

FRAGMENTS AND ISLAND (IN)SENSITIVITY IN TURKISH*

DAVID POTTER

Morehead State University

EMRAH GÖRGÜLÜ

Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University

1 Introduction

It is well-known that long-distance dependencies are a hallmark of the human language faculty. We see this in (1) for English and (2) for Turkish. In (1), the *wh*-phrase originates within the embedded clause, where it is assigned its theta role, but appears in the matrix clause, establishing a long-distance dependency. Similarly, in (2), the object NP in the embedded clause has been scrambled to the sentence-initial position.

(1)[Which language]_i did James say [the student speaks _{t_i]}?

(2) Fransızca_i-y₁ Ülkü [öğrenci-nin _{t_i} konuş-tuğ-u]-nu söyle-di.¹
French-ACC Ülkü student-GEN speak-FNOM-POSS]-ACC say-PST
'French, Ülkü said, the student speaks.'

Long-distance dependencies such as these are constrained by certain syntactic structures, known as islands (Ross, 1967; Chomsky, 1973, 1986). In both English (3) and Turkish (4), relative clauses and finite adjuncts block long-distance dependencies. Turkish is a *wh*-in-situ language, and so we will follow İnce (2012) and use the distribution of Scrambling to establish that relative clauses and adjuncts are in fact islands in Turkish.

* We wish to thank Jaklin Kornfilt, Shigeru Miyagawa, Leyla Zidani-Eroğlu and all the participants of WAFL 15 at Moscow State University for their helpful comments and suggestions. Needless to say, all the remaining errors are our own.

¹ The abbreviations in the glosses are as follows: 1 = first person; 3 = third person; ABL = ablative case; ACC = accusative case; COM = commitative case; COMP = complementizer; COP = copula; DAT = dative case; FNOM = factive nominal; GEN = genitive case; NOM = nominative case; PERF = perfective aspect; PL = plural marker; POSS = possessive marker; PROG = progressive aspect; PST = past tense; Q = question particle; RC = relative clause; SG = singular marker; SR: subject relativizer;

- (3a) *Which language_i did James meet [the student who speaks t_i]?
 (3b) *Who_i is James complaining [because we gave up on t_i]?
 (4a) *Fransızca_i-y₁ Ülkü [t_i çok güzel konuş-an öğrenci]-yle buluş-tu.
 French-ACC Ülkü a lot well speak-SR student-with meet-PST
 ‘French, Ülkü met the student who speaks very well.’
 (4b) *Ahmet_i-ten, Can [Adjunct t_i vazgeç-ti-k diye] biz-e tavır al-mış.
 Ahmet-ABL Can give.up-PST-1PL for] we-DAT attitude take-PERF
 ‘Ahmet, Can is giving attitude because we gave up on.’

One of the most interesting properties of islands is that ellipsis seems to ameliorate the effects of an island violation, as observed by Ross (1969). Consider the English dialogue in (5)², with elliptical (5B) and it-cleft responses (5B’). Both responses have the same interpretation yet the it-cleft response (5B’) is markedly less acceptable than the non-contrastive stripping continuation in (5B). As pointed out by İnce (2012, p.201), similar facts hold of non-contrastive ellipsis Turkish, as illustrated by the contrast in acceptability between (6B) and (4a). What explains the acceptability of (5B-6B); why should ellipsis ameliorate island effects?

(5) English Non-Contrastive Stripping

A: James met [_{RC} the student who speaks a European language].

B: Yeah, French.

B’: *Yeah, it's French that James met [_{RC} the student who speaks t].

- (6) A: Ali [_{RC} [bir Avrupa dil-i-ni konuş-an] öğrenci]-y₁ gör-dü.
 Ali [_{RC} [one European language-3POSS-ACC speak-SR] student]-ACC see-PST
 ‘Ali saw the student who speaks a European language.’
 B: Evet, Fransızca.
 ‘Yes, French’

An influential approach to the island insensitivity of ellipsis is known as the *Move, Elide, and Repair* analysis (Merchant, 2001, 2004; Lasnik, 2001; Fox and Lasnik, 2003; Fox and Pesetsky, 2005). Under these analyses, illustrated in (7B), the ellipsis site contains syntactic structure that is isomorphic to the antecedent, ellipsis targets a constituent, and the remnants move to escape the ellipsis site. This entails that when the ellipsis antecedent contains an island, the ellipsis site will also contain an island and that, in such cases, remnants must be able to move out of the island. Thus, under such analyses, it is necessary that ellipsis can **repair** the ungrammaticality that would otherwise arise from the island violating remnant movement.

- (7) A: James met [_{RC} the student who speaks an Altaic language].
 B: Yeah, Turkish James met [_{RC} the student who speaks t].

In this paper, we critically examine two challenges that have been raised in response to the Move, Elide, and Repair analysis. The first challenge questions how robust the generalization is that ellipsis ameliorates island violations. It has been claimed that while non-contrastive ellipsis does ameliorate island violations, contrastive ellipsis does not (Merchant, 2001; Winkler,

² Some terminological clarification: **Antecedent**: “James met [_{RC} the student who speaks a European language]”; **Correlate**: “a European language”; **Remnant**: “French”

2013; Griffiths and Liptak, 2014). However, recent experimental evidence has shown both contrastive and non-contrastive stripping to be island insensitive in English (Potter, 2017; Potter and Carlson, 2019). In sections 2.1 and 2.2, we argue that similar facts obtain of Turkish, as both contrastive and non-contrastive fragments are insensitive to relative clause and adjunct islands.

The second challenge questions the claim that, in island-violating ellipsis, the remnant actually escapes an island. Here we examine the ability of two alternative analyses of the island insensitivity of ellipsis to account for the Turkish facts. First are the Evasion Analyses (van Craenenbroeck, 2010; Barros, Elliott, and Thoms, 2013; Abels, 2017). Under this family of analyses, the syntax within the ellipsis site is not necessarily isomorphic to the antecedent, and therefore the remnant in island-violating ellipsis need not to move out of an island, thereby avoiding the need to posit that ellipsis can repair island violations. Several variants of this type of analysis are discussed in section 3.1, where we show they cannot account for the Turkish facts.

(8) A: James met [_{RC} the student who speaks a European language].

B: Yeah, French ~~it was t~~. (it-cleft source)

B': Yeah, French ~~the student speaks t~~. (short source)

A second type of alternative analysis is the non-movement analysis, in which ellipsis targets a non-constituent, permitting the remnant to remain in-situ (Ott and Struckmeier, 2018; Abe, 2016). If the remnant need not move to escape ellipsis, then no island violating movement need be posited, again avoiding the need to propose that ellipsis repairs island violations. In section 3.2, we show that the in-situ analysis cannot accommodate the island insensitivity of Turkish fragments. Given the empirical inadequacy of the evasion and the non-movement analyses, we conclude that ellipsis does indeed repair relative clause and adjunct island violations in Turkish.

(9) A: James met [_{RC} the student who speaks a European language].

B: Yeah, James met [_{RC} the student who speaks French].

2 Ellipsis and Island (In)Sensitivity in Turkish

In this section, we address the first challenge to the Move, Elide, and Repair approach to the island insensitivity of ellipsis by presenting data showing that both contrastive and non-contrastive fragments in Turkish are insensitive to relative clause and adjunct islands.

In non-contrastive ellipsis, the correlate and remnant do not contrast with each other (Griffiths and Liptak, 2014, p. 199-200). The correlate in these types of ellipsis are typically *wh*-phrases, indefinites, or disjunctions, as shown in (10), (11) and (12). Contrastive ellipsis is likewise transparently named, as in this case, the remnants and correlates do contrast with one another. The force of a contrastive ellipsis continuation can either be corrective or elaborative, as exemplified in (13)-(16) below. The antecedent of both contrastive and non-contrastive ellipsis can be a question, in which case a fragment response is known as a *fragment answer*. The antecedent for both types of ellipsis can also be declaratives, in which case a fragment response is known as *Stripping*.

(10) Wh-question Fragment Answer

A: Who did James call yesterday?

B: Mary.

- (11) Indefinite Correlate Stripping
 A: James called someone yesterday.
 B: Yeah, Mary.
- (12) Disjunctive Correlate
 A: James called Bill or Mary yesterday.
 B: Mary.
- (13) Corrective Yes-No Fragment Answer
 A: Did James call *Bill* yesterday?
 B: No, Mary.
- (14) Corrective Stripping
 A: James called Bill yesterday.
 B: No, Mary.
- (15) Elaborative Yes-No Fragment Answer
 A: Did James call *Bill* yesterday?
 B: Yeah, and Mary too.
- (16) Elaborative Stripping
 A: James called Bill yesterday.
 B: Yeah, and Mary too.

2.1 Turkish Non-Contrastive Fragments are island insensitive

It has previously been claimed that non-contrastive fragment answers to *wh*-questions are insensitive to relative clause islands, as illustrated in (17) (İnce, 2012). Here we extend this empirical claim to the generalization that, in general, non-contrastive ellipsis is insensitive to relative clause and adjunct islands in Turkish.

- (17) A: Hasan [_{RC} [ne-yi gezdir-en] bir çocuk]-la konuş-tu?
 Hasan what-ACC walk-SR one child-COM talk-PST
 lit: ‘What did Hasan talk to a child who walked?’
 B: Köpeğ-i.
 dog-ACC
 ‘The dog!’

In addition to *wh*-fragment answers, non-contrastive stripping with indefinite correlates (18) with disjunctive correlates (19) are also insensitive to relative clause islands.

- (18) A: Ali [_{RC} [bir Avrupa dil-i mi konuş-an] öğrenci]-yi gör-dü?
 Ali one Europe language-3POSS Q speak-SR student-ACC see-PST
 ‘Did Ali see the student who speaks a EUROPEAN LANGUAGE?’
 B: Evet, Fransızca.
 ‘Yes, French.’
- (19) A: Ahmet [_{RC} [Fransızca mı yoksa Almanca mı konuş-an] öğrenci]-yi gör-dü?
 Ahmet French Q or German Q speak-SR student-ACC see-PST
 ‘Did Ahmet see the student who speaks FRENCH or GERMAN?’
 B: Fransızca.
 ‘French.’

Moreover, non-contrastive ellipsis is also insensitive to adjunct islands in the language. This is exemplified in (20) for *wh*-fragment answers, in (21) for non-contrastive stripping with an indefinite correlate, and in (22) for non-contrastive stripping with a disjunctive correlate. Thus, it is a general property of non-contrastive ellipsis that it is insensitive to both relative clause and adjunct islands in Turkish.

- (20) A: Hasan [_{Adjunct} kim-i göreceğiz diye] bir ekmek daha al-mış?
 Hasan who-a will.see for one bread more buy-PERF
 lit: ‘Who did Hasan bring another loaf of bread because he will see?’
 B: Mehmed-i.
 Mehmet-ACC
 ‘Mehmet.’ (ex. 60, Griffiths and Liptak, 2014)
- (21) A: Hasan [_{Adjunct} birisi-ni mi göreceğiz diye] bir ekmek daha al-mış?
 Hasan someone-ACC Q will.see for one bread more buy-PERF
 ‘Did Hasan buy another loaf of bread because he will see SOMEONE?’
 B: Evet, Mehmed-i.
 yes, Mehmet-ACC
 ‘Yes, Mehmet.’
- (22) A: Ahmet [_{RC} [Fransızca yoksa Almanca konuş-an] öğrenci]-yi gör-dü.
 Ahmet French or German speak-SR student-ACC see-PST
 ‘Ahmet saw the student who speaks FRENCH or GERMAN.’
 B: Fransızca.
 ‘French.’

2.2 Turkish Contrastive Fragments are also island insensitive

Griffiths and Liptak (2014) claim that contrastive fragment answers are sensitive to adjunct islands in Turkish, providing the corrective fragment answer in example (23) as illustration. They provide this data in support of their broader claim that contrastive ellipsis is island sensitive, in contrastive with non-contrastive ellipsis. However, upon closer inspection, it seems that contrastive fragments in Turkish, of both corrective and elaborative varieties, are indeed insensitive to both adjunct and relative clause islands.

- (23) A: Hasan [_{Adjunct} MEHMED-i göreceğiz diye] mi bir ekmek daha almış?
 Hasan Mehmed-ACC will.see for Q one bread more bought
 ‘Did Hasan buy another loaf of bread because he will see MEHMED?’
 B: ?*Hayır, ALİ-Yİ.
 ‘No, Ali.’ (p.62, Griffiths and Liptak, 2014)

Two modifications to example (23) dramatically improves its acceptability, as illustrated in (24). The first modification is to provide the context that supports the relevant contrasts, rather than an out of the blue presentation. The second modification is the attachment of the question particle *mi* to the correlate, rather than to the island. Example (24B) is improved in acceptability over (23B), and judged by our informants to be roughly as acceptable as comparable examples of island violating non-contrastive ellipsis, e.g. (20-22). Also acceptable are examples (24B’), an

elaborative fragment answer, and (25), adjunct island violating corrective and elaborative stripping responses.

- (24) Context: Hasan makes sure that he always has enough bread to have with dinner. In particular, he makes sure he buys extra bread when he is having dinner with friends who also eat a lot of bread.
- A: Hasan [_{Adjunct} MEHMED-i mi göreceğiz diye] bir ekmek daha almış?
 Hasan Mehmed-ACC Q will.see for one bread more bought
 'Did Hasan buy another loaf of bread because we will see MEHMED?'
- B: Hayır, ALİ-Yİ.
 'No, Ali.'
- B': Evet, ve de ALİ-Yİ.
 'Yeah, and also Ali.'
- (25) A: Hasan [_{Adjunct} MEHMED-i göreceğiz diye] bir ekmek daha al-mış.
 Hasan Mehmed-a will.see for one bread more buy-PERF
 'Hasan bought another loaf of bread because we will see MEHMED.'
- B: Hayır, ALİ-Yİ.
 'No, Ali.'
- B': Evet, ve de ALİ-Yİ.
 yes, and also Ali-ACC
 'Yes, and also Ali.'

Contrastive fragments in Turkish are also insensitive to relative clause islands, as illustrated in (26) for corrective and elaborative fragment answers, and in (27) for Stripping. Thus, contrastive elliptical fragments in Turkish, along with non-contrastive fragments, are generally insensitive to adjunct and relative clause islands.

- (26) A: Ali [_{RC} [Almanca mı konuş-an] öğrenci]-yi gör-dü?
 Ali German Q speak-SR student-ACC see-PST
 'Did Ali see the student who speaks GERMAN?'
- B: Hayır, Fransızca
 'No, French.'
- B': Evet, ve de Türkçe.
 yes, and also Turkish
 'Yes, and also Turkish.'
- (27) A: Ali [_{RC} [Almanca konuş-an] öğrenci]-yi gör-dü.
 Ali German speak-SR student-ACC see-PST
 'Ali saw the student who speaks GERMAN.'
- B: Hayır, Fransızca
 'No, French.'
- B': Evet, ve de Türkçe.
 yes, and also Turkish
 'Yes, and also Turkish.'

3 Ellipsis, Repair, and Evasion

In the previous section, we saw that both contrastive and non-contrastive fragments are insensitive to relative clause and adjunct islands in Turkish. In this section, we address the second challenge to the Move, Elide, and Repair approach to the island insensitivity of ellipsis, posed by the question: how robust is the assumption that, in island violating ellipsis, the remnant actually escapes an island? In section (3.1), we examine the premise of the ME&R approach that the structure contained within ellipsis site is isomorphic to the antecedent and conclude that there is good reason to think that the silent syntax is indeed isomorphic to the antecedent. In section (3.2), we examine the premise that the remnant moves out of the ellipsis site to escape ellipsis, and, in the process, may move out an island. The evidence suggests that ellipsis remnants do indeed move to escape ellipsis, and so must be also able to escape islands. The conclusion, then, is that ellipsis must genuinely repair island violations.

- (28) A: Hasan [_{RC} [ne-y i gezdir-en] bir çocuk]-la konuş-tu?
 Hasan what-ACC walk-SR a child-COM talk-PST
 lit: 'What did Hasan talk to a child who walked?'
 B: Köpeğ-i Hasan [_{RC} [t gezdir-en] bir çocuk]-la konuş-tu.
 dog-ACC Hasan walk-SR a child-COM talk-PST
 'Hasan talked to a child who walked the dog.'

3.1 Evasion Approaches to Ellipsis Island Insensitivity

In contrast with the Move, Elide, and Repair approach to ellipsis, the approaches that adopt what we will call the *Evasion Gambit*, propose that, while ellipsis sites do contain silent syntactic structure, this structure need not be isomorphic to the antecedent (Merchant 2001; van Craenenbroeck, 2010; Abels, 2011; Barros, Elliott, & Thoms, 2013, 2014; Barros 2014). Under these approaches, when the antecedent contains an island, the elided syntax can be a non-isomorphic, non-island reformulation of the antecedent, perhaps as a last-resort to avoid an illicit structure. As a consequence of the lax identity condition between the ellipsis site and the antecedent, there need not be an island within the ellipsis site, and so the remnants need not ever move out of an island. The conclusion then is that there is no such thing as ellipsis island repair.

3.1.1 Cleft Analyses

One variety of the evasion approach posits that the ellipsis site contains a cleft structure (van Craenenbroeck, 2010; Abels, 2011; Barros, Elliott, & Thoms, 2014; Barros 2014). The plausibility of such analyses, for English at least, is initially supported by the observation that English reduced it-clefts are island insensitive, (29). Thus, if the ellipsis site were to contain a reduced it-cleft, rather than the full structure isomorphic to the antecedent, the island insensitivity of ellipsis could be explained without appeal to island repair, (30).

- (29) A: James met the student who speaks an Altaic language.
 B: Yeah, it's Turkish.
 B': *Yeah, it's Turkish that James met the student who speaks.
 (30) A: James met the student who speaks an Altaic language.

B: Yeah, Turkish ~~it is t~~.

B': Yeah, Turkish ~~James met the student who speaks t~~.

B'': Yeah, it's Turkish.

Whether a reduced it-cleft analysis is feasible for English, it is not feasible for Turkish. Turkish does not have it-clefts (Kornfilt, 1997). Compare the fragment answer (31B) with the copular reply in (31B'), approximating a reduced cleft. The copular continuation in (31B') is ungrammatical in response to (31A). Thus, Turkish island insensitive ellipsis cannot be explained by appeal to reduced it-clefts in the ellipsis site

(31) A: Sen-i her gün kim arı-yor?
you-ACC every day who call-PROG
'Who calls you every day?'

B: Ahmet.
'Ahmet.'

B': *Ahmet-tir.
Ahmet-COP
'It is Ahmet.'

While Turkish does not have it-clefts, it does have another type of cleft: pseudo-clefts, as shown in (32B). However, it is unlikely that Turkish Fragments can be given a pseudo-cleft analysis. First, the pseudo-cleft pivot, *Fransızca* in (32B), obligatorily appears with verbal morphology, *dir*. Stripping and fragment answers, on the other hand, cannot support any verbal morphology, as illustrated by the contrast between (31B) and (31B'). The absence of verbal morphology on the fragment would be unexpected under a pseudo-cleft analysis. Thus, under a pseudo-cleft analysis of the island insensitivity of Stripping and fragment answers, we must posit an additional, independently unmotivated, mechanism for stripping away the verbal morphology.

(32) A: Öğrenci bir Avrupa dil-i-ni konuş-uyor.
student one European language-POSS-ACC speak-PROG
'The student speaks a European language.'

B: Öğrenci-nin konuş-tuğ-u Fransızca-dır.
student-GEN speak-FNOM-3SG French-COP
'What the student speaks is French.'

A second reason to reject the pseudo-cleft analysis of ellipsis is that pseudo-clefts, unlike ellipsis, are island sensitive. Compare the unacceptable pseudo-cleft response in (33B) to the acceptable fragment answer in (33B'). If we were to assume that the ellipsis site could contain a pseudo-cleft, then ellipsis must still be able to repair the island sensitivity of the pseudo-cleft.

(33) A: Ali [RC hangi Avrupa dil-i-ni konuş-an öğrenci]-yi gör-dü?
Ali which European language-3POSS-ACC speak-SR student-ACC see-PST
lit: 'Which European language did Ali see the student who speaks?'

B: *Ali [RC konuş-an öğrenci]-yi gör-dü Fransızca-dır.
Ali speak-SR student-ACC see-PST French-COP
'Ali saw the student who speaks is French.'

B': Fransızca.
French
'French.'

A third reason to reject a pseudo-cleft ellipsis analysis is that fragments must match in case with their correlates (34), while pseudo-cleft pivots require nominative case (35), (e.g. İnce, 2009, p.35). Thus, neither it-clefts nor pseudo-clefts are viable analyses for Turkish fragments and therefore neither can explain the island insensitivity of Turkish fragments.

(34) A: Hasan-Ø kim-den borç al-dı?
Hasan-NOM who-ABL debt take-PST-3SG
'Who did Hasan borrow money from?'

B: Bir öğrenci-{*Ø/den}.
a student-ABL
'From a student.'

(35) Hasan-in borç al-dı-ğ-1 bir öğrenci-{Ø/*den}-dir.
Hasan-GEN debt take-PST-COMP-POSS3S a student-NOM-COP
'Who Hasan borrowed money from is a student.'

3.1.2 Short sources

An alternative evasion analysis of the island insensitivity of ellipsis posits that the ellipsis site can, in certain circumstances, contain less than the full antecedent (Merchant, 2001; Barros, Elliott, and Thoms 2013; Fukaya, 2003). Under these analyses, the ellipsis site contains syntax that roughly corresponds to just that of the island itself. As illustrated in (36), if the ellipsis site contained just the relative clause, reconstrued as a matrix clause, then the movement of the remnant out of the ellipsis site would not long involve island violating movement. Thus, ellipsis still need not be posited to repair island violations.

(36) A: Ahmet [_{RC} [bir Altay dil-i konuş-an] öğrenci]-yle buluş-tu.
Ahmet one Altaic language-3POSS speak-SR student-with meet-PST
'Ahmet met a student who speaks an Altaic language.'

B: Evet, Türkçe Ahmet t konuş-an öğrenci-yle buluştu.

B': Evet, Türkçe öğrenci t konuşuyor.

However, if we consider non-elliptical counterparts to purported short source fragment answers, we see that the short source answers are infelicitous answers to polar questions, as illustrated in (37). If the island insensitivity of fragment answers were to be explained by the ellipsis site containing a short source, then we should see do difference in felicity between the elided and non-elided variants.

(37) A: Ahmet [_{RC} [bir Altay dil-i mi konuş-an] öğrenci]-yle buluş-tu?
Ahmet one Altaic language-3POSS Q speak-SR student-with meet-PST
'Did Ahmet meet a student who speaks an Altaic language?'

B: Evet, Türkçe.

B': #Evet, [[Ahmet-in buluş-tuğ-u] öğrenci] Türkçe konuş-uyor.

yes Ahmet-GEN meet-FNOM-3POSS student Turkish speak-PROG
 ‘Yes, the student that Ahmet met speaks Turkish.’

Further, a short source analyses does not always predict the correct interpretation for ellipsis continuations. Consider the adjunct island violating (38). If the ellipsis site simply contained the content from the adjunct island, the fragment should have the interpretation that Zeynep arrived. This prediction is incorrect; the fragment yields the interpretation corresponding to the full, isomorphic construal: Ahmet called before Zeynep arrived.

- (38) A: Ahmet [birisi gel-me-den önce] ara-mış-tı.
 Ahmet someone come-NEG-ABL before call-PERF-PST
 ‘Ahmet called before someone arrived.’
 B: Evet, Zeynep.
 B’: ‘Yes, Zeynep.’ (=Ahmet called before Zeynep arrived, !=Zeynep arrived)

In summary, no evasion approach to ellipsis island repair can explain why any islands should be repaired by ellipsis in Turkish. Reduced it-clefts are unavailable in Turkish. Pseudo-cleft analyses incorrectly predict that fragments should be island sensitive, that they should only allow nominative case, and should allow verbal morphology on the pivot. Short source ellipsis site resolutions predict fragments to be infelicitous where they are felicitous, and do not always yield the correct interpretation. Thus, we conclude that the ellipsis site contains syntactic structure isomorphic to the antecedent.

3.2 In-situ analyses

Even if the ellipsis site does contain structure isomorphic to the antecedent, then we could still avoid positing that ellipsis can repair island violations, if we posit that (i) remnants do not move out the ellipsis site and (ii) ellipsis can operate over non-constituents, as illustrated in (39), (Ott and Struckmeier, 2018; Abe, 2016).

- (39) A: Hasan [_{RC} [ne-yi gezdir-en] bir çocuk]-la konuş-tu?
 Hasan what-ACC walk-SR a child-COM talk-PST
 lit: ‘What did Hasan talk to a child who walked?’
 B: ~~Hasan~~ [_{RC} [köpeğ-i gezdir-en] bir çocuk]-la ~~konuş-tu~~.
 Hasan dog-ACC walk-SR a child-COM talk-PST
 ‘Hasan talked to a child who walked the dog.’

However, the behavior of propositional fragment answers provides evidence that the fragment moves, rather than remains in-situ, building off an argument made by Merchant (2001). There is a correspondence between the mobility of propositions and their ability to serve as fragments. Non-finite complement clauses can be scrambled (40B’’) and can be fragment answers (40B’).

- (40) A: Ülkü ne söyle-di?
 Ülkü what say-PST
 ‘What did Ülkü say?’
 B: Ülkü [Zeynep-in git-tiğ-i-ni] söyle-di.

- Ülkü Zeynep-GEN go-FNOM-3POSS-ACC say-PST
 ‘Ülkü said that Zeynep left.’
 B’: [Zeynep-in git-tiğ-i-ni].
 Zeynep-GEN go-FNOM-3POSS-ACC
 ‘That Zeynep left.’
 B’’: [Zeynep-in git-tiğ-i-ni]_i Ülkü t_i söyle-di.
 Zeynep-GEN go-FNOM-3POSS-ACC Ülkü t say-PST
 ‘That Zeynep left, Ülkü said.’

Finite complement clauses, on the other hand, both are poor fragment answers (41B’) and resist scrambling (41B’). This correspondence between mobility and acceptability as a fragment follows if ellipsis remnants move. Conversely, if remnants remain in-situ, we would predict both finite and non-finite propositions to be as equally acceptable fragments as they are in-situ.

- (41) A: Ülkü ne de-di?
 Ülkü what tell-PST
 ‘What did Ülkü tell?’
 B: Ülkü [Zeynep git-ti] de-di.
 Ülkü Zeynep go-PST tell-PST
 ‘Ülkü told that Zeynep left.’
 B’: ??[Zeynep git-ti].
 Zeynep go-PST
 ‘That Zeynep left.’
 B’’: ??[Zeynep git-ti]_i Ülkü t_i de-di.
 Zeynep go-PST Ülkü t tell-PST
 ‘That Zeynep left, Ülkü told.’

4. Conclusions

Turkish fragments, both contrastive and non-contrastive, are insensitive to relative clause and adjunct islands, contra the general claim forwarded by Griffiths and Liptak (2014). Further, neither evasion nor non-movement analyses can explain the Turkish ellipsis island insensitivity. The data follow if ellipsis can repair these island violations, as proposed under a Move, Elide, and Repair analysis. Two related conclusions follow. First, if non-pronunciation, e.g. Ellipsis, repairs an otherwise ungrammatical structure, the ungrammaticality of that structure must be due to constraints on pronunciation (Merchant, 2001, 2004; Lasnik, 2001; Fox and Lasnik, 2003; Fox and Pesetsky, 2005). Second, if an island violation can be repaired, it must have been generable in the first place. This suggests that repairable islands are not derivational (e.g. Boeckx, 2012).

References

- Abe, J. 2016. Make short answers shorter. Support for the in-situ approach. *Syntax* 19(3): 223-255.
 Abels, K., 2011. Don’t fix that island. It ain’t broke. Talk at *Islands in Contemporary Syntactic Theory workshop*, University of the Basque Country.
 Barros, M. 2014. *Sluicing and Identity in Ellipsis*. PhD dissertation. Rutgers University.

- Barros, M, P. D. Elliott, & G. Thoms. 2013. More variation in island repair: Clausal vs. non-clausal islands. In *the Proceedings of the 49th Chicago Linguistics Society*, Vol. 49.
- Barros, M, P. D. Elliott, & G. Thoms. 2014. "There is no island repair". Ms. Rutgers, UCL, University of Edinburgh.
- Boeckx, C. 2012. *Syntactic Islands*. (Key Topics in Syntax). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In S. Anderson & P. Kiparsky (eds.), *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, pp. 232-286. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MA. MIT Press.
- van Craenenbroeck, J. 2010. *The Syntax of Ellipsis: Evidence from Dutch Dialects*. Oxford University Press.
- van Craenenbroeck, J. & T. Temmerman. 2019. *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*. Oxford University Press.
- Fox, Danny, and Howard Lasnik. 2003. Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between Sluicing and VP Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 143-154.
- Fox, D. & D. Pesetsky. 2005. Cyclic linearization of syntactic structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31. 1-45.
- Fukaya, Teruhiko. 2003. Island (in)sensitivity in Japanese sluicing and stripping. In G. Garding and M. Tsujimura (eds.), *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 22*, 179-192. Somerville, MA. Cascadilla Press.
- Griffiths, J. & A. Liptak. 2014. Contrast and Island Sensitivity in Clausal Ellipsis. *Syntax* 17(3), 189-234.
- Griffiths, J. 2019. A Q-based approach to clausal ellipsis: Deriving the preposition stranding and island sensitivity generalizations without movement. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4(1): 12. 1-41.
- Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish*. (Descriptive Grammars). Routledge: London and New York.
- İnce, A. 2009. *Dimensions of ellipsis: Investigations in Turkish*. PhD Dissertation. University of Maryland.
- İnce, A. 2012. Fragment Answers and Islands. *Syntax* 15(2), 181-214.
- Lasnik, H. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 31*. 301-320. Amherst: MA. GSLA Publications. University of Massachusetts.
- Merchant, J. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Merchant, J. 2004. Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661-738.
- Ott, D. & V. Struckmeier. 2018. Particles and deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49(2): 393-407.
- Potter, D. 2017. *The Island (In)Sensitivity of Stripping*. PhD Dissertation. Northwestern University.
- Potter, D. & K. Carlson. 2019. Island repair through stripping. Poster presented at CUNY 2019. University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Ross, J. R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD Dissertation. MIT.
- Ross, J, R. 1969. Guess who? In Robert Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia Green, and Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252-286. Chicago Linguistic Society: Chicago, Illinois.
- Winkler, S. 2013. Syntactic diagnostics for extraction of focus from ellipsis site. In L. L. Cheng and N. Corver (eds.), *Diagnosing syntax*, 463-484. Oxford: Oxford University Press.