

1. Subject omission in English It is uncontroversial that English is not a pro drop language: finite clause subject omission is disallowed (1).

(1) *(He) will arrive tonight.

Nevertheless, English allows some finite clause subject omission. (i) **Second conjunct subject ellipsis** (SCSE) arises under identity with the subject of the adjacent conjunct (2).

(2) He has left Edinburgh this morning and (he)/(she/I) will arrive tonight.

The mechanism underlying SCSE is usually considered as part of English grammar. Accounts for SCSE (2) vary, relying e.g. on postulating ‘small conjunct coordination’ with one shared subject (ATB)-extracted from the conjuncts, (2a), or on postulating coordination of two full-fledged clausal structures with left edge ellipsis of the subject in the second conjunct under identity with that in the immediately preceding conjunct (2b). (Wilder 1997)

(2) a. [_{FP} He [[_{TP} ~~he~~ has left Edinburgh this morning] and [_{TP} ~~he~~ will arrive tonight]]]

b. [[_{CP} He has left Edinburgh this morning] and [_{CP} ~~he~~ will arrive tonight]]

(ii) **Register-specific subject omission** (RSSO) is available in some written registers i.e. diary writing, and digital communication (Tagg 2007).

(3) ___ Believe I saw the first shoot of bindweed today. (Orwell 21/04/1940)

While recoverability is key in restricting register-specific subject omission (RSSO), the distribution of RSSO does not follow entirely from a purely functional account according to which recoverable subjects can be omitted. Syntactic accounts of RSSO tend to attribute RSSO to an idiosyncratic property (a grammatical ‘add on’) differentiating the register-specific grammar from the core grammar of English, the most popular implementations being topic drop (3a) and structural truncation-cum-ellipsis (TP in (3b), cf. (11)) (Haegeman 2013).

(3) a. [_{TopP} I [_{FinP} [_{TP} I believe I saw the first shoot of bindweed today]]].

b. [_{TP} I believe I saw the first shoot of bindweed today].

2. A unified pattern of subject omission? Most analyses assume that the grammatical property underlying RSSO (topic drop (3a), truncation (3b)) is unavailable in the ‘core grammar’. Wilder (1997), however, demonstrates that the distributional restrictions on RSSO (3) parallel those on SCSE (2) in that both SCSE and RSSO are governed by a left edge restriction, being, for instance, incompatible with subject auxiliary inversion (4a), argument fronting (4b) and *wh*-fronting (4c), while remaining compatible with argument fronting (4d).

(4) a. SCSE *Did you go home and did ___ find anything?

a'. RSSO * Will ___ see her again?

b. SCSE *That book, I like and this book, ___ do not approve of. (Wilder 1997)

c'. RSSO *This book, ___ do not approve of.

c. SCSE *She is very impatient and how ___ hates waiting for people.

c'. RSSO *How ___ hates waiting for people.

d. SCSE They are keen golf fans and for years ___ have travelled to the open.

d'. RSSO For years ___ have travelled to the open.

A full assimilation of RSSO and SCSE would entail that RSSO can – and by economy should – receive the same analysis as SCSE, and that a register-specific syntactic add-on is not required. Indeed, Wilder (1997) himself invokes a unified left edge ellipsis account for both RSSO and SCSE. This presentation will show that, however attractive a unification of the two phenomena may be, a closer look at the empirical data reveals that it is not tenable: RSSO and SCSE do not fully converge and hence distinct accounts remain required.

3. RSSO and SCSE: divergencies

3.1. The root restriction. RSSO is generally considered to be a root phenomenon: in contexts in which a matrix subject is non-overt, the embedded subject systematically remains overt, even when coreferential with the (non-overt) matrix subject or fully contextually recoverable, and omission of the embedded subject is judged unacceptable. A 1SG subject is omitted in the root clauses in (5a). It is clear from the context that the subject of the embedded verb

damaged is also 1SG and yet, this subject cannot be omitted. In (5b), the embedded finite verb *is* is unambiguously 3SG and though contextually recoverable, its subject must be overt.

- (5) a. ___ Finished digging limed patch. ___ Transplanted apple tree. ___ Had great difficulty uprooting it & fear *(I) damaged its roots seriously.
 b. ___ Says *(he) has been struck by the number of more or less ordinary Conservatives *(he) has met who are becoming perturbed by the Government's foreign policy. (both from Orwell 24/11/1939)

SCSE, on the other hand, remains available in embedded clauses, provided the **C-layer is shared** between the relevant conjuncts:

- (6) a. They said that he should go home and (*that)___ would be informed of their decision later in the week.
 b. He decided to visit the shop himself after/when he had been denied access to the website and (*after/when) ___ had tried calling their agency.

3.2. *Quantificational antecedents*. In (7a), SCSE arises in a configuration with a **bare quantifier** as the subject of the first conjunct; the pronoun *his* in the second conjunct is bound by the quantifier *no one*. RSSO in (7b), however, cannot have the reading in which the subject of *has felt* would be interpreted as 'no one' and in which *his* has the bound reading. (7b) conveys that (i) the message was not read and (ii) some previously identified male did not feel it his duty to react. (7b) suggests that RSSO is ultimately dependent on the availability of a **referential** antecedent; it would be felicitous if some accessible discourse antecedent allowed the recovery of the content of the subject of *has not felt*, but the quantifier *no one*, being non-referential, cannot furnish the antecedent.

- (7) a. No one_i has read this message and ___ has not felt it his_i duty to react.
 b. No one_i has read this message. ___ has not felt it his*_i duty to react.

3.3. *Out of the blue omission* In the diary context, a sentence with an overt subject can be followed by a sentence with RSSO, even if the null subject is not coreferential with the subject of the preceding clause. This pattern is common with 1SG subjects (Trutkowski 2011):

- (8) Hares are mating. ___ Saw sparrow-hawks courting in the air. (Orwell 09/04/1940)

SCSE requires identity with the subject of the preceding conjunct. In the core grammar, the identity condition is categorical. In (9a), the 3SG subject in the first conjunct, *the deadline*, controls the interpretation of the non-overt subject of the second conjunct; in (9b), the subject of *will* must be 1SG. Without identity, SCSE is ungrammatical in the core grammar (9c).

- (9) a. The deadline was tomorrow but ___ has now been postponed till next week.
 b. I am working on my application and ___ will submit it after the weekend.
 c. *It was cold, but ___ decided to get myself out of the house out anyway.

4. **The analysis** The divergences listed above entail that, despite obvious parallelisms, SCSE and RSSO are distinct phenomena. The availability of quantifier binding in SCSE (7a) can be made to follow from a shared subject analysis, with TP coordination and the ATB-moved subject in Spec,SubjP (Haegeman 2017) (10). In (10), the CP layer is projected.

- (10) [_{CP} [_{SubjP} He [[_{TP} ~~he~~ has left Edinburgh this morning] and [_{TP} ~~he~~ will arrive tonight]]]]

The distributional similarities between SCSE and RSSO and the interpretive restrictions on RSSO will be shown to follow from a truncation analysis of RSSO, with truncation at SubjP.

- (11) [_{SubjP} ~~He~~ [_{TP} ~~he~~ will arrive tonight]]

5. **Extension: RSSO and coordination** When two SubjPs are coordinated in the diary register, RSSO may apply in the first conjunct (12a), but also in the second conjunct, without the identity requirement governing SCSE (12b). (12b) is not derived by SCSE (cf. (9c)) but it is the result of 'out of the blue' 1SG RSSO in the second conjunct SubjP. The availability of (12b) in the register is not expected under full unification of RSSO and SCSE.

- (12) a. ___ Arrived on time at the meeting but the others had not arrived.
 b. It was cold, but ___ decided to get myself out of the house out anyway.