mismatches-in-ellipsis_paper_v3-4.pdf.

DÉKÁNY, ÉVA, and VERA HEGEDŰS. 2015. Word order variation in Hungarian PPs. In *Approaches to Hungarian 14*, ed. by Katalin. É. Kiss, Balázs Surányi and Éva Dékány, 95–120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DRUBIG, HANS BERNHARD. 1994. Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus. *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340: Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen der Computerlinguistik 51*.

É. KISS, KATALIN. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Springer.

FERNÁNDEZ, RAQUEL. 2006. *Non-sentential utterances in dialogue: Classification, resolution and use*. London: King's College University dissertation.

FLETCHER, CHARLES. 1994. Levels of representation in memory for discourse. *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*, ed. by M. A. Gernsbacher, 589–607. New York: Academic Press.

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.

FOX, DANNY. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.143–54.

Frazier, Lyn, and Charles E. Clifton. 2005. The syntax-discourse divide: Processing ellipsis. *Syntax* 8.121–174.

Ginzburg, Jonathan. 1994. An update semantics for dialogue. *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Computational Semantics*, ed. by Harry Bunt, Reinhard Muskens and Gerrit Rentier. Tilburg: ITK.

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 Publications.

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.

Griffiths, James. 2022. Questions underpin deletion: A response to Barros and Kotek (2019). To appear in *Information structure and ambiguity* (Studies in Generative Grammar), ed. by Andreas Konietzko and Susanne Winkler. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Griffiths, James, and Anikó Lipták. 2014. Contrast and island sensitivity in clausal ellipsis. *Syntax* 17.189–234.

Griffiths, James, Güliz Güneş and Anikó Lipták. 2018. A minimalist approach to reprise fragments. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Deutschen Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft*. Stuttgart, March 2018.

Griffiths, James, Güliz Güneş, Anikó Lipták and Jason Merchant. 2021. Dutch preposition stranding and ellipsis: 'Merchant's Wrinkle' ironed out. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 24.269–318. Online: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10828-021-09129-1.

Güneş, Güliz. 2015. *Deriving Prosodic Structures*. Utrecht: LOT Dissertation Series, no.397. Groningen: University of Groningen dissertation.

Hamblin, Charles L. 1973. Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10.41–53.

Han, Chung-Hye, and Maribel Romero. The syntax of *whether*/Q . . . *or* questions: ellipsis combined with movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22.527–64. Online: https://doi.org/10.1023/B:NALA.0000027674.87552.71.

Hankamer, Jorge. 1979. *Deletion in coordinate structures*. New Haven, CT: Yale University dissertation.

Horvath, Julia. 1986. *Focus in the theory of grammar and the syntax of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.

HORVATH, JULIA. 2013. Focus, exhaustivity and the syntax of wh-interrogatives. *Approaches to Hungarian* 13, ed. by Johan Brandtler, Valeria Molnár and Christer Platzack, 97–132. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

JOHANNESSEN, JANNE BONDI. 1998. *Coordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KAPLAN, DAVID. 1989. Demonstratives: An essay on the semantics, logic, metaphysics, and epistemology of demonstratives and other indexicals. *Themes from Kaplan*, ed. by Joseph Almog, John Perry and Howard Wettstein, 481–614. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KÁLMÁN, LÁSZLÓ (ed.) 2001. *Magyar leíró nyelvtan. Mondattan I* [Hungarian descriptive grammar. Syntax 1]. Budapest: Tinta Kiadó.

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.

KENESEI, ISVTÁN. 2006. Focus as identification. *The Architecture of Focus* (Studies in Generative Grammar 82), ed. by Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, 137–68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

KENESEI, ISTVÁN; ROBERT M. VAGO; and ANNA FENYVESI. 1998. *Hungarian*. London: Routledge.

KOTEK, HADAS, and MATTHEW BARROS. 2018. Multiple sluicing, scope, and superiority: Consequences for ellipsis identity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49.781–821.

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. 2020. Constraining head-stranding ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 51.281–318.

LIPTÁK, ANIKÓ. 2011. A fragmentumok mondattana a magyarban. *Általános nyelvészeti tanulmányok* [The syntax of fragments in Hungarian. *General Linguistic Studies*] 23.317–49.

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. 2005. Revisiting syntactic identity conditions. Paper presented at *Workshop on ellipsis*. University of California, Berkeley, 10/2005. home.uchicago.edu/merchant/pubs/berkeley.ellipsis.pdf

MERCHANT, JASON. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. *Topics in ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson, 132–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2010. Three kinds of ellipsis. 2010. *Context-Dependence, Perspective, and Relativity* (Mouton Series in Pragmatics 6), ed. by Francois Recanati, Isidora Stojanovic and Neftali Villanueva, 141–92. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.77–108.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2016. An embarrassment of riches? Cutting up the elliptical pie. *Theoretical Linguistics* 42.297–304.

Messick, Troy, and Gary Thoms. 2016. Ellipsis, economy and the (non)uniformity of traces. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47:306–32.

Morgan, Jerry. 1989. Sentence Fragments Revisited. *Chicago Linguistics Society 25, Parasession on Language in Context*, ed. by Bradley Music, Randolph Graczyk, and Caroline Wiltshire, 228–41. Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.

Mycock, Louise. 2019. Analysing 'Wh' Echo Questions: A typological perspective with special reference to Hungarian. *Argumentum* 15.575–90.

Ott, Dennis, and Volker Struckmeier. 2018. Particles and deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49:2.393-407.

Potter, David. 2017. *The island (in)sensitivity of stripping*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University dissertation.

Potts, Christopher. 2007. The dimensions of quotation. *Direct compositionality* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics), ed. by Chris Barker and Pauline Jacobson, 405–31. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Purver, Matthew. 2004. *The theory and use of clarification requests in dialogue*. London: University of London dissertation.

Ranero Echeverría, Rodrigo. 2021. *Identity conditions on ellipsis*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland dissertation.

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

Reich, Ingo. 2004. Association with focus and choice functions: A binding approach. *Research on Language and Computation* 2.463–89.

Roberts, Craige. 2012. Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 5.1–69. Online: https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.5.6.

Rooth, Mats. 1985. Association with Focus. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Amherst dissertation.

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

Rottman, Isaac, and Masaya Yoshida. 2013. Sluicing, idioms and island repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.651–68.

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

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? *Proceedings of the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by Robert Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia Green and Jerry Morgan, 252–86. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

Rudin, Deniz. 2019. Head-based syntactic identity in sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50.253–83.

Saab, Andrés. 2010. Silent interactions: Spanish TP-ellipsis and the theory of island repair. *Probus* 22.73–16.

Sato, Yosuke. 2011. P-stranding under sluicing and repair by ellipsis: why is Indonesian (not) special? *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 20.339–82.

TAKAHASHI, SHOICHI, and DANNY FOX. 2005. MaxElide and the re-binding problem. *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 15, ed. by Efthymia Georgala and Jonathan Howell, 223–40.

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, 559–72. 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. 2012. Left edge deletion in English and subject omission in diaries. *English Language and Linguistics* 16.105–29.

WEIR, ANDREW. 2014. *Fragments and clausal ellipsis*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, Amherst dissertation.

WEIR, ANDREW. 2017. Cointensional questions and their implications for fragment answers. *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Sinn und Bedeutung conference*, ed. by Robert Truswell, Chris Cummins, Caroline Heycock, Brian Rabern, and Hannah Rohde, 1289–306. University of Edinburgh. Online: https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/DRjNjViN/index.html.

YOSHIDA, MASAYA; DAVID POTTER; and TIM HUNTER. 2018. Condition C reconstruction, clausal ellipsis and island repair. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 37.1515–44. Online: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-9433-0.

YOSHIDA, MASAYA; TIM HUNTER; and MICHAEL FRAZIER. 2015. Parasitic gaps licensed by elided syntactic structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33.1439–71.

ZHANG, NIINA NING. 2010. *Coordination in Syntax* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics Series 123). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ZWICKY, ARNOLD. 1982. Stranded *to* and phonological phrasing in English. *Linguistics* 20.3–57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1982.20.1-2