QUD-anaphoricity of Fragments and Constraints on Clausal Ellipsis

Dennis Ott
University of Ottawa
dott@uottawa.ca

Volker Struckmeier
University of Cologne
volker.struckmeier@uni-koeln.de

Tag
Datum
Zeit
Raum

In this talk, we argue that a conception of fragments as anaphoric to *Questions under Discussion* is better-suited to capture constraints on clausal ellipsis than the widely-adopted movement-based approach.

On Merchant's (2004) move-and-delete analysis (MDA), short answers are derived by A'-movement of the focus and subsequent PF-deletion:

(1)   A: Who did John kiss? – B: [$_{FP}$ Mary F ~~John kissed t~~]

However, some immobile elements are licit fragments (Weir 2014), including German modal particles, which are neither mobile *nor* focusable (Ott & Struckmeier in press); conversely, some mobile and focusable categories *cannot* function as fragments (Krifka 2006). However, in some cases islands appear to constrain fragment formation:

(2)   Q: Would John hire somebody [$_{CP}$ who fixes cars with A HAMMER]?
      A: #No, A MONKEY WRENCH.

We argue that cases of this kind do not support the MDA. The polar question Q is resolved by "No" in A. Therefore, "a monkey wrench" must answer an accomodated QUD. However, *ex-situ* questions extracting the island-internal focus are impossible, while (possible) *in-situ* questions are contextually infelicitous. Island-internal material *can* be isolated by clausal ellipsis if *no* new QUD needs to be accommodated:

(3)   A': A hammer? Yes, he would!   (repetition of QUD)
         A'': A screw driver, you mean? Yup!   (correction of QUD)

We present further examples to support an approach to locality effects in clausal ellipsis based on discourse coherence rather than movement.

References: • Krifka 2006, in Molnár & Winkler, Architecture of focus. • Merchant 2004, Ling & Phil 27. • Ott & Struckmeier in press, LI 49. • Weir 2014, UMass-Amherst diss.