**Reprise Fragments in Minimalism: an in-situ analysis**

James Griffiths, University of Konstanz
Güliz Güneş, University of Leiden
Anikó Lipták, University of Leiden

Although *reprise fragments* (RFs) such as (1B′) have received much attention in monostratal generative frameworks (e.g. Ginzburg & Cooper 2004), RFs remain unexamined from a Minimalist perspective.

(1) A: Pass me the monkey-wrench. B: Pass you {the MONKEY-WRENCH / the WHAT}?
B′: {the MONKEY-WRENCH / the WHAT}?

Adopting the orthodox Minimalist assumption that all fragments are derived from full-fledged utterances via PF-deletion/ellipis (cf. Merchant 2001 et seq.), **this paper will**:

(i) describe the major characteristics of RFs in English (a *wh*-movement language) and Hungarian (a focus-movement language) and demonstrate that they pose problems for Merchant's (2004) 'move-and-delete' (M&D) analysis of fragmentry responses.

(ii) offer a Minimalist analysis of both standard non-*wh* fragments and reprise fragments in these languages that makes no recourse to exceptional $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement of the remnant of ellipsis.

**Problems for M&D.** Merchant (2004) argues that standard fragments undergo $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement out of the ellipsis site so that the input for deletion is a constituent (see 2B, where grey highlighting = deletion). Among other things, support for this analysis comes from island-sensitivity. Fragments for which a non-isomorphic source is unavailable (see Merchant 2001, Barros et al. 2014 for details) and whose correlate is contained in a syntactic island are unacceptable. This is straightforwardly explained if the fragment undergoes island-violating $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement from inside the elided clause (3B).

(2) A: Who did John kiss? B: [ MARY$_1$ [ John kissed $t_1$ ] ].

(3) A: [$_{\text{ISLAND}}$ The rumour that John is dead] must be false.
B: * No, [ MARY$_1$ [ [$_{\text{ISLAND}}$ the rumour $t_1$ is dead] must be false] ].

Although Hungarian RFs are also unacceptable in such configurations (4B), English RFs are **acceptable**, as (5B) shows. The English case is problematic for the M&D approach, which presupposes that the fragment undergoes island-violating $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement to the clausal left-periphery.

(4) A: Vettem [$_{\text{ISLAND}}$ egy 20 kilós dinnyét]. B: * 20?
bought.1SG a 20 kilo.ADJ melon
'I bought a 20-kilo melon.'

(5) A: [$_{\text{ISLAND}}$ The rumour that Dracula is dead] must be false.
B: {DRACULA / that DRACULA is}?

The size of standard fragments is constrained by the QUD: standard fragments must correspond to the *wh*-phrase of an explicit or implicit *wh*-question (cf. Reich 2002) (6). Because a *wh*-phrase cannot denote a passive *v*P in standard English questions, the corresponding *v*P-fragment in (7B) is illicit.

(6) A: John has been spotted with a celebrity. Implicit Qs: *Who has he been spotted with?*
B: Yeah, (with) BEYONCÉ. *With whom has he been spotted?*

(7) A: John has been spotted with a celebrity. Implicit Qs: *Who has he been spotted with?*
B: * Yeah, been spotted with BEYONCÉ. * *What has he?*

Although Hungarian RFs are similarly constrained (8), English RFs can be larger than the *wh*-phrase of the apparent implicit QUD (9). We refer to such fragments as *oversized*.

(8) A: Nádasdynak adtak díjat. B: * Adtak DÍJAT?
Nádasdy.DAT give award-ACC give award-ACC
'An award was given to Nádasdy'

(9) A: John has been spotted with Beyoncé. B: Been spotted with BEYONCÉ? Surely not!

While oversized RFs are not directly problematic for the M&D approach, they are not straightforwardly accounted for by semantic licensing conditions that assume it, such as Weir's (2014).

**Analysis.** Our analysis of RFs has three parts. **First:** Like Merchant, we retain the notion that ellipsis targets a constituent. We claim that clausal ellipsis is generated by the rule in (10). Because this operation suppresses the realisation of all non-F-marked items (10), it allows for the F-marked constituents, i.e. fragments, to be phonologically realised in-situ (11).

(10) $[_{XP} \ldots ([ \ldots ]_F) \ldots ] \longrightarrow [_{XP\varnothing} \ldots ([_{\varphi} \ldots ]_F) \ldots ]$, where XP is licensed for clausal ellipsis
(*where φ = phonological realisation, ∅ = non-pronunciation, and F = F-marking*)

(11) A: What did John give to Mary? B: [$_{\varnothing}$ John gave [$_{\varphi}$ CHOCOLATES]$_F$ to Mary] .

**Second:** We claim that reprise fragments are surface anaphors licensed by a syntactically-derived QUD (which captures their surface anaphoric nature and their sensitivity to QUD-GIVENness, cf. Weir 2014). Furthermore, we argue that standard, non-reprise fragments are only licensed by standard, non-reprise QUDs, whereas RFs are licensed by reprise QUDs. On such an approach, the fragment in (3B) is unacceptable because the implicit QUD required to license it (namely, 12a) is unavailable because it is syntactically ungrammatical. In contrast, (5B) is acceptable because the implicit QUD required to license it (namely, 12b) is syntactically grammatical. Under this account, fragments themselves may stay in-situ: no recourse to A′-movement is necessary.

(12) a. *Who$_1$ [$_{ISLAND}$ the rumour that $t_1$ is dead] must be false?
b. [$_{ISLAND}$ The rumour that WHO is dead] must be false?

**Third:** Cable (2010) argues that *wh*-phrases and focused items denote sets that serve as inputs to choice-functions (CFs). The syntactic reflex of CFs are Q-morphemes, and the position of a Q-morpheme relative to a *wh*-phrase or a focused item determines whether *wh*-pied-piping or 'F-percolation' occurs (specifically, both phenomena are yielded whenever QP does not immediately dominate a *wh*-phrase or focus). Instead of fragments having to correspond to the *wh*-phrase of a QUD (as suggested above with respect to 7B), in Cable's framework a fragment must equate with, or be a member of, the semantic sister of the Q-morpheme. We argue that, although English standard questions involve *QP-complementation* and $\overline{\text{A}}$-movement (13a), English reprise questions are derived via *QP-adjunction* to any phrase that dominates an echoed word (13b). This freedom of QP-adjunction allows for the existence of an oversized RF such as (9B), which corresponds to the semantic sister of Q in the QUD that licenses it, namely (13b).

(13) a. [$_{CP}$ Op$_i$ [$_{QP}$ Q$_i$ [$_{PP}$ with whom]]$_1$ [ has he been spotted $t_1$]]]?
b. [$_{CP}$ Op$_i$ [ he has [$_{vP}$ [$_{QP}$ Q$_i$ ] [$_{vP}$ been spotted with {WHO/BEYONCÉ}]]]]?

Hungarian RFs pattern with standard fragments rather than English RFs because, as a focus-movement language (cf. Horvath 1986), it derives both standard and reprise questions via focus-movement, which can be represented using a 'QP-schema' similar to (13a) (Cable 2010:202-206). As such, oversized RFs are unavailable because the position of QP is highly constrained, and its RFs are island-sensitive because focus-movement is island-sensitive (Krifka 2006). In our talk, we provide evidence for this claim and also give reasons for dismissing the notion that Hungarian RFs are merely 'pseudo-RFs' (see Sobin 2010). To increase cross-linguistic coverage, we also discuss RFs in Turkish, a {*wh*/focus}-in-situ language, and show that Turkish RFs pattern with English rather than Hungarian RFs.

**Conclusion.** The cross-linguistic distribution of RFs motivates a Minimalist analysis of fragmentary responses that treats non-*wh* standard fragments and RFs as in-situ (in languages without overt focus-movement) and subject to a syntactised QuD-licensing condition. This analysis is therefore closely aligned with analyses from other frameworks (e.g. Ginzburg & Sag's 2000 HPSG account), which is

clearly a welcome result.