

An adjunction theory of extraction from coordinate structures

Rob Truswell, University of Edinburgh

(Joint work with Daniel Altshuler, Hampshire College)

Research on extraction from coordinate structures has converged on two opposing positions concerning the relationship between **across-the-board extraction** like (1a) and **asymmetric extraction** like (1b).

- (1) a. What did you [[buy ___] and [read ___]]?
- b. What did you [[go to the store] and [buy ___]]?

The classical assumption has been that ATB-extraction is the central phenomenon in need of explanation, with asymmetrical extraction more marginal. Recently, the opposite position seems to be gaining traction, partly because of the success of recent approaches to ATB-extraction like Citko (2005).

In this talk, standing on the shoulders of Postal (1998) and Reich (2009), I argue for a simple theory of asymmetric extraction from coordinate structures, based on just two main claims:

Claim A. Noninitial conjuncts are adjoined to initial conjuncts (Munn 1993)

Claim B. In some languages, adjuncts are weak islands for extraction; in others, they are strong islands. (Postal 1998, Truswell 2011)

I show that these two claims, bolstered by sensible semantic and information-structural considerations, offer a systematic account of a very wide range of patterns of extraction from coordinate structures, to my knowledge never all considered together before. These include the following (references to original sources omitted for lack of space):

Free extraction of, or from, initial conjuncts There are no specific restrictions on the categories that can be extracted from initial conjuncts (2a). Initial conjuncts themselves can be extracted (2b). Often, in SLF-coordinations and nominal ‘odd coordinations’ (2c) there is no clear interpretive asymmetry triggered by extraction from the first conjunct.

- (2) a. How much can you [[drink ___] and [still stay sober]]?
- b. ?Knjige je Marko [___ i filmove] kupio
 books is Marko and films bought
 ‘Marko bought books and films.’ (Serbo-Croatian)
- c. Äpfel habe ich [[zwei ___] und [drei Bananen]].

Extraction from noninitial conjuncts patterns with extraction from adjuncts For example, both are good in English (3); both are bad in German (4a–b), though German does allow extraction from initial conjuncts (4c).

- (3) a. What did you [come here [to talk about ___]]?
- b. What will you [[go to the store] and [buy ___]]?
- (4) a. *Was bist du [hierher gekommen, [um darüber ___ zu sprechen]]?

- b. *Was wirst du [[zum Laden gehen] und [__ kaufen]]?
- c. Wie viel kannst du [[__ trinken] und [trotzdem noch nüchtern bleiben]]?

No direct effect of coherence relation It is common to see claims, following Lakoff (1986), that different interpretations of the discourse relation between conjuncts license different asymmetric extraction patterns. Lakoff described three such correlations; Kehler (2002) included ATB-extraction with RESEMBLANCE relations as a fourth. In (5b) and (5c), extraction is from the initial conjunct; in (5a), it is from all foregrounded conjuncts, necessarily including the final conjunct.

- | | | | |
|-----|----|---|---------------|
| (5) | a. | What did you [[go to the store] and [buy __]]? | OCCASION |
| | b. | How much can you [[drink __] and [stay sober]]? | VIOLATED EXP. |
| | c. | What do people [[eat __ here] and [get sick]]? | CAUSE-EFFECT |

But discourse relation isn't a direct predictor of extraction pattern in these cases. On the one hand, a CAUSE-EFFECT relation entails OCCASION, but the gap sites in (5a,c) are incommensurate. On the other, I show that a better explanation of the VIOLATED EXPECTATION pattern refers not directly to coherence relations, but to the scope-based treatment of extraction patterns in Szabolcsi & Zwarts (1993).

Summary Overall, the analysis in this talk normalizes extraction from coordinate structures. It takes a simple syntax and shows that the simple predictions it makes are at least as accurate as the sometimes bewilderingly diverse range of specific asymmetric patterns documented in the literature. The major casualty is the CSC, and ATB-exception, which don't feature in the final analysis.

References

- Citko, B. (2005). On the nature of Merge: External Merge, internal Merge, and parallel Merge. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 36, 475–496.
- Kehler, A. (2002). *Coherence, Reference, and the Theory of Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Lakoff, G. (1986). Frame semantic control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. In *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory* (pp. 152–167). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Munn, A. (1993). *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Coordinate Structures*. PhD thesis, University of Maryland.
- Postal, P. (1998). *Three Investigations of Extraction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reich, I. (2009). »Asymmetrische Koordination« im Deutschen. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Szabolcsi, A. & Zwarts, F. (1993). Weak islands and an algebraic semantics for scope taking. *Natural Language Semantics*, 1, 235–284.
- Truswell, R. (2011). *Events, Phrases, and Questions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.