

All is as expected in (6). The matrix clause is both negated and questioned by *why*. Hence B and B' are both good, and ask the same thing, questioning the reason for John's not telling:

- (6) A: John didn't tell Mary that he was going. B: Why? B': Why NOT?
 B = B' = Why didn't John tell Mary that he was going? ✓*why* ~ *tell*

In (7), however, the embedded clause is negated. The context brings out the relevant reading, on which the ellipsis site includes the matrix *tell*-clause. *Why?* is ambiguous in the same way as the unelided version of the sentence – it can be questioning the reason for John's telling or the reason for his not coming. *Why NOT?*, however, can only be questioning the reason for John's not going:

- (7) (In truth, John went to the party. But:) A: John told Mary that he didn't go to the party.
 B: Why? = Why did John tell Mary that he didn't go? ✓*why* ~ *tell* ✓*why* ~ *go*
 B': Why NOT? ≠ Why did John tell Mary that he didn't go? * *why* ~ *tell* ✓*why* ~ *go*

Thus the reason and negation components of *why NOT* must be associated with the same clause. This restriction would be unexpected if *why* and *NOT* were independent pieces, whereby the unavailable reading of (7B') might be derived along the lines of (5).

The one good reading of *Why NOT?* in (7) involves both the reason and the negation associating with the lower clause. As predicted, this reading is blocked by turning the lower clause into an island in (8). While B is rendered unambiguous, B' is left with no readings, hence judged ungrammatical:

- (8) A: John told Mary who didn't go to the party.
 B : Why? = Why did John tell Mary who didn't go? ✓*why* ~ *tell* * *why* ~ *go*
 B': * Why NOT? ≠ Why did John tell Mary who didn't go? * *why* ~ *tell* * *why* ~ *go*

IV. In sum, *why NOT* behaves as a single, fused unit: the reason being questioned by *why* and the negation with which *NOT* is concordant must originate in the same clause. Consequently, the *NOT* of *why NOT* is different to the one observed with stripping clausal ellipsis (9):

- (9) John went to the party, NOT MARY!

While this might initially seem unfortunate, there are independent reasons to keep *why NOT* separate from stripping *NOT*. First, stripping *NOT* does not require a negative antecedent; rather, it introduces a new negation, in concert with another contrastive element. Second, the word order of *why NOT* is exceptional, in that *NOT* comes second. Third, *why NOT* is not productively constructed, *why* being the only *wh*-word that participates in this frame; cf. **when NOT*, **where NOT*, ??*how NOT*.

V. Circling back to (1) and (2), we see that clausal ellipsis interacts with negation very differently from VPE. Clausal ellipsis's fundamental requirement for sameness extends above the elided material itself to include the pronounced negation of *why NOT*, which must find an antecedent. With VPE, however, a new negation can be introduced above the ellipsis site, reflecting VPE's tolerance of (Rooth 1992, Tancredi 1992), or requirement for (Stockwell 2018, Griffiths 2019), contrast.

Chung, S., W. Ladusaw & J. McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3(3). 239–282.

Griffiths, James. 2019. Beyond MaxElide: An investigation of A'-movement from elided phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50(3). 571–607.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1974. Presupposition and linguistic context. *Theoretical Linguistics* 1(3). 181–194.

Kroll, Margaret. 2019. Polarity reversals under sluicing. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 12(18). 1–49.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: OUP.

Merchant, Jason. 2006. Why no(t)? *Style* 40(1 & 2). 20–23.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1. 75–116.

Ross, John R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.

Stockwell, Richard. 2018. Ellipsis in tautologous conditionals: the contrast condition on ellipsis. In Sireemas Maspong, Brynhildur Stefánsdóttir,

Katherine Blake & Forrest Davis (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 28*, 584–603.

Tancredi, Christopher. 1992. *Deletion, deaccenting and presupposition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.