

snippets

Issue 30

June 2015

Contents

1. Andreea Nicolae, Patrick D. Elliott and Yasutada Sudo. *Pair-list readings of conjoined singular which-phrases*.
2. Rick Nouwen. *Presuppositions of superlatives with neg-raisers*.
3. Philippe Schlenker. *Gestural presuppositions*.
4. Yasutada Sudo. *Japanese nominal conjunction only has the split reading*.
5. Susi Wurmbrand. *Does gender depend on number?*
6. Ed Zoerner and Brian Agbayani. *Stripping, deletion and insubordinators*.



Ed Zoerner, Brian Agbayani – *California State University (Dominiguez Hills), California State University (Fresno)*

Stripping, deletion and insubordinators

ezoerner@csudh.edu, bagbayan@csufresno.edu

doi: 10.7358/snipp-2015-030-zoer

The phenomenon known as Stripping has received a fair amount of attention in the syntactic literature of late. Stripping apparently deletes non-contrastive elements from a conjoined clause construction, leaving a single contrasting remnant. The following exemplify this (parentheses enclosed “deleted” material):

- (1) Dana will read *King Lear* tomorrow, and Kim (will read *KL* tomorrow) too
- (2) Gaby gave the president a gift, but (Gaby) not (gave) the vice-president (a gift)
- (3) I should buy a pencil soon, and (I should buy) a pen (soon)

Merchant (2003, 2004) presents what has become a standard analysis for Stripping. In his view, Stripping involves a conjunction of clauses. Within the second clause, the contrasting element raises to a Focus position external to its TP. The TP, which then contains only non-contrastive elements, then deletes. Under this analysis, (3) above would have the following derivation:

- (4) [[_{CP}[[_{TP} I should buy a pen soon]]] and [_{CP}[_{FocP} [_{DP} a pen]] [_{TP} ~~I should buy t soon~~]]]

However, this analysis appears to face a problem when it comes to elements containing insubordinators (as discussed, e.g., in de Vries (2009)) such as *as well as*, *in addition to*, *except (for)* and *instead of*. These insubordinators can apparently conjoin any subclausal phrase, as the following show:

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| (5) She is [extremely bright <i>as well as</i> very athletic] | conjoined APs |
| (6) She enjoys [mystery movies <i>in addition to</i> courtroom dramas] | conjoined DPs |
| (7) She looked for the keys [everywhere <i>except (for)</i> in the bowl] | conjoined PPs |
| (8) She was [writing poems <i>instead of</i> singing songs] | conjoined VPs |

Interestingly, however, these insubordinators may not conjoin full clauses:

- (9) *Gaby gave the president a gift, *as well as* she gave the vice-president a gift
- (10) *I should buy a pencil soon, *in addition to* I should buy a pen soon
- (11) *Everyone will attend the party, *except for* Sam will attend the party
- (12) *Dana will read *King Lear* tomorrow instead of Kim will read *King Lear* tomorrow

Crucially, we do find natural Stripping-type sentences involving these insubordinators:

- (13) Gaby gave the president a gift, *as well as* the vice-president
- (14) I should buy a pencil soon, *in addition to* a pen
- (15) Everyone will attend the party, *except for* Sam
- (16) Dana will read *King Lear* tomorrow, *instead of* Kim

The analysis of Stripping as deletion from conjoined clauses, then, appears problematic; the insubordinators cannot conjoin clauses but do license Stripping. Either the analysis of Stripping as involving deletion from conjoined TPs errs, or the Stripping-type examples of (13)-(16) differ from standard Stripping as in (1)-(3) and require a separate analysis. Either way, we find ourselves faced with a puzzle.

References

- Merchant, J. (2003) Remarks on stripping. Ms., University of Chicago.
Merchant, J. (2004) "Fragments and ellipsis." *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661-738.
de Vries, M. (2009) "Specifying coordination: an investigation into the syntax of dislocation, extraposition and parenthesis," in *Language and Linguistics: Emerging Trends*, ed. C. R. Dreyer. New York: Nova, 37-98.