University of Leipzig, Department of Linguistics
SS2015 – module 04-046-2011/IGRA08
Sharing constructions

Martin Salzmann – martin.salzmann@uni-leipzig.de
www.martinsalzmann.com/teaching.htm#2015_Sharing

Summary

1   The challenges posed by PGs, ATB-mvt, RNR

(1)   a.   Which book does John like __ and Mary dislike __?   ATB
      b.   John likes __ and Mary dislikes __ the book about Bismarck.   RNR
      c.   Which book did John file __ without reading __?   PG

- observation: a filler seems to be related to two gaps
- standard strategy to analyze filler-gap dependencies: movement
- problem: Given the copy-theory of movement and the extension condition, there should always be a 1:1-relationship between filler and gap with the filler c-commanding the gap; in the case at hand, it seems that 2 XPs would have to coalesce during the derivation
- early solutions (1960ies): construction-specific rules (a different rule for each construction)
- 3 major modern solutions
    - multi-dominance: Citko (2005), Bachrach and Kazir (2009), Grosz (2015)
    - movement: Nunes (2004)
    - ellipsis: Salzmann (2012), Barros and Vicente (2011)

- what are possible diagnostics to choose between the 3 theories?
    - movement: locality (de Vries 2013: 157):
        (2)   Anne knows a girl that BOUGHT __ and Mike (knows) a boy that STOLE, *a book about Plato*

    - ellipsis: mismatches (morphological, semantic, see Barros and Vicente 2011: 25):
        (3)   Alice won't __ but Bob already has negotiated his salary with the boss. (*her*/*his*)

    - multidominance: identity effects, e.g. Case matching effects, see Citko 2005: 487:
        (4)   Kogo$_{acc/gen}$ [Jan nienawidzi __$_{acc}$] i   [Maria lubi __$_{gen}$]?
                 who   John hates   and Mary   likes
                 'Who does John like and Mary hate?'   *Polish*

1.1   Parasitic gaps

- Given that there are locality effects, movement must somehow be involved:

    (5)   a.   Which book did you file [without reading __]?
             b.   *Which book did you file [without knowing [the author who wrote __]]?

- Nunes (2004): Sideward movement: there is just one moving element → Sideward movement creates the illusion of extraction from both complements

(6)　a.　[you file [which book]]　　　　b.　without reading [which book]

$$\text{sideward movement}$$

(7)　[$_{CP}$ Which book$_1$ did [$_{vP}$ [$_{vP}$ you file ~~which book$_T$~~] [$_{vP}$ without reading ~~which book$_T$~~]]]?

$$\text{asymmetric extraction}$$

- Assmann (2012): Pre-syntactic fission (leading to an unstable object) + fusion: 2 separate elements (each receiving a theta-role); the XP extracted from the adjunct moves to SpecCP, the one merged in the matrix clause is deleted:

(8)

- de Vries (2013): hints at a multidominance-approach for PGs, but it is unclear how the selective island-sensitivity is to be captured (neither completely insensitive as RNR nor as sensitive as regular leftward movement)
- how to choose between the theories?

    – reconstruction asymmetries favor Assmann (2012):

    (9)　a.　[Which books about himself$_i$?]$_1$ did John$_i$ file __$_1$ before Mary read pg$_1$?
    　　　b.　[Which books about herself$_j$]$_1$ did John file __$_1$ before Mary$_j$ read pg$_1$?

    – Case-mismatches tend to be a problem for both:

    (10)　　I wonder which papers John said were __ available [before reading *pg*]

- what about an ellipsis approach with separate movement inside the island and in the matrix clause? → One may need some form of chain composition; could perhaps handle the mismatches

1.2 ATB-movement

- evidence that movement involved is uncontested as locality constraints hold in each conjunct:

(11)   a. *[Which book] did [John read __ with pleasure] and [Mary adore the author <who wrote __>]?
       b. *[Which book] did [John adore the author <who wrote __>] and [Mary read __ with pleasure]?

- some evidence for multi-dominance (and perhaps sideward movement): identity effects (Citko 2005):

  – single-identity interpretation:

  (12)   a. Who does nobody love and hate? ≠
         b. Who does nobody love and who does nobody hate?

  – Case-matching requirement (see above)

- also some evidence for ellipsis: mismatches

  – morphological mismatches: asymmetric verb movement (+vP-topicalization)

  (13)   a. Was$_1$ hast$_2$ [du __$_1$ gekauft __$_2$] und [der Peter __$_1$ verkauft __$_2$]?
            what have.**2SG** you   bought **2SG** and the Peter   sold   **3SG**
         b. Was$_1$ hat$_2$ [der Peter __$_1$ gekauft __$_2$] und [du __$_1$ verkauft __$_2$]?
            what have.**3SG** the Peter   bought **3SG** and you   sold   **2SG**

  – The ATB-ed constituent need not bear the same θ-role in each CJ, e.g. Theme vs. Agent

  (14)   a. Who did [John support __$_{acc}$] and [M. say __$_{nom}$ would win]?
                                                                    Munn (1993: 43)
         b. I know the man who [John likes __$_{acc}$] and [we hope __$_{nom}$ will win]
                                                                    Williams (1978: 34)

  – reconstruction asymmetries (no reconstruction for Principle A/C into the second conjunct), can be analyzed as vehicle change effects:

  (15)   a. [Which pictures of himself$_i$] did [John$_i$ buy __] and [Mary paint __]? Principle A
         b. *[Which pictures of herself$_j$] did [John$_i$ buy __] and [Mary$_j$ paint __]? Munn (1993: 52)

  (16)   a. *[Which picture of John$_i$] did [he$_i$ like __] and [Mary dislike __]? Principle C
         b. [Which picture of John$_i$] did [Mary like __] and [he$_i$ dislike __]?   Citko (2005: 494)

  – subject mismatches in VP-ATB-mvt (see also Grosz 2015: 28f.):

  (17)   [$_{vP}$ (SU) talked to Mary] [$_{TP}$ I have __] but [$_{TP}$ Bill hasn't __]

  – the pronoun-binding pattern in VP-ATB-mvt discussed in Johnson (2009: 312f.)

→ evidence is equivocal

1.3 RNR

- more or less a consensus that the movement approach is wrong because of
    - the island-insensitivity of the RNR-ed constituent (see above)
    - violation of constraint against P-stranding:

        (18) a. Peter stimmte für __ und Hans stimmte gegen **Maria**.
              Peter voted   for   and John voted   against Mary
              'Peter voted for and John voted against Mary.'
              b. *Wen   hat Peter gegen __ gestimmt?
              Whom has Peter against   voted
              'Who did Peter vote against?'

    - can affect constituents that normally cannot move (including parts of words):

        (19) a. John owns 3 __ and Mary owns 5 **books about syntax**.
              b. *Books about syntax, John owns 3 __.
              c. This theory not only under-__ but also **over**-generates

    - violates the right roof constraint (rightward mvt across a CP-boundary)

        (20) a. *John claimed [$_{CP}$ that Sam loves __] yesterday **the new headmaster**
              b. John claims [$_{CP}$ that Sam loves __] and Mary claims [$_{CP}$ that Sam hates __]
              the new headmaster

- however, there is some scope evidence suggestive of movement out of the coordination (which cannot simply be due to QR of a shared constituent because QR is clause-bound):

    (21) a. [John knows a man who speaks __] and [Mary knows a woman who wants to learn __] every Germanic language ($\exists > \forall$; $\forall > \exists$)
          b. [John knows a man who speaks every Germanic language] and [Mary knows a woman who wants to learn every Germanic language]. ($\exists > \forall$; *$\forall > \exists$)
          c. John knows a man who speaks every Germanic language. ($\exists > \forall$; *$\forall > \exists$)

- evidence for multidominance:

    - Case-matching

        (22) ??Der Staat   unterstützt$_{acc}$ und Private   helfen$_{dat}$ Männern mit
              the government supoprts   and private.people help   men.DAT with
              Videospielsucht.
              addition.to.video.games
              'The government supports and private people help men with an addition to video games.'

    - cumulative agreement (Grosz 2015):

        (23) Alice is proud that Beatrix __ and Claire is happy that Diana {✓ have/*has} travelled to Cameroon

    - internal readings of relational adjectives (unavailable without sharing or under ellipsis)

        (24) Alice composed __ and Bob performed **different songs**.   [ok internal]

        (25) a. Alice composed two quite different songs, and Bob performed two quite different songs.   [*internal]
              b. Alice composed two quite different songs, and Bob did too.   [*internal]

- evidence for ellipsis: mismatches

    - morphological mismatches:

        (26)   a.   Alice won't __ but Bob already has negotiated his salary with the company.
                b.   I already have __ but Alice still has to choose her dissertation topic.

    - vehicle change effects

        (27)   a.   *I hope that the boss won't fire Alice$_i$, but she$_i$ fears that he will fire Alice$_i$.
                b.   She$_i$ hopes that he won't __, but I fear that the boss will fire Alice$_i$.

    - asymmetries in the subject trace:

        (28)   John says that Friederike must __, and that Konrrad may **record two quite different songs**   [ok internal]

→ evidence is conflicting

2   Where to go from here?

- There is no single mechanism that can be used to derive PGs, ATB-mvt and RNR
- even worse, even within the same phenomenon several mechanisms seem to be at play
- possible limit (Barros and Vicente 2011): ellipsis only if independently licensed, however, does not work for

    - ATB-movement (DP-deletion)
    - PGs (DP-deletion)
    - one can form contradictory examples that involve both the signatures of ellipsis and multidominance, cf. Larson (2012): internal reading + morphological mismatch

        (29)   Alice must [work on different topics], and Iris ought to be, [working on different topics].

- so essentially back to the 60ies with construction-specific rules? instead:

    - find a way to allow mismatches under sharing
    - find a way to capture identity effects without sharing
    - find out why certain mismatches are tolerated while others are not (Case vs. agreement)
    - come up with a theory of sharing that explains why sideward sharing has radically different properties from upward sharing (Case, theta-roles, locality, structure-building)
    - come up with a theory of sharing that explains the locality asymmetry between RNR and ATB-movement (cf. Bachrach and Kazir 2009: 313, fn. 24)

- to end on a positive note: There is still a lot of exciting work to do!

References

Ackema, Peter and Kriszta Szendrői (2002): 'Determiner sharing as an instance of dependent ellipsis', *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* **5**(1), 3–34.

Assmann, Anke (2012): Deriving parasitic gaps by fission und fusion. *In:* E. Boone, K. Linke and M. Schulpen, eds, *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIX.* LUCL, Leiden, pp. 49–75.

Bachrach, Asaf and Roni Kazir (2009): Right Node Raising and Delayed Spellout. *In:* K. K. Grohmann, ed., *Interphases.* Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 283–316.

Barros, Matthew and Luis Vicente (2011): The eclectic nature of Right Node Raising. Ms. Rutgers University/University of Potsdam.

Citko, Barbara (2005): 'On the Nature of Merge: External Merge, Internal Merge, and Parallel Merge', *Linguistic Inquiry* **36**(4), 475–496.

de Vries, Mark (2013): 'Multidominance and locality', *Lingua* **134**(0), 149–169.

Gračanin-Yuksek, Martina (2013): Linearizing Multidominance structures. *In:* T. Biberauer and I. Roberts, eds, *Challenges to linearization.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, pp. 269–294.

Grosz, Patrick Georg (2015): 'Movement and Agreement in Right-Node-Raising Constructions', *Syntax* **18**(1), 1–38.

Johnson, Kyle (2009): 'Gapping Is Not (VP-) Ellipsis', *Linguistic Inquiry* **40**(2), 289–328.

Kluck, Marlies (2014): A sluicing account of amalgams. Ms. University of Groningen.

Larson, Bradley (2012): 'A Dilemma with Accounts of Right Node Raising', *Linguistic Inquiry* **43**(1), 143–150.

Lipták, Anikó (2012): 'Strategies of wh-coordination', *Linguistic Variation* **11**(2), 149–188.

Munn, Alan (1993): Topics in the syntax and semantics of coordinate structures. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Nunes, Jairo (2001): 'Sideward Movement', *Linguistic Inquiry* **32**(2), 303–344.

Nunes, Jairo (2004): *Linearization of chains and sideward movement.* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. u.a.

Salzmann, Martin (2012): 'A derivational ellipsis approach to ATB-movement', *The Linguistic Review* **29**(3), 397–438.

Vicente, Luis (2010): 'A Note on the Movement Analysis of Gapping', *Linguistic Inquiry* **41**(3), 509–517.

Williams, Edwin (1978): 'Across-the-Board Rule Application', *Linguistic Inquiry* **9**, 31–42.

Williams, Edwin (1987): 'The ATB Theory of Parasitic Gaps', *The Linguistic Review* **6**(3), 265–279.