Interaction in ellipsis: Determiner sharing as 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 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, Ackema & Szendrői 2002, Citko 2006, Arregi & Centeno 2005) that in this kind of non-constituent ellipsis, gapping of D without gapping of T0/V0 is ungrammatical, see (2-a). However, new data of DS in embedded clauses with overt T0/V0, (2-b), argue against this generalization.¹

(1) a. The girls will study Russian, and _ boys _ (learn) Portuguese. = the boys
   b. I gave my CDs to Masha and _ _ DVDs to Fatma. = my DVDs

(2) a. *Which girls will study Russian and boys will learn Portuguese? ≠ which boys
   b. I wonder which girls will study Russian and _ boys will learn Portuguese. = 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 null allomorphs are inserted into D-positions under certain prosodic conditions. If this is on the right track, it offers evidence for the null-morpheme insertion view of ellipsis.

DS in embedded clauses. Generally, DS is dependent on gapping. Lin (2002) observed a more fine grained distinction: sharing of an object D (like in (1-b)) requires gapping of the lexical verb, while subject-DS requires gapping of T/the finite verb and allows non-finite verbal material to be overt, (1-a). However, as (2-b) shows, in embedded contexts, DS is licit in the absence of T0/V0-gapping. Instead, what is relevant is omission of C0, as new data like (3) show. Only with deletion of dass is a shared-D interpretation possible.

(3) Ich frag mich, welche Bücher dass Maria liest und (*dass) Filme (*dass) Anna schaut.
   I ask myself 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 T0 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, will sometimes sleep in her, office, but Bill, won’t sleep in her, his, 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 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

¹The data come from an informal survey of 26 native English speakers.
²Although examples with identical verbs in the two conjuncts are also attested, contrasting verbs are preferred.
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).

   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.** I assume that LEE is an operation at the syntax-phonology interface, and can refer to both
morphosyntactic and prosodic structure. Concretely, it inserts null items in positions which fail to be inte-
grated into an intonational phrase (Weir 2016). Gapping structures (and symmetric coordinations in general)
give rise to two intonational phrases (Wiklund 2007). Thus, in coordinations, the left edge of the second
conjunct becomes a target for 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. (ι[TP the girls] will [ι[VP t1 study Russian]) (ι[VP the boys learn Portuguese)])
   b. Ich frage mich (ι[ForceP welche Bücher; dass [ι&P [ιTopP t1 Maria liest]) (ι[TopP welche
Filme Anna schaut])]

Object-DS makes visible how gapping feeds DS: the verb has to be deleted first, for the object D to be in the
left edge of the intonational phrase. (I remain agnostic about the exact analysis of gapping, as long as it in-
volves small conjuncts.) The left edge can then be realized by null morphemes to satisfy the **STRONGSTART**
constraint (Selkirk 2011), which penalizes overt elements at the start of intonational phrases that cannot be
parsed into prosodic words (i.e. functional elements, following Selkirk 1995), (8). I follow Weir (2016)
in assuming that Ds can have 0-allomorphs in English. The realization of D should have no effect on the
semantic interpretation – Ds are interpreted as if they had been realized. Optionality of DS results from
variable constraint ranking (**STRONGSTART** > **MAX**: DS; **MAX** > **STRONGSTART**: no DS). The coordi-
nator 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**.

(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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recover</th>
<th><strong>STRONGSTART</strong></th>
<th><strong>MAX</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. (ι(σ the) (ω boys) (φ (ω learn) (ω Portuguese)))</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (ι(ω boys) (φ (ω learn) (ω Portuguese)))</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. (ι(σ and) (ω boys) (φ(ω learn) (ω Portuguese)))</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Conclusions.** An analysis of DS in terms of LEE reveals that, despite of the superficial dependency between
gapping and DS, there is no real syntactic dependency between these two instances of ellipsis. Instead,
gapping and LEE cooperate to give rise to DS structures.
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