

Does Across-the-Board Left Branch Extraction (ATB LBE) Exist?
Barbara Citko (Brandeis University)

This talk explores the interaction between two independently well-studied wh-strategies: across-the-board wh-movement and left branch extraction, illustrated schematically in (1a-b).

- (1) a. $WH_i [_{XP} \dots t_i \dots]$ and $[_{XP} \dots t_i \dots]$?
b. $WH_i [_{IP} [_{DP} t_i NP]]$

Putting these two strategies together yields across-the-board left branch extraction (henceforth, ATB LBE):

- (2) $WH_i [_{XP} \dots [_{DP} t_i NP]]$ and $[_{XP} \dots [_{DP} t_i NP]]$?

An interesting empirical observation, which to the best of my knowledge has not been explored before, is that ATB LBE does not exist (3a). For languages of the English type, this is not surprising given the ungrammaticality of ‘pure’ LBE (3b):

- (3) a. * Which_i did John recommend *t_i* book and Mary read *t_i* book?
b. * Which_i did John recommend *t* book?

In this talk, however, I show that ATB LBE is also ungrammatical in languages that *do* allow ‘pure’ left branch extraction. Crosslinguistically, left branch extraction is somewhat restricted; its availability has been correlated with free word order (Hale 1982), lack of overt determiners (Corver 1992, Boskovic 2003), overt encoding of topic-focus structure (Sekerina 1997). I focus on Slavic languages, which allow both ATB movement and LBE, thus providing good grounds for testing the interaction between the two. I argue that the ungrammaticality of ATB LBE is due to a simple PF violation, ATB LBE sentences simply cannot be linearized. This follows naturally from a multi-dominance analysis of ATB wh-questions, on which they involve a symmetric, multi-dominant structure, in which the wh-pronoun is literally shared between the two conjuncts (Williams 1978, Goodall 1983, 1987, Muadz 1991, Moltmann 1992, Wilder 1998, Citko 2002). Such symmetric structures violate the Linear Correspondence Axiom of Kayne 1994, thus are not linearizable. However, they are compatible with a conceptually more plausible formulation of the LCA of Chomsky 1995 and Moro 2000, according to which the LCA, being relevant for pronunciation, needs to hold only at the level relevant for pronunciation, namely the level of Spell-Out (Chomsky 1995 and Moro 2000). In an ATB wh-question, the shared element undergoes overt movement, which creates a linearizable antisymmetric structure. In an ATB LBE question, on the other hand, only *part* of the shared element, that is the wh-determiner, undergoes overt movement. The resulting structure is not linearizable, since the NP remnant is still shared between the two conjunct.

This talk also discusses an apparent set of counterexamples to the generalization that ATB LBE does not exist. What distinguishes them from the ungrammatical cases is that they all involve verb gapping. In this respect, they are similar to the phenomenon known as ‘determiner sharing’ (McCawley 1993, Johnson 2000, Lin 2000), which is also contingent on gapping. I show that such cases involve a different derivation from the ungrammatical ATB LBE cases. In particular, in such cases no ATB movement takes place, and the illusion of ATB LBE is created by ellipsis, which saves an otherwise ungrammatical structure (‘salvation by deletion’ of Merchant 2001 and Fox and Lasnik 2003).

References:

- Bošković, Ž. 2003. 'On left branch extraction', In P. Kosta, J. Błaszczak, J. Frasek, L. Geist, and M. Zygis (eds) *Investigations into formal Slavic linguistics. Contributions of the Fourth European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages - FDSL IV*, 543-577. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main
- Corver, N. 1990. *The syntax of left branch extractions*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Fox, D. and H. Lasnik. 2003. Successive cyclic movement and island repair: The difference between Sluicing and VP Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:143-154.
- Goodall, Grant. 1987. *Parallel Structures in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodall, Grant. 1983. A Three-Dimensional Analysis of Coordination. In *Chicago Linguistic Society* 19:146-154.
- _____. 1987. *Parallel Structures in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. 2000. Few dogs eat Whiskas or cats Alpo. In *UMOP 23: Issues in semantics and its interface*, Kiyomi Kusumoto and Elisabeth Villalta (eds.), pp. 59-82.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kennedy, C. , and J. Merchant. 2000. Attributive comparative deletion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18:89-146.
- Lin, V. 2000. Determiner Sharing. In R. Billerey and B. D. Lillehaugen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- _____. 2002. *Coordination and Sharing at the Interfaces*. Ph. D. dissertation, MIT.
- McCawley, J. 1993. Gapping with shared operators. *Chicago Linguistics Society*.
- Merchant, J. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and Identity in Ellipsis*. Oxford University Press.
- Moltmann, F. 1992. Coordination and Comparatives. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.
- Moro, A. 2000. Dynamic Antisymmetry. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Muadz, H. 1991. Coordinate Structures: a Planar Representation. Ph.D dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Williams, E. 1978. Across-the-Board Rule Application. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9:31-43.
- _____. 1997. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 577-628.