There is no island repair*

Matt Barros, Patrick Elliott and Gary Thoms

May 30, 2014

Abstract

In this article we argue against the proposal that island violations are repaired by ellipsis. Building on Merchant (2001), we argue that ellipsis sites allow for a number of non-isomorphic construals which give rise to the illusion of island repair; when these non-isomorphic construals are controlled for and island violating construals are forced for the ellipsis sites, island effects emerge. We show that repair and non-repair effects are attested with both sluicing, which is widely assumed to be island-insensitive, and fragment answers which are widely assumed to be island-sensitive, and we show that only the evasion approach can account for the whole set of facts. We therefore reject the proposal that island conditions are fundamentally phonological in nature and conclude that islands provide a strong argument for theories of ellipsis which posit that ellipsis sites contain syntactic structure.

1 Introduction

Since Ross (1969), the phenomenon of *island repair* has figured prominently in work on ellipsis and locality. Consider the sentence in (1), which is typically taken to demonstrate island repair:

(1) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language – guess which! (Merchant, 2001, 209)

(1) is an example of sluicing, which Ross (1969), Merchant (2001) and many others have argued is derived by *wh*-movement of the *wh*-phrase, what we call the *sluicing remnant*, from within a full clausal structure to its scope position in the left periphery, with ellipsis of the TP it was extracted from. As Ross noted, if we assume TP is elided under strict identity with the antecedent TP, and that ellipsis is a deletion process that applies to full syntactic structures, it follows that the underlying structure for (1) is something like what is indicated in (2a), where the *wh*-phrase has moved from within a relative clause island.

(2) a. They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language – guess which ~~they hired someone who speaks~~!
b. *They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language – guess which they hired someone who speaks!

Since examples like (2b) are clearly ungrammatical, it seems ellipsis must have "repaired" the underlying island violation in (2a).[1] Ross (1969), Chung et al. (1995), Merchant (2001) and others have since shown that this repair phenomenon is quite general, applying with many different island types, as shown by (3)-(8) below, where the sluices have antecedents where the indefinite corresponding to the sluicing remnant, which we call the *correlate*, is embedded inside a number of different island types. That violations of all of

*Matthew Barros (Rutgers): mattbarros@gmail.com; Patrick Elliott (UCL): patrick.d.elliott@gmail.com; Gary Thoms (Edinburgh): gary.thoms@gmail.com. This is a submitted draft; acknowledgments to be added.

[1] In Ross' original paper, (1) was judged as somewhat degraded, "?", though still far better than unelided counterpart. Here we follow much work since in reporting the example as completely grammatical.

these islands are repaired by ellipsis is a striking result, especially since islands do not seem to constitute a natural class (Postal 1998, Boeckx 2012, 51).

(3) She bought a big car, but I don't know how big (*she bought a car).
Left branch island, (Merchant, 2008, 136)

(4) The administration has issued a statement that it is willing to meet with one of the student groups, but I'm not sure which one (*it has issued a statement that it is willing to meet with).
CP complement to nouns (Chung et al., 1995, 276)

(5) Sandy was trying to work out which student would solve a certain problem, but I don't know which problem (*she was trying to work out which student would solve).
Embedded question island, (Chung et al., 1995, 276)

(6) Ben will be mad if Abby talks to one of the teachers, but she couldn't remember which (*he will be mad if she talks to).
Adjunct island, (Merchant, 2008, 136)

(7) They persuaded Kennedy and some other Senator to jointly sponsor the legislation, but I can't remember which one (*they persuaded him and to jointly sponsor the legislation).
Coordinate structure island, (Chung et al., 1995, 273)

(8) A biography of one of the Marx Brothers is going to be published this year;
guess which (*a biography of is going to be published this year)!
Subject island, (Merchant, 2008, 136)

The exact implications of the island repair phenomenon depend crucially on our starting assumptions. The analysis schematized in (2a) involves *literal repair*, where some marker or diacritic of "badness" in the structure of the ellipsis site is erased by ellipsis. This representationalist approach has been the most popular one in the literature to date (Chomsky 1972, Lasnik 2001, Fox & Lasnik 2003, Merchant 2001, Merchant 2004, Merchant 2008, Temmerman 2013, Griffiths & Lipták to appear), and it leads to the conclusion that island violations are somehow phonological in their nature. But the analysis in (2a) and concomitant conclusions depend on at least three distinct assumptions regarding the analysis of sluicing: (i) sluicing remnants move to their surface position; (ii) sluicing involves PF-deletion of a syntactically present clausal structure; (iii) ellipsis requires strict identity between the ellipsis site and its antecedent. If we drop one or more of these assumptions, we arrive at different analyses of ellipsis and quite different conclusions emerge.

Many authors have challenged assumptions (i)-(ii), proposing alternative analyses where the *wh*-phrase, or remnant, is not moved to its surface position but base-generated there; let us call this the *base-generation approach*. Versions of this are proposed by Chung et al. (1995), Ginzburg & Sag (2000), Culicover & Jackendoff (2005), Sag & Nykiel (2011) and Barker (to appear), who reject the PF-deletion analysis of sluicing and take island-insensitivity to be good evidence for doing so, since island-sensitivity is a classic (and often definitional) test of movement dependencies. These theories predict there to be little or no locality effects in sluicing and similar elliptical constructions, since there's no movement to speak of. Alternatively, one may challenge assumption (iii) and propose instead that although the ellipsis site contains structure, it does not contain an island violation. That is, in rejecting (iii) we admit that the identity relation is not so strict that it forces the sluice to contain an island violating structure, but rather it is loose enough to allow us to evade the island violation by positing a non-isomorphic structure for the ellipsis site, with no island violation. Thus for an example like (1), the underlying structure in the ellipsis site could be as in (9).

(9) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language – guess which ~~he speaks~~!

Let us call this the *evasion approach*. This is what was proposed in Merchant (2001) for examples like (1). Merchant showed that there is evidence independent of islands that the identity relation is not one of strict syntactic isomorphism, but rather one of a looser kind calculated over semantic representations. Merchant also showed in detail that the specific kinds of non-isomorphism required for "short source" structures like

(9) to be licensed, namely allowing the subject of the sluice to covary with the relative clause head in the antecedent (by means of E-type anaphora), could be made compatible with a specific implementation of semantic identity. Given that further evidence for a looser identity relation of this kind has accumulated since (Potsdam 2007, Yoshida 2010, Thoms 2013, Miller & Hemforth 2014), rejecting assumption (iii) and pursuing a non-repair approach of this kind seems to be a promising route to take.

The evasion approach predicts that when evasion strategies like short sources are controlled for, and island-containing construals are forced for ellipsis sites, island sensitivity should emerge; this is the approach pursued in Merchant (2001, ch.4), where such effects are indeed attested for examples analogous to (9). And yet Merchant resisted embracing the evasion approach wholesale, arguing instead that evasion was involved with only some island types, with others showing literal repair. He did not provide a principled basis for distinguishing islands that repair and ones that don't, and he did not show explicitly that evasion could not explain the apparent cases of literal repair. Moreover he also did not consider evasion strategies other than the short source strategy seen in (9) in great detail, even though there is no reason to rule out the existence of other such strategies *a priori*. Since then Merchant himself has argued in favour of the literal repair approach (Merchant 2004, Merchant 2008, Merchant 2009), and the evasion approach has thus remained largely underexplored, while the alternatives have become quite widely accepted. Indeed the literal repair approach has been particularly influential within Minimalist frameworks, with some taking the representationalist character of island constraints that this implies to justify rethinking various other locality effects in similar terms (see especially Fox & Pesetsky 2005, Park 2005, Bošković 2007, 2011, 2014, Larson & Hornstein 2013).

Here, we argue in favour of a more complete version of the evasion approach initially defended in Merchant (2001), according to which there is no true island repair. The empirical landscape we explore is a set of putative generalizations from the literature regarding island repair in different elliptical constructions, which have been used to argue for different variants of the literal repair theory (Merchant 2004, Temmerman 2013, Griffiths & Lipták to appear). We falsify these generalizations and demonstrate that the common denominator in all repair cases is the availability of *evasion strategies*. We show that there are at least three evasion strategies which are responsible for these illusions of repair: (i) short sources; (ii) cleft sources, and (iii) predicational sources. We provide evidence independent of islands for the availability of each of these forms of non-isomorphic construals for ellipsis sites, and we then demonstrate that once they are controlled for, island effects are attested robustly. This provides a strong argument for the "silent structure" approach to ellipsis, and it indicates that the vast majority of islands are not phonologically conditioned, contra the PF theory of islands. We conclude that care must be taken when it comes to claims about ellipsis data, as it is not always obvious what exactly is lurking within the silence.

The paper is structured as follows. In §2, we introduce three different sorts of evasion strategies that may give rise to the illusion of island repair, namely: short sources, cleft sources, and predicational sources. We demonstrate that such evasion strategies are motivated independently. In §3, we introduce a variety of controls for the non-isomorphic sources introduced in §2, and illustrate that island sensitivity resurfaces under sluicing in such cases, as predicted by the evasion approach. In §4, we shift the focus from sluicing to fragment utterances, which have been analyzed as involving A′-movement of the fragment followed by PF-deletion of TP in the same way as sluicing (Merchant 2004). We show that the predictions of the evasion approach regarding island (in-)sensitivity are borne out for fragments just as for sluicing. In §5, having argued that ellipsis cannot repair island violations, we address the broader question of whether PF deletion can be expected to give rise to other sorts of repair effects, including *comp*-trace effects and derived position islands (as argued for in Merchant 2001), and conclude that the only cases where repair might be attested are those where a PF-based analysis is plausible. In §6 we conclude.

2 Three non-isomorphic sources for ellipsis

In this section we introduce three kinds of non-isomorphism between ellipsis sites and their antecedents in constructions like sluicing and argue that they may be responsible for island repair illusions in some circumstances. We provide evidence for the availability of these non-isomorphic construals independent of their proposed use in creating repair illusions, and we also address some of the arguments in Lasnik (2001) against the use of non-isomorphic sources in Merchant (2001). This sets the stage for what follows, where we show that the evasion strategies account for the apparent repairs and fail in those cases where repair is unattested.

2.1 Short sources

As noted above, Merchant (2001) proposes that many instances of apparent island violations in sluicing involve ellipsis not of the full island-containing structure, but rather some smaller subpart of the antecedent which does not contain an island violation. Thus the analysis for (1) is (10a), rather than (10b).

(10) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language – guess which!
   a. which ~~he speaks~~!
   b. which ~~they hired someone who speaks~~!

We call this a *short source*. Merchant proposes that short sources are employed to evade "propositional islands," that is, islands which correspond to propositional domains (e.g., relative clauses, adjunct clauses, CP-complements to head nouns, and coordinated propositional structures). They satisfy ellipsis identity by taking the clausal island, not the larger structure containing it, as an antecedent. In many cases this seems to involve a degree of non-isomorphism between ellipsis site and antecedent; for instance, in (10) the relative clause in the antecedent has a gap in the subject position while the corresponding position in the short source in (10a) is filled by a pronoun. But Merchant notes these would satisfy his semantic identity condition just like regular sluices if the pronoun is coindexed with the DP that binds the gap position, on what he identifies as an E-type construal (Evans 1980); furthermore, he observes that such a form of non-isomorphism is independently motivated by cases like (11), where the antecedent is another *wh*-question.

(11) We need to know what he is doing, and why ~~he is doing it~~
(cf. #. . . and why ~~we need to know what he is doing~~.)

We refer the reader to Merchant (2001, 201-207) for details of how the E-type pronoun satisfies his identity condition in such configurations, and discussion of the role of modal subordination in ensuring that subjunctive relative clauses and other such intensional islands fare similarly.

Short sources are plausible for cases like (1) for a few reasons. First, the short source and the full version would usually have the same meaning, as attested by the fact that the unelided short source makes for a perfectly good paraphrase for the meaning of the sluice. If we cannot distinguish the short source construal from the island-containing construal for the sluice on the basis of interpretation alone, it is hard to see how one can rule out the former being present rather than the latter. Also, it is often the case that ellipsis allows for construals where the targeted antecedent is a small, non-isomorphic subpart of a larger structure, as is required for short source interpretations. (12) provides two such cases, where islands are not involved but the interpretation of the sluice is clearly as represented in the struckthrough text:

(12) a. John seems to me to be lying about something, but I don't know what ~~he is lying about~~.
($\neq$ what ~~he seems to me to be lying about~~.)
   b. I remember meeting him, but I don't remember when ~~I met him~~.
(cf. $\neq$ #when ~~I remember meeting him~~.) Merchant (2001)

Such examples show that short sources are available quite generally, so there is no reason to rule out such an analysis for apparent island violations.

Merchant's (2001) invocation of short sources as an evasion strategy is criticized by Lasnik (2001), who shows that there are cases of apparent island repairing sluices which do not have a plausible short source analysis. We return to Lasnik's objections at the end of this section after we have introduced the other evasion strategies, where we make the claim, played out in the rest of this paper, that one can only assess the viability of island repair once we control for all the possible evasion strategies. We also discuss the surprising flexibility of short sources more in §3.4.

2.2 Cleft sources

The other two non-isomorphic sources which we consider here are simple copular clauses with pronominal subjects; we distinguish the two on the basis of the semantic properties of the pronominal subjects, although they largely pattern together with respect to their availability for evasion so we conflate them as one broad category in several places in the rest of the article. The first of these what we call a *cleft source*. As the name implies, this is the species of copular clause which is used in cleft constructions, where the subject is an expletive-like pronoun like *it* and the postcopular XP is the "pivot" of the cleft relative which modifies it and which is is missing in so-called "truncated" clefts. The cleft structure, the subject pronoun and copula, are deleted by clausal ellipsis once the remnant moves to the left periphery. Cleft sources were first suggested for sluicing in Erteschik-Shir (1977) and discussed in some detail in Merchant (2001). (13) shows a cleft source analysis for (1):

(13) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language – guess which ~~it was *t*~~!

Cleft sources can be considered to be an additional evasion strategy if we assume with Mikkelsen (2005) and others that so-called "truncated clefts" are not necessarily derived by eliding the relative clause that follows the pivot in the non-truncated counterparts, but rather that they can be simple copular constructions in which the pivot is base-generated in its surface position, thus requiring no movement from within islands, and the "expletive" pronoun is in fact a predicate anaphor.[2] We elaborate further on the distinction between clefts that are truncated by ellipsis and those which are base-generated without the cleft relative in §4.2.

Like short sources, cleft sources are plausible for some cases of sluicing[3] since their overt counterparts are well-formed and have the same meaning as the sluices. Similarly, it is also hard to see how one would block the use of cleft sources, as the component parts, the copula and pronoun, seem to be available quite generally for the resolution of ellipsis, even when there is no linguistic antecedent present. For instance, in his discussion of the ellipsis analysis of fragment answers, Merchant (2004) considers discourse-initial fragments of the sort in (14) which he argues have an underlying predicational copular structure, as in (15).

[2]If we follow Mikkelsen (2005) in analysing the pronominal subject of a truncated cleft as being anaphoric on some type <e,t> property made salient by the preceding discourse, truncated clefts can in fact be shown to satisfy e-GIVENness, the identity condition proposed by Merchant (2001). Consider (i):

(i) John kissed someone, but I don't know who ~~it was~~

There is a property in the discourse which the pronominal subject can take as its antecedent – Namely the property of being kissed by John: λx. John kissed x. If we furthermore assume that the copula is semantically vacuous, the property denoted by the pronominal subject combines directly with the trace of *wh*-movement. Modulo existential closure of the trace, the ellipsis site will bi-directionally entail the antecedent clause.

[3]Merchant (2001, 115-127) dismisses the possibility of reducing all sluicing to cleft sources, as a means of defending the hypothesis that sluicing typically involves *wh*-movement out of full structures which are isomorphic to their antecedents. He provides ten arguments to this effect, showing that there are a variety of contexts where sluicing would be impossible if a cleft source was the only option. But as van Craenenbroeck (2010) notes, while this shows that sluicing cannot be reduced to clefts, it does not rule out clefts as a source altogether. Regarding the matter at hand, what Merchant's discussion gives us is a number of diagnostics which provide us with different ways of ruling out cleft sources. Space prevents us from going through all of these diagnostics, but a number of them are employed throughout the paper, for instance *else* modification in the present discussion, the discussion of left branch extraction in §3.1, and case-marked fragments in §3.4. On sprouting, see fn. 7.

(14) [Abby and Ben are arguing about the origin of products in a new store on their block, with Ben maintaining that the store carries only German products. To settle their debate they walk into the store together. Ben picks up a lamp at random, upends it, examines the label (which reads *Lampenwelt GmbH, Stuttgart*), holds the lamp out towards Abby, and proudly proclaims to her:] From Germany! See, I told you!

(15) From Germany ~~this is t~~

Clefts, just like the predicational copular clause in (15), also consist of a copular verb and pronoun (following e.g. Mikkelsen 2005), so they should be elidable under sluicing just the same. van Craenenbroeck (2012) adduces further evidence for underlying copular sources from tag questions. As van Craenenbroeck notes, tag questions are formed on the basis of the structure to which they are attached, with the matrix subject and auxiliaries being copied into the tag, and when tags are attached to discourse-initial fragments, they often have a cleft-like structure (see Barros & van Craenenbroeck 2013 for further data and argumentation):

(16) a. [Upon meeting someone in the park.] Nice weather, isn't it?
b. [While shaking the hand of a business associate one is meeting in person for the first time:] How do you do? John Smith, isn't it?

Both a cleft source and an isomorphic source are compatible with many instances of sluicing, although there are some contexts which are incompatible with one and not the other. We will see some examples of environments which are incompatible with clefts throughout §3, but here we consider one case, from Barros (in preparation), where the isomorphic source is unavailable and a cleft seems to be the correct analysis, what Barros calls *p-or-q sluices*. The relevant cases involve sluices where the antecedent is a disjunction of propositions, noted in AnderBois (2011), as in (17). The sluice is grammatical, and it is difficult to see how this could be derived from an isomorphic source, but a cleft continuation is possible, indicating that a cleft source may underly the sluicing example.

(17) Either something's on fire, or Sally's baking a cake, but I don't know which.

(18) Either something's on fire, or Sally's baking a cake, but I don't know which it is.

As Barros shows, the cleft-based analysis of disjunction sluices receives strong support from the fact that they are only possible in languages that allow cleft continuations like in (18), such as English, German, Spanish and Portuguese; in languages like Russian and Polish, on the other hand, both the disjunction sluice and the cleft continuation are ungrammatical. (19) demonstrates this for Russian for a variety of possible *wh*-remnants; all options remain ungrammatical if they are followed by an overt cleft pronoun *eto* (the copula is null in the present tense).

(19) *ili Sally opjat' pechet tort ili chto-to gorit, no ya ne znayu {chto/ kakoy/ kakoe iz
or Sally again bake cake or something burns, but I not know what which which of.the
dvuh/ kakoe kotoraja} immeno (eto).
two which situation exactly it

The cleft source analysis is further supported by the fact that in languages with morphological case like German, the sluicing remnant shows up in nominative case, the same case which is assigned to cleft pivots.[4]

(20) Entweder es brennt wo oder die Susi backt wieder Kuchen, aber ich weiß nicht,
Either it burns (some)where or the Susi bakes again cake, but I know not,
welches von beiden (es ist).
which.nom of.the two (it is)
"Either something is on fire or Susi is baking a cake again, but I don't know which."

[4]The Russian example (19) shows only nominative remnants but the sluices are equally ungrammatical in other cases too.

This all indicates that copular/cleft sources are quite readily available for the resolution of ellipsis. Other arguments in favour of allowing ellipsis sites to contain cleft structures come from Vicente (2008), Rodrigues et al. (2009) and van Craenenbroeck (2012), who posit cleft sources to account for apparent P-stranding violations under sluicing in non-P-stranding languages, and Potsdam (2007), who shows that Malagasy sluicing is based on a pseudocleft structure, which would require broadly similar departures from isomorphism in satisfying ellipsis identity. In the absence of good arguments to the contrary, it seems that the ellipsis identity condition should allow the ellipsis of cleft sources, another kind of non-isomorphic source that may give rise to repair illusions in island contexts.

2.3 Predicational sources

The second copular source which we consider here is called the *predicational source*, in which the remnant originates as the pivot of a predicational copular sentence, in the sense of Mikkelsen (2005).[5] The subject of a predicational source is an E-type pronoun which covaries with an argument in the antecedent, and the postcopular XP is a predicate which is predicated of the subject. In the cases that we consider here, the predicate is an adjective or a degree phrase which is then moved to the left periphery, although it is possible that the postcopular predicate could be of other categories. (21) shows a predicational source analysis for (3) which, analyzed as having an isomorphic source, seems to involve a violation of the left branch condition, as indicated by (22).

(21) She bought a big car, but I don't know how big ~~it/[the car that she bought] was~~

(22) *She bought a big car, but I don't know how big she bought a car.

We invoke predicational sources when the correlate is an attributive adjectival modifier. In the predicational source, the remnant originates as the predicate of a copular clause; since the predicate position is a possible target for extraction, these sluices can be derived without violating the left branch condition. This is discussed in more detail in §3.1.

Just as with short sources and cleft sources, predicational sources are plausible since their overt counterparts are well-formed and seem to capture the meaning of the sluice. It can also be shown that predicational sources satisfy at least some formulations of semantic identity, such as Merchant (2001)'s e-GIVENness. The same mechanisms as invoked to show that E-type pronouns in short sources can be used to satisfy semantic identity can be invoked to show that having an E-type pronoun (or definite description) as the subject allows a predicational source to satisfy semantic identity. The descriptive content in the antecedent is built into the descriptive content of the definite subject, just like with the clefts, only in this case it is the postcopular XP that is the predicate, rather than the subject.

Predicational sources are generally non-isomorphic with their antecedent and so we need to motivate the proposal that this kind of non-isomorphism is tolerated. Fortunately there are independent reasons to believe that predicational sources must be possible under sluicing. For example, consider (23), which we take to involve sluicing in an unconditional clause, in the sense of Rawlins (2013). We refer to such constructions as instances of *unconditional sluicing*.

(23) John will kiss anyone after the first date, it doesn't matter who

a. ... who ~~they are t~~

b. #... who ~~John will kiss/kisses t after the first date~~

In (23), a predicational source also serves as a felicitous continuation, whereas an isomorphic source doesn't (and manipulation of tense/modality doesn't seem to help matters). We will not attempt here to give an account about why this might be, but we assume that the infelicity of (23b) rules it out as a possible candidate source. A cleft source would also be possible here, though, so they may not provide evidence for

[5]To be precise, we characterize *predicational* copular sentences as involving a subject of type e, and a pivot of type $< e, t >$.

predicational sources specifically. However the remnant of unconditional sluicing can be a degree phrase as well, with the most natural continuation again being a predicational source, as the left branch condition-violating version (or its pied-piping variant) clearly gets the wrong meaning.

(24) John will fight any man, no matter how tall

a. ... how tall ~~he is *t*~~
b. #/*... how tall ~~John will fight a t man/fights a *t* man~~
c. #... how tall a man ~~John will fight *t*~~

Examples like (24) also motivate positing predicational sources in addition to cleft ones, since a cleft continuation would be ungrammatical here (**I don't know how tall it is*).

Compared to the other evasion sources we have discussed, predicational sources have been the subject of very little discussion in the literature on island repair (although see Ott & de Vries to appear). Merchant (2001) briefly raises and dismisses the possibility of a predicational source in the context of apparent left branch island repair with examples like (3), providing one empirical argument and raising a general concern that predicational sources might run into trouble with the identity condition. We will return to Merchant's empirical points in §3.1, where we look into left branch sluices in more detail.

2.4 Lasnik's objections

The evasion approach to (some) apparent island violations in Merchant (2001) is challenged by Lasnik (2001), who defends a literal repair approach. Lasnik provides two kinds of challenge to the use of short sources for evasion, paying particular attention to relative clause islands: sluices where the E-type anaphora component should fail, and sluices where binding of remnant-internal elements should fail. We address each of these points in turn and show that both are not compelling enough to argue against a pluralistic evasion approach of the kind envisaged here.

Lasnik's first challenge concerns Merchant's (2001) use of E-type anaphora to ensure that short sources satisfy the identity condition. Recall that for a sluice like (1) Merchant posits a short source like (25), where the ellipsis site takes the relative clause island as its antecedent and not the full clause containing it. Since the relative clause contains a gap in the subject position, the identity condition must allow that gap to be a possible antecedent for a pronoun in the ellipsis site. Merchant proposes that this is possible because the subject is an E-type pronoun which covaries with the binder of the trace in the gap.

(25) They hired someone$_i$ who speaks a Balkan language – guess which ~~he$_i$ speaks~~!

Merchant argues that we can find evidence for this approach to island evasion by considering cases where this E-type anaphora relation would be delicensed and the short source would be infelicitous. (26) demonstrates the delicensing of E-type anaphora with quantifiers like *no*, *few* and NPI *any*, rendering the short sources ungrammatical, and he shows that the parallel sluices in (27) are similarly degraded.

(26) a. They hired {*no / ??few} people who spoke a lot of languages – guess how many they spoke!
b. *They didn't hire anyone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't remember which she speaks.

(27) a. They hired {*no / ??few} people who spoke a lot of languages – guess how many!
b. *They didn't hire anyone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't remember which.

Merchant argues that this parallelism follows from the fact that we are tied to using the short source-based construal when islands are involved. If repair were possible, he reasons, then it should be possible to derive these sluices from isomorphic construals, for which E-type anaphora is not an issue.

Lasnik (2001) notes a number of problems for the reasoning here. First of all, he notes that the status of (27b) is not so clear-cut, as it is easy enough to make such examples fully acceptable by adding *certain*

to the correlate to make the specific reading of the indefinite clearer, as in (28a). Such sluices still lack a suitable short source, as shown by (28b).

(28) a. ?They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I don't remember which.
b. *They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I don't remember which she speaks.

Second, Lasnik notes that there are other well-formed cases of apparent island-escaping sluices involving negative indefinites which would also fail to license the E-type anaphora required for a short source.

(29) a. No one had a student who worked on a certain Balkan language, but I can't remember which one.
b. *No one had a student who worked on a certain Balkan language, but I can't remember which one she worked on.

Building on Lasnik's observations, we can show that by changing the *wh*P and correlate in (27a) to make them maximally similar to those in (28a) and (29a) we can create well-formed examples where the head of the relative is a negative indefinite:

(30) a. ?They hired no one who speaks a certain Balkan language – guess which one!
b. *They hired no one who speaks a certain Balkan language – guess which one she speaks!

It seems that the key problem with Merchant's examples is that the correlates are not sufficiently specific to take wide scope; this is indicated by the effect of *certain* modification, and the difference between *a lot of languages* (non-specific) and *a certain language* (specific). Since wide scope of the correlate is required to satisfy scope parallelism (Chung et al. 1995, Merchant 2001, Barker to appear), this is unsurprising.

This specificity effect is compatible with the present approach if we assume that these examples all involve cleft sources, not considered for these cases by Lasnik or Merchant. In most cases, the acceptability of the sluices tracks that of the cleft continuations:

(31) a. They hired {*no / ??few} people who spoke a lot of languages – guess how many it was!
b. They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I don't remember which it was.
c. No one had a student who worked on a certain Balkan language, but I can't remember which one it was
d. ?They hired no one who speaks a certain Balkan language – guess which one it was!

In one case, (27b), it seems that the judgement of the cleft and the sluice diverge, since the sluice is reported as ungrammatical while the cleft is more or less fine:

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

However we contend that the data in (27b) are not so clear-cut as they seem: that is, (27b) can be coerced to grammaticality by simply considering a context where there is a familiar set of Balkan languages in question, and where the specific reading for the indefinite is what is envisaged. The overt cleft in (32) clearly aides this specific interpretation, rendering the discourse more coherent. Thus the availability of clefts allows the evasion approach to meet Lasnik's first challenge.

Lasnik's second challenge comes from binding, in particular cases where the sluicing remnant contains an XP which seems to be bound by some quantificational element contained in a non-short source. The sluicing examples are in (33), with (33a) involving a bound possessive pronoun and (33b) involving *each... the other*; Lasnik provides the examples in (34) to demonstrate that the evasion approach undergenerates.

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

b. Each of the linguists met a philosopher who criticized some of the other linguists, but I'm not sure how many of the other linguists

(34) a. ??[Every linguist]$_i$ met a philosopher who criticized some of his$_i$ work, but I don't know how much of his$_i$ work the philosopher criticized.
b. ?*How many of the other linguists did the philosopher criticize?

Our objection here is that the case made by this data is far from clear-cut. First of all, (34b) is not the right control for the data at hand, since it is an isolated non-root sentence and these differences may condition acceptability; rather, the test case is (35), which is the relevant short source interpretation. On our own judgment, there is little difference in the acceptability of (35) and (33b):

(35) Each of the linguists met a philosopher who criticized some of the other linguists, but I'm not sure how many of the other linguists the philosopher criticized.

Regarding the difference between (33a) and (34a), Lasnik's own judgments are somewhat tentative, as he reports the short source version as only partly degraded while rating the sluice as perfect. But examples of this kind are very complex: they involve two distinct anaphoric processes, ellipsis and binding, and we know that they interact in complex and interesting ways, as attested by the large literature on the interpretation of pronouns in and around ellipsis sites.[6] This might lead one to expect that judgments would be quite variable, and indeed this is what we have found. We asked seventeen native speakers of English, all linguists, to judge (33a) and (34a), and eleven found no difference between the short source and the sluice, with the level of acceptability given to both examples varying from good to ungrammatical; of the remaining six, three found the bound reading better in the sluice, and the other three preferring the short source. Given the complexity of the examples and quite substantial variation in the judgments, we believe the data are not stable enough to be taken as decisive evidence against evasion, although if one did take them to be broadly reliable, the judgments reported here would only serve to support our hypothesis over Lasnik's.

2.5 Summary

In this section we have introduced three kinds of non-isomorphic construals for ellipsis sites – short sources, cleft sources and predicational sources – and shown that they are all independently motivated and all capable of giving rise to repair illusions. We have also seen that Lasnik's challenge to the island evasion theory proposed by Merchant (2001) are not insurmountable, with some being dealt with by cleft sources and others looking like short sources may do the right work after all.

With all this established, we now proceed to show how the evasion approach can explain a number of generalizations regarding island repair effects. In what follows we show that each of the generalizations have their exceptions and that while literal repair approaches are unable to account for these exceptions, the pluralistic evasion approach we have motivated here does in fact get the right cut with the data. This involves showing that when island effects arise, there are independent factors ruling out the various evasion strategies. This is precisely what we would expect if repair were illusory.

3 Unrepaired island violations under sluicing

The first generalization about island repair that we consider is widely accepted statement in (36):

(36) Sluicing repairs island violations.

[6] We include in this not only the literature on strict and sloppy readings of pronouns in the ellipsis site but also the bound pronoun condition on long-distance gapping (Lasnik 2006), and a similar coindexation condition on ACD in French (Dagnac 2010).

In this section, we consider a number of cases where sluicing *does* show island sensitivity, contrary to (1). The key claim that we make, building on Merchant (2001), is that in the vast majority of cases, apparent island repair with sluicing (for instance with examples like (1), (3)-(8)) may be explained as cases of island evasion, involving the use of the strategies we have just introduced. In what follows we describe a number of exceptions to (36) – island sensitivity with Left Branch Extraction (LBE), multiple remnants, contrastive remnants and case-marked remnants – and argue that the reason for island sensitivity is the fact that these structures are incompatible with the evasion strategies. We show that alternative explanations of these exceptions which would salvage the repair approach fail to account for all of the data, and thus we conclude that sluicing *is* island sensitive, despite the false appearances created by evasion.[7]

3.1 Left branch extraction

Merchant (2001, 163) identifies Ross' (1967) Left Branch Condition (LBC) as one of the island constraints for which the case is strongest that its effects arise at PF. As a result, if a general argument is to be developed against the PF approach to island constraints, a convincing argument against the PF approach to the LBC in particular should draw the PF theory of islandhood generally into question.

The LBC is generally taken to rule out extraction of prenominal modifiers, such as possessors, degree words, and attributive adjectival modifiers. Merchant concentrates specifically on extraction of attributive adjectival modifiers, as in (37), as other kinds of LBE introduce confounding factors (see Merchant 2001, §5.2.1 for discussion). Merchant (2001) argues on the basis of data such as (37) that sluicing repairs violations of the LBC. The analysis he gives is as indicated in (37): a fully isomorphic source involving LBE of the *wh*-remnant underlies the sluice. Such extractions are ungrammatical in English in the absence of ellipsis, as shown by (38).

(37) Mary married a tall man, but I don't know [how tall]$_i$ ~~Mary married a t_i man~~

(38) *[How tall]$_i$ did Mary marry a t_i man?

In order to question an attributive modifier in English, the entire DP must be pied-piped, and the attributive DegP undergoes inversion, as in (39).

(39) [[How tall]$_i$ a t_i man]$_j$ did Mary marry t_j?

Given the possibility of the non-island-violating pied-piping movement in (39), there are two possible alternative derivations one could entertain underlying the string in (37). The first involves ellipsis of the string *a man did Mary marry*, as in (40); the second option is that pied-piping with inversion licenses an independent NPE operation applying to the evacuated DP, as in (41). Both of these could plausibly be described as cases of island evasion, where the evasion strategy is to pied-pipe the island so a violation is never incurred, although unlike our other evasion strategies they do not involve non-isomorphism.

(40) ...[[How tall]$_i$ ~~a t_i man]$_j$ did Mary marry t_j~~?

(41) ...[[How tall]$_i$ ~~a t_i man~~]$_j$ ~~did Mary marry t_j~~?

Both of these analyses have problems which make them a non-starter for English. (40) requires deletion of a non-constituent, and since there is good evidence to believe that ellipsis is licensed syntactically (Lobeck 1995, Johnson 2001, Merchant 2001) and therefore tied to constituent structure, it seems reasonable to put this option to one side (see also Sailor & Thoms 2013 for further arguments against non-constituent

[7] Here we do not consider *sprouting* – sluices with implicit indefinite correlates – which were argued by Chung et al. (1995) to be island sensitive. Numerous counterexamples to Chung et al's empirical claim are noted in Kim & Kuno (2012), and it seems the relevant factors are interpretive properties of the implicit correlate and not core syntactic properties of the mechanisms involved in sprouting. We believe that the pattern of data is wholly compatible with the evasion approach, but leave showing this for another time.

ellipsis). (41) is more plausible,[8] but it makes the prediction that the NPE operation seen with the sluice should also be available independent of clausal ellipsis; (42) shows that this prediction is not borne out, indicating that this analysis is not right for English either.[9]

(42) *Mary married a tall man, but I don't know how tall ~~a man~~ she married.

In the absence of further plausible options for an evasion analysis, one may conclude at this point that Merchant's (2001) repair approach is the right way to go.

However we argue that there is a non-isomorphic evasion strategy for sluices like (37), namely, the predicational copular source, as in (43).

(43) ...but I don't know how tall ~~he was *t*~~

Merchant (2001) provides one direct argument against the predicational analysis of these sluices, so we consider this here before turning to our own evidence for this approach.[10] The argument comes from consideration of the prosody of some DegP sluices. (Merchant 2001, 177-178). Merchant observes that in an adjectival left-branch sluice, such as (37) stress obligatorily falls on the *wh*-word *how* rather than the adjective, as illustrated by the contrast in acceptability between (44a) and (44b). Merchant then goes on to consider the placement of stress with an overt continuation involving a predicational copular, giving the data in (45a) and (45b). But there is a confound here: The sluicing examples in (44a) and (44b) contain an adjectival modifier in the first clause, whereas the examples with an overt predicational continuation contain no adjectival modifier in the first clause.

(44) a. *She bought a big car, but I don't know how BIG.
b. She bought a big car, but I don't know HOW big.

(45) a. She bought a car, but I don't know how BIG it is.
b. *She bought a car, but I don't know HOW big it is.

Once we control for this by considering an overt predicational continuation where there is an adjectival modifier in the first clause as well, we can see that stress placement patterns with the sluicing example,[11] as illustrated by the contrast between (46a) and (46b).

(46) a. *She bought a big car, but I don't know how BIG it is.
b. She bought a big car, but I don't know HOW big it is.

Note that the sentence is only grammatical with stress placed on the *wh*-word *how*, just like with sluicing. In sum, prosody can't be used to distinguish between Merchant's isomorphic, island-violating source (37),

[8]Note that an analysis of this kind is viable for another class of apparent LBC violations under sluicing, namely ones involving *wh*-possessors; see Merchant (2001)

[9]Note that we cannot attribute this effect to a general tendency to elide as much as possible such as "MaxElide" (Merchant 2008) because this postadjectival ellipsis is impossible in cases where all other ellipsis options are ruled out as well (whether or not the same adjective is used):

(i) *John first found out how long a desk Mary wanted and then he asked her how long/wide ~~a desk~~ she already owned.

[10]Merchant (2001, 172, fn.7) also mentions the fact Greek DegP sluices show the agreement pattern as attributive modifiers, and not predicative modifiers, but he then hedges this claim by noting that such sluices could be derived without LBE, by pied-piping the NP the DegP modifies and applying an independently available postadjectival NP-ellipsis process.

[11]We cannot consider whether stress placement in the sluicing example without an adjectival modifier in the first clause patterns with stress placement with a predicational continuation without an adjectival modifier in the first clause, since sluicing with an adjectival remnant is independently ungrammatical in the absence of an overt, adjectival correlate. An adjectival modifier cannot be 'sprouted', in the sense of Chung et al. (1995), as illustrated by (i):

(i) *She bought a car, but I don't know how big.

and a predicational source (43).

Here we present two positive arguments in favour of the predicational source analysis of apparently LBC-violating DegP sluices. The first argument involves manipulating the semantics of the remnant to control for a predicational source. In English, there is a small class of non-intersective adjectives which are both gradable and incompatible with predicative structures. Examples include such as *hard* in *hard worker*, and *beautiful* in *beautiful dancer*, and *old* in *old friend* (under the reading *old* modifies the length of the friendship) (see **?** for more detailed discussion). Interestingly, all such adjectives we have came across which meet these criteria are in fact ambiguous between an intersective reading and a non-intersective reading. Consider, by way of illustration the adjective *hard*. Under its intersective reading, *hard* picks out entities which possess the property of being hard. When *hard* is used as a predicate, this is the reading which emerges, and therefore when it is predicated of *the worker*, as in (47), the sentence is infelicitous, since it is difficult to conceive of workers as possessing the property of being hard.[12] When it is predicated of *the problem*, as in (48) the sentence is felicitous, since problems can possess the property of being hard, i.e. hard to solve. When *hard* modifies *worker* prenominally however, the non-intersective reading emerges. (49) can be paraphrased as: *the library hired someone who works hard*. Under this reading, *hard* is indeed gradable, as illustrated by the felicity of (50) and (51).

(47) #The worker is hard. *#intersective/*non-intersective*

(48) The problem is hard. *intersective*

(49) The library hired a hard worker. *#intersective/non-intersective*

(50) How hard a worker did the library hire? *#intersective/non-intersective*

(51) The library hired a very hard worker. *#intersective/non-intersective*

We will say that *hard* is non-predicative under its non-intersective reading, since the non-intersective reading disappears when *hard* is used as a predicate.

This class of adjectives provide us with a means to tease apart the two analytical possibilities we have been considering for DegP sluices: (i) an isomorphic source involving repaired LBE from a modifier position, and (ii) a predicational source. Since the class of adjectives we are considering are gradable, they are possible sluicing remnants as they can be questioned using the degree *wh*-word *how*. Recall that the non-intersective reading is unavailable when *hard* is used as a predicate. Consequently, if a predicational source underlies adjectival left-branch sluices in English, we make the prediction that a non-intersective reading should be unavailable, tracking the unavailability of a non-intersective reading with an overt predicational continuation, as in (52). That this prediction is borne out is shown by (53): a DegP-sluice with *hard* lacks the non-intersective reading (just like the overt predicative version in (52)), and therefore it is infelicitous. (54) is a control that shows that the related DegP sluice with pied-piping of the nominal does allow for the non-intersective reading, indicating that sluicing is not itself incompatible with this reading.

(52) #The library hired a hard worker, but I don't know exactly how hard the worker was t.
*#intersective/*non-intersective*

(53) #The library hired a hard worker, but I don't know exactly how hard.
*#intersective/*non-intersective*

(54) The library hired a hard worker, but I don't know exactly how hard a worker ~~the library hired t~~.
#intersective/non-intersective

Thus the unavailability of the non-intersective reading with sluices like (53) is predicted on our approach: LBE is not repaired by ellipsis, forcing the use of predicational sources for DegP sluices where the correlate is an attributive modifier, and this reading is not compatible with an underlying predicational structure.

[12] In some dialects, *hard* can be used predicatively to mean "tough" or "stern," so such a reading may be appropriate with the right context in some of the sentences we give here.

Importantly, this is *not* predicted by the repair approach, which does not predict there to be any difference between different adjectives with respect to whether they can be part of DegP sluicing remnants.

One alternative analysis of these facts is that non-predicative adjectives are generally incompatible with LBE irrespective of repair by ellipsis, with one quirk possibly relating to the other; one could plausibly accept this and then maintain that other LBE violations are repaired by ellipsis, thus dismissing the argument above. This is difficult to falsify with English sluicing data,[13] but we can find evidence to show that non-predicative readings are not generally incompatible with LBE by looking at Slavic languages like Czech, which allow for overt LBE of adjectival modifiers (Corver 1990). The adjective meaning 'old' in Czech is non-predicative under its non-intersective reading (where *old* modifies the length of the friendship), just as is the case in English; this is illustrated by the fact that the non-intersective reading is available in (55) but not (56). When the adjective undergoes LBE in Czech, as in (57), the non-intersective reading is still available.

(55) Marie včera potkala starého přítele.
Mary yesterday met old.ACC friend.ACC
"Mary met an old friend yesterday." *intersective/non-intersective*

(56) Mari-in přítel je starý
Mary-POSS.NOM friend.NOM is old.NOM
"Mary's friend is old." *intersective/#non-intersective*

(57) Jak starého Marie včera potkala přítele?
how old.ACC Mary.NOM yesterday met friend.ACC
"How old a friend did Mary meet yesterday?" *intersective/non-intersective*

The fact that overt LBE in Slavic is compatible with the non-intersective reading of an adjectival modifier, suggests that in principle, repaired LBE in a language which disallows LBE overtly should be compatible with the non-intersective reading of an adjectival modifier. Now consider a DegP sluice based on this adjective. We predict that such a sluice should be compatible with the non-intersective reading of the adjective, given that an isomorphic source involving LBE violates no grammatical constraints in the language. That this prediction is borne out is illustrated by (58), which differs from its English translation in allowing the non-intersective reading.

(58) Marie včera potkala starého přítele, ale nepamatuji si jak starého.
Mary.NOM yesterday met old.ACC friend.ACC but not-remember REFL.CL how old.ACC
"Mary met an old friend yesterday, but I do not remember how old." *intersective/non-intersective*

Thus the availability of the non-intersective reading is conditioned by whether the isomorphic source for ellipsis is possible: in Czech, it is possible because LBE does not require repair, while in English it is unavailable since it requires LBE and this is not repaired in English.

The experiment just conducted for English can be replicated even more cleanly with Romance, as in these languages whether or not nouns receive the non-intersective reading depends on whether they appear post- or pre-nominally; here we concentrate on Italian, but the same results can be replicated for Spanish. Consider for example *vecchio* ('old') in Italian: when it appears post-nominally, as in (59), it receives an intersective reading, ascribing to the friend in question the property of being old, but when it appears pre-

[13] One possible line of argument would be to consider the same modifiers in attributive AP-comparatives. Kennedy (2000) argue that these involve LBE which is repaired by ellipsis, specifically VP-ellipsis or pseudogapping, and Merchant (2001) takes this as strong support for a repair approach to LBE sluices. If this is correct, then we would predict that the non-predicative adjectives would be incompatible with attributive comparatives. The following indicate that this prediction is not borne out:

(i) a. Mary is a harder worker than Bill is.
b. John is a harder worker than he is a drinker.

An alternative non-LBE-based approach to attributive comparatives is to be found in Izvorski (1995).

nominally on the other hand, as in (60), it receives a non-intersective reading, where, as before, *old* modifies the length of the friendship. As expected, the non-predicative reading is unavailable when *vecchio* is used as a predicate, as in (61), showing that the non-intersective reading is genuinely non-predicative in Italian.

(59) un amico vecchio.
a friend old.
"an old friend" *intersective/*non-intersective*

(60) un vecchio amico.
an old friend.
"an old friend" **intersective/non-intersective*

(61) L'amico è vecchio.
the.friend is old.
"the friend is old" *intersective/*non-intersective*

That *vecchio* is gradable under its non-intersective reading can be shown by the fact that non-intersective *vecchio* can be used in a comparative construction, as in (62).

(62) Gianni è il pi''u vecchio amico che abbia.
John is the more old friend that have.
"John is the friend I've known for the most time."

Thus the word order of the correlate for a sluice will disambiguate for whether it is the intersective reading or the non-intersective reading, and hence this will force the interpretation of the sluice to be the same, removing the ambiguity which we have to control for in assessing the English data.

One further point to note is that generally speaking Italian obeys the LBC: extraction of a degree modifier or degree phrase from a modifier position leads to ungrammaticality, as illustrated by the (illicit) extraction of *quanto* ('how') and *quanto costosa* ('how expensive') in (63) and (64) respectively. One respect in which Italian differs from other LBC-obeying languages such as English is that it is possible to extract *quanto* from an adjectival predicate, in apparent violation of the LBC, as illustrated by (65) (Rizzi 1990, p.35-37), but this does not affect the argument we develop here.

(63) *[Quanto costosa]$_i$ ha comprato una macchina t_i, Gianni?
[How expensive] has bought a car t, John?
"How expensive a car did John buy?"

(64) *Quanto$_i$ ha comprato una macchina t_i costosa, Gianni?
How has bought a car t expensive, John?
"How expensive a car did John buy?"

(65) Quanto é costosa la macchina?
How is expensive the car?
"How expensive is the car?"

On the present approach, it is predicted that a correlate with the prenominal modifier will be ungrammatical, not just unambiguous, with a DegP sluice, since it will involve a non-intersective non-predicative adjective and Italian can only generate DegP sluices by using predicational sources when the correlate AP is in an attributive position. On the other hand, DegP sluices with the postnominally modified correlate are predicted to be fine, as these have the intersective reading and are hence compatible with the predicational source. (66)-(67) show that this prediction is borne out, and (68)-(69) shows that the options here track what we see with the overt predicational sources.

(66) Ho incontrato un amico vecchissimo di Gianni ma non so quanto.
Have met a friend old.very of John but not know how.
"I met a very old friend of John's, but I don't know how old." *intersective/*non-intersective

(67) *Ho incontrato un vecchissimo amico di Gianni, ma non so quanto.
Have met a old.very friend of John, but not know how.
"I met a very old friend of John's, but I don't know how old." **intersective/*non-intersective*

(68) Ho incontrato un amico vecchissimo di Gianni ma non so quanto è vecchio l'amico.
Have met a friend old.very of John but not know how is old the.friend.
"I met a very old friend of John's, but I don't know how old the friend is."
*intersective/*non-intersective*

(69) *Ho incontrato un vecchissimo amico di Gianni, ma non so quanto è vecchio l'amico.
Have met a old.very friend of John, but not know how is old the.friend.
"I met a very old friend of John's, but I don't know how old.' **intersective/*non-intersective*

Thus we see again that apparent LBE tracks the availability of a predicational source, with the DegP sluices becoming ungrammatical when these are unavailable.

Our second argument in favour of the predicational source for apparent LBC-violating DegP sluices comes from adjectival agreement in Germanic, a set of facts also discussed by Merchant (2001) but interpreted in a different way; here we concentrate on German, but the same results can be replicated for Dutch. In German, adjectival predicates and adjectival attributive modifiers differ in their morphological form: adjectival predicates appear bare, as illustrated in (70), whereas adjectival modifiers agree with the noun that they modify, as illustrated in (71). Furthermore, German obeys the Left Branch Condition, as extraction of an adjectival modifier is prohibited, (72), while extraction of an adjectival predicate is allowed, (73).

(70) Der Mann ist groß.
The man is tall.

(71) Lena hat einen groß*(en) Mann geheiratet.
L. has a tall(.ACC) man married.

(72) *Wie großen hat Lena einen Mann geheiratet?
How tall..ACC has L. a.ACC man married?
"How tall a man did Lena marry?"

(73) Wie groß ist der Mann?
How tall is the man?
"How tall is the man?"

The crucial test case is the form of the adjectival remnant in a left-branch adjectival sluice, and we see that the remnant obligatorily surfaces with the agreement we see on an adjectival predicate, (74). The bare adjectival remnant is compatible with predicational continuation, as in (75).

(74) Lena hat einen großen Mann geheiratet, aber ich weiß nicht wie groß(*en)
L. has a tall.ACC man married, but I know not how tall(.ACC).
"Lena married a tall man, but I don't know how tall."

(75) ...[wie groß(*en)]$_i$ ~~er war t_i~~
...[how tall(*.ACC)] ~~he was t~~
"...how tall (he was)."

These facts are noted by Merchant (2001), who concedes that they point to a predicational source for DegP sluices, but he then contends that there seems to be little independent evidence for allowing the kind of non-isomorphism required for such a predicational source. Merchant proposes that these facts "seem to point

to the conclusion that the inflection on attributive adjectives in [German and] Dutch is itself the result of feature realization principles operative at PF" (p.172); that is, DegP sluicing bleeds the agreement process which normally realizes agreement on the AP in the Germanic DP.

This analysis might be plausible in itself, but we are by now in a position to criticize both of its key points. Regarding the identity condition, in §2.3 we already provided independent evidence from concessive sluices for the availability of predicational sources, and the semantic evidence presented in this section for the use of predicational sources has only served to strengthen this point further. Regarding the proposal that AP-agreement is bled by DegP sluicing, besides the fact that there is little independent evidence for this proposal, we have already seen a case of DegP sluices where the adjectival remnant shows agreement, the Czech example (58), which is arguably a case of genuine left branch extraction. Similarly in Spanish, gender agreement shows up on the adjective in a DegP sluice, just as it would in either the predicative or attributive position.

(76) Juan a contratado a un amigo viejo, pero no sé cómo de viejo.
Juan has hired DOM a friend old.M, but not know how of old.M
"Juan has hired an old (male) friend, but I don't know how old." (what his age is)

It is possible that the Germanic agreement processes are simply different from those seen in Slavic and Romance, but the burden of proof lies with those who draw the relevant distinction, whereas for the present approach the AP agreement patterns on DegP remnants are just what we expect to see. One final point is that it would be somewhat strange to find out that Germanic case agreement is as superficial as to be bled by ellipsis, since with DP sluices German shows highly robust case-matching effects, a set of facts we assess in greater detail in §3.4.

We conclude that our predicational source-based approach provides a more parsimonious account of the agreement facts, and so it is to be preferred on those grounds. Combined with the semantic argument from non-predicative adjectives presented earlier, this provides a strong argument in favour of deriving apparent LBC-violating DegP sluices from predicative structures, and it therefore provides more evidence against the proposal that LBC violations are repaired by ellipsis. This conclusion will be supported by further semantic evidence in §4.4, where we will see that a very similar pattern of data can be observed with fragments.

3.2 Multiple sluicing

In this section we consider sluicing with more than remnant, typically called *multiple sluicing*. (77) demonstrates this for English.

(77) Someone was talking about something, but I don't know who about what.

Multiple sluicing is somewhat unexpected in English, since it looks like it involves fronting of two *wh*Ps to a clause-initial position, and this is not allowed in the absence of ellipsis, since it is not a multiple *wh*-fronting language. However Lasnik (2013) argues that English multiple sluicing is better analyzed as involving leftward movement of the leftmost remnant plus extraposition of the rightmost remnant to a high adjoined position above the ellipsis site, as in (78).

(78) ... [$_{CP}$ who$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~[$_{TP}$ t_i was [$_{VP}$ talking t_j]]]~~ [$_{PP}$ about what]$_j$]]

Lasnik shows that the extraposition analysis is supported by the fact that English multiple sluicing is subject to a number of restrictions which track restrictions on rightward movement, such as heaviness, a restriction on P-stranding and clause-boundedness. Thus multiple sluicing cannot target two constituents that are separated by a finite clause boundary, since this would require extraposing the second remnant out of the embedded clause in violation of the Right Roof Constraint (Ross 1967). Note that this analysis entails that the Right Roof Constraint and the other restrictions on rightward movement are not PF-conditions, since if they were we would expect them to be repaired by ellipsis here; we return to this issue in §5.

(79) *Somebody said that John was talking about something, but I don't know who about what.
... [$_{CP}$ who$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~[$_{TP}$ t_i [$_{VP}$ said [$_{CP}$ that [$_{TP}$ John was [$_{VP}$ talking t_j~~]]]]] [$_{PP}$ about what]$_j$]]

In multiple *wh*-fronting languages like Russian and Serbo-Croatian, multiple sluicing is much more unsurprising and much less constrained, effectively showing the same basic characteristics as unelided multiple questions (Grebenyova 2009, Hoyt & Teodorescu 2012).

Multiple remnant ellipsis constructions like this are useful for our present purposes because they are typically incompatible with the evasion strategies introduced in §2. Truncated clefts are incompatible because they can only host one *wh*P, and deriving them from an unreduced cleft would mean that the expected results would be no different from with an isomorphic source. Short sources are incompatible with multiple sluices where one of the correlates is outside of the island (the short source is made up of just the content of the island), but they are compatible with cases where both correlates are within the island, at least in those cases where the short source is viable.[14] Thus, we expect that multiple sluicing will show island sensitivity in the former cases, but not in the latter cases, whereas the literal repair approach would predict uniform island repair, at least in those cases where independent constraints are not violated.

The following examples show that these predictions are borne out for English. (80)-(81) demonstrates three cases where one correlate is inside an island and the other outside the island, a scenario which is incompatible with a short source. Both are strongly ungrammatical, and while (80) might be ruled out independent of the islandhood of the relative clause (since the island is a finite clause), the other example involves a non-finite relative clause which, in principle, should be compatible with extraction of the second remnant if island violations are ameliorated by ellipsis (non-finite relatives are also islands in English).

(80) *One of the panel members wants to hire someone who works on a Balkan language, but I don't know which panel member on which language.

(81) *One of the students brought a book to talk to one of the professors about, but I don't know which student to which professor.

The second prediction, that apparent repair should be attested when a short source would be possible, is demonstrated by (82a); (82b) indicates the short source that would underlie the sluice.

(82) a. They hired someone who teaches an infamous course every year at a famous university, but I forget which course at which university.
b. ...but I forget [which course]$_i$ ~~she teaches t_i every year t_j~~ [at which university]$_j$.

One could easily contend the strength of the challenge to the literal repair approach posed by this data, since English multiple sluicing is so constrained independent of islands. But at the very least, the facts seen so far are readily compatible with the evasion approach and at least troubling for the repair alternative.

[14]Note that the use of short sources in the derivation of English multiple sluicing is not unprecedented, as it is actually what Lasnik (2013) proposes is responsible for the fact that multiple sluicing is possible when the two correlates are both inside an embedded clause:

(i) Fred thinks a certain boy talked to a certain girl. I wish I could remember which boy to which girl.

This can be squared with the clause-boundedness data if we assume that the relevant analysis of (i) is one where the antecedent for ellipsis is the embedded clause only, with the interpretation "I don't know which boy talked to a certain girl." Lasnik (2013, 12) supports this by showing that the multiple sluice is degraded when the embedding predicate is "deny," which would not be compatible with this sort of short source analysis.

(ii) Fred denied that a certain boy talked to a certain girl. ???I wish I could remember which boy to which girl.

Now let us consider multiple sluicing with islands in a multiple *wh*-fronting language, where we need not worry about interfering factors like the Right Roof Constraint.[15] To begin with, we observe that regular Russian sluicing shows the same island repair effect as English with relative clause islands (83) and coordinate islands (84). On our approach these sluices would be derived from underlying short sources, following Merchant (2001).

(83) Oni xotjat nanjat' čeloveka, kotoryj govorit na opredelennom Balkanskom
they.NOM want.3PL to.hire man.ACC which.NOM knows.3S on certain.PREP Balkan.PREP
yazyke, no ja ne znaju na kakom.
language.PREP, but I.NOM NEG know.1SG on which.PREP
"They want to hire someone who works on a Balkan language, but I don't know which one"

(84) Ivan uvidel Mašu i odnogo iz ejo studentov tancujuščimi vmeste, no ja
Ivan.NOM saw.3S Maša.ACC and one.ACC of her students.GEN dance.PART together, but I.NOM
ne znaju kakogo (immeno) iz ejo studentov
NEG know.1SG which.ACC (namely) of her students.GEN
"Ivan saw Maša and one of her students dancing together, but I don't know which of her students"

Now let us test island sensitivity in cases where one of the correlates is inside an island and the other outside the island, where a short source is not plausible. As we can see, the multiple sluices are judged as strongly ungrammatical, even though Russian multiple sluicing allows for these kinds of combinations of remnants when no island boundaries are involved (see Grebenyova 2009 for data).

(85) *Kto-to xočet nanjat' čeloveka, kotoryj govorit na opredelennom Balkanskom
someone.NOM want.3S to.hire man.ACC which.NOM work.3S on certain.PREP Balkan.PREP
yazyke, no ja ne znaju kto na kakom.
language.PREP, but I.NOM NEG know who.NOM on which.PREP
"Someone wants to hire a man who works on a Balkan language, but I don't know who on which Balkan language" relative clause island

(86) *Odin iz učitelej uvidel Mašu i odnogo iz ejo detej tancujuščimi
one.NOM of teachers.GEN saw.3S Maša.ACC and one.ACC of her children.GEN dancing
vmeste, no ja ne znaju kakoj iz učitelej kakogo iz detej
together, but I.NOM NEG know.1SG which.NOM of teachers.GEN which.ACC of children.GEN
"One of the teachers saw Maša and one of her students dancing together, but I don't know which of the teachers which of her students" coordinate island

Finally, as with English we expect to see repair illusions when both remnants are located inside the relative clause island, since such strucures will be amenable to a short source analysis. The following shows that this is correct, in that the multiple sluice is grammatical, just like with English (82a).

(87) Oni vzyali na rabotu kogo-to, kto prepodaët pečal'no izvestnyj kurs v
they.NOM take.PST for work someone.ACC, who teaches sadly known course at
znamenitom universitete, no ja zabyl kakoj kurs v kakom
famous.LOC.SG.M university.LOC.SG but I forget.PST which.ACC course.ACC at which.LOC.SG
universitete
university.LOC
"They hired someone who teaches an infamous course at a famous university, but I forget know which course at which university."

[15]The same experiment was proposed independently by Marušič & Žaucer (2013) for Slovenian, where the same results obtained.

Thus we see again that sluicing shows island sensitivity once we control for the availability of evasion.

3.3 Contrast sluices

As observed by Merchant (2008) (see also Fukaya 2007, Griffiths & Lipták to appear), sluicing typically shows sensitivity to islands when the remnant receives a contrastive interpretation, in what are called *contrast sluices*. This is shown by the relative clause island in (88), from Merchant (2008). A relevant control is (89), which shows that contrast sluices are in principle capable of crossing finite clause boundaries (Merchant (2008, 147)).

(88) *The radio played a song that RINGO wrote, but I don't know who ELSE ~~the radio played a song that t wrote~~.

(89) He said he talked to ABBY, but I don't know who ELSE ~~he said he talked to t~~.

The island-sensitivity of contrast sluicing is attested with a variety of island types, as the following show.

(90) *Ben will be angry if you don't try THE CAKE, but I don't know what ELSE ~~he will be angry if you don't try t~~ *adjunct island*

(91) *?Sandy was trying to figure out which student would solve DAHL'S PUZZLE, but I don't know what OTHER PROBLEM ~~she was trying to figure out which student would solve t~~ *wh-island*

(92) *Ben is spreading false rumours that you criticized SANDY, but I don't know who ELSE ~~he is spreading false rumours that you criticized t~~. *CP complements to nouns*

(93) *They expect Cameron and THE SELECT COMMITTEE to meet next week, but I don't know which OTHER COMMITTEE ~~they expect Cameron and t to meet next week~~ *CSC I*

(94) *Bob saw a movie and reviewed it for THE GUARDIAN, but I don't know which OTHER NEWSPAPER ~~he saw a movie and reviewed it for t~~. *CSC II*

Note that the judgments reported are for the isomorphic construals in the strikethrough, as in a few of these cases the sluicing strings are grammatical on non-isomorphic construals. For instance, some speakers find that (88) is grammatical on the interpretation where the question asks who else co-wrote the song mentioned in the antecedent with Ringo; this would have the parse in (95).

(95) The radio played a song that RINGO wrote, but I don't know who ELSE ~~wrote it~~.

In the terms of §2, these are short source construals for the ellipsis site, the construals which we argue are partly responsible for the island repair effects seen with regular sluicing, and the availability of these interpretations as distinguishable from the isomorphic ones. As noted by Fukaya (2007), the important difference between regular sluicing and contrast sluicing is that with contrast sluicing, the "long reading" (corresponding to the island violation) and the "short reading" (the short source) are distinguished by the scope of focus in the antecedent. The short reading is just that indicated by the short source in (95), where focus takes scope over the relative clause CP but not the head. The long reading, indicated in (88), the focus would scope over the whole clause, including the indefinite head DP; the sluice, were it grammatical, should license a "different songs" reading like "I don't know who else$_i$ is such that the radio played a song [potentially not the same as the one written by Ringo] that s/he$_i$ wrote it."[16]

The absence of the long readings for the contrast sluices looks like good evidence for the present approach, since these could not be derived by any of the evasion strategies invoked in §2. Short sources are

[16]No such reading is distinguishable with a regular sluice with an indefinite correlate, since the *wh*-remnant and the indefinite correlate covary and hence the "different songs" reading would be unavailable.

obviously irrelevant for the other contrast sluices above since they would not derive the correct interpretations. Cleft sources are also not a possible option, as the pivot of a truncated cleft needs to be exhaustive; this is not compatible with the non-exhaustive focus encoded by the contrastive *wh*-remnant (Merchant 2001, Rodrigues et al. 2009, Barros 2013), as we can see from the overt cleft continuations.

(96) *The radio played a song that RINGO wrote, but I don't know who ELSE it was.

Predicational sources are typically only relevant for DegP sluices, and as it happens DegP sluices are compatible with contrastive remnants, as shown by (97) where the correlate is an extracted DegP which pied-pipes the NP. (98) shows that the predicational source is grammatical, as we would expect.[17]

(97) I know how LONG a bridge they built, but not how WIDE.

(98) I know how LONG a bridge they built, but not how WIDE it was.

However the remaining contrast sluicing data cannot be claimed as evidence against (36) just yet, since alternative explanations have been proposed in the literature which are compatible with the literal repair approach. Here we consider the proposals in Merchant (2008) and Griffiths & Lipták (to appear), which account for the islandboundedness of contrast in terms of the scope of the correlate. In critiquing and hence rejecting these approaches to contrast sluices, we therefore develop arguments against other aspects of their accounts of the variable island repair of different ellipsis constructions, which they all situate in a literal repair approach. This will provide important background for the discussion in §4.

Merchant's (2008) proposal is situated in a discussion of the difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis with respect to repair effects, where he notes that the lack of repair with contrast sluicing is a direct challenge to a literal repair approach. To account for this, he proposes the following:

(99) Covert focus movement can only proceed as far as the next VP node when it escapes an island; it cannot adjoin to IP.

This stipulation, in combination with scope parallelism and the assumption that focused definite correlates take scope by covert focus movement, derives the islandbounedness of contrast sluices accordingly. Consider (88): scope parallelism requires that both the sluicing remnant *who else* and its correlate *Ringo* take clausal scope, since the *wh*P's scope is fixed by its surface position, but if (99) holds then *Ringo* will only scope at the VP level (since it has escaped an island), and hence, scope parallelism is violated and the sluice is ungrammatical. (100) schematizes, where we can see that the correlate and sluicing remnant do not scope in parallel positions, in violation of Scope Parallelism. This does not happen in cases of contrast sluicing without islands, since in those cases covert focus movement can target a higher node like IP or CP, unimpeded by (99):

(100) $[_{CP}$ $[_{TP}$ the radio $[_{VP}$ RINGO λx $[_{VP}$ played $[_{DP}$ the song $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP}$ x $[_{VP}$ wrote]..
$[_{CP}$ who else λy ~~$[_{TP}$ it $[_{VP}$ played $[_{DP}$ the song $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP}$ y $[_{VP}$ wrote ..]]]~~

Thus for Merchant's analysis, the problem in (100) is not the island violating overt movement in the sluice, but the island-violating *covert* movement in the antecedent.[18]

The account in Griffiths & Lipták (to appear) (henceforth G&L) is similar to Merchant's 2008 account, although they argue that its empirical scope is broader than what Merchant proposes. G&L propose that

[17] This data is compatible with the alternative theories we critique in what follows, but it would be incompatible with any adjusted version of these theories which captured the islandboundedness of contrast sluices by building it into the syntax of the sluices, rather than the antecedents.

[18] Fukaya (2007) claims that Merchant's proposal makes the prediction that if the antecedent for the sluice is further embedded, the contrast sluices should be grammatical, since in these cases there is a higher VP node that is outside of the antecedent which the focus can adjoin to, and adjoining the focus to this would avoid a parallelism violation. Fukaya claims that this prediction is correct, on the basis of examples like the following, which she claims has the island-escaping construal.

(i) I know the radio played a song that RINGO wrote, but I don't know who ELSE.

island-escaping covert focus movement of the correlate is not just restricted to targeting VP-nodes, but rather it is wholly impossible – that is, it is just as islandbound as overt movement – and hence all cases of contrast sluicing are ruled out as Scope Parallelism violations, just like with Merchant's proposal, although on this analysis the correlates fail to scope out of the islands entirely. Interestingly, G&L propose that this account generalizes beyond contrast sluicing to all clausal ellipsis constructions with a contrastively focused remnant, such as contrastive fragment answers. Their generalization is stated in modified form in (101):

(101) Contrastive ellipsis remnants cannot escape islands. Non-contrastive ellipsis remnants can potentially escape islands.

As G&L note, this is a welcome result as Merchant (2004) has shown that contrastive fragments exhibit island sensitivity too (see §4.1 for much more discussion).

Both of these accounts have problems, however. First, they seem to be theoretically inconsistent: it is hard to see why *covert* movement, which has no PF-effects, would be restricted by islands if they were a purely PF phenomenon, as dictated by the literal repair approach. This criticism doesn't just apply to G&L, who propose that covert movement is completely bound by islands, but also Merchant, who proposes that islands still do some damage to the freedom of covert movement; in his metaphorical terms, "escaping from an island cripples or hobbles further focus movement; it can only limp along up to VP, not to IP" (p.150), and hence covert movement is still affected by the island environment. Second, since both of these theories require the correlate to take scope by covert movement, they would seem to predict that contrastive ellipsis will be restricted from escaping finite clausal complements, since these domains are typically opaque for covert movement.[19] But this is incorrect, since contrast sluicing can escape finite clauses, as shown by (89) above (the same applies with the other contrastive ellipsis constructions). Accounting for this would require a further stipulation that covert focus movement is unlike the other manifestations of covert movement (QR of quantifiers, covert *wh*-movement) in being free of such restrictions (but see Thoms to appear for evidence from pseudogapping that indicates this is wrong).

Since the preceding objections are somewhat indirect, concerning the nature of focus scope more generally, one may still be able to rescue the Scope Parallelism account of the island sensitivity of contrast sluicing by claiming that there is something special about contrast sluicing (or contrastive clausal ellipsis more generally) which requires that covert focus movement must be used to set the scope of the correlate, and that this movement is island-inhibited in some way. What is required, then, is to show that focused correlates *can* scope out of islands in at least some contrast sluicing contexts. This might seem to be an impossible experiment to set up from the perspective of the present approach, since we hold that islands are not repaired by ellipsis and, by definition, an island-escaping correlate requires an island-escaping ellipsis remnant, and hence an unrepaired island violation in the ellipsis site. However, as noted by Abels & Starling (2012), this challenge can be met if we test contrast sluices in languages that have at their disposal alternative means for repairing island violations, specifically, languages with productive resumption strategies which can save island violations. In these languages, we can create contrast sluices which are based on grammatical overt extractions from islands, but whether they are grammatical as contrast sluices will depend on whether they satisfy Scope Parallelism. If the correlate takes scope by islandbound covert focus movement, then it is predicted that the sluices will be ungrammatical, even though the elided overt extractions are themselves grammatical; this is schematized in (102). On the other hand, if the correlate

We disagree with the judgment reported here. While it is true that embedding improves these discourses somewhat, we do not think that it improves the availability of the long construal, and we have found no speakers who agree with Fukaya's claim. Second, it is hard to see the logic of the prediction. Insofar as it is a theoretically viable stipulation, (99) holds that island-escaping covert movement is in some way impeded, being unable to move any further than the next VP node up and hence unable to make it all the way to IP. If this is so, then we would not expect it to be possible for covert focus movement to escape beyond the IP node to the *next* VP node, not least since this would involve crossing a finite clause boundary. Therefore we find Fukaya's defence of Merchant's analysis unconvincing, and put it to one side in what follows.

[19] On the lack of covert movement out of finite clauses, see May (1985) on QR of QPs and Dayal (2002); see also Farkas & Giannakidou (1995), Kennedy (1997) and Kayne (1998) for three distinct classes of exceptions, which we control for in the data presented.

takes wide scope by in-situ mechanisms like choice functions (Reinhart 1997), then it is predicted that the contrast sluice will be grammatical; this is in (103).

(102) Focus takes scope by islandbound focus movement: Scope Parallelism violated
A: [$_{CP}$ ... [$_{ISLAND}$ ... *correlate* ...] ...]
E: *[$_{CP}$ what else ... [$_{ISLAND}$ ... *resumptive* ...] ...]

(103) Focus takes scope in situ by choice functions: Scope Parallelism satisfied
A: [$_{CP}$ ∃f CH(f) ... [$_{ISLAND}$ ... f(*correlate*) ...] ...]
E: [$_{CP}$ what else ... [$_{ISLAND}$ ... *resumptive* ...] ...]

Thus, on the analysis in (102), resumption in the sluice should make no difference, whereas for (103) the grammaticality of the sluice should track the grammaticality of the underlying extraction. In what follows we will see that the latter holds, a fact that is not predicted by the covert focus movement approach.

To begin with, we consider contrast sluices in languages that can use resumption to salvage extraction from weak islands, such as Romanian (the same holds of Iraqi and Palestinian Arabic). The following demonstrate the baseline facts: these languages allow for contrastive *wh*-remnants in sluicing, and they do indeed salvage *wh*-islands with resumption; (105) is ungrammatical without resumption.[20]

(104) L-au concediat pe ION, dar nu ştiu şi pe cine ALTCINEVA
him=aux.3PL fired *pe* Ion, but NEG know.1S also PE who else
"They fired ION, but I don't know who ELSE" Romanian

(105) Nu ştiu pe cine altcineva vrea să STIE care fată l-a sărutat
NEG know.1S PE who else wants.3S C know.3S which girl him=Aux.3S kissed
"I don't know who else$_i$ she wants to know which girl kissed him$_i$" Romanian

Another baseline fact to lay down is that in languages without productive resumption, like English, contrast sluicing is even sensitive to weak islands like *wh*-islands. This was in fact demonstrated earlier by (91), repeated here. (106) shows that the same holds for another kind of *wh*-island violation.

(91) *?Sandy was trying to figure out which student would solve DAHL'S PUZZLE, but I don't what OTHER PROBLEM ~~she was trying to figure out which student would solve t~~

(106) ?*Sandy asked if they fired JOHN, but I don't know who ELSE ~~she asked if they fired t~~.

Now consider (107), the contrast sluicing counterpart of (105). This is a contrast sluice which may plausibly receive a "long" reading, where the remnant has been extracted from a *wh*-island. As it happens, such sluices are indeed grammatical on the long readings, unlike the English counterparts.

(107) Maria vrea să ştie care fată a sărutat pe BILL, dar nu ştiu pe CINE
Maria wants.3S C know.3S which girl Aux.3S kissed PE Bill but NEG know.1S PE who
ALTCINEVA
else
"Maria wants to know which girl kissed BILL, but I don't know who ELSE$_i$ she wants to know which girl kissed him$_i$" Romanian

The acceptability of these contrast sluices thus confirms (103): the correlate scopes out of the island to satisfy Scope Parallelism, and the acceptability of the sluice tracks the acceptability of the unelided coun-

[20] A note on the Romanian glosses: the particle "pe" is a grammaticalized preposition which introduces definite indirect objects, and the unglossed "şi" is an focus adverbial of some which our informant translates as meaning "and" or "also;" it is optional in some cases but improves the contrast sluices.

terpart. If covert focus movement was islandbound, these sluices would be ungrammatical irrespective of the salvaging effect of resumption in the overt movement chain. Resumption gives a focus-meaning for the sluice that is just like the putative island escaping reading, and pied piping of the island in the antecedent would yield a lack of parallelism (as in Krifka 2006); Griffiths and Liptak predict that covert focus movement in the antecedent would be island bound, also predicting ungrammaticality.

One might object that the availability of resumption in these languages indicates that they simply fail to respect island constraints altogether, and that covert focus movement is unimpeded just like overt movement. However resumption only saves weak island violations in Romanian, and is unable to repair strong islands with interrogatives (Sterian 2014). The prediction of the present approach, then, is that violations of strong islands will remain unrepaired under sluicing, and that contrast sluices will lack the long island-escaping readings just like in English. (108) shows that this is indeed the case for relative clause islands.

(108) Vor să angajeze pe cineva care vorbe?te FRANCEZĂ, dar nu ştiu şi ce
want.3PL C employ.3PL PE someone who speak.3S French but NEG know.1S also what
altă limbă.
OTHER LANGUAGE
"They want to hire someone who speaks FRENCH, but I don't know ... Romanian

a. ... what OTHER LANGUAGE he speaks
b. ... *what OTHER LANGUAGE$_i$ is such that they want to hire someone who speaks it$_i$

This correlation between the availability of long readings with certain islands and resumption saving that class of islands can also be observed across languages if we consider Libyan Arabic. Libyan Arabic resumption is able to salvage violations of strong island in interrogatives, as shown by (109) with a relative clause island. (110) shows that contrast sluices with these islands have the long reading.

(109) miš ʕarəf ʔayya luġa tanya yəbb-u ywaḍḍf-u šaxṣ yətkalləm=ha
NEG know.1MS which language other want.3MPL employ.3MP someone speak.3MS-it
"I don't know what other language$_i$ is such that they want to hire someone who speaks it$_i$
Libyan Arabic

(110) yəbb-u ywaḍḍf-u šaxṣ yətkalləm l-faransiya lakən miš ʕarəf ʔayya luġa
want.3MPL employ.3MP someone speak.3MS the-French but NEG know.1MS which language
tanya.
other
"They want to hire someone who speaks FRENCH, but I don't know ... Libyan Arabic

a. ... what OTHER LANGUAGE he speaks
b. ... what OTHER LANGUAGE$_i$ is such that they want to hire someone who speaks it$_i$

This data shows clearly that the acceptability of contrast sluicing with islands is conditioned primarily by whether or not the underlying overt extraction in the sluice is grammatical, and not whether the correlate can take wide scope. Indeed if Scope Parallelism is a hard constraint on sluicing then (107) and (110) show us that focus can scope out of islands without island pied-piping (Wold 1996, Reich 2004; cf. Krifka 2006, Wagner 2006), thus undermining G&L's account of the island sensitivity of contrastive ellipsis constructions more generally. This takes us nicely into §4, where we show that even contrastive ellipsis constructions show repair effects at times, and that the distribution of these repair effects is what we expect on the evasion approach. This constitutes a strong argument for the non-repair approach to sluicing, and indeed a strong argument for the "silent structure" view of ellipsis more generally.

3.4 Case-marked remnants

Case-matching is claimed by Ross (1969) and Merchant (2001) to be one of the most solid pieces of evidence for connectivity in sluicing, so our discussion of sluicing and island evasion would be incomplete

without a discussion of how case interacts with the non-isomorphic sources we have proposed (e.g. clefts) in languages with morphological case. As noted by Merchant (2001), most examples of case connectivity in sluicing are compatible with the use of short sources. Thus for the German example in (111), the short source in (112) would be sufficient to account for the facts.

(111) Sie haben jemanden angestellt der [einen deutschen Dialekt] spricht, aber ich weiß nicht
They have someone hired that [a German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ speaks, but i know not
mehr [welchen deutschen Dialekt]/*[welcher deutscher Dialekt]
more [which German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$/[which German dialect]$_{\text{NOM}}$
"They hired someone who speaks a German dialect, but i don't remember which German dialect."

(112) ...[welchen deutschen Dialekt] er spricht.
...[which German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ he speaks.

(113) ...[welcher deutsche Dialekt] das war.
...[which German dialect]$_{\text{NOM}}$ that was.

Note however that (111) is ungrammatical with a nominative case-marked remnant, even though the overt cleft continuation with nominative case in (113) is possible. Given that we have argued that cleft sources (§2.2) and predicational copular sources (§2.3) are generally available, with some evidence from p-or-q sluices for the availability of cleft sluices in German, our analysis does not predict the case-connectivity facts illustrated in (111) as things stand; that is, we seem to predict that the nominative version will be possible with the source in (113). We begin here by addressing this challenge to the present approach before then turning to the predictions that are made with respect to islands.

One way to capture the data in (111) would be to posit a preferential ordering between possible ellipsis sites: isomorphic sources are less marked than non-isomorphic sources, and short sources are less marked than copular sources; if a less marked source is available, it must be used (cf. van Craenenbroeck 2010). This could be understood in terms of economy, with isomorphic sources coming "for free" and non-isomorphic sources requiring a degree of manipulation of the utterance context, or "accommodation" (Fox 1999, van Craenenbroeck 2012, Thoms 2014b). However there is reason to believe that case-matching is more strict than a competition-based proposal of this kind would predict. The evidence comes from consideration of sluicing environments where non-isomorphism is enforced. The English example in (114), from Thoms (2014b), is one such case. In this example, based on data from Merchant (2001) ((12b) in §2.1), a non-finite clause provides the antecedent for sluicing. The content of the ellipsis site could either be a non-isomorphic short source, as in (114b), or a cleft source, as in (114c); the "short" isomorphic reading is ungrammatical, so not available, and the "long" isomorphic reading, (114d), is incoherent and so unavailable (or ignored) as well. A markedness-based approach of the kind sketched above would favour the parse in (114b), since this is the least marked option.

(114) I remember someone complaining, but I don't remember who.
a. ... *I don't remember who ~~*t* complaining~~.
b. ... I don't remember who ~~*t* complained~~.
c. ... I don't remember who ~~it was *t*~~.
d. ... #I don't remember who ~~I remember complaining *t*~~.

As Thoms notes, either of (114b)-(114c) requires allowing the abstract case on the sluicing remnant to be different from that of correlate, since the correlate would be accusative and the remnant nominative.

Now consider German. If the nominative remnants are typically unavailable because they are blocked by case-matching remnants, then we may expect that the nominative remnants will be possible in environments like these. However (115) shows that this is not correct: the nominative remnants are still ungrammatical, and the case-matching remnant forces the incoherent long reading "I didn't see who I saw leaving."

(115) Ich sah jemanden lassen, aber ich sah nicht {#wen / *wer}
I saw someone.ACC leave, but I saw not who.ACC who.NOM
"I saw someone leave, but I didn't see who."

a. ... *ich sah nicht wer ~~t liess~~
I saw not who.NOM left

b. ... *ich sah nicht wer ~~das was t~~
I saw not who.NOM it was

c. ... #ich sah nicht wen ~~ich t lassen sah~~
I saw not who.ACC I leave saw

What this tells us is that case-matching in German is not just the result of a preference for isomorphism, with blocking of non-isomorphic sources that would result in nominative remnants, but rather it is a stronger condition which imposes identity of morphological case-matching between the correlate and the sluicing remnant. For concreteness, we state the relevant condition informally in (116):

(116) The morphological case on the sluicing remnant must not be distinct from morphological case on its correlate.

van Craenenbroeck (2012) and Sag & Nykiel (2011) propose very similar conditions on sluicing, although they differ in their analysess. Here we will remain agnostic on the exact status of this condition; it is sufficient for our purposes to assume that such a condition holds, and that it constrains the availability of non-isomorphic sources, in particular cleft sources.

With the case condition in place as a control for cleft sources, we now consider sluices with case-matching which would be incompatible with a short source analysis; on our approach, island effects should be attested with these sluices because the unavailability of a short source or a cleft source will force an isomorphic, island-violating construal. Recall from §2.4 that Merchant (2001) proposed that short sources could be controlled for by delicensing the E-type interpretation for pronouns in the gap positions of relative clause islands, typically by using a negative quantifiers, but Lasnik (2001) presented a number of sluices ((a)-examples below) where E-type anaphora seemed to fail ((b)-examples) and yet no island effects were detected.

(117) a. ?They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I don't remember which.
b. *They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain Balkan language, but I don't remember which she speaks.

(118) a. No one had a student who worked on a certain Balkan language, but I can't remember which one.
b. *No one had a student who worked on a certain Balkan language, but I can't remember which one she worked on.

Our proposal was that these English cases could be accounted for by the use of cleft sources, so these seem to be the relevant test cases. The following examples show that German sluices based on these are grammatical with case-matching; the (b)-examples show that the E-type pronoun-based short sources also fail. The (a)-examples also demonstrate that versions of the sluices with a nominative remnant, the surface form we would expect with an underlying cleft source, are completely ungrammatical.[21]

(119) Sie haben keine angestellt, die einen bestimmten deutschen Dialekt sprechen, aber ich
They have no.PL hired, the.PL [a certain German dialect]$_{ACC}$ speak, but I
weiß nicht mehr welchen deutschen Dialekt
know not more [which German dialect]$_{ACC}$
"They didn't hire anyone who speaks a certain German dialect, but i don't remember which

[21] Note that (119) cannot be rendered with an NPI like English as German uses negative indefinites in contexts such as this.

German dialect."

(120) Niemand hatte einen Studenten, der einen bestimmten deutschen Dialekt studierte,
Nobody had [a student]$_{\text{ACC}}$ the.NOM [a certain German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ studied,
aber ich weiß nicht mehr, {welchen deutschen Dialekt / *welcher deutsche Dialekt}
but I know not more [which German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ [which German dialect]$_{\text{NOM}}$
"No one had a student who studied a certain German dialect, but I don't remember which German dialect."

(121) *Niemand hatte einen Studenten, der einen bestimmten deutschen Dialekt studierte,
nobody had [a student]$_{\text{ACC}}$ who.NOM [a certain german dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ studied,
aber ich weiß nicht mehr, welchen deutschen Dialekt sie studierte
but I know not more [which german dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ she studied
"*No one had a student who studied a certain German dialect, but I don't remember which German dialect she studied."

This seems to present a serious problem for the present approach.

Whether the present approach predicts the sluices in (119)-(120) to be ungrammatical is determined by whether there is an appropriate short source available. So far we have focused on the E-type pronoun-based short sources proposed by Merchant (2001), but we need not restrict ourselves to these ones alone. In §(12) we saw a number of other kinds of non-isomorphic parses for sluicing sites which may be called "short sources" but which do not necessarily involve the same E-type strategy. On our view, the key criterion for a short source is that it has the same interpretation as the sluice, so in assessing whether or not a given sluice involves an isomorphic or non-isomorphic parse we should give full consideration to other possible "short" parses. For the German cases at hand, the following are offered by speakers as felicitous continuations conveying the same meaning as the sluices, and as such they can be considered to be potential short sources.

(122) Sie haben keine angestellt, die einen bestimmten deutschen Dialekt sprechen, aber ich
They have no.PL hired, the.PL [a certain German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ speak, but I
weiß nicht mehr welchen deutschen Dialect (keine sprechen).
know not more [which German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ (none.PL speak).
"They hired nobody who speaks a certain Baltic language, but I don't know which Baltic language (nobody speaks)"

(123) Niemand hatte einen Studenten, der einen bestimmten deutschen Dialekt studierte,
nobody had [a student]$_{\text{ACC}}$ who.NOM [a certain German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ studied,
aber ich weiß nicht mehr, welchen deutschen Dialekt kein Student studierte
but I know not more [which German dialect]$_{\text{ACC}}$ [no student]$_{\text{NOM}}$ studied
"No one had a student who studied a certain German dialect, but I don't know which German dialect no student studied."

With both examples, there is a negative indefinite in the position corresponding to the gap, and the nominal in the indefinite is contextually restricted appropriately; this might be encoded by making the nominal a partitive ("none of them," "none of the students"), or by modifying with a relative clause ("no one that they hired"). According to our informants, these intuitively provide the right meaning for the sluice, so we posit that these are responsible for the repair illusions.

The surprising flexibility of short sources can be demonstrated further by examples like (124), where the antecedent entails that the proposition expressed by the CP complement to the noun is false. The expectation with such an example may seem to be that the short source analysis will be unavailable, since the short source which is isomorphic to the CP complement would get the wrong meaning for the sluice. We still predict the English sluice to be grammatical, because a cleft source is possible and the version with an overt cleft receives the (felicitous) long construal, where the indefinite correlate scopes out of the intensional environment (*false rumours that...*). With German, we may expect that a sluice with case-

matching will only have the infelicitous "I don't know who she kissed" meaning, and that one would obtain the felicitous wide-scope interpretation by using a cleft source, with nominative case on the remnant. (125) shows that both of these expectations are not met: (125) is grammatical with a case-matching remnant, and ungrammatical with a nominative case-marked remnant.

(124) Johann spread false rumours that Susi kissed someone, but I don't know who (it/that was/he was/#she kissed.)

(125) Johann verbreitete falsche Gerüchte, daß Susi jemanden geküßt hat, aber ich weiß nicht,
Johann spread false rumours, that Susi someone.ACC kissed has, but I know not,
wen/*wer.
who.ACC/who.NOM
"Johann spread false rumours that Susi kissed someone, but I don't know who."

When presented with these sluices, our informants offer the short source for (125) involving the modal auxiliary *soll* ('should'), as in (126).[22]

(126) ..wen sie geküsst haben soll.
...who.ACC she kissed has should.

We take (126) to involve the *reportative* use of *soll*. Ehrich (2001) assigns $soll_{\text{REP}}$ the following lexical entry:

(127) $[\![\text{soll}]\!]^w = \lambda p.[$ for every world $w'Rw$ in which the claims of x_c in w are true, it holds that $w' \in p]$

x_c is understood as the contextually supplied source of the relevant claims. The antecedent in (125) makes salient *Johann* as the source of the relevant claims, and $soll_{\text{REP}}$ in (126) picks up *Johann* as the contextually supplied value of x_c. Adopting an analysis of the meaning of *soll* along these lines, it should be clear that the short source in (126) can come to mean the same thing as the antecedent clause. The availability of $soll_{rep}$ thwarts our attempt to control for a short source in German. The sheer heterogeneity of possible analysess for non-isomorphic sources in German shows just why our task here is so hard.[23]

In principle, whether these are plausible short sources should be determined by the formulation of the ellipsis identity condition, which would rule out non-isomorphic sources which are too distinct in meaning from their antecedent; thus if we are correct that these short sources are used in the relevant sluices, we should be able to show that these short sources satisfy the identity condition. So far we have been coy about the exact formulation of the identity condition that we are working with; in the remainder of this paper we will refrain from committing to one, since the exact nature of this condition is still a matter of ongoing debate. We agree with Chung et al. (2011); Chung (2013) that Merchant's (2001) numerous arguments for non-isomorphic sources did a good job of killing the idea that the identity condition is one of strict syntactic identity (*pace* Sag 1976, Chung et al. 1995). However we resist adopting Merchant's (2001) semantic identity condition, eGIVENness, since it has been shown in recent work that this condition under- and overgenerates (Hartman 2009, AnderBois 2011, Barker to appear, Thoms to appear, 2014b, Saab to appear, Miller & Hemforth 2014), and much of this work has focused on finding ways to either reconfigure semantic identity or to somehow "loosen up" syntactic identity. As such, the correct formulation of the identity condition is a topic of ongoing debate, and so we are not sure that there exists in the literature a proposal which we may confidently use to restrict our range of short sources. In the absence of this restriction, then, we fall back on speaker intuitions about the meaning of the sluices.

[22] A number of our informants assured us that the sluices have the *soll* reading to the exclusion of fully isomorphic reading paraphrasable as "I don't know who is such that Johann spread a false rumour that Susi kissed that person;" that is, they took these two readings to be sufficiently distinct. We have nothing to say about this intuition here.

[23] Relevant here is the fact noted by Merchant (2001, 22-23) that sluices and their antecedents can mismatch substantially with respect to the syntactic realization of modality, although he also shows that eGIVENness is satisfied in these cases too. We believe the same can be done for these cases as well, although showing this would require a substantial digression.

There is one existing case in the literature which we take to constitute a successful control for a short source in German, specifically, (128) taken from Abels (2011). (128) should be interpreted relative to a context in which there are a glut of German politicians who have had their doctorates revoked, but the revokation of one particular German politician's doctorate caused a stir. This context independently renders a short source, as in (129), infelicitous, as it would imply that there was a unique politician who had his doctorate revoked (see Dayal 1996 on the uniqueness presupposition of singular *which*-questions). (128) is judged by speakers as ungrammatical under the long-construal, which can be paraphrased as: *of all of the politicians who had their doctorates revoked, which politician in particular was such that when his doctorate was revoked, it caused a big stir.* Importantly, neither reportative *soll* nor any other German modal would get the right interpretation here, so short sources based on these are not available either.

(128) *Die Tatsache, dass einem Politiker der Doktortitel entzogen worden ist, hat die Gemüter
the fact that a.DAT politician the.NOM doctorate revoked become is, has the souls
stark erregt, aber ich weiß nicht mehr welchem (Politiker)
strongly stirred but I know not more which.DAT (politician)
"The fact that a (certain) politician had his doctorate revoked caused a big stir, but I don't remember which politician."

(129) ...welchem Politiker ist der Doktortitel entzogen worden.
...which.DAT politician is the.NOM doctorate revoked become.
"(I don't know) which politician had his doctorate revoked"

The fact that (128) is ungrammatical with a case-matching remnant confirms our prediction that once we successfully control for a short source, such that the only remaining source is an island-violating isomorphic source, the sluice should become ungrammatical.

One final prediction that our approach makes here is that we should be able to make a variation on (128) grammatical if we rendered it compatible with a cleft source like its English counterpart. The way to do this would be to make sure that it did not fall foul of the case condition in (116), which requires that the morphological case on the sluicing remnant is non-distinct from that on the correlate. The trouble with a cleft source for (128) is that it requires a nominative pivot, while the correlate is dative. But what if we change the antecedent so that the correlate is also nominative? In this case a short source will not be required to satisfy (116), and so we predict the cleft source will be available to evade the island violation, just like it is with English. (130) shows that this prediction is borne out: the long construal is grammatical with the nominative remnant, just as the cleft-based overt continuation (*das war*) is grammatical.

(130) Die Tatsache, dass ein Politiker einen gefaelschten Doktortitel hat, hat die gemueter
the fact, that a.NOM politician a.ACC forged.ACC doctorate has has the souls
stark erregt, aber ich weiß nicht mehr welcher Politiker
strongly stirred but I know not more which.NOM politician
"The fact that a (certain) politician has a forged doctorate caused a stir, but I don't know which politician."

Taken together, these facts all provide strong evidence for our pluralistic approach to island evasion, where clefts can facilitate island evasion when they satisfy (128), short sources do so when they can get the right interpretation, and island effects emerge when none of the evasions are available.

3.5 Summary

To summarize, we have shown that it is possible to control for the evasion strategies introduced in §2, and that when we do, island sensitivity resurfaces in sluicing. We provided crosslinguistic evidence in support of the hypothesis that apparent cases of left branch violation repair with adjectival remnants actually stem from a predicational source. We additionally exploited multiple sluicing as a control against evasion strate-

gies; sluices with multiple remnants force an isomorphic parse for the ellipsis site when those remnants' correlates are separated by an island boundary. As expected, island sensitivity resurfaces. We also discussed extant repair approaches to island sensitivity under contrast sluicing, highlighting various conceptual and empirical issues for such accounts, issues which are avoided under a non-repair approach like ours. Finally, we showed that morphological case can also be used to control for isomorphic construals, at least once we take into account the surprising flexibility of short sources for sluicing; with the suitable controls in places, we were able to diagnose island effects with regular non-contrastive, single-remnant sluices. Space constraints prevent us from considering all proposed cases of island repair under sluicing in the literature, but we believe that the weight of evidence for island effects accrued here should be enough to lead us to believe that any remaining cases of apparent repair must be spurious.

4 Repair effects and fragments

We have seen that sluicing, a construction which is often claimed to be island-insensitive, shows island sensitivity when evasion is controlled for. In this section we take the opposite tack and turn our attention to another elliptical construction, the fragment answer, which Merchant (2004) proposes is derived by A′-movement of the answer XP to a focus projection in the left periphery followed by clausal ellipsis:

(131) A: What did you buy?
B: [A dog]$_i$ ~~I bought t_i~~.

Building on Morgan (1973), Merchant shows that this analysis is motivated by the fact that fragments show the same kinds of connectivity effects as sluicing.[24] However, he then argues that fragments also differ from sluices in showing island sensitivity. In what follows we will show that the differences between sluicing and fragments are minimal: fragments also exhibit the same mixed pattern of repair effects, with the availability of apparent repair correlating with the availability of the evasion strategies.

4.1 Fragments and island sensitivity

A problem with testing the islandboundedness of fragment answers is that, at least with answers to constituent questions, the required antecedent question would itself be ungrammatical. Merchant (2004) gets round this problem by testing two in-situ question strategies: multiple *wh*-questions, answered by multiple fragments, and yes-no questions with focus on a particular constituent that gives rise to an implicit salient *wh*-question that the fragment addresses.

(132) A: Who bought what?
B: John a book, and Mary a record.

(133) A: Did they buy A BOOK?
B: No, A RECORD.

Both are hypothesized to be derived by focus fronting of the answer constituents followed by clausal ellipsis, just like with answers to constituent questions, and Merchant shows that both are sensitive to island constraints. The island-sensitivity of multiple fragments is demonstrated by (134):

(134) A: Which committee member wants to hire someone who speaks which language?
B′: *Abby Greek, and Ben Albanian.

[24] In fact, Merchant is able to provide more evidence of form-identity and connectivity with fragments than with sluices, since the range of constituents that can serve as remnants in fragment answers is more diverse. For instance, evidence from *that*-deletion provides an argument for movement that cannot be replicated for sluicing, and indeed it is significant that this kind of evidence is not addressed by "direct interpretation" alternatives to such as Ginzburg & Sag (2000) and Jacobson (2013), which hold that fragments are solitary constituents which get propositional meanings by constructional means.

A complication here is that multiple fragments are subject to a number of constraints which may rule out (134) independently. For instance, Thoms (2014a) notes that the two remnants of a multiple fragment are typically required to originate within the same finite clause, as cases like (135) are ungrammatical:[25]

(135) A: Who said you bought what?
B: *John a book, (and Mary a pencil).

Thoms also notes that the availability of multiple fragments typically tracks the availability of pair-list answers, so an additional issue with (134) may be that the pair-list interpretation of the question is marginal at best. What we need to test, then, is a multiple fragment response to a question which allows a pair-list reading and which does not separate the two *wh*Ps by an island boundary. As noted by Dayal (2002) and Cheng & Demirdache (2010), pair-list readings are possible when the second *wh*-phrase is embedded in a *wh*-island. Thus our test case is a non-finite *wh*-island, such as (136).

(136) A: Who knows where to buy what?
B: *?John the cheese, and Mary the coffee.
B′: John where to buy the cheese, and Mary where to buy the coffee.

The unacceptability of the multiple fragment here (compared with the island pied-piping version) thus reinforces Merchant's (2004) point, showing that multiple fragment answers are indeed island sensitive. This is what we would expect on the evasion approach: recall that multiple remnant ellipsis constructions of this kind are incompatible with any of the evasion strategies.

An additional way of testing the islandboundedness of fragments introduced by Merchant (2004) (and discussed in more detail below) is to test answers to yes-no questions with narrow focus on one subconstituent, as these questions give rise to implicit salient *wh*-questions without requiring overt extraction in the antecedent. Thus the yes-no question in (137) gives rise to the question "which language does Abby speak?," and an answer of "no" followed by a fragment is a licit way to answer the implicit question.

(137) A: Does Abby speak ALBANIAN?
B: No, SERBO-CROATIAN.

Examples like (138) indicate that these fragments are bound by relative clause islands.

(138) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?
B: *No, CHARLIE.

Merchant (2004) uses (139)-(141) to show that fragments are sensitive to adjunct islands, left branch islands and coordinate structure islands.

(139) A: Did Ben leave the party because ABBY wouldn't dance with him?
B: *No, BETH.

(140) A: Did Abby vote for a GREEN party?
B: *No, REFORM.

(141) A: Did Abby get 'THE CAT IN THE HAT' and 'Goodnight Gorilla' for her nephew for his birthday?
B: *No, 'THE LORAX'

[25]Merchant (2004) provides a control which seems to indicate that multiple fragments can originate in separate finite clauses:

(i) A: Which lawyer said he was representing which war criminal?
B: Cochrane Milosevic, and Derschowitz Sharon.

However Thoms (2014a) points out that this is only possible when the embedded subject is bound by the higher subject, a configuration which alleviates the clauseboundedness of a number of other constructions (Lasnik 2006); when the pronoun is construed as disjoint, the multiple fragment is substantially degraded. Thus Merchant's example represents a principled exception, rather than the rule.

Note that in all cases the island violations could be avoided by island pied-piping (*because Beth wouldn't dance with him* in (139), *a Reform party* in (140) and *'The Lorax' and 'Goodnight Gorilla'* in (141)).

Taken together with the multiple fragments data, Merchant (2004) argues, this constitutes good evidence for fragment answers being quite different from sluicing in showing island sensitivity across the board, and he takes the fundamental difference between fragments and sluicing to be a structural one. Specifically, Merchant proposes an analysis in terms of "starred traces" (cf. Chomsky 1972), where movements that escape islands leave traces which are marked with a diacritic which renders them PF-uninterpretable, meaning that they lead to a crash at PF if they are not deleted.[26] The key structural difference between sluicing and fragments, then, is that the focus projection, FP, to which fragments are moved is higher than the one to which sluicing remnants are moved, CP, and the fragments pass through CP on the way to FP, leaving behind a starred trace which is then left undeleted by TP-ellipsis. (142) provides a schematic for how this works for (138), where we see the starred trace in Spec,CP would be left undeleted and would hence lead to a crash at PF.

(142) $[_{\mathrm{FP}}$ Charlie$_i$ $[_{\mathrm{F'}}$ F^0 $[_{\mathrm{CP}}$ *t$_i$ $[_{\mathrm{C'}}$ C^0 ~~$[_{\mathrm{TP}}$ Abby speaks the same Balkan language that t$_i$ speaks]~~]]]]

This analysis thus allows Merchant to provide a unified literal repair account of sluicing and fragments, according to which the action is in the left periphery. This account is extended further by Temmerman (2013) with data from Dutch. However, this analysis has a number of problems. First, there are theoretical reasons to object to the notion of the "starred trace" (acknowledged by Lasnik 2001), since the addition of a star diacritic is in violation of widely held conditions like Inclusiveness (Chomsky 1995).[27] There are also several empirical problems. One raised by Griffiths & Lipták (to appear) and Murphy (2014) is it that in Hungarian and Mandarin Chinese the *wh*-remnant of sluicing is moved to a FP-like projection higher in the left periphery, as with fragments according to (142), and yet the usual island-insensitivity effects are seen in these languages. Another issue raised by Griffiths & Lipták (to appear), mentioned briefly in §3.3, is that *non*-contrastive fragments, where the antecedent is a declarative with an indefinite correlate, seem to show island-insensitivity. The following demonstrate this for non-contrastive versions of some of the islands just discussed.

(143) A: Abby speaks the same Balkan language that one of the boys speaks.
B: Yeah, CHARLIE.

(144) A: Abby will be angry if you dance with one of the boys.
B: Yeah, CHARLIE.

(145) A: Abby saw her sister and one of the boys dancing.
B: Yeah, CHARLIE.

There seems to be little reason to believe the foci of non-contrastive fragments occupy a different position from the one occupied by contrastive fragments, so this constitutes a problem for the cartographic approach.

One objection that could be raised is that contrastive and non-contrastive fragments are fundamentally distinct, and that the differences between them give rise to the difference in island sensitivity (Griffiths & Lipták to appear). However we find that there are many cases where even contrastive fragments show apparent repair. (146) shows that relative clause islands much like (1) do not always lead to ungrammaticality

[26]The proposal that traces would lead to a crash at PF is somewhat difficult to understand, since traces have no realization at PF and are in effect PF-uninterpretable by default. Perhaps a better way to frame this notion is in terms of the Copy Theory of Movement, where traces are deleted copies; for instance, we may posit that copies left outside the island cannot be deleted, and that pronunciation of multiple copies leads to a violation of conditions on linearization as in Nunes (2004). But this would be difficult to square with the approach developed by Bošković (2011), according to which the stars created by different kinds of movement have a different status depending on what kind of movement they are created by (i.e. A or A′-stars).

[27]Lasnik addresses this problem by proposing that rather than stars being added to traces, we may instead say that all elements enter the derivation with a ✓ which is required for PF-realization; island-escaping movement removes the ✓ on the moving element, causing a crash without the addition of a diacritic. This strikes us a purpose-built technical solution rather than a genuine solution to the problem at hand, and the theoretical challenge to explain the use of these diacritics remains.

with contrastive fragments:

(146) A: Did they hire someone who works on FRENCH last year?
B: No, GERMAN.

Similarly there are cases of apparent left branch violations which are also well-formed, unlike (140).

(147) A: Is her new boyfriend a TALL man?
B: No, SHORT.

Finally, there are cases of apparent violations of adjuncts islands which are only mildly deviant.

(148) A: Did they leave because you offended MARY?
B: ?No, SARAH.

This rather messy empirical picture is unexpected for approaches which assume strict isomorphism between ellipsis and antecedent and attribute variable island effects to scope parallelism (Griffiths & Lipták to appear, which we have already argued against in §3.3) or starred traces in the left periphery (Merchant 2004), but it is what we have come to expect on the pluralistic evasion approach we are taking here; indeed the cases above may be recognisable from the previous discussion of sluicing.

In what follows we show that the evasion strategies introduced conspire to capture this variation neatly. We show that the evasion strategies are typically unavailable to allow us to avoid island violations with the island-sensitive fragments just discussed, with the exceptional cases of apparent repair correlating with the availability of evasion.

4.2 Non-contrastive fragments and cleft sources

As with non-contrastive sluices, non-contrastive fragments are typically amenable to short source or copular source construals. (149) demonstrates the cleft source analysis for (143), where we can see that the overt cleft is perfectly appropriate and well-formed (the same holds for the other island types).

(149) A: Abby speaks the same Balkan language that one of the boys speaks.
B: Yeah, CHARLIE ~~it is t~~.
B′: Yeah, it's CHARLIE.

As with sluicing, it is necessary for us to show that the evasion strategies invoked here do not overpredict island amelioration with the cases above where we see island sensitivity; we focus on cleft sources for now, and return to short sources in §4.3 and predicational sources in §4.4. Regarding multiple fragments, these are incompatible with cleft sources for the same reason that multiple sluices are: there is only one non-predicate position in a reduced cleft source so a multiple remnant construction could never be derived. Things are a bit trickier with contrastive fragments, since these are compatible with clefts in some situations.

(150) A: Did BEN leave early?
B: No, it was CHARLIE.

However overt clefts with contrastive foci are quite restricted; for instance, Barros (to appear) notes that they are not compatible with focus on embedded arguments; this is especially puzzling since the overt unreduced cleft is acceptable.

(151) A: Did they claim BEN left early?
B: *No, it was CHARLIE.
B′: No, it was CHARLIE that they claimed left early.

More pertinently, overt clefts are also ungrammatical in the same situations where the fragment would be ungrammatical, as shown by the following.

(152) A: Did Ben leave the party because ABBY wouldn't dance with him?
B: *No, it was BETH.

(153) A: Did Abby vote for a GREEN party?
B: *No, it was REFORM.

(154) A: Did Abby get 'THE CAT IN THE HAT' and 'Goodnight Gorilla' for her nephew for his birthday?
B: *?No, it was 'THE LORAX'

The overt cleft data shows that this evasion strategy does not overpredict repair with fragments, but this is a slightly hollow victory in the absence of a fuller explanation for *why* the clefts are not compatible here.

A solution is given to us by the approach to clefts in Reeve (2010), which holds that the information structural properties of the cleft pivot condition the syntax of the cleft relative. Reeve argues that there is a distinction between clefts based on the syntax of the cleft relative clause and the pivot at its head, such that some are based on raising relatives (Brame 1968, Vergnaud 1974, Kayne 1994), with the pivot raising to its surface position from the gap position within its relative clause complement, and others are based on matching relatives (Carlson 1977, Sauerland 1998), with the pivot base-generated in its surface position and the relative adjoined with operator movement out of the gap.

(155) It's this book that Bill bought.

a. it's $[_{DP}$ this book$]_i$ $[_{CP}$ that $[_{TP}$ Bill bought t_i]] *raising*
b. it's $[_{DP}$ this book$]$ $[_{CP}$ Op_i that $[_{TP}$ Bill bought t_i]] *matching*

Building on Carlson (1977) and Aoun & Li (2003), Reeve proposes that the matching analysis is not possible for cleft pivots which are incompatible with overt relative operators, such as APs and PPs with non-locative prepositions. This means that these kinds of clefts are only compatible with a raising analysis, and he shows that this is supported by evidence from Pinkham & Hankamer (1975), which collect a number of arguments for dividing up clefts in a similar fashion.[28] One piece of evidence for this distinction comes from subextraction: only pivots which may receive a matching analysis can be subextracted from, since raised relative clause heads are derived islands. (156) shows that non-locative PPs are not compatible with overt relative operators (and hence a matching analysis), and (157) such non-locative PP pivots do not allow subextraction. This is in contrast to the DP-pivot counterparts, which are compatible with a matching analysis (since DPs are compatible with relative operators) and which allow subextraction.

(156) *It was with a picture of Marx {which/who/where} he decorated his door.

(157) a. It was a picture of Marx that he decorated his door with.
b. ?Who$_i$ was it a picture of t_i that he decorated his door with?
c. It was with a picture of Marx that he decorated his door.
d. *Who$_i$ was it with a picture of t_i that he decorated his door?
e. *What$_i$ was it with t_i that he decorated his door?

On the other hand, (158) shows a locative PP which is compatible with an overt relative operator, meaning they may receive a matching analysis, and (159) shows that these PPs do allow for subextraction. (160) shows that the same ban on subextraction holds for APs

(158) ?It was on this shelf where he put his trophies.

(159) a. It was this shelf that he put his trophies on.
b. Which shelf$_i$ was it on$_i$ that he put his trophies?

[28] Pinkham and Hankamer's distinction is not stated strictly in terms of the syntax of the relative clauses but he shows that their results can be reinterpreted in this way.

(160) a. It was drunk on vodka that he was, (not drunk on slivovitz).
b. *What was it was drunk on that he was?

Reeve concludes that AP-clefts and non-locative PP-clefts force a raising analysis, while most DP-clefts are ambiguous.

There are two differences between raising and matching clefts which are important for our purposes. First, "reduced" versions of these clefts without the relative clause would be derived by different means: with raising clefts, the relative clause can only be removed by ellipsis, since the pivot at the head must have raised from within that structure; but with matching clefts, the relative clauses can simply be omitted, since they are only adjoined to the pivot which is itself base-generated in the copular clause. Second, the obligatoriness of a raising analysis is tracked closely by a condition on focus structure: the pivots of raising clefts must be contrastive foci. This is shown most clearly with AP-clefts, which are necessarily contrastive and which cannot be used to provide answers to *wh*-questions (unlike DP-clefts).

(161) A: What colour are her eyes?
B: #It's blue that her eyes are.

(162) A: Her eyes are green.
B: No, it's BLUE that her eyes are, not green.

Moreover Reeve shows that when contrast is absent, a matching analysis is actually forced for the cleft relative. The key evidence comes from connectivity effects with DP-clefts. An important property of matching clefts is that the pivot is base-generated in its surface position, meaning that it should not show connectivity with the base position inside the relative. The following show that the cleft pivot can take low scope inside the relative clause when it is used contrastively, as in (163), but not when it is used in new information contexts, as in (164).

(163) A: There was a chicken that every dog ate part of.
B: No, it was a different chicken that every dog ate, not the same chicken.

(164) A: What did every dog eat?
B: #It was a different chicken that every dog ate.

This follows if a connectivity-facilitating raising analysis is permitted only with contrastive pivots.

If we assume that contrastive focus on the pivot forces a raising analysis for the relative, we can understand the restriction against truncated clefts with antecedents containing an island, demonstrated by (139)-(141) (and the lack of very general island amelioration with contrastive fragments). This analysis predicts that clefts with contrastively focused pivots, such as (150) and indeed (139)-(141), will always require a raising analysis, and given that the truncation of the raising cleft can only be done by ellipsis, it follows that we expect there to be island sensitivity with (139)-(141), since the relative will be elided under identity with the island-containing antecedent. Thus for the cleft construal of a contrastive fragment like (139), the underlying structure will be (165)B; a very similar structure would be required for (152), with the only difference being whether or not the *it was* is elided.

(165) A: Did Ben leave the party because ABBY wouldn't dance with him?
B: *No, BETH ~~it was t that Ben left because t wouldn't dance with him~~

But with non-contrastive cleft pivots, and indeed non-contrastive fragments with underlying cleft sources, the matching analysis will be available and no relative clause need be generated as part of the structure.

(166) A: Ben left the party because someone wouldn't dance with him?
B: Yeah BETH ~~it was t~~

Therefore Reeve's raising/matching distinction for cleft relatives correctly predicts the unavailability of overt and elided clefts where the focus is in an island, allowing us to understand why clefts are not available to create repair illusions across the board with contrastive fragments.

4.3 Short sources and Information Structure

In §4.1 we showed that the generalization Griffiths & Lipták (to appear) and Merchant (2008) aim to capture is too strong; not all contrastive fragments show island sensitivity. This is unexpected under the approaches they adopt. Here, we show that a non-repair approach is better equiped to handle the facts. We have shown that there are independent considerations ruling out clefts as an evasion strategy for contrastive fragments, and now, we focus on ruling out short sources as well, at least in island-sensitive cases.

Recall that Merchant (2004) used Yes/No Questions with focused correlates to get around the impossibility of testing island sensitivity with Wh-Question antecedents. The rationale behind this was that such Yes/No Questions imply a corresponding salient Wh-Question that the fragment intuitively addresses.

(167) a. A: Did CHRISTINE not dance with him?
B: No, BETH.
b. Implied Wh-question: Who didn't dance with him?
c. A: Did he leave the party early because CHRISTINE didn't dance with him?
B: *No, BETH.
d. Implied Wh-question: Who is such that Fred left the party early because that person didn't dance with him?

However, as argued in Barros (to appear), this mechanism for avoiding an island violation in the antecedent is not without confounding consequences. Specifically, Barros notes that an overt short source continuation for a contrastive fragment does not constitute a congruent answer to an explicit question:[29]

(168) a. A: Who does Jack think likes Sally?
B: CHRISTINE.
b. = He thinks CHRISTINE likes her.
c. ≠ CHRISTINE likes her. (a short source construal)

Speaker B's response in (168a) is interpreted the same as (168b), not (168c), and indeed, as the reader can check, in the absence of ellipsis, (168c) is an infelicitous response to A's explicit question. B's response in (168c) seems to address a different question: *Who likes Sally?* Speaker A might reply, in turn, to (168c) with "*that's not what I asked*," a move which is unlicensed for B's response in (168b) which *does* address A's explicit question. Barros notes that answers to implicit questions like those in (167) must also, of course, be congruent answers. As such, a short source for B's fragment in (167c) would be an incongruent response to the implicit Wh-question paraphrased in (167d). Indeed, an overt short source for B's fragment in (167c) is an infelicitous response as expected:

(169) a. A: Did he leave the party early because CHRISTINE didn't dance with him?
B: #No, BETH didn't dance with him.
(A: Wait, that's not what I asked.)
b. A: Did CHRISTINE not dance with him?
B: No, BETH didn't dance with him.
(A: #Wait, that's not what I asked.)

[29]Barros adopts the definition of Question/Answer Congruence in Roberts (1996), where a question's Hamblin/Karttunen-style denotation (roughly, a set of alternative propositions varying with respect to values substituted for the Wh-phrases in the question) and the answer's set of focal alternatives must be equivalent. There are other formulations of Q/A congruence available of course - though as far as we can tell they do not differ in ways which bear on our analysis. We refer the reader to Barros (to appear) for specific details of implementation in terms of Roberts's (1996) theory.

With the additional assumption that there is no island repair under ellipsis, contrastive fragments with island-bound correlates are stuck without a simultaneously felicitous and grammatical option for the content of the ellipsis site. This much captures the unacceptability of examples like (167c).

One advantage of this approach is that it also allows for apparent exceptions to the generalization that contrastive fragments are always island sensitive. Question/Answer congruence is primarily a pragmatic/ information-structural notion. The neat correspondence between syntactic structure and information structure in examples like (167c) is thus not expected to always hold. That is, there could be cases where a short source can be rendered a congruent answer to a non-short question. We assume this is what is at work in cases like (146) mentioned at the end of §4.1, repeated below:

(170) A: Did they hire someone who speaks FRENCH?
B: No, GERMAN.

In short, we assume such examples are acceptable because there are corresponding evasion strategies available. This predicts the evasion strategies themselves should be felicitous/congruent responses overtly in place of the fragments in each case. The prediction is borne out:

(171) A: Did they hire someone who speaks FRENCH?
B: No, she (= the person they hired) speaks GERMAN.

In (171), a Merchant (2001)-style short source with an E-type pronoun in subject position (where s/he = *the person they hired*) is available as a felicitous non-elliptical response. Short sources like (171) differ from those in unacceptable cases like (167c) in that the presence of the E-type pronoun in the E-site in (170) acts as a sort of bridge to the informational content of the matrix clause in the antecedent. This is sufficient to render a short source such as this a congruent response to the implicit WH-question implied by the antecedent.

Finally, as predicted, the acceptability of the fragment correlates with the acceptability of the evasion strategy when we control for the evasion strategy.[30]

(172) [Context: in an admissions office]
A: Did they admit no one who speaks GERMAN in 2013?
B: {*?No, FRENCH./*?No, she speaks FRENCH/*No, it was FRENCH.}

This confirms what we expect under the assumption that ellipsis cannot repair islands; when evasion strategies are controlled for, island sensitivity resurfaces.

4.4 Predicational sources and adjectival fragments

The account of the variation with adjectival modifiers is the same as that given for DegP sluices: repair effects derive from the use of underlying predicational sources, and repair effects are absent when the predicational source is unavailable. Thus for our (147), the only possible underlying sources is (173), which is also a felicitous answer to the Question Under Discussion in its non-elliptical form. The predicational analysis is not possible for Merchant's (140) because the modifier *Reform* cannot occur in a predicational position, as shown by (174)C, so it is correctly predicted to be ungrammatical. (174)D shows that an island pied-piping response is possible here.

(173) A: Is her new boyfriend a TALL man?
B: No, SHORT$_i$ ~~he is t$_i$~~.
B′: No, he's SHORT.

[30] We note here that there is some interspeaker variation with respect to the status of examples like (172), as some speakers we tested (informally) found it more acceptable than others. This pattern is consistent with our analysis, however, since all consultants judged examples like (172) as significantly degraded in comparison to examples like (146). We currently do not understand the source of such variation.

(174) A: Did Abby vote for a GREEN party?
B: *No, REFORM.
C: *No, it/the party was REFORM.
D: No, it was a REFORM party.

(175)-(176) demonstrate the generality of this analysis, with predicative APs working as contrastive fragments and non-predicative adjectives failing. In all cases, the island pied-piping option (a DP-fragment containing the AP) is grammatical.

(175) A: Is John a LAZY worker?
B: #No, HARD.
B′: #No, he's HARD.

(176) A: Is that a LIGHT box?
B: No, HEAVY.
B′: No, it's HEAVY.

These examples all involve copular sentences in the antecedent, but AP fragments are also compatible with other antecedents. As before, the non-predicative adjectives still fail.

(177) A: Did they buy a BLUE car?
B: No, GREEN.
B′: No, it was GREEN.

(178) A: Do they hire LAZY workers?
B: #No, HARD.
B′: #No, they are HARD.

Thus we see that only adjectives that work in predicational structures work as left branch fragments, as predicted by the evasion approach developed in section 3.1.

In addition to controlling the semantics of the adjectival remnant, another way to control for a predicational source is to control for the semantic properties of its subject. Recall that the pronoun in the subject position of the predicational source is an E-type pronoun which corefers with the nominal which contains the adjective in the antecedent. The present approach predicts that the left branch fragment should fail if we vary the discourse to rule out E-type anaphora. One way to do this is to ensure that the existential presupposition is not met, as in cases like (179). Note again that the AP fragment is not possible, whereas the island pied-piping response with the full DP is much better.

(179) A: Did no one write a LONG poem?
B: *No, SHORT.
B′: *No, it was SHORT.
B″: No, a SHORT poem.

Another way to rule out E-type anaphora is to test cases where a contrastively focused fragment response is followed by the focus particle *too*, which carries an additive presupposition. We will refer to such cases as *additive fragments*. (180) demonstrates a simple additive fragment, where the fragment is used in response to a declarative with narrow focus on an argument; as indicated by the strikethrough, the additive fragment asserts that the presupposition of the focus of the antecedent also holds of the focus fragment.

(180) A: John bought A BOOK.
B: Yeah, A RECORD ~~he bought~~, too.

Now (181) provides a test case involving an AP remnant where the correlate is an attributive adjective in a indefinite. If the underlying structure involved extraction of an AP from an indefinite in the ellipsis site,

the fragment should license an interpretation where John hired two workers, one short and one tall, as with the island pied-piping strategy shown by B″. However, the AP fragment does not have this interpretation; rather, it can only be interpreted as in the predicational structure in B′, which is incoherent in this case as it requires the worker to be both short and tall. Note also that such AP fragments are possible when the underlying predicative structure would be coherent, as in B‴ where *handsome* can sensibly be used to describe the tall worker.

(181) A: John hired a tall worker.
B: #Yeah, SHORT too.
B′: #Yeah, he was SHORT, too.
B″: Yeah, a SHORT worker, too.
B‴: Yeah, HANDSOME, too!

This shows that a predicational structure is required even for those adjectives which seem to show repair effects with regular contrastive fragments. It is not that some curious property of non-predicative adjectives prevents them from occurring as fragments, but rather there is an across-the-board reliance on predicational sources for AP fragments with DP-contained AP correlates.

Interestingly, the same pattern of success and failure with contrastive AP-fragments can be seen with non-contrastive AP-fragments (or more precisely DegP fragments with AP-predicates in complement position), which are used in response to declaratives containing modified indefinite DPs (Griffiths & Lipták to appear). (182) shows that non-contrastive fragments involving predicational adjectives like *big* are possible (Griffiths & Lipták to appear).

(182) A: Jack bought a big car.
B: Yeah, TOO big.

On the other hand, (183) demonstrates that non-predicative adjectives fail as non-contrastive fragments of this kind, replicating what we saw for the other kinds of fragments.

(183) A: They hired a hard worker.
B: #Yeah, TOO hard.

This shows that whether or not AP-fragments are possible is not conditioned by contrast (contra Griffiths & Lipták to appear); rather, all that matters is that the fragment could be derived from an underlying predicational structure.[31] As with sluicing, the best way to make sense of this picture is to assume that left branch extractions are not repaired by ellipsis, and to assume that those cases of apparent repair involve non-isomorphic parses and not true repair.

4.5 The Utterance-Final Effect

We now turn to a particularly tricky corner of the fragment data, namely the two cases of contrastive fragments targeting arguments inside adjunct islands in (139) and (148). The surprise here is that while subject extraction from an adjunct shows no repair effect, like with many other islands discussed so far, object extraction from the very same kind of island shows a repair effect, at least to some extent. [32]

(139) A: Did Ben leave the party because ABBY wouldn't dance with him?
B: *No, BETH.

[31]The results from adjectival agreement in section 3.1 on can also be replicated for fragments, but we leave these out here for reasons of space.

[32]The reported difference in acceptability between (139) and (148) here was backed up by an informal questionnaire, where 10 linguists were asked to rate these and other examples on a 7-point Likert scale: (139) was rated low by almost all speakers, with a mean of 2.7, while (139) was rated high by most speakers, with a mean of 5.

(148) A: Did Ben leave because you offended ABBY?
B: ?No, BETH.

The fact that the fragment in (139) is ungrammatical is not so surprising under our account. The short source evasion strategy is unavailable, as a short source does not provide an answer to A's question, as illustrated by the infelicity of the discourse in (184). Recall also from section 4.2, we argued that a truncated cleft source is unavailable for contrastive fragments targeting embedded arguments. As predicted, an overt truncated cleft continuation is heavily degraded, as in C's answer in (184). (139) conforms to our general prediction that once evasion strategies are controlled for, island sensitivity emerges. What about (148)? Similarly, a short source cannot be responsible for the amelioration, as again, a short source does not provide an answer to A's question (185). One suggestive initial observation is that a copular response is unexpectedly OK.

(184) A: Did Ben leave the party because ABBY wouldn't dance with him?
B: #No, BETH wouldn't dance with him.
C: *No, it was BETH

(185) A: Did Ben leave the party because you offended ABBY?
B: #No, I offended BETH.
C: ?No, it was Beth

At first blush this looks like it could be a subject/object asymmetry that we might attribute to Comp-trace effects (as proposed by Barros et al. to appear) or some other structural difference between the argument positions. However things are not so clear-cut, as (186)-(189) show, this unexpected repair effect is not attested with a variety of other object fragments involving adjunct islands, including cases like (189) where the only difference is the addition of a sentence-final adjunct.

(186) A: Did Ben leave because they sent ABBY away?
B: *No, BETH.

(187) A: Did Ben leave because they told ABBY he was coming?
B: *No, BETH.

(188) A: Did Ben leave because you gave BEER to his dog?
B: *No, CAKE.

(189) A: Did Ben leave because you offended ABBY with your crude jokes?
B: *?No, BETH.

If subject-object does not capture the right distinction, what does? One characteristic that distinguishes (148) from the other examples is that the focused correlate is utterance-final in (148) but not in the others. If the focused correlate being utterance-final is the reason for amelioration here, we may expect to see this with other islands. The contrast between following examples with putative extraction from definite DP islands demonstrate that this is indeed the case:

(190) A: Did you steal Mary's picture of PRINCE?
B: ?No, ELVIS

(191) A: Did you steal Mary's picture of PRINCE from her office?
B: *?No, ELVIS

We even see this effect with coordinate islands:

(192) A: Does a white russian involve mixing milk and RUM?
B: ?No, VODKA.

(193) A: Does a white russian involve mixing milk and RUM together with ice?
B: *?No, VODKA.

It seems, then, that the utterance-final effect is real. We posit that this effect, also discussed briefly by Griffiths & Lipták (to appear, fn.10), is at least partly responsible for the fact that the island data with fragments is often disputed by some speakers and at least unclear for others. And while this effect describes a small fuzzy corner of exceptions among a quite large body of clear data, it should still be troubling for the approach to fragments we have adopted here, and indeed any account of fragments hypothesising silent structure, as according to this approach all the relevant conditions on what may constitute a fragment are dependent upon syntactic structure and not non-structural notions like "utterance-final".

A full investigation of the utterance-final effect and the factors underlying it is beyond the scope of this paper,[33] but there is evidence indicating that a copular source with a definite subject is on the right track. In many instances, the availability of a continuation of this kind seems to track utterance-finality, as in (184) (and see the discussion in footnote 33). The presence of a definite in the ellipsis site also predicts that if we change the discourse so that the fragment is incompatible with the copular continuation, these fragments should be just as ungrammatical as the others. (197)-(198) show this is the case with additive fragments which, as we saw in the previous section, are incompatible with cleft or predicational sources (at least on the "different people leaving" reading).

(197) A: Someone left because Ben offended ABBY.
B: *Yeah, BETH, too.
B′: *Yeah, it was BETH, too.

(198) A: Someone stole Mary's picture of PRINCE.
B: *?Yeah, ELVIS, too.
B′: *Yeah, it was ELVIS, too.

Even in the absence of a full explanation of the utterance-final effect, we believe that this may still be a case where the exception proves the rule: island effects are the way of life with contrastive fragments, and it is only with a narrow set of exceptions, which we can characterize formally, which we see repair effects. This is hard to account for with a non-structural approach to fragments, or with a structural account which assumes strict isomorphism between ellipsis and antecedent, but it is just what we expect on the approach adopted here.

[33] One possible analysis of the utterance-final amelioration effect in (148) is that the pitch-accent on ABBY is compatible with broad focus on the *because*-island. This can be evidenced by the fact that the declarative version of (148) is congruent to a *why*-question, as in (194). Question-Answer Congruence dictates that the entire *because*-clause must be F-marked in this instance.

(194) A: Why did Ben leave the party? B: Ben left the party [because you offended ABBY]$_F$

It would then be possible to analyze the focused fragment *Beth* as contrasting with the entire *because*-clause. This would necessitate type-raising the individual denoting expression *Beth* to the same type as the *because*-clause, so that Rooth's (1985) membership condition on focus is satisfied. That individual-denoting expressions can function as *reasons* is evidenced by the fact that they constitute felicitous answers to *why*-questions, as in (195), so this seems plausible.

(195) A: Why were you late this morning?
B: Abby (it was).
B': My wife (it was).
B": The dog (it was).

The analysis sketched here then, is that a copular source underlies (148), where *Beth*, contrasting with the focused *because*-clause, is identified with the reason for Ben leaving the party, as in (196).

(196) A: Did Ben leave the party [because you offended ABBY]$_F$?
B: No, BETH (it was).

It is not clear, however, how this might be extended to account for the amelioration effect in (190)-(193). It is indeed possible that the amelioration effect associated with utterance-finality should receive a heterogenous explanation. We leave this as a matter for future research.

4.6 Summary

In this section, we have discussed some issues for the repair-based approaches in Merchant (2008) and Griffiths & Lipták (to appear) to lack of repair in contrastive fragments with island bound correlates. Their assumptions about scope are suspect for a variety of conceptual reasons and we provided new empirical data that further undermines the assumption that the pattern can be captured by appealing to covert movement constraints on focused correlates. Second, the generalization they aim to capture, namely, that contrastive clausal ellipsis is island sensitive, is too strong. The evasion approach, on the other hand, was shown to handle not only those cases where island sensitivity obtains, but also those cases which are surprisingly acceptable for Merchant (2004, 2008) and Griffiths & Lipták (to appear)). Not only does this allow us to provide a unified account of the quite uneven distribution of apparent island effects with fragments, it also strengthens the case for the use of evasion strategies more generally, thus adding support to our account of island repair with sluicing as well.

5 Is there any repair by ellipsis?

Thus far we have seen that when evasion strategies are controlled for, island effects are attested under ellipsis with both sluicing and fragments. The following examples show these effects for left branch islands (199), relative clause islands (200), adjunct islands (201), CP complements to nouns (202), *wh*-islands (203), extraction of coordinated phrases (204) and extraction out of coordinated phrases (205).

(199) *The library hired a hard worker, but I don't know exactly how hard ~~they hired a t worker~~. = (52)

(200) *The radio played a song that RINGO wrote, but I don't know who ELSE ~~the radio played a song that t wrote~~. = (88)

(201) *Ben will be angry if you don't try THE CAKE, but I don't know what ELSE ~~he will be angry if you don't try t~~ = (90)

(202) *Ben is spreading false rumours that you criticized SANDY, but I don't know who ELSE ~~he is spreading false rumours that you criticized t~~. = (92)

(203) *?Sandy was trying to figure out which student would solve DAHL'S PUZZLE, but I don't what OTHER PROBLEM ~~she was trying to figure out which student would solve t~~ = (91)

(204) *They expect Cameron and THE SELECT COMMITTEE to meet next week, but I don't know which OTHER COMMITTEE ~~they expect Cameron and t to meet next week~~ = (93)

(205) *Bob saw a movie and reviewed it for THE GUARDIAN, but I don't know which OTHER NEWSPAPER ~~he saw a movie and reviewed it for t~~. =(94)

The typology of unrepaired islands revealed here is wider than the one proposed by Merchant (2001), since Merchant argued that left branch extraction and the conjunct condition of the coordinate structure constraint were "PF islands" that were repaired by ellipsis. However the sample considered so far does not consider Merchant's other PF islands, namely *comp*-trace islands and derived position islands (e.g. subjects). In this section we consider these and some other potential repairs and conclude that ellipsis almost always fails to repair island violations, and that the only cases where repair might be attested are ones where a PF-based analysis is plausible.

First let us consider subject islands, which we take to be representative of derived islands more generally (following Merchant 2001). (206) is Merchant's example demonstrating apparent repair under sluicing:

(206) A biography of one of the Marx brothers has just been published – guess which Marx brother!

Cases like these are unrevealing from the present perspective, since they could potentially be derived from a cleft source (*guess which Marx brother it was!*) or perhaps even from predicational copular sources of some

kind. An additional complication is that it has often been noted that derived subjects are often not islands to extraction, with many extractions (in particular extraction of PPs without pied-piping) being grammatical (Ross 1967, Chomsky 2008, Haegeman et al. 2014).

(207) Of which cars were the hoods damaged by the explosion? (Ross, 1967, 242)

To test the islandhood of subjects more rigorously we use contrast sluices targeting transitive subjects, since contrast sluices are particularly resistant to non-isomorphic construals (being incompatible with both of the copular sources we have invoked throughout) and have proven to be our most potent tool for diagnosing island effects so far, and transitive subjects are much stronger islands than promoted passive subjects. The following example shows that the island-escaping construal is unavailable, with the only available reading being the one where one of the other Marx Brothers caused a scandal himself.

(208) *A biography of HARPO caused a scandal, but I don't know which OTHER MARX BROTHER ~~a biography of t caused a scandal~~.

We can strengthen this further by testing contrastive fragments (see also Griffiths & Lipták to appear, p14) and additive focus fragments, both of which would not be compatible with evasion here (note that we also control for utterance-finality: see §4.5 for discussion). These are also ungrammatical on the relevant isomorphic construals.

(209) A: Did a biography of HARPO cause a scandal?
B: *No, GROUCHO ~~a biography of t caused a scandal~~.

(210) A: A biography of Harpo caused a scandal.
B: *Yeah, GROUCHO ~~a biography of t caused a scandal~~, too.

This indicates that subject island violations are not always repaired by ellipsis.

This result may seem to force another change to Merchant's (2001) typology of islands repair, but things are more complicated than this since, on Merchant's own analysis, subject islands do not actually involve island repair. Rather, Merchant argues that the repair effect arises because we avoid ever having to violate the relevant locality condition in the first place: ellipsis bleeds A-movement of the subject to SpecTP, ensuring that the subject does not become a derived island (see also van Craenenbroeck & den Dikken 2006). Thus for the sluice in (208) the underlying structure is something like (211), where the *wh*P is extracted from the subject in its base position; crucially, there is no island extraction in sight, and hence no need to invoke "repair" of an island violation. On this analysis, non-movement of the subject is effectively another evasion strategy, although it is unlike the others in only being available under ellipsis.

(211) $[_{CP}\ [_{DP}$ which Marx brother$]_i$ ~~$[_{TP}\ [_{T'}$ has $[_{VOICEP}$ been $[_{VP}$ published $[_{DP}$ a biography of t_i $]]]]]$~~]

Since the subject island violations seem not to be ameliorated by ellipsis after all, we might conclude that there is no "EPP repair," contra Merchant (2001) and van Craenenbroeck & den Dikken (2006) (cf. Lasnik & Park 2003). This may be too hasty, however. Haegeman et al. (2014) have recently provided a comprehensive reassessment of the various effects observed with subject islands and concluded that in many cases, subject island effects are multiply determined, with a number of unrelated constraints often conspiring to give rise to a cumulative effect of degradation. If this is correct, then it is possible that subject movement is bled by ellipsis, and that derived position islands are in fact repaired (in some sense) by ellipsis, but it so happens that the other constraints which restrict subject islands in particular are responsible for the degradation of the subject island extractions above.[34] Testing this would require more space than we can afford here, but we hope that the preceding discussion has made the case for using ellipsis constructions which favour isomorphism as a probe for the internal structure of ellipsis sites, and therefore as a means of investigating which constraints are PF-constraints and which are not.

[34]For discussion of cases where ellipsis seems to bleed movement, see Lasnik (2001) and van Craenenbroeck & Lipták (2008)).

The important theoretical point that we take from this discussion of subject islands is that island effects may be multiply determined, with at least some constraints not being PF-constraints which are ameliorated by ellipsis. A similar picture emerged with *comp*-trace islands, and the data is murky as a result. Zeroing in on solid evidence for repair by ellipsis with these islands is not straightforward, since in many cases some degree of non-isomorphism may remove potential *comp*-trace violations. For instance, with cases like (212), where the correlate in the antecedent is dominated by an overt complementizer, it seems perfectly likely that the ellipsis site could contain a near-identical clause which simply lacks this complementizer, as indicated by the strikethrough.

(212) They said that JOHN is learning French, but I don't know who ELSE ~~they said t is learning French~~.

When we try to ensure that a complementizer would be obligatory, we typically end up using complement clauses which are islands to extraction for arguments other than subjects as well. This can be seen with non-bridge verbs (213) and *wh*-complements (214), which are weak islands across the board.

(213) a. Bill whined *(that) Mary likes John.
b. ?Who are you whining that you don't like?[35]

(214) a. Bill wondered *(whether) Mary likes John.
b. ??Who does Bill wonder whether Mary likes?

Since we are aiming to control for other kinds of non-isomorphism as well (i.e. cleft sources), the relevant tests for true repair of *comp*-trace effects under ellipsis would be contrast sluices targeting embedded subjects and objects, with the expectation that the difference between the two extractions would be minimal with *comp*-trace repair. Unfortunately the data is not so clear due to the weak island effects, which seem not to be repaired by ellipsis either.

(215) a. ?*Bill wants to know whether HIS PARENTS dislike Mary, but I don't know who ELSE ~~Bill wants to know whether t dislike Mary~~.
b. ??Bill wants to know whether his parents dislike MARY, but I don't know who ELSE ~~Bill wants to know whether his parents dislike t~~.

As the reported judgments indicate, the subject extraction seems to be only slightly more degraded than the object extraction, but judgments of relative degradation are difficult to assess. Thus on the question of whether there is true repair of *comp*-trace effects under ellipsis, we must be equivocal.

While further, unequivocal evidence in favour of repair of *comp*-trace effects by ellipsis would undermine the headline claim here that island violations are not repaired by ellipsis, we believe that it would only serve to further strengthen the broader point of this article (and to some extent of Merchant 2001), that is, that we should only expect to find repair by ellipsis when there is reason to believe that all the conditions responsible for the island in question are phonological in nature. In the case of *comp*-trace effects, there is good evidence independent of ellipsis for these being conditioned primarily by phonological factors (deChene 1995, Drury 1999, Kandybowicz 2006), such as the fact that it is ameliorated if there is an adverb intervening between trace and complementizer (Bresnan 1977).

(216) Who do you think that after years of cheating death finally died?

We suggest that this is the profile we would expect to see with a PF-island and that the absence of any such phonological mitigation should be cause for skepticism. It is significant, then that none of the other island types examined in this article are mitigated by phonological factors in this manner.[36] More important

[35] Stowell (1981) provides (213b) with the comment that it is "only minimally acceptable," which we take to be a weak island effect of the familiar kind.

[36] To be sure, the mitigation effects demonstrated by (216) is not due to the semantic contribution of adverbial modification as it's absent in cases where the adverb would not intervene between the trace and the complementizer (Hasegawa 2003, cited in Sato & Dobashi 2012).

still, a number of the other islands are mitigated by *semantic* factors. For instance, it has been known since Ross (1967) and especially Goldsmith (1985) and Lakoff (1986) that there are a large number of exceptions to the coordinate structure constraint which indicate that a syntactic (or indeed phonological) characterization would not be appropriate; more recently, Kehler (2002) has shown that the conditions under which extraction from a coordinate structure are possible may be characterized in terms of a set of "coherence relations" which are operative in constraining other kinds of discourse dependencies. Adjunct islands are similar, in that Truswell (2011) has shown that there is a large class of principled exceptions to the islandhood of adjuncts which can be characterized in semantic terms, with a fundamentally semantic explanation for this island following from this analysis. It seems clear now that weak islands may be given a semantic explanation (see especially Abrusán 2014), and there is even evidence in Sichel (to appear) which suggest that the islandhood of relative clauses is conditioned by interpretive properties of the relativization chain, with island effects being mitigated in circumstances where the head is interpreted external to the relative clause.

It is surely the case that there is a role for syntax with these island effects (see e.g. Truswell 2009 on syntactic dimensions of variation with adjunct islands), but nevertheless it would be a strange world if it turned out that violations of these at least partly semantic island conditions were to be repaired uniformly by something as superficial as non-pronunciation. Indeed it would be particularly strange given that we know that a number of other quite uncontroversially syntactic constraints on movement are *not* repaired by ellipsis. One such case that was mentioned in the course of this article is the Right Roof Constraint, discussed in §3.2. Recall that Lasnik (2013) analyzed multiple sluicing as involving leftward movement of the leftmost *whP* and rightward extraposition of the second one, with evidence for the latter component of the analysis coming from Right Roof effects such as clause-boundedness, shown by (79) (repeated here). As noted earlier, this analysis only goes through if violations of the Right Roof Constraint are not repaired by ellipsis.

(79) *Somebody said that John was talking about something, but I don't know who about what.
... [$_{CP}$ who$_i$ [$_{TP}$ ~~[$_{TP}$ t$_i$ [$_{VP}$ said [$_{CP}$ that [$_{TP}$ John was [$_{VP}$ talking t$_j$~~]]]]] [$_{PP}$ about what]$_j$]]

The exact nature of the Right Roof Constraint is still an unsettled matter in the contemporary literature, but it seems clear that the relevant condition should not be semantic, since most models of syntax would hold that directionality is purely a matter of syntax and phonology (or even just phonology). If constraints of this kind are not repaired by ellipsis, it seems implausible it that semantically conditioned island effects would be. This is not to say that repair by ellipsis is itself implausible, though, as there are some cases of apparent repair which seem both empirically and theoretically well-founded. For instance, pseudogapping examples like (217a) has been argued by Jayaseelan (2002), Gengel (2007) and Thoms (to appear) to involve leftward focus movement of the remnant *beer*, but this requires movement to a VP-internal position which doesn't normally host movement in English, (217b). This looks a lot by repair by ellipsis.

(217) a. John will bring WINE to the party, and Mary will BEER ~~bring to the party~~.
b. *Mary will BEER bring to the party.

The effect in (217b) is clearly not an island effect, as the VP is not normally an opaque domain; rather, it seems clear that this is a shape preservation restriction of a kin with the restrictions on object shift in OV languages (Holmberg 1986, Wallenberg 2009), where the object cannot precede the lexical verb within a given domain. We agree with Fox & Pesetsky (2005) that shape preservation constraints should be a matter for PF, and so we take the fact that violations of these constraints are repaired by ellipsis to be entirely plausible.

More argumentation is required to defend this sort of claim, and claims of plausibility are only as good as the theoretical assumptions they rest on, but we take from this the lesson that the wider literature on long distance dependencies should inform our assessments of whether a putative case of repair is viable or not. This is especially important given that we have seen many ways in which elliptical appearances can be

deceiving.

6 Conclusion

In this article we have shown that island repair effects under ellipsis are illusory, with the appearance of repair being brought about by the availability of non-isomorphic construals for the ellipsis sites which help us to evade ever violating islands in the ellipsis sites in the first place. We showed that when evasion is controlled for, island effects emerge robustly with sluicing and fragment answers, and we demonstrated that alternative analyses of variable island repair effects failed to cover the full range of data we discussed. We conclude, then, that there is no island repair, contra Ross (1969) and much work since.

The conclusion reached here has a number of implications, some of which we have discussed in passing throughout; we pause to consider the broader points here. With respect to the theory of ellipsis, the rediscovery of island effects under ellipsis provides us with a very strong argument for the "silent structure" approach to sluicing and fragments, according to which the ellipsis remnants move to their surface position from a fully represented syntactic structure before ellipsis then applies to delete the evacuated structure. On the other hand, it is very difficult to reconcile the evidence for island effects with Direct Interpretation approaches to ellipsis (e.g. Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Barker to appear, Jacobson 2013), according to which there is no silent structure in these ellipsis constructions; islands are a near-definitional diagnostic for structure and long-distance dependencies, so the presence of island effects requires a structural representation in which these effects can be located. In addition, in arguing for the availability of a wide range of non-isomorphic construals for ellipsis sites we have provided further evidence (on top of the initial evidence cited in §2) for allowing ellipsis identity to be quite loose, in consonance with much recent work, and in §3.4 we suggested that islands might provide a tool for probing the extent of the looseness of ellipsis identity, at least if the case against repair with the islands in question is sufficiently established. However a great deal of work remains to be done to refine this mode of inquiry, and other questions remain regarding the case condition and how it may interact with identity as well.

With respect to the theory of islands and locality, the main result of this article is that we can dismiss the notion that all islands are repaired uniformly by ellipsis. As we noted, in many ways this should be an unsurprising result, given that we know that islands do not form a homogeneous class and that we know from other work that many island effects may be characterized as partly semantic conditions. This dismissal has broader implications for the theory of syntax more generally, as the argument we have developed against island repair constitutes a strong challenge to some of the foundational assumptions of much recent work in theoretical syntax which has taken what we might call a "representationalist turn," according to which syntactic constraints like locality and intervention are to be understood in representational terms, typically as PF-constraints (e.g. Bošković 2011). Much of this work is predicated on the assumption that at least island constraints are PF-constraints, and we believe that we have shown that this assumption was mistaken. We suggested that it is possible that evidence from ellipsis may be taken to support the view that some particular grammatical constraints are to be understood in this way, but we urge caution in the use of ellipsis as a means of testing the nature of grammatical constraints, as we cannot always be sure what lurks within the silence.

References

ABELS, KLAUS. 2011. Don't fix that island! it ain't broke. Paper presented at the Islands in Contemporary Linguistic Theory conference, Vitoria-Gasteiz.

ABELS, KLAUS, and GEORGE STARLING. 2012. Resumptives and sluicing in welsh. Handout for a talk given at Ellipsis2012 workshop, Vigo.

ABRUSÁN, MARTÁ. 2014. *Weak island semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ANDERBOIS, SCOTT. 2011. *Issues and alternatives*. Santa Cruz, CA: UCSC dissertation.

AOUN, JOSEPH, and AUDREY YEN-HUI LI. 2003. *Essays on the representational and derivational nature of grammar: the diversity of* wh*-constructions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

BARKER, CHRIS. to appear. Scopability and sluicing. *Linguistics and Philosophy*.

BARROS, MATTHEW. 2013. *Else*-modification as a diagnostic for pseudosluicing. Paper presented at NELS 43, CUNY Graduate Center.

BARROS, MATTHEW. in preparation. *Pseudosluicing and the identity condition on ellipsis*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University dissertation.

BARROS, MATTHEW. to appear. A non-repair approach to island-sensitivity in contrastive TP ellipsis. *Proceedings of Chicago Linguistics Society 48*, Chicago, IL.

BARROS, MATTHEW, and JEROEN VAN CRAENENBROECK. 2013. Tag questions and ellipsis. Handout for a talk given at DGfS, Universität Potsdam.

BARROS, MATTHEW; PATRICK ELLIOTT; and GARY THOMS. to appear. More variation in island repair: the clausal/non-clausal island distinction. *Proceedings of CLS 49*, Chicago, IL.

BOECKX, CEDRIC. 2012. *Syntactic islands*. Key Topics In Syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BOŠKOVIĆ, ŽELJKO. 2007. On the locality and motivation of Move and Agree: An even more minimal theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38.589–644.

BOŠKOVIĆ, ŽELJKO. 2011. Rescue by PF deletion, traces as (non)interveners and the *that*-trace effect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42.1–44.

BOŠKOVIĆ, ŽELJKO. 2014. Now i'm a phase, now i'm not a phase: on the variability of phases with extraction and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45.27–89.

BRAME, MICHAEL. 1968. *A new analysis of relative clauses: evidence for the interpretive theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

BRESNAN, JOAN. 1977. Variables in the theory of transformations. *Formal syntax*, ed. by Peter Culicover, Thomas Wasow, and Adrian Akmajian, 157–196. New York, NY: Academic Press.

CARLSON, G. 1977. Amount relatives. *Language* 53.520–542.

CHENG, LISA LAI SHEN, and HAMIDA DEMIRDACHE. 2010. Trapped at the edge: on long-distance pair-list readings. *Lingua* 120.463–484.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1972. Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar. *The goals of linguistic theory*, ed. by Stanley Peters, 63–130. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1995. *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

CHOMSKY, NOAM. 2008. On phases. *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of jean-roger vergnaud*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

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

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

CHUNG, SANDRA; WILLIAM A. LADUSAW; and JAMES MCCLOSKEY. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3.239–282.

CORVER, NORBERT. 1990. *The syntax of left branch extractions*. Katholieke Universiteit Brabant dissertation.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN. 2010. Invisible last resort: a note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120.1714–1726.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN. 2012. Ellipsis identity and accommodation. Ms., HUBrussels.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN, and MARCEL DEN DIKKEN. 2006. Ellipsis and EPP repair. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37.653–664.

VAN CRAENENBROECK, JEROEN, and ANIKÓ LIPTÁK. 2008. On the interaction between Verb Movement and Ellipsis: New Evidence from Hungarian. *Proceedings of WCCFL XXVI*, ed. by Charles B. Chang and Hannah J. Haynie, 138–146. Somerville, Massachusetts: Cascadilla Press.

CULICOVER, PETER W., and RAY JACKENDOFF. 2005. *Simpler syntax*. Oxford University Press.

DAGNAC, ANNE. 2010. Modal ellipsis in French, Spanish and Italian: evidence for a TP-deletion analysis. *Romance linguistics 2008: Interactions in romance*, ed. by Karlos Arregi, 157–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DAYAL, VENEETA. 1996. *Locality in Wh-quantification: Questions and relative clauses in Hindi*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.

DAYAL, VENEETA. 2002. Single-pair versus multiple-pair answers: wh-in-situ and scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.512–520.

DECHENE, BRENT. 1995. Complementizer-trace effects and the ECP. *Geneva Generative Papers* 3.1–4.

DRURY, JOHN. 1999. Mechanics of π-derivations: an alternative "direction" for syntactic theory. *University of Maryland Working Papers In Linguistics* 8.180–212.

EHRICH, VERONIKA. 2001. Was nicht müssen und nicht können (nicht) bedeuten können: Zum Skopus der Negation bei den Modalverben des Deutschen. *Modalität und Modalverben im Deutschen*, ed. by R. Müller and M. Reis, *Linguistische Berichte Sonderhefte*, vol. 9, 149–176. Hamburg: Buske.

ERTESCHIK-SHIR, NOMI. 1977. *On the nature of island constraints*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

EVANS, GARETH. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11.337–362.

FARKAS, DONKA, and ANASTASIA GIANNAKIDOU. 1995. How clause-bounded is the scope of universals? *Proceedings of SALT 6*, ed. by T. Gallway, 35–52.

FOX, DANNY. 1999. Focus, parallelism, and accommodation. *Proceedings of the ninth conference on semantics and linguistic theory*, ed. by T. Matthews and Devon Strolovitch, 70–90. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

FOX, DANNY, and HOWARD LASNIK. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair: the difference between Sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.143–154.

FOX, DANNY, and DAVID PESETSKY. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31.1–46.

FUKAYA, TERUHIKO. 2007. *Sluicing and stripping in Japanese and some implications*. University of Southern California dissertation.

GENGEL, KIRSTEN. 2007. *Focus and ellipsis: a generative analysis of pseudogapping and other elliptical structures*. University of Stuttgart dissertation.

GINZBURG, JONATHAN, and IVAN SAG. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: the form, meaning and use of english interrogatives*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

GOLDSMITH, JOHN. 1985. A principled exception to the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Proceedings of the chicago linguistic society 21*, ed. by William H. Eilfort, Paul D. Kroeber, and Karen L. Peterson, 133–143.

GREBENYOVA, LYDIA. 2009. Sluicing and multiple wh-fronting. *Proceedings of GLOW in asia 5*, New Delhi, 219–242.

GRIFFITHS, JAMES, and ANIKÓ LIPTÁK. to appear. Contrast and island-sensitivity in clausal ellipsis. *Syntax*.

HAEGEMAN, LILIANE; JIMÉNEZ-FERNÁNDEZ; and ANDREW RADFORD. 2014. Deconstructing the Subject Condition in terms of cumulative constraint violation. *The Linguistic Review* 31.73–150.

HAMBLIN, CHARLES. 1973. Questions in Montague grammar. *Foundations of Language* 10.41–53.

HARTMAN, JEREMY. 2009. When e-GIVENness overpredicts identity. Paper presented at BCGL4.

HASEGAWA, KINSUKE. 2003. *Seiseibumpoo no hoohoo: Eigo toogron no sikumi. (methodologies in generative grammar: mechanisms of English syntax)*. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.

HOLMBERG, ANDERS. 1986. *Word order and syntactic features*. Stockholm dissertation.

HOYT, FREDERICK, and ALEXANDRA TEODORESCU. 2012. How many kinds of sluicing and why? single and multiple sluicing in romanian, english and japanese. *Sluicing: crosslinguistic perspectives*, ed. by Jason Merchant and Andrew Simpson, 83–103. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

IZVORSKI, ROUMYANA. 1995. A solution to the subdeletion paradox. *Proceedings of WCCFL 14*, ed. by José Camacho, Lina Choueiri, and Maki Watanabe, 203–219. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

JACOBSON, PAULINE. 2013. The short answer: implications for direct compositionality and vice versa. Ms., Brown University.

JAYASEELAN, K. A. 2002. IP-internal topic and focus phrases. *Studia Linguistica* 55.39–75.

JOHNSON, KYLE. 2001. What VP ellipsis can do, and what it can't, but not why. *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, ed. by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 439–479. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

KANDYBOWICZ, JASON. 2006. That-trace effects explained away. *Proceedings of WCCFL 25*, ed. by Donald Baumer, David Montero, and Michael Scanlon, 220–228. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

KARTTUNEN, L. 1977. Syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1.3–44.

KAYNE, RICHARD S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

KAYNE, RICHARD S. 1998. Overt vs. covert movement. *Syntax* 1.128–191.

KEHLER, ANDREW. 2002. *Coherence, reference and the theory of grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

KENNEDY, CHRIS. 1997. Antecedent contained deletion and the syntax of quantification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28.662–688.

KENNEDY, CHRIS. 2000. Comparative (sub)deletion and ranked, violable constraints in syntax. *Proceedings of the north east linguistic society*, ed. by Masako Hirotani, Andries Coetzee, Nancy Hall, and Ji-yung Kim, 389–414. Rutgers University: Graduate Linguistic Student Association.

KIM, SOO-YEON, and SUSUMU KUNO. 2012. A note on sluicing with implicit indefinite correlates. *Natural Language Semantics* 21.315–332.

KRIFKA, MANFRED. 2006. Association with focus phrases. *The architecture of focus.*, ed. by V. Molnár and Susanne Winkler, no. 82 in Studies in Generative Grammar, 105–135. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LAKOFF, GEORGE. 1986. Frame semantic control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Proceedings of the chicago linguistic society 22*, ed. by Anne M. Farley, Peter T. Farley, and Karl-Erik McCullough, 152–167.

LARSON, BRADLEY, and NORBERT HORNSTEIN. 2013. A note on P-stranding and adjunct extraction from nominals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44.669–674.

LASNIK, HOWARD. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? *Proceedings of the north east linguistic society 31*, ed. by Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, 301–320. Georgetown University: GLSA.

LASNIK, HOWARD. 2006. A family of questions. Handout from a talk at Nanzan University.

LASNIK, HOWARD. 2013. Multiple sluicing in English? *Syntax* 16.

LASNIK, HOWARD, and MYUNG-KWAN PARK. 2003. The EPp and the Subject Condition under Sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.649–660.

LOBECK, ANNE. 1995. *Ellipsis: Functional heads, licensing and identification*. New York: Oxford University Press.

MARUŠIČ, FRANC, and ROK ŽAUCER. 2013. A note on sluicing and island repair. *Annual workshop on formal approaches to slavic linguistics, the third indiana meeting*, ed. by Steve Franks, 176–189. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

MAY, ROBERT. 1985. *Logical form: Its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2001. *The syntax of silence: sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and philosophy* 27.661–738.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. *Topics in ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson, 132–153. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

MERCHANT, JASON. 2009. Phrasal and clausal comparatives and the abstractness of syntax. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9.134–164.

MIKKELSEN, LINE. 2005. *Copular clauses: Specification, predication and equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MILLER, PHILIP, and BARBARA HEMFORTH. 2014. Verb phrase ellipsis with nominal antecedents. Ms., Université Paris Diderot.

MORGAN, JERRY L. 1973. Sentence fragments and the notion "sentence". *Issues in linguistics*, ed. by Braj Kachru, Robert Lees, Yakov Malkiel, Angelina Pietrangeli, and Sol Saporta. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

MURPHY, ANDREW. 2014. *The syntax of* shì*: a focus movement account of sluicing in Mandarin Chinese*. Master's thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin.

NUNES, JAIRO. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

OTT, DENNIS, and MARK DE VRIES. to appear. A biclausal analysis of right dislocation. *Proceedings of NELS 43*.

PARK, BUM-SIK. 2005. *Locality and identity in ellipsis*. College Park, MD: University of Connecticut dissertation.

PINKHAM, JESSIE E., and JORGE HANKAMER. 1975. Deep and shallow clefts. *Papers from the eleventh meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, ed. by R.E. Grossman, L.J. San, and T.J. Vance, 429–450. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistics Society.

POSTAL, PAUL M. 1998. *Three investigations of extraction*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

POTSDAM, ERIC. 2007. Malagasy sluicing and its consequences for the identity requirement on ellipsis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25.577–613.

RAWLINS, KYLE. 2013. (un)conditionals. *Natural Language Semantics* 21.111–178.

REEVE, MATTHEW. 2010. *Clefts*. London: UCL dissertation.

REICH, INGO. 2004. Association with focus and choice functions: a binding approach. *Research on Language and Computation* 2.463–489.

REINHART, TANYA. 1997. Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20.335–397.

REINHART, TANYA. 1998. Wh-in-situ in the framework of the Minimalist Program. *Natural Language Semantics* 6.29–56.

RIZZI, LUIGI. 1990. *Relativized minimality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

ROBERTS, CRAIGE. 1996. *Information structure: Towards an integrated theory of formal pragmatics*. Ohio State University: OSU Working Papers in Linguistics.

RODRIGUES, CILENE; ANDREW NEVINS; and LUIS VICENTE. 2009. Cleaving the interactions between sluicing and preposition stranding. *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2006*, ed. by W. Leo Wetzels and J. van der Weijer, 175–198. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

ROSS, JOHN. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

ROSS, JOHN ROBERT. 1969. Guess who? *Chicago linguistics society*, ed. by Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, Chicago, Illinois, 252–286.

SAAB, ANDRES. to appear. Ineffable narratives: another case of overgeneration by egivenness. *Probus*.

SAG, IVAN. 1976. *Deletion and logical form*. MIT dissertation.

SAG, IVAN, and JOANNA NYKIEL. 2011. Remarks on sluicing. *Proceedings of the HPSG11 conference*, ed. by Stefan Müller, Stanford, CA.

SAILOR, CRAIG, and GARY THOMS. 2013. On the non-existence of non-constituent coordination and non-constituent ellipsis. *Proceedings of WCCFL 31*.

SATO, YOSUKE, and YOSHIHITO DOBASHI. 2012. Functional categories and prosodic phrasing in English: evidence from *that*-trace effects and pronominal object shift. Ms., National University of Singapore and Niigata University.

SAUERLAND, ULI. 1998. *The meaning of chains*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT dissertation.

SICHEL, IVY. to appear. Resumptive pronouns and competition. *Linguistic Inquiry*.

STOWELL, TIMOTHY. 1981. Complementizers and the Empty Category Principle. *Proceedings of NELS 11*, ed. by V. Burke and J. Pustejovsky, 345–363. Amherst, MA: GLSA.

TEMMERMAN, TANJA. 2013. The syntax of Dutch embedded fragment answers: on the PF-theory of islands and the WH/sluicing correlation. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31.235–285.

THOMS, GARY. 2013. Lexical mismatches in ellipsis and the identity condition. *Proceedings of NELS 42*, ed. by Stefan Keine and Shayne Sloggett, 559–572. Amherst, MA: CSLI Publications.

THOMS, GARY. 2014a. Constraints on exceptional ellipsis are only parallelism effects. *Proceedings of NELS 43*, ed. by Hsin-Lun Huang, Ethan Poole, and Amanda Rysling, 195–208. Amherst, Massachusetts: GLSA Publications.

THOMS, GARY. 2014b. Syntactic identity, parallelism and accommodated antecedents. Ms., University of Edinburgh.

THOMS, GARY. to appear. Pseudogapping, parallelism and the syntax of focus. *Syntax*.

TRUSWELL, ROB. 2009. Preposition-stranding, passivisation, and extraction from adjuncts in Germanic. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 9.131–177.

TRUSWELL, ROB. 2011. *Events, phrases and questions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VERGNAUD, JEAN-ROGER. 1974. *French relative clauses*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

VICENTE, LUIS. 2008. Syntactic isomorphism and non-isomorphism under ellipsis. Ms., UCSC.

WAGNER, MICHAEL. 2006. Association by movement: evidence from NPI-licensing. *Natural Language Semantics* 14.297–324.

WALLENBERG, JOEL C. 2009. *Antisymmetry and the conservation of c-command: scrambling and phrase structure in synchronic and diachronic perspective*. University of Pennsylvania dissertation.

WOLD, DAG E. 1996. Long distance selective binding: The case of focus. *Proceedings of SALT VI*, ed. by Teresa Galloway and Justin Spence, 311–328. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

YOSHIDA, MASAYA. 2010. "Antecedent-contained" sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42.348–356.