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:

\[
\begin{align*}
A: \text{Who did John kiss?} & \quad \Rightarrow \text{B: } [FP \text{ Mary } F \{ John \text{ kissed } t \}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Q: Would John hire somebody } & \text{ [CP who fixes cars with a hammer]}? \\
\text{A: } \#\text{No, a monkey wrench.}
\end{align*}
\]

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 accommodated QUD. However, \textit{ex-situ} questions extracting the island-internal focus are impossible, while (possible) \textit{in-situ} questions are contextually infelicitous. Island-internal material \textit{can} be isolated by clausal ellipsis if no new QUD needs to be accommodated:

\[
\begin{align*}
A’: \text{A hammer? Yes, he would!} & \quad \text{ (repetition of QUD)} \\
A”: \text{A screw driver, you mean? Yup!} & \quad \text{ (correction of QUD)}
\end{align*}
\]

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