“Gapping” in Determiner Phrase
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Since Ross (1970), there have been extensive studies on gapping in verbal domain (Verbal Gapping: VG), however, gapping-like constructions in nominal domain (Nominal Gapping: NG) have attracted little attention in generative syntactic studies (Jackendoff 1971). Jackendoff (1971) revealed that VG and NG show some similarities, which have motivated the view that VG and NG have the same structure and derivation (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005; Yoshida 2005). Despite these similarities, this study attempts to claim that these two constructions involve totally different processes. Specifically, we argue that VG is best analyzed as Verb or VP-sharing through Across-the-Board (ATB) movement as Johnson (1994; 1996/2004; 2009) convincingly argues, whereas NG involves ellipsis as crucial part of the derivation. To support this claim, we show two crucial pieces of evidence. First, NG does not exhibit the so-called “odd” scope properties that VG exhibits. Second, NG does not show the locality effect that VG shows. Finally, we show that the distributions of NG and NP-ellipsis overlap completely and thus conclude that NG involves the same ellipsis process as NP-ellipsis does.

Although VG and NG share superficial similarities (Jackendoff 1971; Yoshida 2005), for example, deletion of the head of the phrase in the second conjunct in (1), prohibition of preposition stranding in (2), at most two gapping survivors allowed in (3), VG and NG exhibit different properties, which resists a unified analysis.

We assume Johnson (1994; 1996/2004; 2009)’s analysis of VG as Verb or VP-sharing through Across-the-Board (ATB) movement (as demonstrated in (4)) since this analysis can capture important properties of VG. First, VG exhibits “odd” scope properties. For example, negation and modals that appear in the first conjunct in VG can scope over the second conjunct (Oehrle 1987): (5a) can be interpreted as in (5b), where the negation takes wide scope over both conjuncts; in the same way, modals like must in (6) scope over the entire coordination. Another example is that a quantified subject in the first conjunct of VG can bind into the pronoun in the second conjunct but not into a non-gapped second conjunct, as illustrated by the contrast in (7)(McCawley 1993). Second, VG obeys the locality constraints: while VG is most acceptable across a coordinator, and or or, VG is less acceptable when applied across subordinators such as that, because and while, which is illustrated in (8) (Kennedy 2001); neither the gapped head nor its antecedent of the gapped head in VG can be embedded inside the conjunct (Johnson 1996/2004), as illustrated in (9).

NG, however, contrasts with VG in terms of scope properties and locality constraints. First, NG does not exhibit the same scope properties as VG does. Assuming that numerals are generated above the core NP projection in the same way that negation and modals are generated above the core VP projection (Lobeck 1995; Ritter 1991), numerals do not scope over the entire coordination: (10) must be interpreted that John read six books, instead of three. Moreover, a prenominal pronoun in the second conjunct in NG can receive a bound variable interpretation whether the head noun is gapped or not (11). Second, NG is not subject to the same locality constraints as VG. NG can be applied freely across coordinators and subordinators, as illustrated in (12), and the gap and its antecedent in NG can be embedded within the arguments of matrix or embedded coordinated clauses, relative clauses, and even embedded within other DPs, as exemplified by (13). Since NG does not exhibit either of two properties that motivate Johnson’s ATB analysis, we claim that NG involves a different derivation.

We suggest that NG can be analyzed as arising from rightward movement of the complement followed by NP-ellipsis (NPE) (Jayaseelan 1990), as illustrated in the derivation of (14). This analysis can capture the complete overlap of the distributions of NG and NPE. Both can be freely embedded as supported by the examples in (12) and (13). They also have identical licensing conditions: where NPE is legitimate, NG is also legitimate, as in (15); NG is not licensed where NPE is not, as in (16). In addition, although attributive adjectives as in (16b) license neither NPE nor NG, the adjectives in the superlative form can license both NPE and NG (Panagiotidis 2003), as illustrated in (17).

In conclusion, NG shows different properties from VG but overlaps with NPE in terms of distribution. Therefore, NG can be analyzed as NPE, instead of being derived through the ATB movement.
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Examples
(1) a. Some ate natto and others ate rice.
(2) a. Bill talked about Sue and John talked *(about) Mary.
(3) a. Alan gave Sandy a book and Peter gave *(Betty) a magazine.
   b. Ormandy’s recording of Ives’s 1st on Columbia and Von Karajan’s recording *(of Mozart’s 40th) on Angel can be recommended none too highly.
(4) Some will eat beans and others rice.
   Some will eat beans and others *rice.
(5) a. Ward can’t eat caviar and Sue can’t eat beans.
   b. It’s not the case that [Ward can eat caviar and Sue can eat beans].
(6) a. James must finish his paper and Sally must finish her book.
   b. It both must be the case that James finishes his paper and Sally finishes her book.
(7) Not every girl, ate a green banana, and her mother *(ate) a ripe one.
(8) a. John ate pizza and/or Mary ate pasta.
   b. *(John ate pizza because/while/if Mary ate pasta.
(9) a. *John read those books and she claims that others read these magazines.
   b. *John said Peter read those books, and Sally read these books.
(10) John read David’s three books of music and Mary’s three books (of poems).
(11) Not every doctor’s knowledge of tax law or his accountant’s (knowledge) of medicine is reliable.
(12) a. John will read Bill’s book of music and/or Mary’s book of poems.
   b. John’s book of music will be published because/if Mary’s book of poems is successful.
   c. John read Mary’s book about Sue’s proof of this theorem and Bill’s book about David’s proof of that theorem.
(14) John read [DP David’s [NP three [NP books of music]]] and [DP Mary’s [NP three [NP books of music]]] [of poems]].
(15) a. All
   The books are new, and all books (of music) are on sale.
   b. Demonstratives
   Mary likes those books of poems, but I like these books (of music).
   c. Numerals
   Mary bought some new books of poems and I like these six books (of music) the best.
   a. Genitives
   John read Mary’s book of poems, and Bill’s book (of music) as well.
(16) a. Determiners
   *John read the book of music and Mary read the/a book (of poems).
   b. Adjectives
   *John read Mary’s long book of poems and Bill’s short book (of music).
   b. John read Mary’s most interesting book of poems and Bill’s most boring book (of music).
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