
Incomplete Conjuncts

Author(s): Richard Hudson

Source: *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Summer, 1982), pp. 547-550

Published by: The MIT Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178289>

Accessed: 14/12/2009 15:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=mitpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The MIT Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Linguistic Inquiry*.

Squibs and Discussion

INCOMPLETE CONJUNCTS

Richard Hudson,

University College London

Williams (1978) and Gazdar (1981) make different claims with respect to examples like (1).

- (1) John gave the books to Mary and the records to Sue.

Williams argues that such examples show the need for a rule of Conjunction Reduction, since the surface conjuncts are not structurally comparable—the first being (*John gave the books to Mary* and the second *the records to Sue*. Indeed, the second conjunct does not constitute a complete constituent of any recognized kind (being a VP containing two NPs, but lacking the verb). On the other hand, Gazdar claims that it is possible to account for the absence of a verb from the second conjunct in (1) by the same mechanism that is responsible for the absence of *saw* from the second conjunct in (2), namely “Gapping”.

- (2) John saw Mary and Bill, Sue.

According to this analysis, the second conjunct of (1) would still be incomplete, but it could be generated by a grammar which contained a mechanism capable of generating gapped examples like (2). In other words, examples like (1) would not count as evidence against Gazdar’s phrase structure treatment of coordinate structures. I shall give evidence below (mostly taken from Hudson (1976)) suggesting strongly that (1) is not in fact an example of Gapping, which means that such sentences remain beyond the present capacity of a phrase structure grammar without transformations. On the other hand, there is no need to take the evidence as support for a transformational treatment of such sentences, as claimed by Williams; it shows merely that phrase structure grammar, even as enriched by Gazdar, still faces problems which may be soluble only within some alternative theory.

The following facts seem to show that sentences like (1) have all the properties of the sentences that can be directly

I have benefited from the comments of Bob Borsley, Gerald Gazdar, and Neil Smith.

generated by “phrasal conjunction”—except for the crucial fact that the second conjunct is incomplete—and none of the properties of gapped sentences which distinguish these from the former. Even though a nontransformational treatment of gapping can be developed (e.g. Stump (1978), Hudson (in preparation)), it will need to reflect these factual differences, and so will not be able to help in the generation of sentences like (1).

A. In gapped sentences, the only possible conjunctions are *and*, *or*, and *nor*; however, in sentences with phrasal conjunction (PC), *but* is also possible:

- (3) a. John drinks coffee and/or/*but Mary, tea.
- b. John drinks coffee and/or/but likes tea.

Example (1) takes *but* without any problems:

- (4) John gave the books to Mary but the records to Sue.

If *gave*'s absence from the second conjunct really resulted from Gapping, it would be necessary to impose a very complex restriction on this rule, so that it would not apply after *but* if the gap is in the middle of the second conjunct (e.g. (3a)), but would be compatible with *but* if the gap is at the start of the second conjunct.

B. In gapped sentences, only two constituents are possible in the second conjunct, one before the gap and the other after it; in PC sentences, on the other hand, the second conjunct may contain any number of constituents:

- (5) a. *John drinks coffee at 11, and Mary, tea at 10:30.
- b. John drinks coffee at 11 in his office with his colleagues, and eats his lunch at 1 with his friends.

It is easy to add extra items to (1), showing that it is like PC sentences and not like gapped ones:

- (6) John gave the books to Mary at Christmas and the records to Sue for her birthday.

C. In gapped sentences, the order of constituents in the second conjunct is very severely restricted, so that they parallel the order of the corresponding constituents in the first conjunct; but in PC sentences, the order after the conjunction is much freer:

- (7) a. ?*John left at 11 and, at 12, Bill.
- b. John left his office at 11, and, at 12, the library.

The order of elements in (1) can be altered simply by making Heavy NP Shift necessary:

- (8) John gave the books to Mary, and to Sue the records which he'd been saving up for such a long time to buy for her.

D. In gapped sentences, the first constituent in the second conjunct must be the subject of the shared verb, but obviously no such restriction applies to PC sentences:

- (9) a. *Which book did Mary buy and which record, Bill?
 b. John drinks coffee for breakfast and tea in the afternoon.

It will be seen that in (1) the first constituent of the second conjunct (*the records*) is not subject, but object, so once again (1) does not satisfy the conditions which otherwise need to be placed on Gapping.

E. If the first clause of a gapped sentence is negative, the conjunction must be either *nor* or *or* (i.e. not *and*), but *and* is possible after a negative clause in a PC sentence:

- (10) a. John didn't see Mary nor/or/*and Bill, Sue.
 b. John doesn't drink coffee nor/or/and smoke a pipe.

If the first clause of (1) had been negative, the conjunction could still have been *and*, contrary to what we should expect if (1) were the result of Gapping:

- (11) John didn't give the books to Mary and the records to Sue.

F. Gapped sentences are stylistically very restricted, and (as far as I can tell from informal observation over some years) hardly ever occur in casual conversation, although they are common in prepared speech such as news broadcasts (*Five people were killed and fifteen injured*), as well as in formal writing. However this fact should be incorporated into a complete description of English, it will clearly need to presuppose the distinction between gapped and other sentences (including PC sentences). My stylistic intuitions about (1) are quite clear: (1) is no more "formal" or "deliberate" than any other kind of PC sentence, and I should not be at all surprised to hear such a sentence used casually, in the course of conversation, whereas I should be surprised to hear a genuine gapped sentence.

In conclusion, then, (1) is not an example of a gapped sentence, so we cannot assume, with Gazdar, that it will be generated by a PSG provided the latter contains a rule of Gapping. Instead, we have seen that (1) has all of the characteristics of the conjoined structures which Gazdar proposes to generate directly by PS rules, with the crucial difference that at least one of the conjuncts is a constituent which is incomplete—that is, a constituent which the PS rules cannot generate. It is hard to see how Gazdar's theory can provide satisfactory analyses for such sentences.

References

- Gazdar, G. (1981) "Unbounded Dependencies and Coordinate Structure," *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 155–184.
- Hudson, R. A. (1976) "Conjunction-Reduction, Gapping and Right-Node Raising," *Language* 52, 535–562.
- Stump, G. T. (1978) "Interpretive Gapping in Montague Grammar," in D. Farkas et al., eds., *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 472–481.
- Williams, E. (1978) "Across-the-Board Rule Application," *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 31–43.

GENERATIVE PHONOLOGY AND
TURKISH RHYME

Joseph L. Malone,
Barnard College and
Columbia University

In a pair of important studies, Paul Kiparsky (1968; 1972) has demonstrated that, in poetic traditions as dissimilar as those of the Finnish folk epic *Kalevala* and the Sanskrit *Rigveda*, key aspects of phonetic organization in verse may depend upon presurface phonological regularities. However, despite the great promise of these studies for new and deeper understanding of poetic traditions elsewhere on the globe, very few applications of Kiparsky's methods to other languages have appeared.¹ The purpose of this note is to rectify this deficit in part, by showing how Kiparskian analysis illuminates an important aspect of traditional Turkish rhyme.²

A frequent traditional Turkish verse form comprises a lead-off quatrain having the rhyme scheme *a b a b*, and one or more follow-up quatrains rhyming *c c c b*, *d d d b*, etc. Rhyme groups evidence phonological identity minimally of word-final -V(C) (e.g. *salıp* 'spreading'/*atıp* 'removing'), but usually also of -CV(C) or even of a wider leftward subsequence (e.g. *salıp/kalıp* 'mould'). Moreover, rhyme usually involves morphological (suffixal) identity (-*ip* in *salıp/atıp* is a participial suffix), though this is not necessary (*kalıp* is a single morpheme).³

The identity required for rhyme was said to be *phonological*. This requirement is in fact the Kiparskian key to Turkish rhyme, for to construe the identity as (broad) *phonetic* proves to be either starkly or subtly inadequate, depending on what sort of rhyme is envisaged.

¹ Part of the rationale for this might be preemption by more recent work of Kiparsky's, notably his important application of the new "metrical phonology" to the analysis of (poetic) meter in (neo-Classical) English verse; see Kiparsky (1977) and applications to other languages/traditions such as Chen (1979).

² Considerably more detailed treatments of two other languages (and traditions) appear in Malone (ms.; forthcoming). I should also mention unpublished work on French verse by Juliette Levin (formerly of Barnard College, now of MIT).

³ All examples are from Anonymous (n.d., 73–79). Though the poems are undated, a nineteenth century date seems likely.