

snippets

Issue 24

November 2011

Contents

1. Theresa Biberauer and Johan Oosthuizen. *More unbearably light elements? Silent verbs demanding overt complementizers in Afrikaans.*
2. Alex Drummond. *The ban on rightward P-stranding is a global constraint.*
3. Giorgio Magri. *The plurality inference of object mass nouns.*
4. Jacopo Romoli. *Presupposition wipe-out can't be all or nothing: a note on conflicting presuppositions.*
5. Philippe Schlenker. *Generalized bishop sentences.*
6. Carson Schütze. *There does not undergo predicate inversion.*
7. Michelle Sheehan. *A note on case assignment to CP.*
8. Gary Thoms. *P-stranding diagnoses A'-movement in tough constructions.*
9. Honglei Wang, David Potter and Masaya Yoshida. *Cross-conjunct binding in nominal gapping.*



9.

Honglei Wang, David Potter, Masaya Yoshida - *Northwestern University* *Cross-conjunct binding in nominal gapping*

honglei-wang@northwestern.edu

Gapping is normally understood as a construction in which the verbal head is ‘gapped’ in a coordination context. One of the questions in the study of gapping is whether other ‘gapped’ constructions have the same derivation as the well-known cases of gapping in the verbal domain (Verbal Gapping: VG). One of the unique properties of VG is so-called cross-conjunct binding (Johnson 1996/2004, McCawley 1993): a quantifier in the first conjunct can bind the subject in the second conjunct only when the verb is gapped as in (1).

- (1) a. No one₁ will eat beans and his₁ friend ~~eat~~ rice.
b. *No one₁ will eat beans and his₁ friend eat rice

Among other interesting properties, cross-conjunct binding provides strong support for the Across-the-Board (ATB) movement under VP-coordination analysis of VG (Johnson 1994, 1996/2004, 2006, 2009, Lin 2000 among others).

A similar binding relation also exists in gapping in the nominal domain (Nominal Gapping: NG, Chaves 2005, Jackendoff 1971, Postal 2004, Yoshida 2005), which thus suggests that NG has the same type of derivation as VG, namely ATB movement under small constituent coordination (NP-coordination). In (2), for example, the head noun in the second conjunct is gapped and the genitive/possessive pronoun in the second conjunct is bound by the quantifier in the first conjunct.

- (2) Not every doctor₁'s knowledge of tax law or his₁ accountant's ~~knowledge~~ of medicine is reliable.

However, interestingly, such a binding relation can be achieved even without the gap (3a), or even in the non-coordination context (3b).

- (3) a. Not every doctor₁'s knowledge of tax law or his₁ accountant's knowledge of medicine is reliable.
b. No parent₁'s attitude toward politics should bias his₁ children's (attitude) toward religion.

These examples show that the cross-conjunct binding does not provide us with a reliable testing ground for the structure of NG.

This leads us to question whether the derivation of NG involves ATB movement or ellipsis. Interestingly, the distribution of NG perfectly overlaps with that of NP-ellipsis (NPE): whenever NPE is licensed, NG is licensed as well. The examples in (4) illustrate that NPE and NG are both licit subsequent to possessives, *all*, numerals, and

superlatives and are both illicit subsequent to determiners and bare attributive adjectives.

(4) a. John read Mary's/the shortest book of music and Bill's/all/three/the longest/~~book~~ (of poems) (as well).

b. *John read the/a/a long/ book of music and the/a/a short ~~book~~ (of poems).

The examples in (5) demonstrate that in embedded contexts, NG and NPE are both licensed.

(5) a. Mary's book of rock music was published because Bill's ~~book~~ (of heavy metal) was so successful.

b. I read Mary's book of music and John says he read Bill's ~~book~~ (of poems).

In sum, the difference between VG and NG in terms of cross-conjunct binding indicates that VG and NG are derived differently. Unlike VG, NG seems to involve ellipsis rather than ATB movement.

References

- Chaves, Rui. P. (2005) "A linearization-based approach to gapping," in *The Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Formal Grammar and the 9th Meeting on Mathematics of Language*. Stanford: CSLI, 1-14.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1971) "Gapping and related rules." *Linguistic Inquiry* 2, 21-35.
- Johnson, K. (1994) "Bridging the gap." Ms. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Johnson, K. (1996/2004). "In search of the English middle field." Ms. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Johnson, K. (2006). "Gapping," in *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, ed. M. Everaert, H. van Riemsdijk, R. Goedemans and B. Hollebrandse. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 407-435.
- Johnson, K. (2009) "Gapping is not (VP-) ellipsis." *Linguistic Inquiry* 40, 289-328.
- Lin, Vivian. (2000) "Determiner sharing," in *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*, ed. R. Billerey and B. D. Lillehaugen. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 274-287..
- McCawley, J. D. (1993) "Gapping with shared operators," in *Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 245-253..
- Postal, P. M. (2004) *Skeptical Linguistic Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yoshida, M. 2005. "The rightward movement analysis of gapping in NP and its structural implications," in *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. J. Alderete, C. Han and A. Kochetov. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 388-396.