

**Fragments, truncated clefts and island-sensitivity**  
Matthew Reeve (Centro de Linguística, Universidade Nova de Lisboa)  
Ellipsis Across Borders, Sarajevo, 20 June 2016

## 1. Introduction

- Most analyses of clausal ellipsis (sluicing, fragments, etc.) involve movement of the ‘remnant’ to some extent. The main difference is in the nature of the movement:
  - Overt movement of the remnant always takes place (e.g., Merchant 2001, 2004, 2008, Barros, Elliott & Thoms 2014, Griffiths & Lipták 2014)
  - Covert movement of the remnant always takes place (e.g., Kimura 2010, Abe 2015)
  - The remnant moves only at PF (e.g., Weir 2014)
  - The remnant does not move (e.g., Chung, Ladusaw & McCloskey 1995, Wilder 1997, Den Dikken, Meinunger & Wilder 2000, Fukaya 2007, 2012, Ott & Struckmeier 2016, Sato 2016)
- Proposal: no direct connection between ellipsis and movement in fragments:
  - Movement of the remnant (whether overt, covert or at PF) is not a precondition for clausal ellipsis, which is derived by PF-realising an F-marked constituent in a CP.
  - New information fragments are licensed by an identification (recoverability) condition based on entailment (related to Merchant’s (2001) e-givenness condition), which can apply with the remnant *in situ*.
  - Where this condition fails (e.g., in contrastive fragments), ellipsis is licensed through ‘background-marking’, which requires the remnant to be peripheral to the elided clause. This forces movement of the remnant unless the remnant is already peripheral in its clause.
- Evidence & results:
  - This accounts for the basic opposition between new information fragments (not island-sensitive) and contrastive fragments (island-sensitive) (Griffiths & Lipták 2014), as well as the parallel observation for truncated clefts (Barros et al. 2014).
  - Given that background-marking merely requires clause-peripherality, not necessarily movement, the analysis can account for the fact that the island-sensitivity of contrastive fragments is reduced when the correlate is clause-final (Griffiths & Lipták 2014, Barros et al. 2014).
  - This is strengthened by the observation that truncated clefts do not (always) show the utterance-final effect, as expected if clefts independently involve movement of the remnant (Reeve 2012). The ‘utterance-final effect’ thus favours an approach to fragments that does not require movement of the remnant.
  - On the other hand, the fact that certain truncated clefts *do* show the utterance-final effect can be accounted for if the constituent that moves is the island itself, rather than the remnant. Unlike standard analyses, the present analysis allows for this kind of mismatch between the remnant and the moved constituent.

## 2. A partially *in situ* analysis of fragments

- The standard analysis of fragments takes movement to be a crucial component of ellipsis: the non-deleted constituent (the ‘remnant’) moves overtly out of the clausal constituent that undergoes PF-deletion (e.g., Merchant 2004):
  - (1) a. A: This talk is about some area of linguistics.  
B: Yes, ELLIPSIS.
  - b. [FP [DP ellipsis]<sub>i</sub> F [CP  $t_i$  C [IP ~~this talk is about  $t_i$ ]]]]~~
- An alternative analysis claims that overt movement is not a crucial component of clausal ellipsis (though it may happen for other reasons) (e.g., Den Dikken et al. 2000, Abe 2015). I take fragments to be derived by the condition in (2a) (similar to that proposed by Abe 2015) and licensed by the condition in (2b) (based on proposals by Merchant 2001 and Abe 2015):
  - (2) a. **Pronounce Focus:**  
Within a CP, pronounce (i.e., send to the PF component) only the smallest constituent containing all F-marks.
  - b. **Identification Condition on Clausal Ellipsis:**

A clause  $\alpha$  subject to PronFoc is ‘identified’ by an antecedent A if  $\alpha$  entails A.

- According to this analysis, the fragment in (1) is simply derived as in (3):

(3) [<sub>IP</sub> ~~this talk is about~~ [<sub>DP<sub>IF</sub></sub> ellipsis]]

- The elliptical clause in (1/3) is successfully identified by (2b), as (3) entails *This talk is about some area of linguistics*.
- The situation is different when the remnant is contrastive, as in (4):

(4) a. A: This talk is about PROLEPSIS.  
       B: No, ELLIPSIS.  
       b. {*this talk is about ELLIPSIS, this talk is about PROLEPSIS, ...*}

- *This talk is about ellipsis* does not entail *This talk is about prolepsis*, so condition (2b) cannot apply here. Nevertheless, there is clearly an identity requirement of some kind on the non-focused material (the ‘background’). In this case, I assume – as is generally assumed in some form – that contrastive fragments are ‘identified’ by a parallelism requirement on the focus-background structures of the two clauses. In (4), then, both A and B clauses must have the background  $\lambda x$ .*this talk is about x* (alternatively, select from a set of contextually determined propositions such as (4b)).<sup>1</sup>
- This is where the present analysis differs from Abe’s (2015) ‘in situ’ analysis of clausal ellipsis. Abe assumes that although the remnant does not undergo overt movement (and hence ellipsis is not constituent deletion), it does undergo covert movement (to satisfy the same feature that would be satisfied by overt *wh*/focus-movement), regardless of whether it is a new information or a contrastive focus. By contrast, I assume that the condition in (2b) is all that is needed to license clausal ellipsis where the remnant is a new information focus.
- Under the simplest mapping from syntax to information structure, the background would correspond to a syntactic constituent. Indeed, it has been argued that this is the function of A’-focus-movement: it enables ‘background-marking’ (e.g., Neeleman & van de Koot 2008), the costly movement operation being compensated for by the simplified syntax-information structure mapping.
- Yet A’-focus-movement is typically restricted to contrastive and/or exhaustive foci (e.g., Prince 1981, É. Kiss 1998), which suggests that background-marking is only required (and movement licensed) for foci that involve selection out of a set of contextually specified elements (i.e., non-new-information foci), e.g. (4b):

(5) a. A: What did the boy eat?  
       B: #THE CAKE he ate.  
       b. A: The boy ate the salad, didn’t he?  
       B: No, THE CAKE he ate, not THE SALAD.

- Of course, A’-movement of contrastive foci is generally optional (see Neeleman & van de Koot 2008:145 fn. 9 for reasons to believe that background-marking is not achieved through covert focus-movement in this case). I assume that this is because background-marking can normally be achieved prosodically, via the intonational contour associated with contrastive focus. As Katz & Selkirk (2011) show, the intonational contours associated with contrastive and new information focus differ in terms of the relative phonetic prominence of the focused and the non-focused material in the same sentence (which is greater in the case of contrastive focus).

<sup>1</sup> Griffiths & Lipták (2014) argue that the ‘correlate’ in the antecedent clause (e.g., *the salad* in (5)) has to be a contrastive focus, but in fact the only requirement seems to be that it be a narrow focus. For example, the following exchange is felicitous:

(i) A: What did John eat?  
       B: He ate THE SALAD.  
       C: No, THE CAKE.

- If clausal ellipsis applies, then, this relative prominence is obscured, as the background material is not realised phonetically. This leaves A'-focus-movement as the only option available (though see section 3) for marking the background of a contrastive fragment, and thus satisfying the identification condition.

### 3. Island-sensitivity and the new information/contrastive distinction

#### 3.1. The basics: contrastive fragments are island-sensitive; new information fragments are not

- If new information fragments involve no movement of the remnant, we expect that they will never show island effects even if the remnant originates inside an island in the ellipsis site. On the other hand, contrastive fragments should always show island effects in this situation.
- As Griffiths & Lipták (2014) observe, this is generally the case:<sup>2</sup>

- (6) a. A: Abby speaks the same Balkan language that one of the boys speaks.  
       B: Yeah, CHARLIE.  
       b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?  
       B: \*No, CHARLIE.

- A similar contrast holds for sluicing; non-contrastive sluices are insensitive to islands while contrastive sluices are island-sensitive (e.g., Merchant 2001, 2008, Fukaya 2012):

- (7) a. Abby speaks the same Balkan language as one of the students, but I don't know which.  
       b. Abby speaks the same Balkan language that CHARLIE speaks, but I don't know which OTHER student. [\* on 'long reading']

- Griffiths & Lipták (2014) argue that the difference between new information and contrastive fragments is due to a difference in the nature of the remnant: an indefinite in new information fragments, and a (contrastively) focused phrase in contrastive fragments. They assume the PF-repair theory of island amelioration, according to which movement of the remnant out of an island does not cause a violation, as PF-deletion removes the offending configuration. Rather, (6b) is bad because the remnant undergoes covert focus-movement out of the island. As QR of indefinites (or existential closure of a choice function) does not obey islands, (6a) does not suffer from the same problem. As Barros et al. (2014) note, the idea that covert movement of the correlate is island-sensitive is problematic: e.g., under a PF theory of strong islands, it is surprising that movement only having effects at LF should be island-sensitive. The present analysis does not need to make this assumption, as I assume (following, e.g., Barros et al. 2014) that the island violation arises in the ellipsis site, and that the movement involved is overt.
- Barros et al. (2014) argue that island violations in fragments are due to a violation in the ellipsis site (i.e., PF-deletion does not repair island violations): apparent repair is due to the use of a non-island-containing ellipsis site (an 'evasion strategy') which is semantically identical (in some sense) to the antecedent clause. Thus, (6b) is the expected case: *Charlie* must move out of the complex DP, and there is no evasion strategy (short

<sup>2</sup> A reviewer (a native speaker of a South Slavic variety) notes that the equivalent of (i) is unacceptable in her/his language. For me, it is perfect provided 'Beatles' receives main sentential stress:

- (i) A: A book that talks about one of the BEATLES has just come out.  
       B: Yes, RINGO.

As for the South Slavic facts – and similar facts reported for German (Abels 2011, Barros et al. 2014) and Russian (Elena Titov p.c.) – I suggest that this may have to do with the fact that these languages have stricter requirements on the relation between constituent order and focus. For example, Russian has been argued to require new information foci to originate in a clause-final position, while contrastive foci must occur preverbally or clause-initially (Neeleman & Titov 2009). One possibility, then, is that even new information fragments in these languages require the remnant to be clause-peripheral (this is reminiscent of Stepanov's (1998) analysis of multiple *wh*-questions as involving multiple focus-movement). The alternative that Barros et al. (2014) propose for German – that English examples such as (i) involve a truncated cleft source (*Yes, it's RINGO*), accounting for the lack of island effect, while German examples normally disallow this for reasons of case mismatch – will not work for Russian, as new information sluicing and fragments in this language are island-sensitive even where the remnant is nominative (the same case found in truncated clefts) (Elena Titov, p.c.). Nevertheless, the observation of Barros et al. that German new information fragments show island-insensitivity when the remnant is nominative is difficult to account if truncated clefts are never permitted in ellipsis sites, as are the preposition-stranding facts discussed by Rodrigues et al. (2009) and van Craenenbroeck (2010, 2013).

source, truncated cleft) that would work here. In (6a), the ellipsis site can contain a truncated cleft (*it's Charlie*), and provided that there is no 'cleft clause' here (which would replicate the island problem), we expect there to be no island violation. While it is difficult to argue with the claim that TCs can be used in ellipsis sites to obviate certain violations (in particular, P-stranding violations; e.g., van Craenenbroeck 2010), Sato (2016) notes that Indonesian shows island amelioration in new information fragments despite the fact that a TC would be ungrammatical, so it appears that the in situ strategy must also be available, and Russian presents the converse case where a TC would be grammatical but a fragment would not (see note 2), so the question of how to regulate the appearance of TCs in ellipsis sites remains open. The present analysis leaves open the possibility that TCs are never used to remedy island violations, only to remedy P-stranding violations (though it is not clear why).

- Abe (2015) argues that all remnants undergo covert movement. He assumes (following Abe & Hornstein 2012) that covert movement (in the sense of movement that would be overt normally, but is covert in the case of ellipsis) is not subject to islands; hence the acceptability of (6a). On the other hand, he follows Merchant (2008) in assuming that the island violation in (6b) follows from covert movement of the correlate in the antecedent clause. He takes the difference between the two types of covert movement to be in the fact that the movement in the elliptical clause is potentially overt, but turns out to be covert because of an economy condition ruling out pronunciation of the top copy if the two are 'adjacent'. On the other hand, covert movement of the correlate in (6b) is 'inherently covert', rather than covert because of this adjacency condition, and he takes this movement to be subject to islands. This distinction seems to be highly artificial, and the fact that the present analysis derives the difference between (6a/b) without such a difference is an advantage.

### 3.2. The 'utterance-final effect'

- Barros et al. (2014) observe that the island-sensitivity of contrastive fragments disappears if the correlate is utterance-final:

- (8) a. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?  
 B: \*No, CHARLIE.
- b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that spoken by BEN?  
 B: (?)No, CHARLIE.

- According to their theory, apparent island repair is due to the use of a non-island-containing ellipsis site that is semantically identical (in some sense) to the antecedent clause. In this case, they suggest that the 'utterance-final effect' (UFE) in (8b) can be accounted for by the use of a truncated cleft (*it's Charlie*) in the ellipsis site, as the TC is also acceptable as a response to A. They do not account for the acceptability of the TC, however, which should still be unacceptable under their analysis (see section 4). Furthermore, there are cases discussed below in which the fragment shows the UFE but the TC does not, which suggests that the UFE in fragments must have an explanation independent of TCs.
- I would like to argue that the UFE has the same origin as the 'scope extension' property of focus-sensitive quantifiers (e.g., *not*, *only*, *even*): when attached to an embedded DP, such quantifiers can take main clause scope if the DP is a clause-final direct object, but not if it is, e.g., a subject (e.g., Taglicht 1984, Rooth 1985, Bayer 1996, Kayne 1998, Blaszcak & Gärtner 2005):

- (9) a. She has requested that they read not a single linguistics book.  
 (*request* > *not*, *not* > *request*)
- b. She has requested that not a single student read our book.  
 (*request* > *not*, \**not* > *request*)

- Blaszcak & Gärtner (2005) argue (contra, e.g., Kayne 1998) that it is problematic to account for the contrast in Q-scope extension in terms of restrictions on syntactic movement (either QR or a series of overt

movements) of the QP.<sup>3</sup> Instead they propose a condition on Q-scope extension requiring the extended scope of *not* to correspond to a “linearly and prosodically continuous string”.

- That linear continuity is relevant is shown by the fact that Q-scope extension is impossible if the QP is a non-clause-final object:

- (10) a. They have requested that we turn down no one.  
(*request* > *not*, *not* > *request*)  
b. They have requested that we turn no one down.  
(*request* > *not*, \**not* > *request*)

- That prosodic continuity is relevant is shown by the fact that inserting intonational/intermediate phrase boundaries, or shifting the focus away from the QP, prevents Q-scope extension:

- (11) a. She has requested || that they read not a single linguistics book.  
b. She requested that the students who finish first | read not a single linguistics book.  
c. She requested that THEY read not a single linguistics book.  
(All: *request* > *not*, \**not* > *request*)

- The same is true of the UFE (taken here to be the result of ‘focal scope extension’). The relevance of linear continuity to focal scope extension is observed by Barros et al. (2014) (hence the name ‘utterance-final effect’), and illustrated by, e.g.:

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

- An example testing for the relevance of intonational phrase boundaries to focal scope extension is given in (13b), involving a *wh*-island. As parentheticals correspond to intonational phrases, this should prevent focal scope extension if prosodic continuity is required, and this seems correct (cf. the non-island-containing long-distance case in (13c)):

- (13) a. A: Did Ben ask whether I offended ABBY?  
B: ?No, BETH.  
b. A: Did Ben ask, as far as you know, whether I offended ABBY?  
B: ?\*No, BETH.  
c. A: Did Ben say, as far as you know, that I offended ABBY?  
B: ?No, BETH.

- Finally, the use of a ‘heavy’ subject, introducing an intermediate phrase boundary, prevents focal scope extension in (14b):

- (14) a. A: Did Ben leave because you offended ABBY?  
B: ?No, BETH.  
b. A: Did Ben leave because that guy over there | offended ABBY?  
B: ?\*No, BETH.

---

<sup>3</sup> As B&G note, Kayne (1998) provides no detailed account of the difference between (9a,b), beyond suggesting that it may have the same source as ECP effects. B&G point out that this incorrectly predicts that pre-subject adverbials should facilitate Q-scope extension, just as they remedy *that*-trace effects. With respect to (10), Kayne suggests that the ‘long-distance particle-preposing’ needed to derive (10b) may be unavailable, but B&G show that two potential ways of implementing this (Pred in a higher clause does not constitute an available landing site for particles, as a result of ‘lexical factors’; taking the clause boundary to be a ‘barrier’ for movement of the particle) are not workable.

- I suggest that the Q-scope extension seen in (9a/10a) is parasitic on focal scope extension.<sup>4</sup> Suppose a third option for marking a background is via the rule below:<sup>5</sup>

(15) Mark Background:<sup>6</sup>

Divide a clause into two linear strings, focus and background, the latter of which must be linearly and prosodically continuous.

- Recall that, according to the present proposal, the background of a contrastive focus must be ‘identified’ (prosodically, syntactically or linearly). In cases of clausal ellipsis, where prosody is not available to mark the background, movement of the focus is obligatory in examples such as (16a); hence the island violation.
- On the other hand, Mark Background can apply where the focus is clause-final, as the background will form a single string even without focus-movement, as in (16b):

(16) a. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?

B: \*No, CHARLIE.

[<sub>IP</sub> CHARLIE<sub>i</sub> ~~Abby speaks~~ [<sub>C,DP</sub> ~~the same language that’s spoken by t<sub>i</sub>~~]<sub>BG</sub>]

b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that’s spoken by BEN?

B: (?)No, CHARLIE.

[<sub>IP</sub> ~~Abby speaks~~ [<sub>C,DP</sub> ~~the same language spoken by~~]<sub>BG</sub> CHARLIE<sub>i</sub>]

- Further evidence that Q-scope and focal scope extension pattern together comes from Italian, which allows both preverbal and postverbal subjects. With preverbal subjects, neither Q-scope extension nor focal scope extension is possible; with postverbal clause-final subjects, both are possible (Longobardi 1992, Ludovico Franco p.c.):

(17) a. È proprio necessario che solo GIANNI ci venga a trovare. (Longobardi 1992)

is really necessary that only Gianni us comes to visit

(*necessary* > *only*; \**only* > *necessary*)

b. È proprio necessario che ci venga a trovare solo GIANNI.

is really necessary that us comes to visit only Gianni

(*necessary* > *only*; ***only*** > ***necessary***)

Both: ‘It is only really necessary that Gianni come to visit us.’

(18) a. A: Gianni ha lasciato la festa perché MARIA non avrebbe ballato con lui?

Gianni has left the party because Maria not had danced with him

B: \*No, LUISA.

b. A: Gianni ha lasciato la festa perché hai offeso MARIA?

Gianni has left the party because you.have offended Maria

B: No, LUISA.

c. A: Gianni ha lasciato la festa perché non avrebbe ballato con lui MARIA?

Gianni has left the party because not had danced with him Maria

B: No, LUISA.

<sup>4</sup> I say ‘parasitic’ because Q-scope extension is subject to island constraints, while focal scope extension obviously cannot be if the present proposal is correct. This suggests that Q-scope extension involves not just focal scope extension, which allows the Q-scope to cross clause boundaries, but an additional constraint on Q-scope (the exact nature of which I have nothing more to say about).

<sup>5</sup> It is tempting to treat background-marking via A’-movement as feeding Mark Background, but this would face the problem that the background in this case does not have to be prosodically continuous. Furthermore, clause-final foci can undergo A’-movement, which would be surprising if the only function of A’-focus-movement were to feed Mark Background; this suggests that ‘syntactic’ and ‘prosodic’ options are independently available. (The same is suggested for Q-scope extension by the fact that scope extension is possible via overt movement in, e.g., *Not a single linguistics book did she suggest that they read.*)

<sup>6</sup> The fact that background-marking both feeds scope and focus and has an effect on prosodic properties suggests a model of grammar along the lines proposed by Erteschik-Shir (1997) and Zubizarreta (1998), in which a level of Focus Structure (the level at which background-marking and F-marking take place) intervenes between the syntax proper and the LF and PF components.

- We can also account for the fact that TCs do not consistently show the UFE (though see section 4). If contrastive foci must be licensed by background-marking, this forces the presence of a cleft clause (representing the background) in examples such as (19).
- Furthermore, under any analysis of clefts, they invariably involve movement (either of the focus itself or of a relative operator). (I argue in Reeve 2012 that this is to permit the cleft clause to function like a relative clause modifying the subject pronoun *it*.)
- Hence we expect contrastive TCs to be island-sensitive regardless of whether the focus is utterance-final (one exception being the case where a ‘short source’ is available; see Barros et al. 2014 for discussion):

- (19) a. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?  
 B: \*No, it's CHARLIE.
- b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that's spoken by BEN?  
 B: \*No, it's CHARLIE.

- (20) a. [<sub>IP</sub> it's CHARLIE [<sub>CP</sub> ~~who~~<sub>i</sub> C [<sub>IP</sub> Abby speaks [<sub>CP</sub> ~~the same Balkan language spoken by  $t_i$~~ ]]]] – ‘matching structure’
- b. [<sub>IP</sub> it's CHARLIE<sub>i</sub> [<sub>CP</sub>  ~~$t_i$~~  C [<sub>IP</sub> Abby speaks [<sub>CP</sub> ~~the same Balkan language that's spoken by  $t_i$~~ ]]]] – ‘raising structure’

- The UFE suggests that movement of the remnant in contrastive fragments is not motivated by a requirement for a focused constituent to enter a (feature-checking) relation with a functional head in the left periphery (e.g., Merchant 2004, Abe 2015). Rather, movement is only one way of satisfying a requirement for the background to be identified, a requirement that can also be satisfied in situ provided the conditions on Mark Background are met.

### 3.3. Previous (partially) in situ analyses

- The above arguments against ‘generalised move-and-delete’ do not necessarily apply with the same force to what we might call ‘partially in situ’ analyses. Weir (2014) argues that fragments involve movement at PF only, while Abe (2015) argues that they involve covert movement (interpreted as pronunciation of the lower copy within a single-cycle model of grammar).
- Weir (2014) notes that as well as the evidence that has been provided in favour of movement in fragments (Merchant’s 2001 P-stranding generalisation, the impossibility of bare Ns and Vs and finite TPs as fragments), there are many cases in which items that cannot move can be fragments: e.g., NPIs (Den Dikken et al. 2000), (*each*)...*the other*, bare QPs, particles and intransitive Ps. Furthermore, moved predicates do not permit inverse scope readings, but predicate fragments do. Weir suggests that the movement-suggesting cases plausibly involve ‘contextual’ restrictions (e.g., Abels’ 2012 use of PP as a phase to prevent P-stranding), while the non-movement-suggesting cases involve interpretative properties (scope, NPI-licensing). He proposes that fragments undergo movement at PF (accounting for the movement-suggesting properties) but not otherwise (accounting for the non-movement-suggesting properties).
- The present analysis accounts for Weir’s data concerning NPIs etc. in the same way as his analysis, at least in the case of new information fragments. On the other hand, at least NPIs and *the other* seem worse as contrastive fragments, which his analysis does not account for. Under the present analysis it could be accounted for if background-marking through syntactic movement is preferred over string-marking (perhaps because this provides a more transparent syntax-IS mapping):

- (21) A: What didn't John buy?  
 B: (?)Any wine.  
 C: #No, any beer.

- (22) A: Who does each of them hate?  
 B: His best friend.  
 C: #No, the other.

- Abe (2015), partially following Kimura (2010), argues that a covert movement approach can account for the lack of island effects in new information sluicing and fragments (see 3.1) while at the same time naturally accounting for the general patterning between movable constituents and possible remnants.
- As Ott & Struckmeier (2016) point out, the link between movability and possible fragments is not as clear-cut as it is often presented. The P-stranding generalisation of Merchant (2001) is often pointed out as strong evidence for movement in fragments, but a number of works have pointed out problems with the generalisation (e.g., Sato 2016). Similarly, Weir (2014) does not provide an account of all constituents that cannot move but can be fragments (e.g., particles, bare QPs), but these are accounted for naturally if the remnant of fragments does not move at all. A relatively accurate empirical generalisation would be that fragments are elements that can be maximally F-marked; perhaps if F-marking requires F to be a property of the entire projection, and cannot be restricted to the head (as seems natural), we can account for the impossibility of e.g. bare V or N fragments (Merchant 2004).

#### 3.4. Truncated clefts and the utterance-final effect

- Barros et al. (2014) observe that truncated clefts (TCs) generally pattern with fragments in terms of island-sensitivity: thus, new information TCs are island-insensitive while contrastive TCs are island-sensitive (the exception being where a ‘short source’ is available, just as for contrastive fragments):

- (23) a. A: Abby speak the same Balkan language that one of the boys speaks.  
 B: Yes, it's CHARLIE.
- b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?  
 B: \*No, it's CHARLIE.

- On the other hand, it was noted in section 3 that TCs do not always pattern with fragments in showing the UFE; see (24a). However, Barros et al. (2014) claim that TCs do show the UFE, giving (24b) as an example. They suggest that we would expect fragments and TCs to pattern together if TCs can be used in ellipsis sites to evade islands (see 3.2), but this leaves (24a) as a mystery.

- (24) a. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that's spoken by BEN?  
 B: ?No, CHARLIE.  
 B': ?\*No, it's CHARLIE.
- b. A: Did Ben leave the party because you offended ABBY?  
 B: ?No, BETH.  
 B': ?No, it was BETH.

- It is initially tempting to attribute the difference between (24a/b) to the potential availability of a ‘short source’ in (24a) as opposed to (24b), but as Barros et al. note, a short-source-based TC (*No, it was Beth that I offended*) in (24a) would not be an appropriate answer to A's question.
- So what is behind the contrast? It is telling that TCs that show the UFE appear to be those in which the island is a clausal adjunct that could potentially itself be a cleft focus:

- (25) a. A: Did Ben leave the party because you offended ABBY?  
 B: ?No, BETH.  
 B': ?No, it was BETH.  
 B'': No, it was because I offended BETH (that Ben left the party).
- b. A: Did Ben leave the party before you offended ABBY?  
 B: ?No, BETH.  
 B': ?No, it was BETH.  
 B'': No, it was before I offended BETH (that Ben left the party).
- c. A: Will Ben leave the party when you offend ABBY?  
 B: ?No, BETH.  
 B': ?No, it will be BETH.  
 B'': No, it's when I offend BETH (that Ben will leave the party).



- d. A: Did Ben leave the party so he could avoid ABBY?  
 B: ?No, BETH.  
 B': ?No, it was BETH.  
 B'': No, it was so he could avoid BETH (that Ben left the party).
- e. A: Will Ben leave the party if you offend ABBY?  
 B: ?No, BETH.  
 B': ?\*No, it's BETH.  
 B'': ?\*No, it's if I offend BETH (that Ben will leave the party).

- By contrast, TCs in which the island is a complex DP do not show the UFE (except where a 'short source' cleft clause can be used, in which case the UFE is irrelevant), even though the complex DP could itself be the cleft focus:

- (26) a. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that's spoken by BEN?  
 B: ?No, CHARLIE.  
 B': ?\*No, it's CHARLIE.  
 B'': No, it's the same Balkan language that's spoken by BEN (that Abby speaks).

- The same appears to be true of coordinate islands:

- (27) a. A: Does Abby speak French and GREEK?  
 B: ?No, ALBANIAN.  
 B': ?\*No, it's ALBANIAN.  
 B'': No, it's French and ALBANIAN (that Abby speaks).

- I suggest the following analysis. The acceptable TC responses involve a clausal island as the cleft focus, with two instances of background-marking: background-marking through movement of the clausal island (which represents a 'superordinate' question under discussion), and string-marking within the cleft focus.<sup>7</sup> Then the CP containing both undergoes Pronounce Focus:<sup>8</sup>

- (28) i. it was [<sub>CP</sub> because I offended<sub>BG2</sub> BETH]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>BG1</sub> that Ben left the party *t<sub>i</sub>*].  
 ii. it was [<sub>CP</sub> because I offended<sub>BG2</sub> BETH]<sub>i</sub> [<sub>BG1</sub> ~~that Ben left the party~~ *t<sub>i</sub>*].

- If background-marking is restricted to CPs (e.g., Szendrői 2010), we predict that the derivation in (28) will not be possible for complex DPs or coordinate structures, as it will not be possible to mark all of the material to be elided by PronFoc as background. We also account for the fact that, while fragments show the UFE in the case of definite DP islands (Barros et al. 2014:40), TCs do not:

- (29) A: Did you steal Mary's picture of PRINCE?  
 B: ?No, ELVIS.  
 B': ?\*No, it was ELVIS.  
 B'': No, it was [<sub>DP</sub> Mary's picture of ELVIS] that I stole.

- If correct, this analysis provides further evidence against the generalised move-and-delete analysis of CE: what is deleted in (28ii) does not correspond to a single clausal constituent.

#### 4. Conclusion

- The island pattern of fragments and truncated clefts sheds light on the derivation of clausal ellipsis: the island-insensitivity of new information fragments/TCs is accounted for if the remnant does not move, while

<sup>7</sup> I am assuming here that *because*, *before* etc. form part of the clausal extended projection, just as prepositions selecting DPs have been argued to form part of the extended projection of DP (e.g., Grimshaw 1991).

<sup>8</sup> This raises questions about what it means for there to be two instances of background-marking: do they 'add up' to one background, or do they involve two backgrounds representing two 'questions under discussion'? I leave these questions for future research.

the island-sensitivity of contrastive fragments/TCs is accounted for if the remnant must move to enable background-marking.

- The exception to the movement requirement is when the remnant is utterance-final, in which case background-marking of a string can take place with the remnant in situ. This is supported by the parallel with Q-scope extension, which Błaszczak & Gärtner (2005) show does not involve movement of the QP. This provides evidence against accounts of fragments in which movement is a crucial step in ellipsis.
- The fact that TCs do not consistently show the utterance-final effect provides further evidence against such an analysis: a plausible analysis of the difference between, e.g., clausal islands with *because* and *if* involves movement of the clausal island containing the remnant, which is not possible under a generalised move-and-delete analysis.
- The analysis/facts seem to be neutral on the question of whether island amelioration takes place by literal repair through PF-deletion (e.g., Merchant 2001, 2008, Fox & Lasnik 2003, Griffiths & Lipták 2014) or through the use of non-island-containing sources (e.g., Merchant 2001, Fukaya 2007, 2012, Barros et al. 2014).

## References

- Abe, J. 2015. *The in-situ approach to sluicing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Abe, J. & N. Hornstein. 2012. 'Lasnik-effects' and string-vacuous ATB movement. In: M. Uribe-Etxebarria & V. Valmala (eds.), *Ways of structure building*, 169-205. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Abels, K. 2011. Don't fix that island! It ain't broke. Paper presented at the Islands in Contemporary Syntactic Theory Conference, Vitoria-Gasteiz. Barros, M. 2014. Sluicing and identity in ellipsis. Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University. Barros, M., P. Elliott & G. Thoms. 2014. There is no island repair. Ms., Rutgers University / University College London / University of Edinburgh. Bayer, J. 1996. *Directionality and Logical Form*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. Błaszczak, J. & H.-M. Gärtner. 2005. Intonational phrasing, discontinuity, and the scope of negation. *Syntax* 8: 1-22. Chung, S., W. A. Ladusaw & J. McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and Logical Form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3: 239-282. É. Kiss, K. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74: 245-273. Erteschik-Shir, N. 1997. *The dynamics of focus structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Fox, D. & H. Lasnik. 2003. Successive-cyclic movement and island repair: the difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:143-154. Fukaya, T. 2007. Sluicing and stripping in Japanese and some implications. Ph.D. dissertation, USC. Fukaya, T. 2012. Island-sensitivity in Japanese sluicing and some implications. In: J. Merchant & A. Simpson (eds.), *Sluicing: cross-linguistic perspectives*, 123-163. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Griffiths, J. & A. Lipták. 2014. Contrast and island sensitivity in clausal ellipsis. *Syntax* 17: 189-234. Grimshaw, J. 1991. Extended projection. Ms., Brandeis University. Katz, J. & E. Selkirk. 2011. Contrastive focus vs. discourse-new: evidence from phonetic prominence in English. *Language* 87: 771-816. Kayne, R. 1998. Overt vs. covert movement. *Syntax* 1: 12-191. Kimura, H. 2010. A *wh*-in-situ strategy for sluicing. *English Linguistics* 27: 43-59. Lasnik, H. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In: M.-J. Kim & U. Strauss (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 31*, vol. 2, 301-320. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, GLSA. Lasnik, H. & M.-K. Park. 2003. The EPP and the Subject Condition under sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 649-660. Longobardi, G. 1992. In defense of the Correspondence Hypothesis: island effects and parasitic constructions in Logical Form. In: C.-T. J. Huang & R. May (eds.), *Logical structure and linguistic structure: linguistic perspectives*, 149-196. Dordrecht: Springer. Merchant, J. 2001. *The syntax of silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27: 661-738. Merchant, J. 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In: K. Johnson (ed.), *Topics in ellipsis*, 132-153. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Neeleman, A. & E. Titov. 2009. Focus, contrast, and stress in Russian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40: 514-524. Neeleman, A. & H. van de Koot. 2008. Dutch scrambling and the nature of discourse templates. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11: 137-189. Ott, D. & V. Struckmeier. 2016. Deletion in clausal ellipsis: remnants in the middle field. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 22: 225-234. Prince, E. F. 1981. Topicalization, focus-movement, and Yiddish-movement: a pragmatic differentiation. *Proceedings of BLS 7*, 249-64. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society. Reeve, M. 2012. *Clefts and their relatives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Rooth, M. 1985. Association with focus. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Ross, J. R. 1969. Guess who? In: R. Binnick, A. Davison, G. Green & J. Morgan (eds.), *Proceedings of CLS 5*: 252-286. Sato, Y. 2016. Deriving fragments in Indonesian without movement: toward an in-situ theory of clausal ellipsis. Ms., National University of Singapore. Stepanov, A. 1998. On *wh*-fronting in Russian. *Proceedings of NELS 28*: 453-467. Szczegielniak, A. 2008. Islands in sluicing in Polish. In: N. Abner & J. Bishop (eds.), *Proceedings from the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 404-412. Somerville, CA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Szendrői, K. 2010. A flexible approach to discourse-related word order variations within the DP. *Lingua* 120: 864-878. Taglicht, J. 1984. *Message and emphasis: on focus and scope in English*. London & New York: Longman. van Craenenbroeck, J. 2010. Invisible Last Resort: a note on clefts as the underlying source for sluicing. *Lingua* 120: 1714-1726. van Craenenbroeck, J. 2013. Ellipsis, identity, and accommodation. Ms., CRISSP/Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel/KULeuven. Weir, A. 2014. Fragments and clausal ellipsis. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Zubizarreta, M.-L. 1998. *Prosody, focus, and word order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.