

A Dual-Source Analysis of Gapping

David Potter, Michael Frazier, Masaya Yoshida

Gapping constructions (1) have long been known to be ambiguous with respect to the scope of modals and negation [11], with the scope-taking material scoping either under the coordinator, yielding *distributed scope*, or above the coordinator, yielding *wide scope*. Extant analyses of Gapping [2, 5, 4, 6, 9] stumble over this ambiguity, failing to account for its full distribution and a constraint on *split scope*: multiple scope-taking elements cannot be split between wide and distributed scopes. In turn, we propose that Gapping is a heterogenous phenomenon and that this scope ambiguity should be reduced to a structural ambiguity between the coordination of CPs (2a) and vPs (2b).

- (1) Jim can't eat caviar and Sue can't eat beans.
- (2) a. [_{CP} Jim can't eat caviar] and [_{CP} Sue_i beans_j [_{TP} t_i can't eat t_j]]
- b. Jim can't [_{vP} eat caviar] and [_{vP} Sue_i beans_j [_{vP} t_i eat t_j]]

Distributed scope follows from the interpretation of scope-taking material within the scope of the coordination; this reading of (1) can be paraphrased as “Jim is not permitted to eat caviar and Sue is not permitted to eat beans.” In the *wide scope* reading, the scope-taking material scopes over the coordinator and can be paraphrased “it is not permitted for Jim to eat caviar and for Sue to eat beans.” Most other elements in the IP and CP domains participate in this ambiguity, including high adverbs (3), aspect (4), and epistemic and root modality (5). Furthermore, scope-taking material in the IP and CP domains must all take either distributed or wide scope. (1) cannot be interpreted as in (6a) or (6b): *split scope* is impossible in Gapping.

- (3) James is probably writing his term paper and Mary her final exam
- (4) James has been working hard on their article and Mary on their presentation.
- (5) a. James might vote independent and Mary Democrat
- b. James can cook the pasta and Mary the chicken.
- (6) a. It is not the case that Jim is permitted to eat caviar and Sue is permitted to eat beans.
- b. It is permitted for Jim not to eat caviar and for Sue not to eat beans.

Material interpreted below the IP domain, including manner adverbs and adverbial negation (7), can only take distributed scope. However, *wh*-words at the left edge of the correlate conjunct are interpreted with a single referent, obligatorily taking wide scope along with *can't* (8).

- (7) a. James quickly ate the beans and Mary the rice.
- b. James can't not eat beans and Mary rice.
- (8) Who can't James meet on Monday and Bill on Tuesday?

This data suggest that Gapping is supported in exactly two configurations: CP and vP coordinate structures. In the large-conjunct structures, each conjunct contains a copy of the gapped material, resulting in the distributed scope reading. Remnants interpreted in the CP domain, including epistemic modality (5a)[1], and topicalized elements (9) [10] can receive a distributed interpretation, and so the large conjuncts must be full CPs (contra [9, 6, 4]). In the small conjunct structures, the scope-taking material in the IP and CP domains c-commands and consequently takes wide scope over the low coordinate structure. Material within the vP

domain, including adverbial negation (7b) and manner adverbials (7a), cannot occur above the coordinate structure, and so cannot take wide scope. Furthermore, assuming that Gapping is supported in only two configurations, the split-scope facts follow; the relevant scopal material is either entirely contained with the large conjuncts, or positioned above the small conjuncts. No intermediate configurations are possible.

(9) Beans, Peter can't eat, and rice, Mary.

The gap in both structures is derived through ellipsis, licensed by an ellipsis feature [7] hosted on the head of a CP-domain FocP [10] or a vP domain FocP [3]. The obligatorily focused remnants raise to the FocP domain to escape ellipsis, following [8]. While the small-conjunct structures may be compatible with either ellipsis or ATB movement analyses, the large-conjunct structures resist an ATB movement analysis. For parsimony and expository clarity we therefore assume that the ellipsis process is identical in both large and small conjunct structures.

In this analysis, it is the complements of the FocPs that are elided. This derives the well known proscription of complementizers in Gapping constructions (10). Complementizers, in the head of FinP in large-conjunct structures, are elided as elements of the complement of FocP [10]. The conjuncts in small-conjunct structures contain no FinP, precluding the appearance of complementizers. This analysis also derives the obligatory wide scope of *who* in (8). English *wh*-words raise to FocP, thereby escaping the ellipsis site; any fronted *wh*-phrase cannot be elided in large conjunct structures. Small conjunct structure do permit non-remnant *wh*-words, which ATB move to the shared CP domain from the coordinate structure, from which position they take wide-scope, the only available parse for (8).

(10) Peter thinks that James hates beans and (*that) Mary rice.

Finally, we address examples like (11a), in which the disjunction can be interpreted conjunctively [11] even when the modal takes distributed scope. If the conjunctive reading were solely due to the negation c-commanding the disjunction it would constitute a counterexample to the split scope generalization. We argue that conjunctive *or* in large conjunct structures is a variant of *nor*, licensed in the same manner, by a sentential negation operator [12]. This correctly predicts the ability of *nor* to replace *or* exactly when the conjunctive reading is available (11b).

- (11) a. Bill shouldn't drink PBR or Jane champagne.
b. Bill should drink PBR *nor/or Jane champagne.

References

- [1] V. Hacquard. On the event relativity of modal auxiliaries. *Natural language semantics*, 18(1):79–114, 2010.
- [2] K. Hartmann. *Right node raising and gapping: Interface conditions on prosodic deletion*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000.
- [3] K. Jayaseelan. IP-internal topic and focus phrases. *Studia Linguistica*, 55(1):39–75, 2001.
- [4] K. Johnson. In search of the english middle field. *Ms, University of Massachusetts, Amherst*, 2004.
- [5] K. Johnson. Gapping is not (VP-) ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 40(2):289–328, 2009.
- [6] V.I.W. Lin. *Coordination and sharing at the interfaces*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2002.
- [7] J. Merchant. Polarity items under ellipsis. *Diagnosing syntax*, ed. by Lisa Cheng & Norbert Corver. Oxford: OUP, To Appear.
- [8] C. Nakao. On focus of negation. In *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics Poster Session*, pages 61–70, 2008.

- [9] S. Repp. \neg (A& B). Gapping, negation and speech act operators. *Research on Language & Computation*, 4(4):397–423, 2006.
- [10] L. Rizzi. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), editor, *Elements of Grammar*, pages 281–337. Kluwer Dordrecht, 1997.
- [11] M.E.A. Siegel. Gapping and interpretation. *Linguistic Inquiry*, pages 523–530, 1984.
- [12] S. Wurmbrand. Nor: neither disjunction nor paradox. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 39(3):511–522, 2008.