

Subject ellipsis and the anaphorising deficiency of impersonal pronouns
Liliane Haegeman- Ghent University

This paper discusses restrictions on subject ellipsis in second conjuncts in French and Dutch and their implication for Wilder's (1997) unified analysis of second conjunct subject ellipsis.

1. The anaphoric deficiency of impersonal *on*. In 'standard' French (as opposed to 'advanced French' cf. Zribi-Hertz 1994), subject pronouns do not pattern homogenously in second conjuncts: referential subject pronouns such as *il* ('he') licence (forward) ellipsis, second conjunct subject ellipsis is unavailable for impersonal *on* ('one') as shown in (1a).

- (1) a. *Il/on* mange de la viande et ^v(*il*)/*(*on*) boit du bon vin
 he/one eats of the meat and (he)/*(one) drinks of-the good wine

Rizzi (1986) considers both *il* and *on* as weak pronouns/phonological clitics. The contrast between *il* and *on* in (1a) is due to the discourse inertness (Prince 2006, Malamud 2012, 2013) of *on*. Rizzi admits both the 'small conjunct' analysis of coordination, in which the higher structural layers, including that containing the canonical subject position, are shared by both conjuncts (possibly as a result of ATB movement) and the full clausal analysis of coordination, in which each conjunct is projected to include the canonical subject position. The 'small conjunct analysis' for (1a) with one subject pronoun scoping over both conjuncts as schematized in (1b) is unavailable for *il* and *on* because both are clitics. In (1b) FP is the functional layer whose head hosts the finite verb; '=' represents the intended cliticization. (1b) violates the coordinate structure constraint (CSC) because the subject pronoun cliticizes on the (adjacent) finite verb of the first conjunct (*mange*) but not on that of the second conjunct (*boit*). The alternative is that (1a) be analysed a coordination of two clausal projections each including the canonical subject position with a null subject ('ec') in the second conjunct. In this approach, the difference between the grammatical variant with *il* and the ungrammatical variant with *on* follows from the fact that a (null) subject in the second conjunct in (1c) can be referentially dependent on *il* in the first conjunct but not on *on* because *on* cannot introduce a discourse antecedent (cf. a.o. Kayne 1972, 1975, Koenig&Maurer 2000, Malamud 2012, Jouitteau&Rezac 2017).

- (1) b. *Pronoun = [[_{FP} =mange de la viande] et [_{FP} boit du bon vin]]
 c. [_{TP} ^vil/*on mange du vin] et [_{TP} ec boit du vin]

It is correctly predicted that (2) (cf. Kayne (1972, 1975) does not distinguish between the pronouns *il* and *on*: (2) can be derived by small conjunct coordination (e.g. VP), and the coordination does not interact with the unique (shared) layer hosting the clausal subject.

- (2) *Il/On* = [=a [_{FP} mangé de la viande] et [_{FP} bu du bon vin]]
 he/one has eaten of the meet and drunk of-the good wine

2. A comparative perspective. Rizzi's analysis leads to the prediction that if a language had an impersonal pronominal which, like French *on*, is discourse inert but does not have clitic status, derivation (1b) (= (3a)) becomes licit. In (3a) the impersonal subject scopes over both conjuncts and the CSC problem in (1b) does not arise. The prediction is verified by Dutch (and German). Dutch impersonal *men* (German *man*) are also discourse inert (cf. Prince 2006, Malamud 2012, etc). Like the subject pronoun *hij* ('he'), Dutch impersonal *men* can surface as the subject of a first conjunct and is compatible with second conjunct subject ellipsis.

Crucially, (3b) does not instantiate a second conjunct null subject that is referentially dependent on the impersonal as its 'antecedent'. (A small conjunct coordination analysis will raise question of implementation in V2 root clauses (e.g. (3c)) (cf. Bjorkman2013:403) and will necessitate postulating an articulated left periphery).

- (3) a. ^vPronoun [[_{FP} ...] et [_{FP} ...]]
 b. dat men/hij de drukproeven deze week opstuurt
 that one/he the proofs this week off sends
 en ___ ze dan (waarschijnlijk) volgende week al terug verwacht
 and ___ them then (probably) next week already back expects
 (3) c. Men/hij stuurt de drukproeven deze week op

one/he sends the proofs this week off
 en ___ verwacht ze dan (waarschijnlijk) volgende week al terug
 and ___ expects them then (probably) next week already back expects

Alternative accounts for the contrast in (1a) have proposed that the difference between *on* and *il* is syntactic. Sportiche (1998: 306) differentiates *il* and *on* in terms of their clitic status: for him *il* need not be a clitic, while *on* is. Hence, small conjunct coordination only violates the CSC (cf. (1b)) for *on*). In a similar vein, De Crousaz & Shlonsky (2003: 426, note 2) relate the contrast in (1a) to the syntactic position of the pronouns, suggesting that “*on* occupies a lower position than the other (droppable) S[subject]C[litic]s – a position that must be included in the second conjuncts.” Approaches which majorly explore the syntactic properties of the subject pronominals make the correct predictions with respect to the availability of a shared position for the impersonal subject and capture the contrast between French (1a) vs. French (2) and Dutch (3b,c). As shown below, however, the anaphorizing deficiency of impersonal pronouns will remain relevant in relation to other patterns of subject ellipsis.

3. Register-specific subject ellipsis and the syntax of coordination From the discussion, we infer that both ‘small conjunct coordination’ and ‘full clausal coordination’ are required to capture the distribution of pronominal subjects in coordination. This conclusion is in line with, for instance, Bjorkman (2013), but contrasts with Wilder (1997), who, rejecting small conjunct coordination, argues for a generalized approach to coordination in which second conjunct subject ellipsis uniformly results from forward left edge ellipsis in a full clausal conjunct. A compelling argument advanced by Wilder (1997) is the fact that postulating left edge ellipsis (however formulated) is independently required to account for register-specific subject ellipsis like that found in diary entries. Indeed, there are striking parallelisms between the two ellipsis patterns (Haegeman 2013, 2018): like register-specific subject omission, second conjunct subject ellipsis is unavailable in the context of a fronted auxiliary (4a) or an initial argument (4b), while remaining compatible with an initial adjunct (4c).

- (4) a. * Did you go home and did ___ find anything?
 b. * This wine Bill has always drunk but that one ___ has never served to anyone.
 (te Velde 2005: 231, (111b))
 c. They are dedicated golf fans and for years ___ have travelled to the Open.

However, the parallelisms are not perfect and Wilder’s unified left edge ellipsis account of second conjunct subject ellipsis developed for English fails to generalize cross linguistically. In Dutch (and German) second conjunct subject ellipsis of impersonal *men* is available (3b,c), but register-specific subject ellipsis cannot affect *men* (5). The contrast between *il* and *on* in Standard French (1a) thus re-emerges in Dutch (5), and it is captured in terms of the discourse inertness of this impersonal pronoun. If, following Wilder (1997), Dutch second conjunct subject ellipsis (3b,c) could only be derived by full clausal coordination with forward subject ellipsis, the unavailability of the forward subject ellipsis in (5) remains mysterious.

- (5) Men_i/hij_j stuurt de drukproeven vandaag op. ___ *_{i/j} verwacht ze volgende week terug.
 one/he sends the proofs today off ___ expects them next week already back

References. Bjorkman, B. 2013. A syntactic answer to a pragmatic puzzle: the case of asymmetric and. Folli, R. et al (eds). *Syntax and its limits*. Oxford: OUP; 391-408. Crousaz, I. de & U. Shlonsky. 2003. The distribution of a subject clitic pronoun in Franco-Provencal dialect and the licensing of pro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 413-442. Koenig, J.P. & G. Mauner. 2000. A-definites and the discourse status of implicit arguments. *Journal of Semantics* 16, 3: 207-236. Rizzi, L. 1986. On the status of subject clitics in Romance. O. Jaeggli & C. Silva-Corvalan (eds). *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 391-419. Sportiche, D. 1998. *Partitions and atoms of clause structure*. London: Routledge. Wilder, C. 1997. Some properties of ellipsis in coordination. *Studies in Universal Grammar and Typological Variation*. A. Alexiadou & T. A. Hall (eds.), 59-107. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.