1. Introduction

- Reprise fragments (RFs) (Bolinger 1978, Ginzburg 2012:148) are nonsentential questions that prototypically involve the repetition of a morpheme, word, or phrase from the most recent utterance in a discourse:

  (1) A: Is John a neurophysiologist? B: NEURO?
  (3) A: John’s bought a red car. B: A RED car?

- No prior Minimalist analyses of RFs
- No prior cross-linguistic research on RFs whatsoever

- The connectivity effects displayed by standard, non-reprise fragments motivates a clausal ellipsis approach to standard fragments: (see Merchant 2004: 676-684)

  (4) A: Wem folgt Hans? B: {Dem / * Den} Lehrer
     who.DAT follows Hans? the.DAT the.ACC teacher

  (5) Hans folgt_{[+DAT]}{[+DAT]} Lehrer. (underlying clause for 4B)

- RFs also display connectivity effects (see 7-11), which motivates an analysis whereby RFs are derived from reprise questions (RQs) (e.g. echo questions) via clausal ellipsis.

---

1 The term reprise question was coined by Bolinger (1978). The term reprise fragment is commonly used in the monostratal generative literature (e.g. Ginzburg & Cooper 2004, Purver 2004, Ginzburg 2012), in which these fragmentary utterances have received exclusive attention. For current purposes, one can think of reprise question and reprise fragment as synonymous with echo question and echo fragment.

2 English RFs have been analysed in monostratal frameworks such as HPSG (Ginzburg & Cooper 2004), Conversation-Oriented Semantics (KoS, Ginzburg 2012), and Dynamic Syntax (Kempson et al. 2011).
(6) a. Is John a neurophysiologist?  
   b. Did Bo finagle a raise?  
   c. John’s bought a red car?  
(RQ counterpart of 1B, 2B, 3B)

Connectivity effects displayed by reprise fragments

(7) Case connectivity in reprise fragments
   a. A: Did he phone you?  B: He? / * Him?  
(Ginzburg & Cooper 2004:302)

   b. A: Ist dieser Platz noch frei?  
   Is this.NOM place still free?
   B: {Dieser / * Diesen / * Diesem} Platz?
   This.nom / this.acc / this.dat place

   (ibid.)

(8) Anaphoric binding in reprise fragments
   a. A: John, will arrive in his car.  B: * In John’s CAR?  

   Principle C violation

   b. A: John, thinks that he is being spied on.  
   B: * That the bastard, is being SPIED on?

   Principle C violation

   c. A: Does John, think that Mary will kiss him?  
   B: * That MARY will kiss himself?

   Principle A violation

(9) Morphological mismatch violations in reprise fragments
(Ginzburg 2012:152)


(10) Quantifier-binding in reprise fragments
   A: [Every Englishman], admires his mother.  B: His, MOTHER?

Aim: Outline an analysis of clausal ellipsis that accounts for the behaviour of standard and reprise fragments in English and Hungarian.

§2: The syntax of reprise questions (RQs) in English and Hungarian

§3: The distribution of reprise fragments (RFs) in English and Hungarian

---

3 One might argue that RFs show connectivity effects not because they are derived from an underlying RQ, but because they are verbatim ‘copies’ of the expression in the antecedent clause which they reprise. For evidence that RFs are not verbatim copies, see Appendix 1.
§4: Analysis. Crucial components:

(i) Clausal ellipsis may occur ‘around’ in-situ remnants
(ii) Clausal ellipsis is always licensed by a **syntactically derived** question
(iii) QUD is composed of two non-intersecting sets; standard and reprise questions

2. Reprise questions in English and Hungarian

2.1. The syntax of English reprise questions


\[(11) \text{A: Did Bo finagle a raise? B: Did Bo FINAGLE a raise?}\]

\[(12) \text{(syntax tree for 11B)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C} \text{EQ-i} \\
\text{C_Q} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{did} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Bo} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{FINAGLE}_{F_i} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{a raise}
\end{array}
\]

- English RQs are insensitive to syntactic islands:

\[(13) [\text{ISLAND The man that kissed WHO}] \text{ is coming to dinner?} \quad \text{(Artstein 2002 and refs therein)}\]

- No restriction on F-percolation = no restriction on the size of question phrase:

\[(14) \text{a. } [\text{C}_{\text{EQ-i}} \text{ Did Bo FINAGLE}_{i} \text{ a raise}]]? \quad \text{(question phrase = finagle)}
\text{b. } [\text{C}_{\text{EQ-i}} \text{ Did Bo } [\text{VP FINAGLE a raise}]_{F-i}]? \quad \text{(question phrase = finagle a raise)}
\text{c. } [\text{C}_{\text{EQ-i}} \text{ Did } [\text{TP Bo FINAGLE a raise}]_{F-i}] \quad \text{(question phrase = Bo finagle a raise)}\]

- This differs to English standard questions, which display limited pied-piping:

\[(15) \text{a. } [\text{DP Who}]_i \text{ did Mary speak with } t_i? \\
\text{b. } [\text{PP With whom}]_i \text{ did Mary speak } t_i? \\
\text{c. } * [\text{VP Speak with whom}]_i \text{ did Mary } t_i?\]
2.2. The syntax of Hungarian reprise questions

(16) Áron ki-t csókolt meg? [standard question]
Áron who-ACC kiss.PST.3SG PRT 'Who did Áron kiss?'

- Hungarian standard questions involve:
  (i) overt A'-movement of the wh-item (or the phrase containing it) to Spec, FocP
  (ii) covert A'-movement of the wh-item to Spec, CP (Lipták 2001)

- Hungarian reprise questions generally display same syntax as Hungarian standard questions, but with an additional C_EQ projection.

(17) A: Áron meg csókolta Drakulát.
Áron PRT kiss.PST.3SG Dracula.ACC 'Áron kissed Dracula.'

a. B: Áron KI-T csókolt meg? [wh-RQs: preverbal]
Áron who-ACC kiss.PST.3SG PRT 'Áron kissed WHO?'

Áron Dracula-ACC kiss.PST.3SG PRT 'Was it really DRACULA that Áron kissed?'

c. B: * Áron meg csókolt KI-T? [* wh-RQ: in-situ]
Áron PRT kiss.PST.3SG who-ACC

(18) (syntax tree for 16, 17a, and 17b)
• If FocP isn’t projected, then the question phrase only undergoes covert A’-movement:

(19) A: El a Kalasnyikovval!
away the Kalashnikov.INST
‘Away with the Kalashnikov!’

B: * A KALASNYIKOVVAL el?
[polar RQ: A’-movement]

B’: El a KALASNYIKOVVAL?
[polar RQ: in-situ]

(20) A: Látott János a görög úton kariatidákat?
see.PST.3SG János the Greek trip.on caryatids.ACC
‘Did John see caryatids during the Greece trip?’

B: ?? Hogy KARIATIDÁKAT látott-e a görög úton? [RQ: A’-movement]
that caryatids.ACC see.PST.3SG-Q the Greek trip.on
‘Did he see CARYATIDS during the Greece trip?’

B’: Hogy látott-e a görög úton KARIATIDÁKAT? [RQ: in-situ]
that see.PST.3SG-Q the Greek trip.on caryatids.ACC
‘Did he see CARYATIDS during the Greece trip?’

(21) 
\[\text{(syntax tree for 18B')}\]  
\[\text{Covert A’-movement}\]

• Both standard and reprise questions are sensitive to syntactic islands in Hungarian:

(22) a. * Hány adtad el [ISLAND a \(t_1\) kilós dinnyét]. (standard q)
how.many sell.PST.2SG PRT the \(t_1\) kilo.HEAD melon.ACC
‘How many kilos was the melon that you sold?’

b. * HÚSZ\(_1\) adtad el [ISLAND a \(t_1\) kilós dinnyét]? (reprise q)
twenty sell.PST.2SG PRT the \(t_1\) kilo.HEAD melon.ACC
‘You sold the TWENTY kilo melon?’
• The apparent ‘island-insensitivity’ displayed by in-situ reprise questions in Hungarian is illusory, as the phrase that undergoes covert A’-movement is actually the entire island:

(23) A: El [\textsc{island} a húsz kilós dinnyével]!
    away the twenty kilo.\textsc{adj} melon.\textsc{inst}
    ‘Away with the twenty kilo melon!’

B: El [\textsc{island} a HÚSZ kilós dinnyével]?  \hspace{1cm} \text{(reprise q)}

(24) LF for (23): [\textsc{cp} [\textsc{island} a HÚSZ kilós dinnyével], C\textsc{eq} [\textsc{pp} el t₁]]

(for more on in-situ RQs, see Appendix 2)

Summary of §2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of utterance</th>
<th>Standard question</th>
<th>Reprise question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Overt A’-movement to SpecCP</td>
<td>Unselective binding with C\textsc{eq}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question phrase: limited pied-piping</td>
<td>Question phrase: unrestricted F-percolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Island-sensitive</td>
<td>Island-insensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Overt A’-movement to SpecFocP</td>
<td>(Overt A’-movement to SpecFocP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert A’-movement to SpecCP</td>
<td>Covert A’-movement to SpecCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question phrase: limited pied-piping</td>
<td>Question phrase: limited pied-piping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Island-sensitive</td>
<td>Island-sensitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Reprise fragments in English and Hungarian

(25) A: John saw an Alsatian yesterday.  \hspace{1cm} B: \{A \textsc{dog} / (a) \textsc{what}\}? 

(26) A: Áron meg csókolta Drakulá-t.  \hspace{1cm} B: \{KI-T / DRAKULÁ-T\}? 
Áron \textsc{prt} kiss.\textsc{pst.3sg} Dracula-\textsc{acc} who-\textsc{acc} Dracula-\textsc{acc}
‘Áron kissed Dracula.’

• Reprise fragments (RFs) in English and Hungarian must:
  (i) Contain the focused/\textit{wh}-item item (i.e. the ‘echoed’ phrase)
  (ii) Be a constituent with a pronounced head \hspace{1cm} (see Appendix 3 for discussion)

(27) A: Sally saw the man that fell with her binoculars.
    B: [\textsc{pp} with her \textsc{binoculars}]?
    B’: * [\textsc{vp} fell][\textsc{pp} with her \textsc{binoculars}]?

(28) A: John has given a vampire some garlic.
    B: [\textsc{vp} given₁ [\textsc{vp} a vampire t₁ some \textsc{garlic}]]
    B’: * [\textsc{vp} a vampire t\textsubscript{given} some \textsc{garlic}]?
(29) A: Did Bo finagle a raise?
   B: \([\text{TP} \text{FINAGLE a raise}/vendor]\)?
   B': \(* \text{TP} \text{Bo} \ t\text{did FINAGLE a raise}*/vendor)\]

- In English, a standard, non-reprise fragment is unacceptable when its correlate in the antecedent clause is island-bound (and no island-evading source is available)\(^4\)

(30) A: \([\text{ISLAND} \text{The rumour that John is dead}]\) must be false.
   B: \(* \text{No, MARY}_1\) (contrastive fragment)

- However, RFs are island insensitive, and \textbf{can} have correlates in the antecedent clause that are island-bound. (as noted by Merchant 2004:709)

(31) A: \([\text{ISLAND} \text{The rumour that Dracula died last night}]\) is surely false.
   B: \{\text{WHO / that WHO died}\}?
   B': \{\text{DRACULA / that DRACULA died}\}?

- Both standard and reprise Hungarian fragments are unacceptable when their antecedent correlates are island-bound (compare 32B and 33B).

(32) A: Kidobtuk \([\text{ISLAND} \text{a valamit tartalmazó palackokat}]\).  
   \textit{lit. ‘We threw away the something-containing bottles.’}
   
   B: \(* \text{Igen, BPA-t.} \) (standard fragment)
   
   yes \textbf{BPA-ACC}

(33) A: Eladtam \([\text{ISLAND} \text{a húsz kilós dinnyét}]\).
   \textit{lit. ‘I sold the twenty-kilo melon.’}
   
   B: \(* \textbf{HÚSZ}? \) (‘TEN?’) (reprise fragment)

- Island-sensitivity obtains with RFs even when the corresponding RQ has an ‘in-situ’ configuration:

\(^4\) For years, islands were thought to be obviated under clausal ellipsis (e.g. Ross 1969; Chung, Ladusaw & McCloskey 1995, Merchant 2001: §5.1). Building on work from Merchant (2001), Abels (2011) and Barros, Elliot & Thoms (2013, 2014) show that most apparent ‘island-obviations’ arise from the fact that a short, non-isomorphic elliptical ‘source’ is available (see (i)). When adequately controlled to preclude short sources, island-violations are indeed observed (see (ii)).

(i) John has bought a big house. God knows \[\text{TP} \text{it is } t\_1\].
(ii) They hired a hard worker. God knows \[\text{TP} \text{he was } t\_1\]. \textit{Short source: bad intersective reading}  
* \[\text{TP} \text{they hired } \text{a } t\_1 \text{worker}\] \textit{Isomorphic source precluded}
(34) A: El [el [el ISLAND a húsz kilós dinnyével]]! away the 20 kilo. ADJ melon. INST ‘Away with the twenty-kilo melon!’

B: El [el [el ISLAND a HÚSZ kilós dinnyével]]? (reprise question)
B’: * HÚSZ? (reprise fragment)

(35) A: Látta János a görög útján [el [el ISLAND a húsz kilós dinnyét]]? see.3SG.DEF János the Greek trip. on the 20 kilo melon. ACC ‘Did János see the twenty-kilo melon on the Greek trip?’

B: Hogy látta-e a görög útján [el [el ISLAND a HÚSZ kilós dinnyét]]? (reprise question)
B’: * HÚSZ? (reprise fragment)

Summary of §3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of fragment</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hungarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard fragments</strong></td>
<td>Constituent with its head</td>
<td>Constituent with its head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-sensitive?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reprise fragments</strong></td>
<td>Constituent with its head</td>
<td>Constituent with its head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island-sensitive?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where “Island sensitive?” means “unacceptable if the correlate in the antecedent clause is island-bound?”

4. A Minimalist analysis of standard and reprise fragments

4.1. Background assumptions

[1] Assumed model of clausal ellipsis

→ Clausal ellipsis applies to a clausal constituent
→ Renders constituent unpronounced (PF-deletion) to exclusion of wh/focus phrase(s)

(Reich 2002, Abe 2015, 2016, Ott & Struckmeier 2016, among others)

(36) A: John spoke with someone.

a. B: [CP [PP with WHOM] did John speak t₁]? (standard wh-fragment)

b. B: Yeah, [CP John spoke [PP with MARY]]. (standard non-wh-fragment)
Assumed recoverability condition on clausal ellipsis

- Clausal ellipsis site is recovered from the meaning of a single \( q \) in the set of questions under discussion (QUD)
  

(37) **Background-matching condition**

(draastically simplified from Weir 2017)

Let \( q \) be a question in the QuD. Let \( \alpha \) be a target utterance. Clausal ellipsis is recoverable in \( \alpha \) iff:

1. The question/focused phrases of \( q \) and \( \alpha \) correspond in size
2. If the backgrounded parts of \( q \) and \( \alpha \) are identical.

Assumed composition of the QUD

- The QUD is composed only of syntactically well-formed \( q \)s in language L, regardless of whether these \( q \)s are explicitly uttered or inferred.
  
  *(contra Roberts 1996/2012, see Appendix 4 for justification of this claim)*

- At any point in conversational-time, the QUD is composed of two non-intersecting sets of \( q \)s, **standard** \( q \)s and **reprise** \( q \)s.
  

(38) John waltzed with something.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{QUD:} & \quad \begin{cases}
\text{Standard } q \text{s} \\
\begin{cases}
\text{with what did John waltz?}, \\
\text{what did John waltz with?}, \\
\text{what else did John do?}, \\
\text{...}
\end{cases}
\end{cases} & \quad \begin{cases}
\text{Reprise } q \text{s} \\
\begin{cases}
\text{John WHATed with something?}, \\
\text{WHO waltzed with something?}, \\
\text{John waltzed with someTHING?}, \\
\text{...}
\end{cases}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

- Fragments are licensed by \( q \)s in the QUD that match in function:
  
  → Standard fragments are only licensed by standard \( q \)s in the QUD
  → Reprise fragments are only licensed by reprise \( q \)s in the QUD

Assumptions [1-3], added together =

If a question \( q \) is syntactically ill-formed in language L, then \( q \) cannot be a member of the QUD in L. Clausal ellipsis therefore cannot be licensed in any utterance that relies on \( q \) for its semantic licensing.

---

5 In Ginzburg & Cooper’s (2004) HPSG analysis, standard \( q \)s and reprise \( q \)s are modelled as being invoked from either the propositional \text{CONT(ENT)} of an utterance or from the \text{C(ONTEXTUAL)-PARAM(ETERS)} of an utterance.
4.2. Capturing the behaviour of fragments in English and Hungarian

4.2.1. Standard fragments

- ‘Island-sensitive’ standard fragments are simply fragments without a licensing q in the QUD:

(39) T_1 → A: [ISLAND The rumour that John is dead] must be false.
T_2 → B_1: No, ...

\[ \text{Standard qs} \]

| What must be the rumour that John is dead be?, |
| What must be false?, |
| ... |

\text{NOT} in QUD: * Who must the rumour that is dead be false? |

T_4 → B_2: * No, [[ the rumour that MARY is dead] must be false].

- Clausal ellipsis not licensed because (39B) relies on a syntactically ill-formed standard q for licensing. No such q is present in the QUD.
- The analysis for ‘island-sensitive’ Hungarian standard fragments follows the same reasoning.

4.2.2. Reprise fragments

- The apparent ‘island-insensitivity’ of English reprise fragments arises because such fragments are licensed by implicit reprise qs in QUD, which are wh-in-situ in English:

(40) T_1 → A: [ISLAND The rumour that Dracula is dead] must be false.

\[ \text{Reprise qs} \]

| The rumour that WHO is dead must be false?, |
| The rumour that Dracula is DEAD must be false?, |
| ... |

T_3 → B: [[ the rumour that DRACULA is dead] must be false].

- Hungarian reprise qs are formed via island-sensitive A’-movement (see §2). Consequently, reprise fragments in Hungarian are unacceptable because there is no q in the QUD available to license such fragments (as such qs cannot be syntactically generated).
Hungarian reprise fragments that correspond to in-situ reprise questions also seem island-sensitive (see 34, repeated below) because a subconstituent inside the island – rather than the entire island – is the Focus phrase. Covert A′-movement of the Focus phrase is therefore crosses an island-boundary (see 41).

(34) A: El [\textsc{island} a húsz kilós dinnyével]! away the 20 kilo.\textsc{adj} melon.\textsc{inst}
‘Away with the twenty-kilo melon!’

B: El [\textsc{island} a HÚSZ kilós dinnyével]? (reprise question)

B′: *HÚSZ? (reprise fragment)

Take-home message of §4.2:
- Questions that require island-violating A′-movement to be formed can’t be \textit{qs} in the QUD. Fragments that rely on such \textit{qs} to licensed are therefore judged as unacceptable.

5. An extension: oversized RFs in English

- Weir’s Background-matching condition on clausal ellipsis (see 37) states that fragments must correspond in size to the question-phrase of a \textit{q} in the QUD:

(42) T₁ → A: John just met with someone important.

\textbf{QUD:} { \textit{Who did John meet with?, ...} \hspace{1cm} wh = [\textsc{dp} who]}

T₂ → B: Yeah, DONALD TRUMP.

\textit{B′: *Yeah, met with DONALD TRUMP.} \hspace{1cm} wh = [\textsc{vp} met with DT]
• Syntactically, there's no restriction on the size of the question-phrase of reprise questions in English (see §2).

(43) John spoke to the man that Pete introduced to WHO?

• These gives rise to the prediction that RFs that match the focuses in (44) are licit in English. This is borne out, see (45). We refer to larger-than-usual fragments as oversized.

(45) A: John spoke to the man that Pete introduced to Dracula.
   a. B: WHO?
   b. B: introduced to WHO?
   c. B: that Pete introduced to WHO?
   d. B: the man that Pete introduced to WHO?
   e. B: to the man that Pete introduced to WHO?
   f. B: spoke the man that Pete introduced to WHO?, etc...

• Oversized RFs are not permitted in Hungarian, however (46). This is because the question-phrase of Hungarian RQs are limited in size, according to whatever limits standard pied-piping (see Cable 2010 for popular approach).

that.ACC think.1SG that Peti quickly will eat.INF the ice.cream.ACC
‘I think that Peti will quickly eat the ice cream.’

   B: Azt hiszed, hogy Peti gyorsan fogja enni a FAGYIT?
that.2SG think.2SG that Peti quickly will eat.INF the ice.cream.ACC a FAGYIT?

   a. B: A FAGYIT?
   b. B: *Enni a FAGYIT?
   c. B: *Fogja enni a FAGYIT?
   d. B: *Gyorsan fogja enni a FAGYIT?
   e. B: *Peti gyorsan fogja enni a FAGYIT?
f. B: Hogy Peti gyorsan fogja enni a FAGYIT?

g. B: *Hiszed, hogy Peti gyorsan fogja enni a FAGYIT?

h. B: Azt hiszed, hogy Peti gyorsan fogja enni a FAGYIT?

NB: There are an interesting independent prosodic constraint on oversized RFs in English. See Appendix 5 for details.

6. Conclusion

• We have presented novel data on reprise fragments from English and Hungarian.

• We have shown that standard and reprise fragments display dissimilar properties in English, whereas Hungarian standard and reprise fragments pattern similarly.

• Our small-sample study is suggestive of a broader cross-linguistic typology of reprise fragments.

• The cross-linguistic distribution of RFs motivates a Minimalist analysis of fragmentary responses that treats fragments as in-situ (in languages without (c)overt focus-movement) and subject to a syntacticised 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.
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Appendix 1: Reprise fragments as metalinguistic copies?

- Merchant (2004:709) suggests that reprise fragments (and other confirmatory, clarificational, and elaborative fragments) involve “a kind of metalinguistic conjunction [with their antecedent correlate]: the speaker is suggesting a correction of some aspect of the form of the original utterance...”.

- We interpret this notion of ‘metalinguistic conjunction’ as the conjunction of two type-\(u\) expressions (Potts 2007) at a discourse level. First, this requires that reprise fragments are type-\(u\) expressions. Second, this requires that reprise fragments are verbatim copies of their correlates (seeing as reprise fragments show connectivity effects, see §1).

- Reprise fragments don’t show the opacity expected of type-\(u\) utterances, however. Why should a type-\(u\) expression (i.e. a string of sounds/symbols) need to be a constituent with a pronounced head (see §3)? Why should RFs be apparently ‘island sensitive’ in Hungarian (see §3)?
• Reprise questions and reprise fragments don’t need to be verbatim copies of the clause or subclausal constituent they reprise, either. Both may deviate in form from their antecedents through diexis shift, synonym, hyponym, and pronominal substitution, through dative shift, and through the application of ellipsis:

Reprise questions

(A1) A: Scratch my little toe!  
B: Scratch your little TOE?

(A2) A: Did you go to New York recently?  
B: Did I go to the Big APPLE recently?

(A3) A: Do you want an Alsatian?  
B: Do I want a DOG?

(A4) A: I want John to kiss me.  
B: You want HIM to kiss you?

(A5) A: I want him to kiss me.  
B: I want JOHN to kiss you?

(A6) A: I should’ve given Bo your room.  
B: You should’ve given my room to Bo?

(A7) A: The rumour that Dracula came to brunch is surely false.  
B: The rumour that WHO did Δvp is surely false?

Reprise fragments

(A8) A: Scratch my little toe!  
B: Your little TOE?

(A9) A: Did you go to New York recently?  
B: To the Big APPLE?

(A10) A: Do you want an Alsatian?  
B: A DOG?

(A11) A: I want John to kiss me.  
B: HIM?

(A12) A: I want him to kiss me.  
B: JOHN?

(A13) A: I should’ve given Mary your room.  
B: Given my room to MARY?

(A14) A: The rumour that Dracula came to brunch is surely false.  
B: That WHO did Δvp?

• Conclusion: reprise fragments do not obtain their connectivity effects through metalinguistic conjunction. They are reprise questions to which clausal ellipsis applies.

Appendix 2: Prosodic constituency and wh-in-situ

• English RQs exhibit a high plateau preceding the echoed phrase which displays no internal prosodic constituency.

• The assertion in (A15A) displays four accentual phrases (in square brackets). In comparison, the material that precedes the echoed phrase in (A15B) is contained in one accentual phrase, along with the echoed phrase.

(A15) A: [ I wish] [ I was born] [ in India] [ as a man].  
B: [You wish you were born in India as a WHAT?]
I wish I was born in India as a man.

**Figure 1.** F0 contour of an English declarative assertion (A15A)

You wish you were born in India as a WHAT?

**Figure 2.** F0 contour of an English reprise question (A15B)

- Hungarian RQs retain the prosodic constituency of their antecedents (albeit in a compressed form). This constituency is often more metrically-prominent than in standard questions and declaratives (Varga 2010, Kálmán 2001:27 as cited in Gyuris 2017).

(A16)  
A: [ Bárcsak] [ születtem volna] [ Indiában férfinak]!  
   if.only born.PAST.1SG COND India.in man.DAT  
   ‘If only I were born in India as a man!’

B: [ Bárcsak] [ születtél volna] [ Indiában] [ MINEK]?  
   if.only born.PAST.2SG COND India.in what.DAT  
   ‘If only you were born in India as WHAT?’
The observation that English and Hungarian in-situ RQs display different prosodic traits eliminates potential prosodic explanations for why *wh*-in-situ questions are grammatical in *wh*-movement languages (such as Richards 2010).

**Appendix 3: Why must RFs have pronounced heads?**

- We have tacitly adopted Büring’s (2006) *Unrestricted Vertical Focus Projection* principle during this presentation, which states that:

6 Notice that the F0 peak on the *wh*-item in Fig. 4 is not due to focus-related prominence, but to the question-intonation boundary tone (cf. Ladd 1996, Grice *et al.* 2000).
(A17)  i. Any argument or adjunct of XP licenses F-marking on X.
   ii. X licenses F-marking on XP.

- According to Büring’s principle, any F-marked XP contains an F-marked head.
- F-marked items retain their F-marking when they move (Sauerland 1998). Pronounced copies in a movement-chain are pronounced with the prosodic reflex of F-marking (i.e. a pitch accent).
- Reprise fragments without pronounced heads are therefore unacceptable because ellipsis is improperly applied. In such cases, we’ve attempted to render unpronounced an item to which a pitch accent must be applied:

(A18)  A: John has given a vampire garlic.
        B: * [He has \[F given\] [VP a vampire t given \[F GARLIC\]r ]]?

Appendix 4: Support for inferred \textit{q}s in the QUD being syntactically derived

- Fiengo & May (1994:193) suggest that inferred \textit{q}s from which ellipsis is recovered are syntactically derived because they defend a theory of ellipsis-licensing that makes reference to syntactic phrase markers.
- But if ellipsis recoverability is purely semantic, and ellipsis is recovered from a \textit{q} in the QUD, then one may uphold Robert’s (2012) claim that inferred \textit{q}s in the QUD are unstructured, and merely denote sets of sets of possible worlds.
- Weir (2017) provides support for the notion that inferred \textit{q}s are structured (i.e. they have LFs). Because LFs are the product of syntax, this entails that inferred \textit{q}s in the QUD are \textbf{syntactically derived}.
- Weir’s evidence comes from pairs of \textit{cointensional} questions: pairs of questions with distinct syntax but which pick out the same sets of possible worlds (A19-A20). If inferred \textit{q}s were unstructured, clausal ellipsis would be licensed by either \textit{q}. Because they are not (see A21), inferred \textit{q}s must be structured (i.e. syntactically derived).

(A19)  How many signals did the machine send?
(A20)  How many times did the machine send a signal?

(A21)  A: I heard that the machine sent a certain number of signals.
        B: Yes, \{TWO / * TWICE\}.

(A22)  QUD for A21B \textbf{is} the structured \textit{q} “\textit{how many signals did the machine send?}”
        QUD for is A21B \textbf{isn’t} the unstructured \textit{q} “\{\{w_1, w_2, w_3\}, \{w_3, w_4, \ldots\}, \ldots\}”
where \( w \) = worlds in which the machine sends a different number of signals / sends signals a different number of times.

**Appendix 5: Uninflected perfect *have***

- While it might appear from §2.1 that constituency is the only requirement on oversized reprise fragments in English, some interesting additional constraints are observed. For instance:

- Oversized reprise fragments cannot be introduced by uninflected perfect *have*, but can be introduced by possessive, causative, and experiential *have*.

  (A23)  
  A: John may have kissed Dracula last night.  
  B: (*Have) kissed WHO last night?  

  (perfect uninflected *have*)

  (A24)  
  A: John has eaten his homework.  
  B: (Has) EATEN it?  

  (perfect inflected *have*)

  (A25)  
  A: Mary wants to have a quiet holiday in Ibiza.  
  B: Have a QUIET holiday?  

  (possessive *have*)

  (A26)  
  A: We should have this portrait hung.  
  B: Have it HUNG?  

  (causative *have*)

  (A27)  
  A: Jill will have a quiet holiday in Ibiza.  
  B: Have a QUIET holiday in Ibiza?  

  (experiential *have*)

- Interestingly, of the types of *have* in (A23) to (A27), only perfect *have* may undergo contraction in non-elliptical constructions:

  (A28)  
  a. John should {have / *-’ve} kissed Mary.  

  b. They might {have / *-’ve} students leaving their seminars.  

  c. John will {have / *-’ve} them all fired.  

  d. Jill will {have / *-’ve} a quiet holiday in Ibiza.  

  - Uninflected perfect *have* also resists being separated prosodically from the modal verb that precedes it:

    (A29) * John should, *I thought to myself*, have been arrested.

- **Conclusion**: uninflected perfect *have* is a clitic, regardless of whether it has undergone phonological contraction or not. It must cliticise leftwards. If there is no leftward item to cliticise onwards, *have* cannot be prosodically licensed. This rules out uninflected perfect *have* introducing reprise fragments (as in A23).