

More Variation in Island Repair: Clausal vs. Non-Clausal Islands*

Matthew Barros,¹ Patrick D. Elliott² and Gary Thoms³

Rutgers University,¹ University College London,² University of Edinburgh³

1 Introduction

Since Ross (1969), it has standardly been assumed that A'-movement under sluicing is island insensitive. Recently, Griffiths & Lipták (2012) have noted that fragment answers appear to behave the same way, apparently indicating that island repair under deletion is a general property of clausal ellipsis.¹ As an illustration, consider the sluice in (1a), and B's fragment in (1c). The remnant (the Wh-phrase in sluicing or the fragment in fragments) is extracted from a relative clause, and PF-deletion (represented via strikethrough) apparently renders the island violation acceptable.

- (1) a. They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language; ~~they hired someone who speaks t_i~~ .
- b. * They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language; they hired someone who speaks t_i .
- c. A: They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language.
B: Yes, Greek; ~~they hired someone who speaks t_i~~ , in fact.
B': *Yes, Greek; they hired someone who speaks t_i , in fact.

Some authors have challenged the assumption that the E(llipsis)-site hides an island violation in such cases (e.g., Merchant 2001, Fukaya 2007, Abels 2011, a.o.). Such work assumes that the E-site hides a non-island containing structure; either a shorter version of the antecedent (a *short source*), or some non-isomorphic structure. Under this view, (1a) would have the non-island containing structure in (2).

- (2) They hired someone who speaks a Balkan language, but I don't know which Balkan language; ~~s/he speaks t_i~~ .
(Where *s/he* = the person they hired.²)

Short sources such as this can be seen as an *island evasion strategy* which gives rise to a *repair illusion*, under the faulty assumption that the E-site hides an island

*We'd like to express our gratitude to participants of CLS 49, for insightful questions and fruitful discussion. Additionally, audience members at the Edinburgh Ellipsis Workshop, and the Edinburgh Meaning and Grammar Reading Group, where aspects of this work were originally presented. Many individuals have contributed through helpful discussion and acceptability judgements. In particular, we'd like to thank Klaus Abels, Zoltan Galsi, Timo Klein, Anikó Lipták, Jason Merchant, Ad Neeleman, and Jeroen van Craenenbroeck.

¹Merchant (2004) provides a lot of good evidence in support of an A'-movement+TP-deletion analysis of fragments.

²See Merchant (2001) for an account of how a short source (containing an e-type pronoun) can be shown to satisfy a concrete notion of semantic identity (specifically, e-GIVENness).

violation. Proponents of this view show that the evasion strategy in (2) can be controlled for, and when it is independently ruled out, island effects resurface, as would be predicted if there were no repair (see Fukaya 2007, Barros to appear).

In this paper we argue for the non-repair view. It has already been noted that the availability of repair is variable; for instance, Merchant (2008) claims that repair is unavailable in contrastive sluicing in English (i.e. when the remnant is contrastively focused), and Temmerman (2013) highlights differences between English and Dutch in the availability of repair. We contribute a new dimension of variability which cross-cuts the claims made by Merchant and Temmerman: the clausal/non-clausal island distinction. Specifically, we defend the generalization in (3):

- (3) Clausal islands show repair more readily than non-clausal islands.

We show that (3) follows not from some fundamental syntactic difference between clausal and non-clausal islands, but from the availability of evasion strategies: in general, clausal islands have more evasion strategies available than non-clausal islands, and are therefore more likely to yield repair illusions. We introduce two additional island evasion strategies in the course of the discussion, which, like short sources, can be controlled for, and when unavailable, yield island sensitivity.

We begin by looking at clausal islands, showing that variability in repair effects is not as clear cut as has been assumed in the recent literature (in particular Merchant 2008, Griffiths & Lipták 2012). Nonetheless, the observed gradience in acceptability between different example types tracks well-established properties of A'-movement. We also motivate a new evasion strategy we dub *Double Clausal Ellipsis* (DCE), accounting in the process for previously unnoticed subject/object asymmetries in repair. We then consider non-clausal islands, namely definite DPs and left branch islands, and we show that these give rise to repair illusions in a more restricted set of contexts. This is in line with the unavailability of short sources and DCE with non-clausal islands. The remaining cases of apparent repair in left branch sluices are correlated with the availability of a third evasion strategy: Predicative sources. Finally, we show that the same pattern can be seen in Dutch, which has been claimed to show pervasive repair (Temmerman 2013).

2 Clausal islands and 'double clausal ellipsis'

2.1 Contrastive sluicing and short sources

As noted in Fox & Lasnik (2003), Merchant (2008), contrastive sluicing is island sensitive. Sluicing remnants typically correspond to some XP in the antecedent, called the *correlate*. In contrastive sluicing, the remnant is contrastively focused with its correlate (indicated with italics below). Fukaya (2007), Griffiths & Lipták (2012) show that the same holds for fragments, so both contrastive sluicing and fragments pattern alike.

- (4) a. * The radio was playing a song that *Ringo* wrote, but I don't know who *else*_i the radio was playing a song that *t*_i wrote
b. A: Was the radio playing a song that *Ringo* wrote?
B: *No, *Lennon*_i the radio was playing a song that *t*_i wrote.
(From Merchant 2004, Merchant 2008)

The pattern in (4) differs from the non-contrastive pattern in (1). As noted in Barros (to appear), an interesting property of contrastive ellipses like those in (6b), is that a non-elliptical short source paraphrase for the E-site is typically infelicitous. Consider the putative overt short sources for the ellipses in (5) for instance:

- (5) a. # The radio was playing a song that *Ringo* wrote, but I don't know who *else* wrote {it/a song that the radio was playing}.
- b. A: Was the radio playing a song that *Ringo* wrote?
B: #No, *Lennon* wrote {it/a song that the radio was playing}.

Barros accounts for the infelicity by appealing to the theory of information structure in Roberts (1996). In short, narrow focus in the antecedent presupposes a discourse where only a non-short source is felicitous, with the result that there is a stronger parallelism requirement between the ellipsis clause and the antecedent (since they must both be non-short sources in order to be felicitous).³ In such cases, the corresponding overt *non*-short source would be congruent, as evidenced by the acceptability of the following:⁴

- (6) a. The radio was playing a song that *Ringo* wrote, but I don't know who *else* is such that the radio was playing a song that they wrote.
- b. A: Was the radio playing a song that *Ringo* wrote?
B: No, the radio was playing a song that *Lennon* wrote.

Of course, a non-short source for the ellipses in (4) would entail an island violation, since the remnants come to be such via A'-movement. Thus, contrastive cases such as those in (4) are stuck between a rock and a hard place under the non-repair approach, as neither the infelicitous island evasion strategy (a short source) nor the felicitous island violating strategy (non-short source) will yield acceptable results, correctly predicting the absence of repair illusions.

2.2 Variation with contrastive fragments

While the pragmatic account sketched above captures the indicated judgements, it turns out that there is no clean split between contrastive and non-contrastive clausal ellipsis with respect to the availability of repair illusions. A common objection is that there are many apparent island-escaping contrastive remnants that are a lot better than expected or even fully grammatical.⁵

- (7) a. A: Did they hire someone who works on *French* (last year)?
B: No, *German*.
- b. A: Did they leave because you offended *Mary*?
B: ?No, *Sarah*.

³For space reasons we cannot go into the formal details of the account, we refer the reader to Barros (to appear), Roberts (1996) for details.

⁴Since overt Wh-movement *is* island sensitive, we must resort to the, perhaps cumbersome, but evidently felicitous “such-that” construction for (6a).

⁵Jacobson (under review) disputes the claim that fragments are always island-sensitive in English, and we have bumped into resistance in our own presentation of the facts in related work over the years.

- c. They hired a multilingual person who speaks *Greek*, but I don't know which *other* languages.

Additionally, extraction of the remnant from a subject position yields stronger unacceptability than extraction from an object position:

- (8) a. A: Did Ben leave the party because *Abby* wouldn't dance with him?
B: *No, *Sally*.
- b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that *Ben* speaks?
B: *No, *Charlie*.

To back up the claim that variability in repair tracks structural properties of the antecedent, the third author conducted a small informal survey of twelve linguists. Subjects were asked to rate examples on a seven point Likert scale (1=*, 7= grammatical). The results are shown in the table below:⁶

Example	Mean rating
(7a)	6.7
(9) (7b)	5.1
(8a)	3.1
(8b)	1.1

The pragmatic account given for the split between contrastive and non-contrastive clausal ellipsis suggests a solution. Specifically, the context can be manipulated such that a short source follow-up is felicitous. Heuristically, we can check, for any given case, whether a non-island containing short source will be acceptable, the prediction being that the resulting judgement should coincide with the data reported in (9). This prediction is borne out for relative clause islands,⁷ but not for adjunct (*because*) islands:

- (10) Relative clause islands:
 - a. A: Did they hire someone who works on *French* (last year)?
B: No, (they work on) *German*. (cf. (7a))
 - b. A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that *Ben* speaks?
B: *No, *Charlie* (speaks it). (cf. (8b))
 - c. They hired a multilingual person who speaks *Greek*, but I don't know which *other* languages (s/he speaks).
- (11) *Because* islands:
 - a. A: Did they leave because you offended *Mary*?
B: No, (?I offended) *Sarah*. (cf. (7b))
 - b. A: Did Ben leave the party because *Abby* wouldn't dance with him?
B: No, *Sally* *(?wouldn't dance with him). (cf. 8a)

⁶For (7a), almost all speakers reported it as fully grammatical. For (7b), all scored between 4 and 6. For (8a), the majority scored around 3, and for (8b), the majority scored between 1 and 3.

⁷See Fukaya (2007) for detailed discussion of contrastive sluicing data like (10c).

For relative clauses, the acceptability of an overt short source tracks the acceptability of the corresponding sluice, as predicted. However, the facts are not so clean with adjunct *because* islands. In (11a), the fragment is better than the overt short source, whereas in (11b), the fragment is worse than the short source. In both cases, the short source is not terrible, but definitely degraded (intuitively, it addresses speaker A’s question indirectly at best).

We conclude that short sources cannot be the correct explanation for the amelioration patterns with *because* islands. The observation that overt short sources with *because* islands are ruled out is consistent with the information structure account proposed to capture the availability of repair illusions in contrastive vs. non-contrastive relative clause cases. In short, the short sources in (11a-11b) are out because speaker B’s short source response, in each case, fails to address speaker A’s question (it is an *incongruent* response, in the sense of Roberts 1996). Of course, the pattern itself tells us that short sources are unavailable, so something else must be behind both the amelioration we see in (11a), and the stronger-than-expected unacceptability we see in (11b).

2.3 Island pied-piping and double clausal ellipsis

To account for the pattern with *because* islands, we propose an additional evasion strategy consistent with the non-repair approach. As a tentative first step, observe that examples like (12) are possible, instantiating island pied piping (see Krifka 2006, Merchant 2004). Importantly, the ellipsis clause here corresponds to a non-short source, which would be felicitous and congruent with speaker A’s question.

- (12) A: Did they leave because you offended *Mary*?
 B: No, [because I offended *Sarah*]_i they left *t_i*.

Island pied-piping may be described as an evasion strategy in its own right, since it is a way of circumventing island violations in the overt syntax.⁸ Another relevant observation is that when an A’-operator that needs to move occurs in an island, in some cases the operator moves to the left periphery of the island in order to avoid getting “trapped” in the island. This is what is seen in Finnish, where *wh*P’s contained in islands first move to the edge of the island, and then the island is then pied-piped to the scope position of the operator (Huhmarniemi 2012).⁹

- (13) [CP₁ ... [island wh_i ... *t_i* ...]_j ...] → [CP₁ [island wh_i ... *t_i* ...]_j ... *t_j* ...]

A similar phenomenon can be observed in DP pied-piping in English DegP-questions; first the DegP moves to the left-periphery of the DP-island (DegP inversion), and then the island is pied-piped to the left periphery of the clause.

- (14) a. Mary married [[DegP how tall] [D a *t*_{DegP} man]]_j?
 b. [[DegP how tall] [D a *t*_{DegP} man]]_j did Mary marry *t_j*?

⁸Interestingly, Nishigauchi (1990) and Richards (2000) note that island pied-piping happens in *covert* syntax too. This is difficult to square with the PF theory of islands, which would seem to predict that covert syntax is unconstrained by islands.

⁹See Cheng & Demirdache (2010) for similar data from Romanian.

Thus island pied-piping is alive and well in the grammar of English. Our proposal is that these ingredients – movement to the edge of islands and island pied-piping – are involved in deriving examples like (7b) from an isomorphic source, without island repair. The steps are as follows:

- (15) a. The fragment first moves to the left edge of the island:
 $[_{CP_1} [_{TP} \text{they left } [_{CP_2} \text{Sarah}_i [_{C'} \text{because } [_{TP} \text{you offended } t_i]]]]]]$
- b. Clausal ellipsis applies once in the island:
 $[_{CP_1} [_{TP} \text{they left } [_{CP_2} \text{Sarah}_i [_{C'} \text{because } [_{TP} \text{you offended } t_i]]]]]]$
- c. The island is pied-piped to the left edge of the matrix CP:
 $[_{CP_1} [_{CP_2} \text{Sarah}_i [_{C'} \text{because } [_{TP} \text{you offended } t_i]]] [_{TP} \text{they left } t_{CP_2}]]]$
- d. Clausal ellipsis applies a second time in the matrix CP:
 $[_{CP_1} [_{CP_2} \text{Sarah}_i [_{C'} \text{because } [_{TP} \text{you offended } t_i]]] [_{TP} \text{they left } t_{CP_2}]]]$

All of the different steps involved in this sample derivation are independently available. Ellipsis in steps (15b) and (15d) is straightforwardly available in fragments, and focus movement to the left periphery in (15a) is possible in the absence of ellipsis in, e.g., Finnish and Romanian, but only with ellipsis in English. Island pied-piping in (15c) is also independently motivated, given the possibility of derivations like (14), and the possibility of the pied-piped island itself as a fragment in (12). As for the deletion of *because*, this is in keeping with Merchant’s 2001 Sluicing-COMP generalization, where no non-operator material may appear in the complementizer domain in clausal ellipses.¹⁰ The only real leap of imagination is allowing fronting to the left periphery of an island only when ellipsis applies (which we see overtly in Finnish and Romanian). Allowing for some overt movements to occur only when ellipsis applies seems inevitable in other contexts too (e.g., pseudogapping, most cases of stripping, multiple fragments, etc., see Thoms to appear), so this should not be too disturbing.¹¹

Since the proposed derivation for (7a) involves two applications of clausal ellipsis – one within the island and one at the matrix level – we describe this as a case of *double clausal ellipsis* (DCE). This evasion strategy involves exploiting two important facts about clauses: that their edges can be landing sites for movement, and that ellipsis may typically apply at this level. Importantly, DCE doesn’t just give us a way of accounting for apparent repair in object extraction cases like (7a), but it also give us an account of the fact that these differ from subject extraction cases like (8a), repeated here (recall they are consistently rated lower than object extractions like (7a)).

¹⁰See also Thoms 2010, where it is argued that movement of an element α licenses deletion of the sister of α ’s derived position. Under this account, sluicing involves deletion of C' , not TP.

¹¹Though it raises the interesting question of why *these* movements are ‘repaired’ by ellipsis, while island-escaping movements are not (as claimed here). One substantial difference is that the “exceptional” movements discussed by Thoms and invoked by us here are possible without ellipsis in other languages, whereas island-escaping movements are impossible (without ellipsis) in most or perhaps all languages. If cross-linguistic variation in the inventory of overt movement rules is largely a matter for the interfaces, most likely PF, then the repairability of the former class is unsurprising; on the other hand, if the impermeability of islands is not subject to substantial cross-linguistic variation, then we may expect them to be less likely to be repaired.

- (16) A: Did Ben leave the party because *Abby* wouldn't dance with him? B:
*No, *Beth*.

While DCE is an analytical option for (16) just as much as it is for (8a), here it would involve A'-movement from SpecTP to SpecCP, thus invoking a *that*-trace violation. We propose that is *not* repaired by ellipsis, as we do for other islands, which accounts for the fact that the subject extraction case remains degraded:¹²

- (17) [_{CP₁} [_{TP} Ben left [_{CP₂} Beth_i [_{C'} because [_{TP} t_i wouldn't dance with him]]]]]
*step 1

We conclude by noting that DCE will not work for relative clause islands, for a few reasons. First, [SpecCP] in relative clauses is filled by the relative pronoun, so it is not a possible landing site for movement of the fragment and subsequent application of clausal ellipsis (at least in English, but see Craenenbroeck & Lipták 2006 on Hungarian). Second, even if this were a possible landing site, the application of ellipsis inside the relative clause would still leave behind the external material of the relative clause, such as the determiner or the external head NP.¹³

2.4 Summary

In this section, we have covered two evasion strategies, short sources and DCE, and highlighted the fact that the data surrounding contrastive clausal ellipsis is more nuanced than has been assumed in the literature. An important feature of the analysis provided here is that “repair” fails when the evasion strategies are unavailable (as with e.g. (8b)) or if they lead to other kinds of violations (as with (16)).

3 Non-clausal islands

3.1 Non-repair with non-clausal islands

In this section, we discuss cases where neither short sources, nor DCE are available, by virtue of the fact that the island in which the remnant is contained is non-clausal, i.e. a DP. We account for the fact that some of these display apparent repair by introducing a new evasion strategy: a non-isomorphic, predicative source. Furthermore, we show that once predicative sources are controlled for, repair illusions vanish. The non-clausal islands we consider involve illicit extraction of a left-branch modifier from its host DP, (18-19) (Ross (1967)'s ‘Left Branch Condition’ (LBC)), and illicit extraction from a definite DP, (20).

¹²Note that it follows from our account that *that*-trace effects are not PF phenomena, contra Merchant (2001), Kandybowicz (2006), a.o.

¹³More needs to be said about how DCE is blocked from occurring with contrastive sluicing, which does not show repair with subject or object extractions. We posit that the key factor here is that (contrast) sluicing in English is generally not compatible with island pied-piping, a crucial ingredient of DCE.

- i. *They want to hire someone who speaks *French*, but I don't know someone who speaks *what other language*

- (18) *Whose did Bill steal [_{DP} *t* car]?
 (19) *How tall did Mary marry [_{DP} *t* man]?
 (20) ?* Who did you take [_{DP} John's picture of *t*]?

It has already been noted in Merchant (2004) that left branch extractions in contrastive fragments (CFrs) are unacceptable, (21a).¹⁴ Extraction from definite DPs yields similar ungrammaticality, (21b).

- (21) a. A: Did Abby vote for a *Green* party?
 B: *No, *Reform*_i Abby voted for [_a *t*_i party]. (left branch)
 b. A: Did you give Mary's picture of *Prince* to her?
 B: *?No, *Elvis*_i I gave [_{Mary's picture of} *t*_i] to her. (definite DP)

The third author, in addition to collecting the data reported in (9), also checked examples like (21a-21b). The mean score for examples like (21a) was 1.1 on the seven point Likert scale (all but one participant rated such examples as 1). (21b) fared better with a mean of 3.1 (mode = 3), but this difference is expected given that LBC-violations are generally much more severe than extraction from definite DPs:

- (22) *It's *reform* that I voted for a *t* party.
 (23) ?* It's *Prince* that I gave Mary's picture of *t* to her.

Relevant here is the observation that CFrs can in fact target XPs within DPs when the DP is not an island, as in extraction from PP complements to indefinite DPs.

- (24) A: Did you give a picture of *Prince* to Mary?
 B: No, *Elvis*_i I gave [_a picture of *t*_i] to her.
 (25) It was *Elvis*_i that I gave a picture of *t* to her.

Thus it is not some general property of DPs that they are incompatible with CFrs that require subextraction, but rather that the extraction must not require crossing an island boundary. The lack of repair illusions here is expected on the present account, since these environments are not amenable to the use of the evasion strategies discussed in the previous section: there are no congruent short source variants of the DP islands which avoid the island violations, and DCE is not possible since they are not clauses (and DPs do not host left-peripheral ellipsis of the kind seen in clauses).

3.2 Explaining repair illusions with non-clausal islands

With respect to LBC violations, the datum in (21a) is consistent with the non-repair approach thus far defended. However, since Merchant (2001), Kennedy & Merchant (2000), it has standardly been assumed that LBC violations are repaired in sluicing contexts, based on data like that in (26):

- (26) Mary married a tall man, but I'm not sure [how tall]_i; ~~she married a *t*_i man.~~

¹⁴The claim in Merchant (2004) was that fragments in general are island sensitive. This conclusion is no longer tenable given results in Griffiths & Lipták (2012).

We present evidence here from non-predicative adjectival remnants that challenges this assumption. A motivation for focusing on adjectival remnants here comes from the basic observation that the diagnosis of e.g., possessive left branch violations is confounded by the possibility of Noun Phrase Ellipsis (NPE) ((27a)), whereas attributive APs do not license NPE ((27b)).

- (27) a. Jane kissed Mary's husband, and Susan kissed Helen's husband.
b. * Mary married a tall man, and Jane married a short man.

NPE can thus create the illusion of LBE with possessives, since sluicing with a possessive remnant could in fact just be sluicing with a full DP remnant in which NPE has applied. No such illusion can be created with English adjectival remnants, however, so these seem to be genuine cases of AP-extraction, though whether the AP is extracted from a left branch remains to be established.

3.3 Left branch extraction and predicative sources

To account for cases of apparent LBC violation repair, we propose an additional evasion strategy. Specifically, we provide evidence that the E-site in such cases is actually a predicative copula clause.

- (28) Mary married a tall man, but I'm not sure [how tall]_i ~~he was~~ _{t_i}.

In support of this claim, we provide two sorts of evidence: (i) Data from Case concord in German and Dutch, and (ii) the lack of repair effects in English with non-predicative adjectival remnants. In German/Dutch, such sluicing remnants show the Case we would expect on the remnant were the E-site to hide a predicative structure. In English, the unavailability of repair illusions with attributive-only adjectives supports the notion that the remnant in examples like (26-30) stems from a predicative source, where the remnant is extracted from the predicative, post-copular position.

Data from Case concord in German/Dutch suggest that the remnant AP is not merged as an NP-modifier, and hence that the E-site is not, in fact, isomorphic with the antecedent. Perhaps surprisingly, the adjectival Wh-remnant must show up in its bare form, patterning with an AP predicate.^{15,16} First consider (29a) and (30a), which illustrate predicative clauses where the post-copular adjective shows no agreement. This is distinct from (29b) and (30b), where an AP modifier of NP obligatorily agrees in Case with that NP. As (29c) and (30c) show, the agreement pattern consistent with prenominal modifiers is unacceptable in a sluice.

German

¹⁵Many languages which seem to show Case-matching effects on APs, such as Greek, independently allow post-adjectival NPE, making it difficult to draw any conclusion regarding island evasion vs. repair.

¹⁶Merchant (2001) acknowledges these facts, but resists the conclusion that this is evidence for a predicative analysis, speculating that "... this lack [of adjectival agreement] may open an interesting window into the nature of the inflection itself" (pg. 233). Merchant provides two reasons for not adopting a predicative analysis: (i) it would apparently require loosening of the identity condition on ellipsis, and (later on) (ii) we see repair by deletion with LBC violation in the domain of attributive comparative subdeletion as well (see e.g. Kennedy & Merchant 2000). Here we'll argue that the loosening of the identity condition is inevitable. For alternative analyses of the comparative subdeletion facts, see Izvorski (1995) and Kennedy (2002).

- (29) a. Der Mann ist groß(*en).
The man is tall(.AC).
- b. Lena hat einen groß*(en) Mann geheiratet.
Lena has a tall(.ACC) man married.
- c. Lena hat einen großen Mann geheiratet, aber ich weiß nicht wie groß(*.en)
Lena 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.”

Dutch (Merchant 2001 p.236-247)

- (30) a. De man is lang(*e).
The man is tall(.ACC).
- b. Zij hebben een lang*(e) man aangesteld.
They have a tall(.ACC) man hired.
- c. Zij hebben een lange man aangesteld, maar ik weet niet hoe lang(*.e)
They have a tall.ACC man hired, but I know not how tall(.ACC).
“They hired a tall man, but i don’t know how tall.”

A potential counterargument to the relevance of the above data comes from Baker (2008), who claims German and Dutch are exceptions to a wider generalization that predicates show richer agreement than modifiers; thus Baker argues that Case concord in German/Dutch isn’t true agreement. Correlate/remnant mismatches in Case as in (29c) and (30c), then, might be an artifact of a property unique to German and Dutch.

However, Hungarian conforms to Baker’s generalization. Predicates in Hungarian agree in number (31b), whereas prenominal modifiers do not (31a). Crucially, the remnant *must* display number agreement, even when the correlate is a modifier (Elliott 2013) (31c), suggesting that mismatches in the adjectival domain are not an isolated phenomenon.

Hungarian

- (31) a. John ismer néhány magas(*ak) lányt
J. knows some tall(.PL) girls
“John knows some tall girls.”
- b. A lányok magasak
The girls tall.PL
“The girls are tall.”
- c. John ismer néhány magas lányt, de nem tudom milyem
J. knows some tall girls, but not know.I how
magasak/*magas.
tall.PL/tall
“John knows some tall girls, but I don’t know how tall.”

In addition to the Case facts, we present English data in support of predicative sources as an evasion strategy for apparent cases of LBC violation repair. Predicative adjectives (e.g. *diligent*) and non-predicative adjectives (e.g. *hard*, as in *hard-working*) appear as modifiers ((32a)), but only predicative adjectives can be predicates ((32b)). Both kinds can be fronted, so long as they're gradable ((32c)).

- (32) a. Billy hired a diligent/hard worker.
 b. This worker is diligent/*hard.
 c. [How diligent/hard a worker]_i did Bill hire *t*_i?

However, a non-predicative AP remnant is markedly degraded compared to a predicative counterpart (with a modifier correlate).¹⁷ This suggests that the AP remnant is merged as a predicate, and that an isomorphic E-site is not possible, as it would give rise to an unrepaired LBC violation.¹⁸

- (33) Billy hired a diligent/hard worker, but I don't know how diligent/*hard.

Similar observations extend to *heavy* (as in *drinks heavily*):

- (34) a. Mary ignored a ugly/heavy drinker.
 b. The drinker was ugly/*heavy.¹⁹
 c. [How ugly/heavy a drinker]_i did Mary ignore *t*_i?
 d. Mary ignored a heavy/ugly drinker, but I'm not sure how ugly/*heavy.

Finally, we can see that a similar pattern holds of CFrs in English. Merchant's example (21a) is another case of a non-predicative left branch modifier which strongly resists being an ellipsis remnant. Things are different when we try a CFr where the remnant is a left branch modifier which does work as the predicate in copular sentences, like (35). Such examples are good for most speakers and perfect for many (mean 5.3 and mode 6 in our test).

- (35) A: Did Mary buy a *green* car?
 B: ?No, *blue*.

As with the relative clause examples, the acceptability of (35) is understandable since a full predicative response *it was blue* would be a congruent and well-formed answer. The contrast between (21a) and (35) thus gives further evidence in favour of the evasion-based analysis of apparent repair that we provide here.

To summarize, left branch sluicing remnants pattern morphosyntactically with predicates, not modifiers, and non-predicative adjectives cannot be remnants at all.

¹⁷An online questionnaire study of 24 British English speakers corroborated our intuitions regarding the status of (33) (Elliott 2012). The first author of this paper confirms the judgements extend to American English, and has informally corroborated this with other American English speakers.

¹⁸Ad Neeleman (p.c.) suggests one possible alternative explanation: [hard worker] could constitute an idiom chunk. (33) is degraded because it violates some manner of adjacency requirement. Note however that [how hard] undergoes DegP-inversion in (32c), and the idiomatic interpretation remains. Note furthermore, that generally speaking, idiom chunks reconstruct under Wh-extraction, e.g. *who was being taken advantage of?*

¹⁹Ignoring the irrelevant "the drinker was overweight" reading.

The simplest explanation for this pattern is that sluicing *cannot* repair LBC violations. We claim, therefore, that examples like (26) stem from a predicative (non-syntactically isomorphic) source. predicative sources constitute an additional evasion strategy which gives rise to repair illusions, just like short sources and DCE. Importantly, this conclusion fits with the general picture outlined in this paper, that non-clausal islands aren't amenable to repair; once confounding factors are controlled for (by using non-predicative adjectives), both left branch extractions and extractions from definite DPs consistently fail to yield repair illusions.

4 On apparent cross-linguistic variation

Temmerman (2013) reports that Dutch shows repair even with contrastive clausal ellipsis in contrast to English. However, Temmerman's claims were based on results in Merchant (2004), which claims that English fragment utterances are island sensitive. As previously mentioned, Griffiths & Lipták (2012) renders this assumption no longer tenable. We show here that there is, in fact, no difference between Dutch and English as regards repair. In short, repair illusions exist in Dutch where they do in English. For instance, consider object A'-extractions illustrated in (36):²⁰

- (36) a. Dutch *because*-island
 Is Jack gekomen omdat hij *Marin* wil versieren?
 Is Jack come because he *Marin* wants seduce
 "Has Jack come because he wants to seduce *Marin*?"
- b. Dutch relative clause island
 Nee, ik had gedacht *Lynn*
 No I had thought *Lynn*
 "No, I had thought *Lynn*."

Temmerman (2013) interprets the acceptability of examples such as in (36) as support for a syntactic difference between English and Dutch, explaining the difference in terms of different CP layers which are targeted for deletion in different languages. This claim is based on Merchant's (2004) observation that English does not show repair in fragment answers, but as Griffiths & Lipták (2012) show, this is not a tenable claim for English. As we have seen, the comparison is not straightforward. Merchant's (2004) islands involve subject extraction, whereas Temmerman's examples involve object extraction. Our own English object extraction cases were only mildly deviant for most speakers, and more or less perfect for some. Moreover, we found that some Dutch speakers found cases like those in (36) less than perfect, some ruling them out altogether.

Temmerman's good relative clause islands involve object remnants apparently extracted from an indefinite relative clause, unlike Merchant's (2004) bad examples

²⁰Temmerman's data involves embedded fragments, but extends to simpler test cases with matrix responses. Parentheses in some parts of Temmerman's examples indicate so, and Jeroen van Craenenbroeck confirms this for us. Note that we have found that not all speakers agree about the status of adjunct island cases like (36), much like with our English data.

but like our perfect case (7a). In sum, we endorse Temmerman’s data, but note that the good cases track good cases in English, so we suggest that the good data is good for the same reasons as in English, namely the availability of DCE and short sources. Importantly, repair fails in Dutch where it fails in English, i.e. definite DPs and left branches.²¹

- (37) a. Heb je die nieuwe kerel van *Frankrijk* ontmoet?
 Have you that new guy from France met
 “Did you meet the new guy from *France*?”
 b. *Nee, van Italië
 No from Italy
 “No, (from) Italy” (Dutch, definite DP island)²²
- (38) a. Heeft Marie een aantal *Luie* werkers in dienst?
 Has Mary a number lazy workers in service
 “Does Mary have a number of *lazy* workers in service?”
 b. *Nee, *hard*
 No hard
 “No hard.” (Dutch, left branch island)

We conclude that the clausal/non-clausal island distinction holds for both English and Dutch CFRs, and that the explanation for this distinction (and its wrinkles) is the same in both languages: clausal islands allow for more repair illusions than non-clausal islands.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have described further variation in “repair by ellipsis” effects with islands. The variation that we have described cuts across and thus falsifies previous generalizations about island repair. It can be characterized in terms of a generalization about the kinds of islands involved: clausal islands show repair more readily than non-clausal islands. Importantly, this generalization is epiphenomenal. We do not claim that it follows from specific structural properties of clauses. Rather, we have argued that the key factor in determining the distribution of island repair effects is the availability of strategies to avoid actually having an island violation in the ellipsis site. As a consequence, clauses, as larger domains, allow for more such evasion strategies than non-clauses.

The empirical picture we have presented only makes sense if we assume that there are islands in the ellipsis sites, contra Barker (in press) and many others, and that these islands are not in fact repaired by ellipsis, contra Ross (1969), Lasnik (2001), Merchant (2008) and many others. After all, there would be no need for evasion if repair was an option, or indeed if there was no island in the ellipsis site. We conclude, then, that there is structure in the silence, but that there is no island

²¹The Dutch here represents the Flemish-inflected variety of Jeroen van Craenenbroeck, but it has been checked with speakers of other dialects as well (who e.g. offer *uit* in place of *van* in (37)).

²²Note that this is on the relevant “different guys” interpretation.

repair, at least not with any of the island types we have considered in this paper. This is ultimately a return to the position defended in Merchant (2001) for a certain class of islands, but expanding the role of island evasion to cover islands-types Merchant considers amenable to genuine repair (e.g. left branch islands) by expanding the inventory of available evasion strategies (DCE, predicative sources). We leave for future work the job of ascertaining whether island repair should be ruled out altogether, as this would require more systematic testing of other island types not considered here, but the outlook is promising given that there are so many options available for evading islands. Of course, the introduction of further evasion strategies raises interesting questions about the ellipsis identity condition, since this requires allowing a certain amount of non-isomorphism between ellipsis site and antecedent. However it has already been observed, independent of the islands debate, that clausal ellipsis must allow for a certain amount of non-isomorphism (Merchant 2005, van Craenenbroeck 2012, Thoms 2013). We leave the formulation of an identity condition which allows for the evasion strategies we have argued for, without over-generating, as a matter for future research.

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.
- Baker, Mark C. 2008. *The Syntax of Agreement and Concord*. Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, Chris. in press. Scopability and sluicing.
- Barros, Matthew. to appear. Short sources and pseudosluicing: a non-repair approach to island sensitivity in contrastive TP ellipsis. In *Proceedings of CLS 48*.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai Shen, & Hamida Demirdache. 2010. Trapped at the edge: on long-distance pair-list readings. *Lingua* 120.463–484.
- Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van, & Anikó Lipták. 2006. The crosslinguistic syntax of Sluicing: Evidence from Hungarian relatives. *Syntax* 9.248–274.
- Elliott, Patrick D., 2012. Illusory island repair in sluicing: Evidence from non-predicative adjectives. Paper presented at the Syntax and Semantics Research Group, University of Edinburgh.
- , 2013. Towards a theory of radical island evasion under ellipsis. Paper presented at LEL Postgraduate conference, University of Edinburgh.
- Fox, Danny, & Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive cyclic movement and island repair: the difference between sluicing and VP-ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34.143–154.
- Fukaya, Teruhiko. *Sluicing and Stripping in Japanese and some Implications*. University of Southern California dissertation.
- Griffiths, James, & Anikó Lipták. 2012. Contrast and island sensitivity in clausal ellipsis. *Syntax* .
- Huhmarniemi, Saara. *Finnish A'-movement: edges and islands*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki dissertation.
- Izvorski, Roumyana. 1995. A solution to the subdeletion paradox. In *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL) 14*, ed. by José Camacho, Lina Choueiri, & Maki Watanabe, 203–219, Stanford, CA. CSLI Publications.

- Jacobson, Pauline, under review. The short answer: Implications for direct compositionality (and vice-versa). Ms.
- Kandybowicz, Jason. 2006. *Comp*-trace effects explained away. In *Proceedings of WC-CFL 25*, 220–228.
- Kennedy, Chris. 2002. Comparative deletion and optimality in syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20.553–621.
- , & Jason Merchant. 2000. Attributive comparative deletion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18.89–146.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2006. Association with focus phrases. In *The architecture of focus*, ed. by Valerie Molnár & Susanne Winkler, 105–136. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society 31*, ed. by M. Kim & U. Strauss, volume 2, 301–320. GLSA.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27.661–738.
- . 2005. Revisiting syntactic identity conditions. Handout, Workshop on ellipsis, University of California, Berkeley.
- . 2008. Variable island repair under ellipsis. In *Topics in Ellipsis*, ed. by Kyle Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1990. *Quantification in the Theory of Grammar*, volume 37. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Richards, Norvin. 2000. An island effect in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 9.187–205.
- Roberts, Craige. 1996. Information structure: Towards an integrated theory of formal pragmatics. In *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics*, ed. by Jae-Hak Yoon & Andreas Kathol, volume 49. OSU: The Ohio State University Department of Linguistics.
- Ross, John, 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. MIT PhD thesis.
- . 1969. Guess who? In *Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS) 5*, ed. by Robert Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia Green, & Jerry Morgan, 252–286, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- 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. (to appear).
- Thoms, Gary. 2010. Verb floating and VPE: towards a movement account of ellipsis licensing. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 10.252–297.
- . 2013. Lexical mismatches in ellipsis and the identity condition. In *Proceedings of NELS 42*, ed. by Stefan Keine & Shayne Sloggett, 559–572, Amherst, MA. CSLI Publications.
- , to appear. Constraints on exceptional ellipsis are only parallelism effects. *North Eastern Linguistic Society (NELS) 43*.
- van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen, 2012. Ellipsis, Identity, and Accommodation. Ms. Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel.