

Which QuD?

(6) **QuD required by sluice in (2b):**

Who did [Sally] call?

- Did Sally call Alex?
- Did Sally call Brad?
- Did Sally call Chad?

⋮

(7) **QuD raised by antecedent in (2a):**

If not Alex, then who did [Sally] call?

- ~~Did Sally call Alex?~~
- Did Sally call Brad?
- Did Sally call Chad?

⋮

Next, the Yes/No Q in (3) is congruent to — and a subquestion of — the QuD *Who did Sally call?*. By virtue of A in (3) being a direct question itself, it constitutes the most recently raised QuD. This Yes/No QuD is not identical to the sluiced question *Who did Sally call?*. We correctly predict sluicing to be impossible.

In sprouting, (4), we propose that the antecedent raises the QuD *in which cabin is he asleep?* in a context with a conditional presupposition of the form: *If Jack is asleep, it must be in some cabin*. The antecedent affirms the antecedent of the conditional, adding the consequent proposition *Jack must be asleep in some cabin* to the common ground, raising the issue of *which cabin it is that Jack is sleeping in*. In sprouting, the content of the antecedent determines the antecedent of the conditional presupposition, and the sluiced question's existential presupposition determines the consequent; (4) would be infelicitous, for instance, in a context where, if Jack is asleep, it must be in some hotel room.

The Answer Ban: Our proposal helps explain Barker's (2013) 'Answer Ban' (8), intended to account for examples like (9). Since *Jack left* is an answer to the sluiced question, the Answer Ban is violated. The prosody in the antecedent presupposes congruence to the QuD *Who left?*. Since the antecedent answers the QuD, it is no longer active; hence the sluice is left without an equivalent QuD antecedent to license it (see also discussion in Barros 2013). In a context where more than one individual is presupposed to have left (9), however, sluicing becomes available with exceptive modifiers.

(8) **The Answer Ban:** The antecedent clause must not resolve, or even partially resolve, the issue raised by the sluiced interrogative.

(9) Sue left, but Mary doesn't know who *(else) left.

The antecedent in (9) is only a partial answer to the QuD *who all left?*. Once the antecedent proposition is added to the discourse, a sub-question remains concerning the identities of non-Sue individuals who left. Exceptive modification renders the sluice identical in meaning to this sub-QuD, licensing the ellipsis in (9).

The Antecedent Correlate Harmony generalization: Our proposal also explains Dayal&Schwarzschild's (2010) observation that remnant and correlate must agree on the presence/absence of a contentful head noun.

(10) Joan ate a donut.

a. *Fred doesn't know what.

b. Fred doesn't know which donut.

(11) Joan ate something.

a. Fred doesn't know what.

b. *Fred doesn't know which donut.

The most recently raised QuD in (10) is *Which donut did Joan eat*, and in (11) it is *What did Joan eat?*. Only sluices based on these QuDs are licensed, not sluices targeting a different level in the discourse tree.

Conclusion: QuDs must be constrained so as not to over-generate cases of sluicing. We propose that sluicing is only licensed by the most recently raised QuD in the discourse, not by super- or sub-questions (Rojas-Esponda, 2014, cf Buring 2003). We show how this proposal gives a principled account of recent observations concerning the nature of sluicing in the literature (Dayal and Schwarzschild, 2010; Barker, 2013).

Selected references: Barker 2013. Scopability and sluicing. *L&P* 36 • Barros 2013. Harmonic sluicing: Which remnant/correlate pairs work and why. *SALT* 23 • Buring 2003. On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents. *L&P* 26 • Dayal&Schwarzschild. 2010. Definite inner antecedents and *wh*-correlates in sluicing. *Rutgers Working Papers in Linguistics* 3 • Rojas-Esponda 2014. A discourse model for überhaupt. *S&P* 7.

References

- AnderBois, Scott. 2011. Issues and alternatives. Doctoral Dissertation, UC Santa Cruz.
- Barker, Chris. 2013. Scopability and sluicing. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 36:187—223.
- Barros, Matthew. 2013. Harmonic sluicing: Which remnant/correlate pairs work and why. In *Proceedings of SALT 23*, 295–315.
- Barros, Matthew. 2014. Sluicing and identity in ellipsis. Doctoral Dissertation, Rutgers University.
- Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-Trees, Beans, and B-Accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:511–545.
- Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:239–282.
- Dayal, Veneeta, and Roger Schwarzschild. 2010. Definite inner antecedents and wh-correlates in sluicing. In *Rutgers Working Papers in Linguistics*, ed. Peter Staroverov, Aaron Braver, Daniel Altshuler, Carlos Fasola, and Sarah Murray, volume 3, 92–114. New Brunswick, NJ: LGSA.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan, and Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning and use of english interrogatives*. CLSI publications.
- Kotek, Hadas, and Matthew Barros. To appear. Multiple sluicing, scope, and superiority: Consequences for ellipsis identity. *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Craige. 2012. Information structure in discourse: towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5:1–69.
- Rojas-Esponda, Tania. 2014. A discourse model for überhaupt. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 7:1–45.
- Ross, John. 1969. Guess who? In *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. R. Binnick, A. Davison, G. Green, and J. Morgan, 252–286. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Weir, Andrew. 2014. Fragments and clausal ellipsis. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.