# Parasitic gapping: Determiner sharing is gapping + LEE

**Introduction & Claim.** I show how two independent ellipsis processes, gapping and left edge ellipsis (LEE) conspire to create determiner sharing (DS) constructions. These are gapping structures which also allow the omission of a determiner or quantifier, in addition to gapping of the (tensed) verb, (1). It has been reported (e.g. McCawley 1993, Johnson 2000, Lin 2002, Ackema & Szendrői 2002, Citko 2006, Arregi & Centeno 2005) that in this kind of non-constituent ellipsis, DS is *parasitic* on gapping, i.e. gapping of D without gapping of $T^0/V^0$ is ungrammatical, see (2-a). However, DS in embedded clauses with overt $T^0/V^0$, (2-b), argues against this generalization. This observation by Ackema & Szendrői (2002) is supported by my study of 36 English speakers.

(1)    a.    The girls will drink whiskey, and _ boys _ (drink) wine.      = *the boys*
        b.    I gave my CDs to Masha and _ _ DVDs to Fatma.      = *my DVDs*
(2)    a.   *Which girls will drink whiskey and boys will drink wine?     ≠ *which boys*
        b.    I wonder which girls will drink whiskey and _ boys will drink wine.    = *which boys*

I argue that (2-b) provides new evidence for the SMALL CONJUNCTS analysis of gapping (Johnson 2009, Toosarvandani 2013). Based on this assumption, I propose a new analysis of DS in terms of LEE (Zwicky & Pullum 1983, Weir 2012), by which prosodically weak material at the left edge of a conjunct is deleted under recoverability.

**DS in embedded clauses.** What seems to be relevant for sentences like (2-b) is the omission of $C^0$, as (3) shows. Thus, the general dependency of DS on gapping can be upheld.

(3)    *... welche Bücher dass Maria liest   und (\*dass) Filme   (\*dass) Anna schaut.*
       which books that Maria reads and   that   movies   that   Anna watches
      "(I wonder) which books Maria reads and which movies Anna watches."     *Swiss German*

Correlating the gapping requirements with the height of coordination, such that the gapped element is the head immediately above the coordination (Johnson 2000, Lin 2002), accounts for these facts straightforwardly. This means that gapping of the complementzier in $Force^0$ results from a coordination of TopPs; gapping of $T^0$ is derived by coordination of vPs (= the small conjuncts account). This view has been the basis of DS-analyses like Lin 2002, Citko 2006, Arregi & Centeno 2005 (vs. a LARGE CONJUNCT analysis in Ackema & Szendrői 2002). I will also adopt it here.

**Previous analyses.** DS exhibits one of the hallmarks of ellipsis: it allows morphosyntactic mismatches between the antecedent and the gap (as in the VP-ellipsis in (4)).

(4)    $Anna_i$ will sometimes sleep in $her_i$ office, but $Bill_j$ won't ~~sleep in $her_i$/$his_j$ office~~.

Consider the Polish examples in (5). Polish allows sharing of possessive pronouns, and the second conjunct in (5) can receive the sloppy reading in which John is the proprietor of the pencil.

(5)    *Marysia    pożyczyła Andiemu jej długopis, a   Janek     ołówek.*
       Mary.NOM lent     Andy.DAT her pen.ACC and John.NOM pencil.ACC
      "Mary lent Andy her pen and John – pencil."

This immediately excludes DS-analyses in which a single element is literally shared between the conjuncts (i.e. ATB-movement (Johnson 2000, Lin 2002) and Multidominance approaches (Citko 2006)). Move-and-delete accounts, in which remnants undergo (focus-) movement and the evacuated XP is subsequently deleted, are not plausible for DS, either, for two reasons. First, NPs, which would have to undergo remnant movement, are generally immobile in English (*Red car, I saw that*). Second, DS is not sensitive to islands. Sailor and Thoms (2013) illustrate for ellipsis in non-constituent coordinations that if a remnant is contained in an island like a possessive DP,

ellipsis becomes ungrammatical, since movement of the remnant out of that island is impossible, (6-a). DS is grammatical, even if the ellipsis site is contained in an island, (6-b).

(6)   a.   *John wrote everyone's favorite song about football in 2001 and basketball in 2012.
      b.   Whose favorite song is played on Wednesday and _ movie on Friday?

Taking all of this into consideration, I will argue that DS can be conceived of as *in situ* deletion (Ott & Struckmeier 2018), specifically, prosodically driven LEE.

**LEE analysis.** LEE is a post-syntactic operation that deletes prosodically weak elements in prosodically strong positions (like constituent-initial positions) under recoverability. The gist of the analysis is this: Gapping structures (and symmetric coordinations in general) give rise to two intonational phrases (Wiklund 2007). Thus, the second conjunct in these coordinations contains a prosodically prominent edge (the start of the $\iota$ phrase) that can be targeted by LEE. The apparent dependency of DS on gapping is explained by the height of the coordination: subject-D sharing requires T-gapping (Lin 2002). This translates to a coordination of vPs. The left edge is occupied by the subject DP, making only the subject D accessible for LEE, (7-a). If VPs are coordinated, the left edge is occupied by the object D, giving rise to object DS, and in embedded clauses, where a DP moves to ForceP, TopPs are coordinated, (7-b).

(7)   a.   $(_\iota$ [$_{\text{TP}}$ the girls$_i$ will [$_{\&\text{P}}$ [$_{\text{vP}}$ $t_i$ drink whiskey ] ) $(_\iota$ and [$_{\text{vP}}$ ~~the~~ boys drink wine ]]] )
      b.   ... $(_\iota$ [$_{\text{ForceP}}$ *welche Bücher$_i$ dass* [$_{\&\text{P}}$ [$_{\text{TopP}}$ $t_i$ *Maria liest* ] ) $(_\iota$ *und* [$_{\text{TopP}}$ ~~*welche*~~ *Filme Anna schaut* ]]] )

Object-DS makes visible how gapping feeds DS: the verb has to be deleted first (in syntax proper), for the object D to be in the left edge of the intonational phrase. (I remain agnostic about the exact analysis of gapping.) This left edge is then radically de-accented (Tancredi 1992) and left unpronounced to satisfy the STRONGSTART constraint (Selkirk 2011), which penalizes elements at the start of intonational phrases that cannot be parsed into prosodic words (i.e. functional elements, following Selkirk 1995), (8). The realization of D should have no effect on the semantic interpretation – Ds are interpreted as if they had been realized.

(8)   STRONGSTART (Selkirk 2011, Bennett et al. 2016)
      Prosodic constituents above the level of the word should not have at their left edge an immediate sub-constituent which is prosodically dependent (smaller than a prosodic word).

(9)

| ... and the boys learn Portuguese | RECOVER | STRONGSTART | MAX |
|---|---|---|---|
| a.   $(_\iota$ $(_\sigma$ the) $(_\omega$ boys) $(_\phi$ $(_\omega$ learn) $(_\omega$ Portuguese))) | *! | * | * |
| b.   $(_\iota$ $(_\omega$ boys) $(_\phi$ $(_\omega$ learn) $(_\omega$ Portuguese))) | *! |  | ** |
| c.  ☞  $(_\iota$ $(_\sigma$and) $(_\omega$ boys) $(_\phi$$(_\omega$ learn) $(_\omega$ Portuguese))) |  | * | * |

The coordinator may not be deleted since it is not recoverable. This account explains why sharing of adjectives is impossible, (10): they are not functional, can be parsed into prosodic words, and are thus not targeted by STRONGSTART.

(10)   *Italian red wines are outstanding and _ white wines _ excellent.          (McCawley 1993)

**Conclusions.** DS is not a completely syntactic deletion process, but sensitive to prosodic structure. This and the dependency on gapping can be captured by a conspiratorial analysis: gapping provides a coordination structure which involves a prominent initial position that can be targeted by LEE.