



and embedded left dislocated constituents: they are less articulated than +EFA complements (see de Cuba 2006, Haegeman 2006, a.o. for CP truncation analyses).

**Differences in semantics:** Differences in structure alone cannot straightforwardly account for the contrast in sluicing since Spec,C is available for both complements of +EFA and –EFA verbs. We appeal to the observation in Chung et al. (1995) that remnants of (inner antecedent) sluicing tend to be discourse linked (in the sense of Pesetsky 1987). This is clear from (6b) from above, where *quién* refers to the individual introduced into the discourse context by *alguién*. Interestingly, we find strikingly similar observations from Suñer (1991 et seq.), illustrated in (8).

- (8) a. (Te) recuerdo/se **cuáles** eran sus actores favoritos: Nicholson y Depardieu.  
 You remind/know.1sg **which** were his/her actors favorite: Nicholson and Depardieu  
 “I (will) tell/remind/know (you) who his/her favorite actors were: N and D.”
- b. Te <sup>?</sup> digo/repito que **cuáles** eran sus actores favoritos: #Nicholson y Depardieu.  
 You ask/repeat.1sg. that **which** were his/her actors favorites: #Nicholson and Depardieu  
 “I’ll ask you which his/her favorite actors are: N and D.”

In (8a), with our -EFA verbs, *cuáles* is discourse linked to the answer which is supplied felicitously: Nicholson and Depardieu. N and D are the specific members of the set to which *cuáles* refers. In contrast, in (8b), *cuáles* does not refer to any specific members of a set; it is not discourse-linked. Thus, it is infelicitous to interpret it as referring to N and D as the answer.

In this respect, our –EFA verbs take *referential* complements, while our +EFA verbs take *non-referential* complements. We follow Cinque’s (1990) definition of referentiality and adapt it to the CP domain, along the lines of de Cuba & Ürögdi (2009), as in (9):

- (9) a. **Referential CP:** denotes an accepted (or pre-established) proposition in the existing discourse which has no illocutionary force.
- b. **Non-referential cP:** denotes a speech act which introduces a proposition (or an open question) which is not yet accepted (or pre-established) in the existing discourse.

**The role of *que*:** We claim that the *que* which appears above the *wh*-words in (7a) and (8b), and the *que* which introduces embedded fragment answers in (4) both head a non-referential cP which itself is higher than FP in (3a) (structurally parallel to Rizzi’s (1997) ForceP: see also Demonte & Fernandez Soriano (2010)). As support, consider verbs that can appear with or without this *que*: *decir* “say” and *repetir* “repeat”. Suñer (1991) notes that these verbs can show the same pattern and interpretation as the verbs in (8a), but crucially, only when *que* is not present (data not shown here). As (8b) shows, it is *only* in the presence of *que* that the embedded *wh*-word is interpreted non-referentiality. Since sluicing remnants tend to be referential, we can explain why these verbs cannot appear in sluicing with *que*, as in (6b), but can when *que* is not present, as in (10), a continuation of (6a): *que* would make the remnants non-referential.

- (10) ...me dijeron/repetieron (tres veces) (\*que) **quién**  
 ...to me they said/they repeated three times that **who**

The opposite is true of fragment answers - *que* must be present (4). The presence of *que* (heading cP) is an indication of the additional structure needed to house the remnant of fragment answers (FP is truncated along with cP in referential CPs). Since fragment answers are clauses, and since they introduce new information into the discourse (see (9b)), they are non-referential cPs.

### Selected References

**Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990.** *Types of A'-Dependencies*. MIT Press.

**de Cuba, Carlos & Barbara Ürögdi. 2009.** Eliminating Factivity from Syntax: Sentential Complements in Hungarian. In: *Approaches to Hungarian*: vol. 11. Marcel Den Dikken & Robert Vago (eds.). John Benjamins. 29-63.

**Merchant, Jason. 2004.** Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27.6:661-738.

**Rizzi, Luigi. 1997.** The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In: *Elements of Grammar. A Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Liliane Haegeman (ed.). Kluwer: Dordrecht. 281–337.

**Saab, Andrés Leandro. 2008.** *Hacia una teoría de la identidad parcial en la elipsis*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Buenos Aires.

**Suñer, Margarita. 1991.** Indirect questions and the structure of CP: Some consequences. In: *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*. Hector Campos and Fernando Martinez-Gil (eds.). Georgetown University Press. 283-312.