

# Hierarchies of Parallelism in Elliptical Polish Structures\*

Marjorie J. McShane

*Abstract:* This paper discusses the ellipsis of accusative direct objects (DOs), the enclitic *się*, and the conditional marker *by* in Polish. While these three elements are grammatically heterogeneous, they show identical patterns of ellipsis in configurations marked by a high degree of parallelism. This suggests that certain fundamental properties of ellipsis hold language-wide, and that generalizations are missed when ellipsis is approached in the traditional category-by-category fashion.

## 1. Introduction

Ellipsis is a phenomenon that cuts across all linguistic subdisciplines. There is a syntactic component that has been explored in frameworks like Principles and Parameters Theory (P&P), and there are semantic, lexical, phonetic, and pragmatic components that have been considered within Functional Grammar.<sup>1</sup> At all these levels of the language system, parallelism promotes ellipsis. I will show that significant predictive power can be achieved by considering the relative number of ellipsis-promoting and ellipsis-impeding factors in Polish structures.

The most typical and widely discussed parallel structures are syndetic coordinate structures which are coordinate structures containing an overt conjunction. These will be the focus of Sections 2–4. The syntactic literature on coordination focuses largely on the following four issues: (i) whether coordinate structures have binary or ternary branching; (ii) whether coordinate structures are headed by the conjunction itself or by the category that heads each of the conjuncts; (iii) whether empty categories (ECs) in coordinate structures are absent in the syntax, or whether they are present in the syntax but deleted at the level of phonetic form (PF); (iv) whether same-subject conjuncts are instances of VP coordination

---

\* I am grateful to Katarzyna Hagemajer, Pawel Rutkowski and Ewa Willim for assisting as Polish informants and providing invaluable insights. I also sincerely thank Piotr Bański, Steven Franks, Sophia Lubensky, Abby Wildman, and anonymous *JSL* readers for their valuable commentary on drafts of this paper and their suggestions regarding directions for future work on this topic.

<sup>1</sup> For syntactic approaches to ellipsis see the references in notes 2, 11 and 12. For functional considerations, see Hajičová 1994, Halliday 1994, and Yokoyama 1986.

with a common subject, or CP/IP coordination with the second subject elided.<sup>2</sup> Points (i) and (ii) will not be pursued here, as theoretical agnosticism does not detract from the current analysis. Points (iii) and (iv), however, require attention.

Elided elements in coordinate structures could be absent in the syntactic structure, as argued by Chao (1988), or they could be present throughout the syntactic derivation but deleted in PF, as argued by Klein (1993) and Wilder (1997).<sup>3</sup> As Wilder notes, the latter analysis is more suitable for a Minimalist model, which builds syntactic trees in bottom-up fashion, starting with lexical items that project to form phrase structures. The deletion-in-PF analysis is further suggested by Polish data. Phonetic identity between the antecedent and the following coreferential category is among the factors that promote ellipsis in Polish. If the EC were missing from the beginning of the computation, it is unclear how phonetic identity or a lack thereof could be established.

The second relevant syntactic issue regards the structure of sentences containing same-subject conjuncts. They could represent VP coordination with a common subject: John [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> came] and [<sub>VP</sub> joined the party]], or CP/IP coordination with the second subject elided: [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>CP/IP</sub> John came] and [<sub>CP/IP</sub> *Jóhn* joined the party]].<sup>4</sup> Without presenting the argumentation on both sides of the issue, I will adopt the VP coordinate analysis for two reasons. First, when same-subject conjuncts are coordinated in Polish, the second subject generally cannot be overt; it is unclear how a CP/IP coordinate analysis could *require* ellipsis of the latter subject. Second, the VP-coordinate analysis potentially sheds light on certain patterns of ellipsis in Polish. That is, there are significant differences in ellipsis potential between same-subject and different-subject coordinate structures.<sup>5</sup> If these differences derive at all from syntax (they may not—they may derive entirely from semantic/discourse/pragmatic considerations), we would expect different X-bar structures for each type of coordination. An X-bar distinction can be instantiated by considering sentences like *John came and joined the party* to be VP coordinate structures with a shared subject, and by considering sentences like *John came and Mary left* to be CP/IP coordinate structures: [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>CP/IP</sub> John came] and [<sub>CP/IP</sub> Mary left]].

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Bresnan and Thráinnson 1990, Gazdar *et al.* 1982, Goodall 1987, Hankamer 1973, Kayne 1994, Mithun 1988, Sag *et al.* 1985, and Wilder 1994, 1997.

<sup>3</sup> I draw the analysis of Chao and Klein from Wilder 1997.

<sup>4</sup> The non-committal notation "CP/IP" will be used throughout.

<sup>5</sup> It is notable that DOs in Icelandic can be elided only in VP coordinate structures (see Rögnvaldsson 1990 for the Icelandic data). This suggests that there is a cross-linguistic tendency for VP coordinate structures to be more ellipsis-promoting than CP/IP coordinate structures.

The major thrust of this paper is to explore the interrelated parallelism effects deriving from various modules of the language system. Thus, it is lesser-studied interface issues, rather than well defined modular issues, that will be addressed.

### 1.1. Why DOs, *się*, and *by*?

A survey of ellipsis in Polish reveals a notable fact: while some categories—like subjects, verbs, and DOs—are liberally elided in many types of syntactic configurations, other categories—like *się* and *by*—are primarily elided only when the antecedent conjunct and ellipsis conjunct are structurally parallel and occur in series.<sup>67</sup> The reason why subjects, verbs and DOs can be elided in the absence of structural parallelism is that each of them has one or more alternative ellipsis-licensing strategies. For the sake of comparison, let us first consider some such strategies.

*Subjects.* Elided subjects in Polish are licensed by the agreement morphology on the verb, so subject ellipsis is in no way restricted to parallel configurations.<sup>8</sup> In fact, the antecedent for an elided subject need not even be syntactically overt, as in (1).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> With respect to *się*, this generalization applies only to sentences in which the instances of *się* occur in different VPs. Within a single VP, instances of *się* resulting from different sources are often collapsed, creating haplology (discussed in Kupść 1999). For example, in (i), two instances of inherent *się* (from the verbs *bać się* 'to fear' and *roześmiać się* 'to laugh') are collapsed into one surface *się*; in (ii), one instance of inherent *się* (occurring as part of the nominalized form *modlenie się* 'praying') and one instance of impersonal *się* (arising when the verb *zakazać* undergoes impersonalization) can—but need not—be collapsed into one surface *się*.

(i) *Boję się głośno roześmiać.* (Kupść: 91)  
fear<sub>1.SG</sub> *się* loudly laugh<sub>INFIN</sub>  
'I'm afraid to laugh loudly.'

(ii) *W naszym kraju zakazało się modlenia (się).*  
in our country forbade<sub>3.SG</sub> *się* praying (się)  
'Praying was forbidden in our country.'

(In examples drawn from linguistic sources, the glossing devices are changed to those adopted in the current paper.)

<sup>7</sup> It is difficult to find a single term to refer to all the parallel entities in question. The term "conjunct" will work until Section 5, in which the entities are not coordinated and therefore cannot be called conjuncts.

<sup>8</sup> Whereas elided elements in parallel structures are present in syntax then phonetically reduced in PF, subject *pro* is arguably a base-generated empty category. See Nillson 1982 and Franks 1995 for analyses of *pro*-drop in Polish.

<sup>9</sup> The following conventions apply to the presentation of examples. In word-for-word translations, *się* and *by* are represented as such in order to avoid cumbersome, inexact or opaque abbreviations. Grammatical information is presented sparsely in order not to

- (1) [e] Wybraliśmy się na wycieczkę.  
 [e] went<sub>1,PL</sub> się on trip  
 'We went on a trip.'

*Verbs.* Polish verbs can be elided in a wide range of configurations. V<sup>0</sup> and V<sup>1</sup> ellipsis can be licensed either by structural parallelism, as in (2), or by a syntactically and semantically compatible combination of overt categories within the clause, as in (3).<sup>10</sup>

- (2) Sara chce narysować łódkę, a Piotr [e] — samolot.  
 Sara wants draw<sub>INF</sub> boat<sub>ACC</sub> and Peter [e] plane<sub>ACC</sub>  
 'Sara wants to draw a boat and Peter a plane.'

clutter the often lengthy examples. Elided categories are represented by [e] in boldface. When necessary, the nature of the empty category is indicated within the bracket: e.g., [e]<sub>by</sub> indicates an elided *by*. When relevant, the type of *się* is indicated using the following notation: inherent (INH), reflexive (REFL), reciprocal (RECIP), middle (MID), impersonal (IMPERS). The antecedents for ellipsis are in boldface in all examples. The following symbols are used to mark examples with regard to their felicity:

- \* ungrammatical
- ? of questionable grammaticality
- (?) almost perfectly grammatical, but not quite
- ! stylistically marked but not ungrammatical
- !! stylistically highly marked but not ungrammatical
- (!) slightly stylistically marked

The symbols ?/(?) question the grammaticality per se of elliptical utterances. The symbols !/!!/(!) suggest the stylistic infelicity—albeit not ungrammaticality—of non-elliptical utterances (overtly expressing an element that is subcategorized for cannot, it would seem, produce ungrammaticality). Slash notation will be used to show conflicting judgments for the elliptical and non-elliptical variants: e.g., *go*\*/[e] means that the elliptical variant is ungrammatical, while [e]!!*go* means that the overt-object variant is highly marked stylistically. Many of the examples in this study are drawn from Polish literature; others were invented in cooperation with native speakers. One speaker served as my primary informant; two more accepted those original judgments; several others provided examples of, and insights into, given phenomena. Based on previous work on ellipsis in Russian, I assume that not all speakers of Polish will agree with the absolute judgments of all examples; however, I expect there to be general agreement regarding the relative felicity of examples.

<sup>10</sup> Example (2) represents a type of verbal ellipsis known as Gapping, a term that originated in early transformational grammar and continues to be used in Principles and Parameters (P&P) Theory. The type of ellipsis in (4) cannot be accounted for by any of the ellipsis-licensing strategies found in P&P Theory. This type of ellipsis, which is employed more extensively in Russian than in Polish, is described in McShane 1998, 2000, 2002c.

- (3) Podstawił jej nogę... „Łobuzy!“ kryczy gruba pani  
 stuck-out<sub>MASC.SG</sub> her<sub>DAT</sub> foot<sub>ACC</sub> jerks yells fat lady  
 „Ja [e] nienaumyślnie.“<sup>11</sup>  
 I [e] unintentionally  
 ‘He stuck out his foot to trip her... “Jerks!” yells the fat lady. “I didn’t mean it.”’

VP Ellipsis is generally licensed by a finite verb form or impersonal predicate word (like *można* ‘it is possible, one may’) that takes a VP complement, as in (4).

- (4) Maria nie umie grać na organach, ale wydaje  
 Mary NEG knows-how play<sub>INF</sub> on organ but seems  
 mi się, że Piotr umie [e].  
 me<sub>DAT</sub> się that Peter knows-how [e]  
 ‘Mary doesn’t know how to play the organ, but it seems to me that Peter does.’

*Direct Objects.* Direct objects are a third type of syntactic category whose ellipsis can be licensed either by structural parallelism, as in (5), or by other means, as in (6).

- (5) Wziął piłkę i rzucił [e].  
 took<sub>3.SG</sub> ball<sub>ACC</sub> and threw<sub>3.SG</sub> [e]  
 ‘He took the ball and threw it.’
- (6) [The speaker holds out a bag]  
 Potrzymaj [e], proszę.  
 hold<sub>IMPER.2.SG</sub> [e] please  
 ‘Hold this, please.’

In (6), the EC is formally licensed by a null discourse topic that is located in a topic functional projection, as proposed by Huang (1984) for Chinese null argument phenomena: [TOPIC Op<sub>i</sub> [IP [v P *Potrzymaj* [e]<sub>i</sub>], *proszę*]]. The content of the EC is recovered by a pragmatically understood antecedent.

To summarize, the ellipsis of subjects, verbs, and DOs can be licensed either by parallelism or in some other fashion, while the ellipsis of *się* and *by* is generally licensed by parallelism (examples below).

<sup>11</sup> From Janusz Korczak’s *Król Maciuś pierwszy* (1923: 188).

The obvious question, therefore, is why compare the ellipsis patterns of DOs with those of *się* and *by*, rather than just concentrating on *się* and *by* in isolation? There are three reasons.

1. DOs, *się* and *by* are similar in that they have the same status when elided in parallel structures: they are present syntactically but are not expressed in PF, unlike subject *pro*, which is arguably a base-generated empty category.
2. The fact that the ellipsis of such unrelated items is affected by similar factors makes a strong statement about the language-wide nature of certain elliptical processes.
3. [A meta-consideration] There is a well established cross-linguistic literature on DO ellipsis that can be used as a springboard for the investigation of elided *się* and *by*.<sup>12</sup>

## 1.2. Types of Parallelism

The grammatical effects of parallelism have long been recognized and are addressed, for example, in the literature on Gapping and coordinate structures.<sup>13</sup> The crucial property of parallelism with respect to ellipsis is that it functions on many levels simultaneously: syntactic, phonetic, morpho-syntactic and lexico-semantic. The more layers of parallelism that obtain in a given structure, the more strongly the elliptical variant tends to be preferred. Before proceeding to the Polish data, a brief description of each level of parallelism is warranted.

*Syntactic Parallelism.* Coordinate structures are generally composed of structurally parallel conjuncts.<sup>14</sup> They can be broken into several subtypes on the basis of parameters that have more ellipsis-promoting [+ ellipsis] and less ellipsis-promoting [(-) ellipsis] values, as summarized in Table 1.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The following are among the studies of DO ellipsis in the world's languages: Cole 1987, Farrell 1990, Huang 1987, Lillo-Martin 1986 and 1991, Raposo 1986, Roberge 1990, Suñer and Yépez 1988.

<sup>13</sup> For Gapping, see, e.g., Hudson 1976, Jackendoff 1971, Lobeck 1995, Neijt 1979, Rooryck 1985 and Ross 1967. For coordinate structures, see the sources in footnote 2.

<sup>14</sup> Absolute parallelism is not always required in coordinate structures, as pointed out by Sag *et al.* 1985: *Pat is either stupid or a liar*. Here, one contrasted feature is an adjective phrase, *stupid*, while the other is a noun (or determiner) phrase, *a liar*.

<sup>15</sup> There is one other syntactic factor that affects at least DO ellipsis: whether the conjuncts are joined by an overt conjunction (syndetic coordination) or not (asyndetic coordination). See Quirk *et al.* 1972, Mithun 1988, and Carston 1993 for discussion. In many instances, where a syndetic structure would permit stylistically neutral ellipsis, the corresponding asyndetic structure produces stylistic infelicity—a somehow “overly elliptical”

Table 1

Parameter	+ Ellipsis	(-) Ellipsis
Type of Conjuncts	VPs	CPs/IPs
Number of Conjuncts	3 (+)	2

The first parameter contrasts VP and CP/IP coordinate structures. While this is formally a syntactic distinction, the reason why CP/IP coordinate structures are less permissive of ellipsis is at least in part due to functional considerations: introducing a new subject shifts the theme of discourse, thereby reducing the recoverability of previously mentioned categories.

The second parameter contrasts two-conjunct and multi-conjunct structures. This is another syntactic distinction whose ellipsis effects appear to be functionally based. The more coreferential elements there are in a sentence, the more desirable it is to elide one or more of them in order to avoid needless and stylistically undesirable repetition.

*Phonetic Parallelism.* Phonetic parallelism refers to the relationship between the phonetic shape of the antecedent and the phonetic shape of the following coreferential element. For *by* and *się*, phonetic identity always obtains because these lexical items are invariant in form. However, for DO ellipsis, phonetic identity does not always obtain because the antecedent for an elided DO can either be a referential expression (R-expression) or a pronoun. Assuming that all potentially elided DOs are pronominal in nature, they will phonetically match their antecedents only if the antecedent is itself a pronoun (*it = it*). If the antecedent is an R-expression, phonetic

utterance. This contrast is shown in (i) below. The (a) variant is an asyndetic structure that occurred as a stage direction in a play (*Adwokat i róże*, 113). The object is elided and the structure sounds markedly telegraphic, as stage directions often do. The (b) variant is the corresponding syndetic structure, which permits stylistically neutral ellipsis.

- (i) a. [Dorota] w zdenerwowaniu bezwiednie zdjęła kapelusz i  
 Dorothy in agitation mechanically took-off hat and  
 szal. Położyła !![e] obok stolika.  
 shawl<sub>ACC</sub> put !![e]<sub>ACC</sub> next-to table
- b. Dorota w zdenerwowaniu bezwiednie zdjęła kapelusz i  
 Dorothy in agitation mechanically took-off hat and  
 szal i położyła (je) obok stolika.  
 shawl<sub>ACC</sub> and put them<sub>ACC</sub> next-to table

'In her agitation, Dorota mechanically took off her hat and shawl and put them next to the table.'

For reasons of space, the non-trivial issues associated with overt and covert conjunctions will not be pursued here. See McShane 1998, 1999, 2000d for discussion of DO ellipsis in syndetic versus asyndetic structures in Russian, Polish and Czech.

identity will not obtain (*dog != it*). The evidence shows that having a phonetically identical antecedent—be it a pronominal NP, *się* or *by*—strongly promotes ellipsis in Polish.

*Morpho-Syntactic Parallellism.* Morpho-syntactic parallelism, pertinent only for DO ellipsis, refers to the relative case-marking of the antecedent and the DO. The antecedent for an elided DO may be ACC, and therefore match the case of the potentially elided DO, or it may be non-ACC. While ACC antecedents widely support DO ellipsis in Polish, non-ACC antecedents permit it only in highly restricted circumstances.<sup>16</sup> Only ACC antecedents, which show morpho-syntactic parallelism, will be addressed here so as not to take the discussion too far afield.

*Lexico-Semantic Parallellism.* There are two types of lexico-semantic parallelism pertinent to the topic at hand. The first concerns the selection of verbs in the antecedent and ellipsis conjuncts. The verbs can be identical, creating maximal parallelism, semantically related, creating significant parallelism, or semantically unrelated, creating a lack of parallelism. Semantically related verbs are associated by what Yokoyama (1986: 312) calls set membership. According to her analysis, sets can be of the following three types: universal (*live/die*), culturally-dependent (*pitch/hit*), and those limited to a certain group of individuals sharing some common knowledge. Evidence shows that the closer the semantic tie between the verbs in the antecedent and ellipsis conjuncts, the more likely it is that ellipsis of a DO, *się*, or *by* will be possible/preferred.

The second type of lexico-semantic parallelism pertains only to *się*. *Się* carries out many functions in Polish: it is used productively to create reflexives, reciprocals, middles, and impersonals, and it occurs idiosyncratically with certain verbs, like *bać się* 'to fear'. As Kupść (1999) points out, the ellipsis of *się* depends in part upon whether or not the same *się* is being used by both verbs in question.

### 1.3. Notes on *się* and *by*

As mentioned above, *się* is an enclitic that carries out a number of functions in Polish. In keeping with the "free" word order of Polish, *się* can occur in various positions in the clause, subject to some restrictions. Basically, it can occur either closely following the verb or just about anywhere in the clause preceding the verb, except in clause-initial position.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> For discussion of DO ellipsis with non-ACC antecedents in Russian, see McShane 1998, 2002b, 2002c.

<sup>17</sup> Clitic placement is discussed widely in the literature, e.g., Franks 1998, Franks and Bański 1999, Kupść 1999.



With respect to its mobility, *się* is much like person-number agreement markers (PNs) in Polish, whose legal placement is shown in (7).<sup>18</sup>

- (7) a. My-*śmy* znowu wczoraj poszli do parku.  
           we-1PL again yesterday went to park  
 b. My znowu-*śmy* wczoraj poszli do parku.  
 c. My znowu wczoraj-*śmy* poszli do parku.  
 d. My znowu wczoraj poszli-*śmy* do parku.  
 e. \*My znowu wczoraj poszli do-*śmy* parku.  
 f. \*My znowu wczoraj poszli do parku-*śmy*.

(Franks and Bański 1999: 125)

*By* is the conditional marker in Polish. It can either be attached to the main verb or detached, in which case it precedes the verb. When attached to the verb, it is placed after gender agreement morphology but before the PN. For example, *plywałabym* 'I would have swum' contains:

- (8) pływał -a- by -m  
       swim<sub>SG</sub> FEM.SG conditional 1.SG

When detached, both *by* and the PN (if there is one) precede the verb, as in *ja bym pływala*, described in (9).

- (9) ja by- -m pływał- -a  
       I<sub>NOM</sub> by 1.SG swam<sub>SG</sub> FEM.SG

According to traditional analyses, conditional *by* attaches to the past tense form of the verb, but Borsley and Rivero (1994; hereafter B&R) put forth a new analysis. They suggest that the so-called "past tense" is actually composed of a participle that shows gender and number (e.g., *widział* 'seen') plus a perfect auxiliary that shows person (e.g., *-ś* '2nd'). The perfect auxiliary originates in the head of the inflection phrase (I°), and the participle originates in the head of the verb phrase (V°). Sentences like (10) are formed when the participle moves up and incorporates into the perfect auxiliary; sentences like (11) are formed when the participle remains in situ.

<sup>18</sup> Another property that likens PNs to *się* is that certain types of PNs can be elided in coordinate structures, e.g., plural PNs when word stress is antepenultimate (Franks and Bański 1999: 126):

- (i) Czytali-*śmy* i pisali-[e-*śmy*]  
       read-1.PL and wrote-[e1.PL]

The non-trivial restrictions on the ellipsis of PNs will not be investigated here.



One syntactic configuration in which all three categories should generally be elided is multi-conjunct VP coordination: [NP<sub>SUBj</sub> [XP [VP VP<sub>i</sub>] [VP VP<sub>j</sub>] *and/but* [VP VP<sub>k</sub>]]]. Consider examples (14) and (15), in which coreferential DOs appear in three consecutive conjuncts. There are four possible patterns of ellipsis: the (a) and (b) variants are equally acceptable; the (c) variant is somewhat less felicitous—it is felt to be slightly unbalanced unless there is a marked pause after the word *powietrzem*; the (d) variant is considered by some speakers to be overly repetitive, although such repetition often occurs in unedited, colloquial speech, especially if there is a pause after *powietrzem*.

(14) Możemy wykonać **stonia** z gumy w odpowiedniej  
 can<sub>1.PL</sub> make<sub>INF</sub> **elephant**<sub>ACC</sub> from rubber in right  
 wielkości.  
 size

a. napełnić **go** powietrzem i wstawić [e] za ogrodzenie.<sup>19</sup>  
 fill<sub>INF</sub> **it**<sub>ACC</sub> air<sub>INST</sub> put<sub>INF</sub> [e] behind railing

b. napełnić [e] powietrzem i wstawić [e] za ogrodzenie.

c. (!) napełnić [e] powietrzem i wstawić **go** za ogrodzenie.

d. (!) napełnić **go** powietrzem i wstawić **go** za ogrodzenie.

'We can make an elephant of the right size out of rubber, fill it with air and put it behind the railing.'

(15) Z półki z książkami zdjęła **Biblię**,  
 from shelf with books took<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> **Bible**<sub>ACC</sub>

a. otworzyła ją w odpowiednim miejscu i położyła [e]  
 opened<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> **it**<sub>ACC</sub> in right place and put<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> [e]  
 na stole koło okna.<sup>20</sup>

on table near window

b. otworzyła [e] w odpowiednim miejscu i położyła [e] na stole koło okna.

c. (!) otworzyła [e] w odpowiednim miejscu i położyła ją na stole koło okna.

d. (!) otworzyła ją w odpowiednim miejscu i położyła ją na stole koło okna.

'She took the Bible from the bookshelf, opened it to the right place and put it on the table near the window.'

<sup>19</sup> The (a) variant of this example is from *Stoń*: 110 in *Tango, Stoń, Wesele w Atomicach, Woda*.

The reason why various combinations of overt and covert DOs are possible in these examples is because the antecedent is an R-expression, meaning that it does not phonetically match the pronominal DOs in the following two conjuncts. When the antecedent is a pronoun, the single pattern of ellipsis shown in (16) is strongly preferred. However, again, if there is a pause before the final conjunct, the last pronoun may be overt without stylistic deviance (this pause-dependent variant is not shown below).

- (16) Dowiedziałem się wkrótce, że człowiek siedzący naprzeciw  
 learned<sub>1.SG.MASC</sub> się soon that man<sub>NOM</sub> sitting across-from  
 mnie jest łowcą dzikich słoni. Łowi je, oswaja  
 me is trapper wild elephant<sub>GEN</sub> traps<sub>3.SG</sub> them<sub>ACC</sub> tames  
 [e]//!je i oddaje [e]//!je  
 [e]//!them<sub>ACC</sub> and gives [e]//!them<sub>ACC</sub>  
 wyedukowane w służbę ludzi.<sup>21</sup>  
 educated to service people<sub>GEN</sub>  
 'Before long I learned that the man sitting across from me was a  
 trapper of wild elephants. He traps them, tames them, and hands  
 them over, educated, to people for their use.'

The ellipsis pattern in (16), overt-[e]-[e], is strongly preferred because of the layering of ellipsis-promoting factors: superimposed upon the syntactic parallelism is phonetic identity between the antecedent and its coreferential DOs. The cooccurrence of syntactic and phonetic parallelism makes any overt repetition of DOs undesirable.

As mentioned earlier, *się* and *by* are invariant in form, so they always exhibit the phonetic identity found in DO examples with a pronominal antecedent. Accordingly, we would expect their preferred ellipsis patterns to correspond to the one in (16), as they consistently do.

- (17) Marek i Monika pozwalają się, zaręczyli [e]//!się i pobrali  
 Marek and Monika met się engaged [e]//!się and married  
 [e]//!się w ciągu 3 miesięcy.  
 [e]//!się in span 3 months  
 'Marek and Monika met, got engaged, and married within the span  
 of three months.'

<sup>20</sup> The (a) variant of this example is from *Cudowna podróż*: 7.

<sup>21</sup> This example is from *Profesor Tutka*: 93.

- (18) Justynka umyła się, ubrała [e]//się i uczesała  
 Justynka washed się<sub>REFL</sub> dressed [e]//się<sub>REFL</sub> and brushed  
 [e]//się zanim jej rodzice wstali.  
 [e]//się<sub>REFL</sub> before her parents got-up  
 'Justynka washed up, got dressed, and brushed her hair before her  
 parents got up.'
- (19) Gdybym mieszkała nad oceanem, pływałabym, biegła[e]/  
 if<sub>1.SG</sub> lived<sub>FEM.SG</sub> near ocean swim<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub>run<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e-1.SG]/  
 !!biegałabym i opalała[e<sub>by</sub>]/!!opalałabym  
 !!run<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub> and sunbathe<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>]/!!sunbathe<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub>  
 się codziennie.  
 się daily  
 'If I lived near the ocean, I would swim, run, and sunbathe every  
 day.'
- (20) Gdyby pogoda była ładna, Mary czytałyby, uczyła[e]  
 if weather was nice Mary<sub>NOM</sub> read<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by study<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e]  
 /uczyłyby się i drzemała[e]//!drzemałyby na dworzu.  
 //!study<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by się and snooze<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e]//!snooze<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by outside  
 'If the weather were nice, Mary would read, study, and snooze  
 outside.'
- (21) Gdyby szef jej pozwolił, Masza  
 if boss<sub>NOM</sub> her<sub>DAT</sub> allowed<sub>MASC.SG</sub> Masha<sub>NOM</sub>  
 przychodziłyby do pracy w południe, robiła[e<sub>by</sub>]/!!robiłyby  
 come<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by to work at noon do<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by</sub>]/!!do<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by  
 przerwy na kawę co pół godziny i słuchała[e<sub>by</sub>]/  
 breaks for coffee each half hour and listen-to<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by</sub>]/  
 !!słuchałyby rocka podczas pisania na maszynie.  
 !!listen<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by rock while typing on typewriter  
 'If her boss would let her, Masha would come to work at noon, take  
 coffee breaks every half hour, and listen to rock music while she  
 typed.'

We conclude that the syntactic parallelism inherent in three-conjunct VP-coordinate structures in itself promotes ellipsis. When combined with

phonetic identity, the result is a marked preference for the elliptical pattern overt-[e]-[e] for all three elements under investigation.

### 3. Two Conjunct Syndetic VP Coordinate Structures

The structure that is next highest on the hierarchy of syntactic parallelism is two conjunct syndetic VP coordination: NP<sub>SUBJ</sub> [XP [VP VP<sub>i</sub>] *and/but* [VP VP<sub>j</sub>]]. When structures of this type contain coreferential DOs, the first of which is an R-expression, ellipsis of the second DO is optional, irrespective of whether the conjuncts contain additional arguments or adjuncts, and irrespective of whether the coordinated VPs are finite or non-finite.

- (22) Doktor Mortimer złożył gazetę i schował (ją) do  
 Doctor Mortimer folded newspaper<sub>ACC</sub> and put (it)<sub>ACC</sub> in  
 kieszeni.<sup>22</sup>  
 pocket  
 'Doctor Mortimer folded up the newspaper and put it in his pocket.'
- (23) Helcia się rozzłościła, rzuciła grzyb i podeptała (go)  
 Helcia się got-mad threw mushroom<sub>ACC</sub> and crushed (it)<sub>ACC</sub>  
 nogami.<sup>23</sup>  
 feet<sub>INST</sub>  
 'Helcia got mad, threw down the mushroom, and stomped on it.'
- (24) Tak uratować dziecko i wychować (je), to  
 in-that-way save<sub>INF</sub> child<sub>ACC</sub> and raise<sub>INF</sub> (it)<sub>ACC</sub> that(-is)  
 naprawdę więcej, niż je urodzić!<sup>24</sup>  
 really more than it<sub>ACC</sub> bear<sub>INF</sub>  
 'Saving and raising a child that way really means more than giving birth to it.'

If, however, the antecedent is pronominal, DO ellipsis is preferred due to the layering of syntactic and phonetic parallelism:

<sup>22</sup> From *Pies Baskerville'ów*: 22. The DO was overt in the source text.

<sup>23</sup> From *Król Maciuś pierwszy*: 85. The DO was elided in the source text.

<sup>24</sup> From *Drzewo sprawiedliwości*: 139. The DO was overt in the source text.

- (25) Gatsby wziął nas pod ramiona i wprowadził [e]/!nas  
 Gatsby took us<sub>ACC</sub> by arms and took [e]/!us<sub>ACC</sub>  
 do restauracji...<sup>25</sup>  
 to restaurant  
 'Gatsby took us by the arm and led us into the restaurant...'
- (26) Patrzyłyśmy na siebie w milczeniu, potem wzięła mnie  
 looked<sub>1,PL</sub> at each-other in silence then took<sub>3,FEM.SG</sub> me<sub>ACC</sub>  
 za rękę i wprowadziła [e]/!mnie do środka.<sup>26</sup>  
 by hand and led<sub>3,FEM.SG</sub> [e]/!me<sub>ACC</sub> inside  
 'We looked at each other in silence, then she took me by the hand  
 and led me inside.'

Since *się* and *by* always contribute phonetic identity to the structure, their ellipsis patterns would be expected to match those of DOs with a pronominal antecedent. This expectation is realized, as confirmed by examples (27–32). The difference between preferred ellipsis ([e]/!overt) and highly preferred ellipsis ([e]/!!overt) is lexico-semantically based and therefore difficult to formalize. Examples (27) and (28) employ reflexive *się*, and (29) employs reciprocal *się*. The nature of *się* does not affect ellipsis preferences, as long as both instances of *się* in the sentence match.

- (27) Jak tylko Maciuś umył się i ubrał [e]/!!się,  
 as only Maciuś<sub>NOM</sub> washed się<sub>REFL</sub> and dressed [e]/!!się<sub>REFL</sub>  
 zjawił się poseł króla zagranicznego z  
 appeared się envoy<sub>NOM</sub> king<sub>GEN</sub> foreign<sub>GEN.ADJ</sub> with  
 pozdrowieniem.<sup>27</sup>  
 greetings  
 'As soon as Maciuś had washed up and gotten dressed, the foreign  
 king's envoy showed up bringing greetings.'
- (28) Rozebrałem się i rzuciłem [e]/!się do rzeki.<sup>28</sup>  
 undressed<sub>1,SG,MASC</sub> się<sub>REFL</sub> and threw<sub>1,SG,MASC</sub> [e]/!się<sub>REFL</sub> into river  
 I got undressed and leaped [*lit.*: threw myself] into the river.

<sup>25</sup> From *Wielki Gatsby*: 99.

<sup>26</sup> From *Listy miłości*: 9.

<sup>27</sup> From *Król Maciuś pierwszy*: 77.

<sup>28</sup> From *Profesor Tutka*: 54.

- (29) Marek i Monika zaręczyli się i pobrali [e]//się  
 Marek and Monika engaged się<sub>RECIP</sub> and married [e]//się<sub>RECIP</sub>  
 w ciągu trzech miesięcy.  
 in course-of three months  
 'Marek and Monika got engaged and married within three months.'

Examples (30–31) show a preference for the ellipsis of [*by* + PN] in the second conjunct of VP coordinate structures.

- (30) Gdyby pogoda była ładna, siedziałabym i czytałabym [e]<sub>by<sub>ym</sub></sub>]  
 if weather was nice sit<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> and read<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>]  
 /!czytałabym na dworzu.  
 /!read<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> outside  
 'If the weather were nice, I would sit and read outside.'
- (31) Gdybym miała czas, pojechałabym do Polski i  
 if<sub>1.SG</sub> had<sub>FEM.SG</sub> time go<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> to Poland and  
 uczyła[e]<sub>by<sub>ym</sub></sub> /!uczyłabym się polskiego.  
 study<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>] /!study<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> się Polish  
 'If I had the time, I would go to Poland and study Polish.'

To summarize this section so far, two-conjunct VP coordinate structures are highly ellipsis-promoting configurations. When the antecedent and potentially elided element match phonetically, ellipsis is preferred, depending on the lexico-semantic features. When the antecedent and potentially elided element do not match phonetically, as when the antecedent for DO ellipsis is an R-expression, ellipsis is optional.

A number of factors can offset the high degree of parallelism typical of VP coordinate structures and permit, sometimes even favor, repetition of elements. Some such factors are discussed below.

*Substantial distance separates the verbs in question.* When substantial distance separates the verbs in the coordinated VPs (which is usually caused by long or numerous adjuncts), the perceived level of interconjunct parallelism is reduced and overt repetition of elements often sounds perfectly natural. This is shown for a DO in (32), for *się* in (33), and for *by* in (34).



## (32) [Of a rock on the beach]

Podniosła go z piasku, wciąż wilgotnego po  
 picked-up<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> from sand still wet after  
 niedawnej burzy, i wrzuciła (go) do oceanu.  
 recent storm and threw<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> (it)<sub>ACC</sub> into ocean

'She picked it up from the sand, still wet from the recent storm, and threw it into the ocean.'

(33) Spotkali się w zeszłym roku gdzieś we Francji  
 bumped-into<sub>3.PL</sub> się in last year somewhere in France  
 i pogodzili (się), a teraz są zaręczeni.  
 and made-up<sub>3.PL</sub> (się) and now are engaged

'Last year they bumped into each other somewhere in France and made up, and now they're engaged.'

(34) Gdyby nie klienci i związane z nimi sprawy, [mecenas]  
 if NEG clients and connected with them matters [lawyer]<sub>NOM</sub>  
 chętnie poszukałby jakiejś cichej, małej uliczki i tam  
 gladly look-for<sub>3.SG.MASC-by</sub> some quiet small street and there  
 (by) zamieszkał.<sup>29</sup>

(by) live<sub>3.SG.MASC</sub>

'If it weren't for his clients and their business, the lawyer would gladly have looked for some quiet, little street and would have settled there.'

*The elements in the conjuncts are ordered differently.* Another way to counterbalance the impression of extreme parallelism, and thus permit stylistically neutral repetition of elements in VP coordinate structures, is to order elements differently in each conjunct. Compare, in this respect, examples (35a) and (35b).

(35) a. Gdy dojechali do domu, Caroline pragnęła tylko zamknąć  
 when arrived<sub>3.PL</sub> to home Caroline wanted only lock<sub>INF</sub>  
 się w pokoju i wyplakać [e]!/się.<sup>30</sup>  
 się<sub>REFL</sub> in room and cry-(self)-out<sub>INF</sub> [e]!/się<sub>REFL</sub>

'When they arrived home, Caroline wanted nothing other than to lock herself in her room and cry and cry.'

<sup>29</sup> From *Profesor Tutka*: 66.

<sup>30</sup> From *Pożądanie*: 194.

- (35) b. Gdy dojechali do domu, Caroline pragnęła tylko  
 when arrived<sub>3,PL</sub> to home Caroline wanted only  
 zamknąć się w pokoju i (się) wypłakać.  
 lock<sub>INF</sub> się<sub>REFL</sub> in room and (się<sub>REFL</sub>) cry-(self)-out<sub>INF</sub>  
 'When they arrived home, Caroline wanted nothing other than to  
 lock herself in her room and cry and cry.'

In (35a), *się* follows the verb in both conjuncts and should be elided in the second. That is, having two instances of post-verbal *się* would be stylistically bad. (Of course, when *się* is elided, we cannot tell for sure where the null category is positioned.) In (35b), by contrast, *się* follows the verb in the first conjunct but precedes it in the second; here, *się* may be realized overtly twice with no stylistic deviance.

Examples from Kupść (1999) provide further evidence of this word-order effect on ellipsis (although Kupść does not discuss the matter of word order). Both the (a) and (b) variants of (36) and (37) are acceptable. In the (a) variants, *się* is repeated and occupies a different position relative to the verb in each conjunct; in the (b) variants, the second *się* is elided. It appears that it is the mismatch in word order that makes repetition of *się* in the (a) variants stylistically acceptable.

- (36) a. Siedziało się i się gadało.  
 sat<sub>3,SG.NEUT</sub> się<sub>IMPERS</sub> and się<sub>IMPERS</sub> chatted<sub>3,SG.NEUT</sub>  
 (Kubiński 1987, cited by Kupść 1999: 106–07).
- b. Siedziało się i [e<sub>się</sub>] gadało.  
 'One would sit and chat.'
- (37) a. Jan umył się i szybko się ogolił.  
 Jan washed<sub>MASC.SG</sub> się<sub>REFL</sub> and quickly się<sub>REFL</sub> shaved<sub>MASC.SG</sub>  
 (Kupść 1999: 95)
- b. Jan umył się i szybko [e<sub>się</sub>] ogolił.  
 'Jan washed and quickly shaved.'

The order of sentence elements is also in part responsible for permitting overt *by* in (34) above: if *by* is overt, it should be located before, not after, the verb in the second conjunct, making its position not comparable to that of its antecedent.

*Verbs taking by also take a PN.* In sentences containing multiple instantiations of affixal *by*, repetition of *by* can be permitted/preferred for a reason not applicable to any other part of speech: the presence of a PN on *by*.

In Polish, all past tense and conditional verb forms take gender-number suffixes, but only the first and second persons take PNs. As explained above, if a verb takes the conditional marker *by*, *by* comes between the gender-number suffix and the PN, if there is a PN. Consider, for example, the pair of coordinated *by*-conjuncts in Table 2, which mean 'I would swim and run' and 'She would swim and run', respectively. The symbol (!) indicates that the elliptical variant of the 1st person structure tends to be stylistically marked and that the non-elliptical variant of the 3rd person structure tends to be stylistically marked (although these judgments can be influenced by the context).

Table 2

Person	PN	Non-Elliptical Variant	Elliptical Variant
1st	-m	plywałabym i biegałabym	(!) plywałabym i biegała[e <sub>by</sub> m]
3rd		(!) plywałaby i biegałaby	plywałaby i biegała[e <sub>by</sub> ]

Eliding *by* in such verb forms necessitates eliding the PN as well, if there is one. However, the combined ellipsis of [*by* + PN] is not a preferred strategy in many contexts, as evidenced by the following minimal pairs.

- (38) a. There is a PN and [*by* + PN] is preferably overt:

Gdybym mieszkała na wsi, pływałabym i  
 if<sub>1.SG</sub> lived<sub>FEM.SG</sub> in country swim<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub> and  
 biegałabym/! biegała[e<sub>by</sub>m] codziennie.  
 run<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub>/! run<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by</sub>-1.SG] daily  
 'If I lived in the country, I would swim and run every day.'

- b. There is no PN and 'by' is preferably elided:

Gdyby moja siostra mieszkała na wsi, pływałaby i  
 if my sister lived<sub>FEM.SG</sub> in country swim<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by and  
 biegała[e<sub>by</sub>]/!biegałaby codziennie.  
 run<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by</sub>]/!run<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by daily,  
 'If my sister lived in the country, she would swim and run every day.'

- (39) a. There is a PN and [by + PN] is preferably overt:

Gdybym wygrała na loterii, kupiłabym konia i  
 if<sub>1.SG</sub> won<sub>FEM.SG</sub> in lottery buy<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub> horse<sub>ACC</sub> and  
 jeździłabym/!jeździła[e<sub>bym</sub>] na nim po całej  
 ride<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by<sub>1.SG</sub>/!ride<sub>FEM.SG</sub>.[e<sub>by</sub>-1.SG] on it around whole  
 okolicy.  
 countryside.

'If I won the lottery, I would buy a horse and ride it all around the countryside.'

- b. There is no PN and 'by' is optionally elided:

Gdyby moja córka wygrała na loterii, kupiłaby  
 if my daughter<sub>NOM</sub> won<sub>FEM.SG</sub> in lottery buy<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-by  
 konia i jeździła(by) na nim po całej okolicy.  
 horse<sub>ACC</sub> and ride<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-(by) on it around whole countryside

'If my daughter won the lottery, she would buy a horse and ride it all around the countryside.'

The obvious question is what causes the ellipsis of [by + PN] to be deemed "not preferred" in the (a) variants above? One possible explanation derives from an extended notion of parallelism. Consider the 3rd person pair *plywałaby* ~ *biegała(by)*, which has no PN. When *by* is elided from the second verb form, what remains is a typical 3rd person form. Consider now the 1st person pair *plywałabym* ~ *biegała(bym)*, which contains a PN. When *-(bym)* is elided, what remains is *not* a typical 1st person form—in fact, it looks just like a 3rd person form. Therefore, there is a certain lack of parallelism created when the PN is elided along with *by*. This may in part account for why the ellipsis of *by* is more prevalent in structures whose verb forms do not contain a PN.

It must be emphasized, however, that the presence of a PN does not always preclude the ellipsis of *by*, especially if there are other ellipsis-promoting factors at work.<sup>31</sup> One factor that strongly promotes ellipsis even with a PN is for the conjuncts to contain coreferential pronominal DOs. In most such sentences, like (40–41) below, the conditional marker, the PN, and the DO should all be elided—pronouncing them all would be too repetitive and eliding a subset of them would be unbalanced.

<sup>31</sup> Examples (30–31) favor ellipsis of [by + PN] for reasons that are not entirely clear.

- (40) Gdybyś napisał mi list miłosny, porwałabym  
 if<sub>2.SG</sub> wrote<sub>MASC.SG</sub> me<sub>DAT</sub> letter<sub>ACC</sub> love<sub>ACC-ADJ</sub> tear<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub>  
 go i wyrzuciła[e<sub>by<sub>m</sub></sub>] [e<sub>go</sub>]/!!wyrzuciła-bym go.  
 it<sub>ACC</sub> and throw-away<sub>FEM.SG</sub>[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>] [e<sub>i</sub>]/!!throw-away-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub>  
 'If you wrote me a love letter, I would tear it up and throw it away.'
- (41) Gdybyś pozmywał naczynia, ja wytarłabym je  
 if<sub>2.SG</sub> washed<sub>MASC.SG</sub> dishes<sub>ACC</sub> I<sub>NOM</sub> dry<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> them<sub>ACC</sub>  
 i schowała[e<sub>by<sub>m</sub></sub>] [e<sub>je</sub>]/!!schowała-bym je.  
 and put-away<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>] [e<sub>them</sub>]/!!put-away-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> them<sub>ACC</sub>  
 'If you had washed the dishes, I would have dried them and put them away.'

The notion of balance in elliptical structures raises the issue of dependencies among elided and overt categories within an utterance. Despite significant evidence that such dependencies exist, it is extremely difficult to formalize them, as they appear to have as much to do with rhythm and semantics as with morpho-syntax. For the time being, I will simply note such dependencies, leaving their full exploration to future work.

Returning to (40–41), the generalization was that when two consecutive clauses contain a conditional marker, a PN, and a DO, all should be elided in the second clause. However, this is not an absolute rule. Consider in this respect the ellipsis judgments for the four variants of example (42).<sup>32</sup> For ease of comparison, the (a) variant is presented twice: first in the full context, then as an excerpt corresponding to the (b–d) variants.

- (42) a. Gdybym był radnym miasta, kupiłbym to  
 if<sub>1.SG</sub> was<sub>1.SG.MASC</sub> mayor<sub>INSTR</sub> city<sub>GEN</sub> buy-*by*<sub>1.SG</sub> this  
 obrzydlistwo i spalił[e<sub>by<sub>m</sub></sub>] [e<sub>je</sub>]<sup>33</sup>  
 monstrosity<sub>ACC</sub> and burn[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>] [e<sub>DO</sub>]  
 If I were the mayor of this city, I'd buy this monstrosity and  
 burn it to the ground.
- a. kupiłbym to obrzydlistwo i spalił[e<sub>by<sub>m</sub></sub>] [e<sub>je</sub>]  
 b. !kupiłbym to obrzydlistwo i spaliłbym je  
 c. kupiłbym to obrzydlistwo i spalił[e<sub>by<sub>m</sub></sub>] je  
 d. \*kupiłbym to obrzydlistwo i spaliłbym [e<sub>je</sub>]

<sup>32</sup> I do not present variants in which *by-m* is split up, such that one component is overt and the other is elided, because all such variants would be absolutely ungrammatical.

<sup>33</sup> From *Nowoczesna komedia*: 281.

The first thing to note is that two variants are perfectly fine, and a third is stylistically marked but not impossible—a flexibility in ellipsis patterns that was not seen in (40–41). The crucial difference between (42), on the one hand, and (40–41), on the other, is that (42) has an R-expression antecedent whereas (40–41) have pronominal antecedents. Therefore, we would expect more repetition of elements to be acceptable in (42).

The second thing to note are the dependencies in ellipsis patterns. Variants (a) and (b) show the “all or nothing” strategy, which creates balance. Variants (c) and (d), by contrast, have one element overt and one elided—a blatant lack of balance. But while (c) is perfectly grammatical, (d) is not. That is, ellided *bym* and overt *je* is acceptable, but overt *bym* and ellided *je* is not. To account for this contrast, we need a significantly developed theory of ellipsis dependencies.

There is yet another variation on the “all or nothing” theme that deserves note, as it is liberally employed in Polish: all repeated elements can precede the first verb form and “carry over” to the latter conjunct(s), as shown in (43).<sup>34</sup>

- (43) Gdyby Mary      wykapała psa,      Claire    by go  
       if        Mary<sub>NOM</sub> wash<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> dog<sub>ACC</sub> Claire<sub>NOM</sub> by it<sub>ACC</sub>  
       nakarmiła i    wyprowadziła na dwór.  
       feed<sub>FEM.SG</sub> and take<sub>FEM.SG</sub>      outside  
       ‘If Mary had washed the dog, Claire would have fed and walked it.’

This strategy is particularly interesting for two reasons. First, it makes ellipsis of all repeated elements in the second conjunct practically obligatory. Second, it erases the problematic mismatch in participial forms found in examples like (38a) and (39a). Recall that those examples resisted ellipsis because the first participle contained a 1.SG affix while the second one did not, and this created a lack of parallelism between the surface forms of the participles. When, however, the PN precedes *both* participles, the surface form of the participles is identical—both lack a PN. This makes structures like (44) fully acceptable.

<sup>34</sup> Such structures could be analyzed variously: (i) the participles could first be coordinated, then jointly select a direct object and be marked conditional; the resulting structure would be non-elliptical; (ii) both conjuncts could contain [*by* (+ PN) + DO]; the preverbal clustering of these elements in the first conjunct could trigger a strong preference for ellipsis in the second conjunct; (iii) such structures could display some form of across-the-board extraction, such that there is a set of elliptical slots associated with each conjunct.

- (44) Gdybyś wykapała psa, ja bym go nakarmiła i  
 if<sub>2.SG</sub> wash<sub>FEM.SG</sub> dog<sub>ACC</sub> I<sub>NOM</sub> by<sub>1.SG</sub> it<sub>ACC</sub> feed<sub>FEM.SG</sub> and  
 wyprowadziła na dwór.  
 take<sub>FEM.SG</sub> outside  
 'If you had washed the dog, I would have fed and walked it.'

#### 4. Syndetic CP/IP Coordination

Syndetic CP/IP coordinate structures are composed of conjuncts with different subjects joined by a coordinating conjunction: [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>CP/IP</sub> Subj<sub>i</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> VP<sub>i</sub>]] *and/but* [<sub>CP/IP</sub> Subj<sub>j</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> VP<sub>j</sub> ]]]. Ellipsis in CP/IP coordinate structures is subject to more restrictions than ellipsis in VP coordinate structures for the discourse-oriented reason mentioned in Section 1.2. Factors that play a deciding role in determining whether or not an element can be elided in a CP/IP coordinate structure include: (i) the semantic relationship between conjuncts; (ii) the choice of conjunction; (iii) intonation; (iv) [for DOs only] the nature of the antecedent, whether it is an R-expression or a pronoun; (iii) [for *się* only] the type/function of *się* in each conjunct. These factors are discussed in the subsections below.

##### 4.1. The Semantic Relationship between Conjuncts

CP/IP conjuncts in Polish can be joined using either the coordinating conjunction *i* or the contrastive conjunction *a*.<sup>35</sup> In some instances, the semantic relationship between conjuncts requires one or the other conjunction; in other instances, either conjunction may be employed with slightly different semantic nuances resulting. The semantic relationship between conjuncts, as well as the conjunction selected, affect the ellipsis potential of DOs, *się*, and *by*.

Minimal pairs (45–50) permit the conjuncts to be joined either by the coordinating conjunction *i* or by the contrastive conjunction *a*. The (a) variants contain *a* and permit ellipsis; the (b) variants contain *i* and block ellipsis. (Note that the sentences with *się* employ different types of *się*, but there is no mixing of types of *się* within a given sentence.)<sup>36</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Contrastive conjunctions are a type of coordinating conjunction; the opposition is to subordinating conjunctions.

<sup>36</sup> The (a) variants of (46–49) are from Kupść 1999: 108. She omits *się* and provides no judgments for if it were overt; my informants approved overt *się* for all (a) variants. The (b) variants were judged by three informants: two considered ellipsis unacceptable; one considered it degraded but possible.

- (45) a. Zdjęłam mu płaszcz, a Maria powiesiła  
 took-off<sub>1.FEM.SG</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> raincoat<sub>ACC</sub> and<sub>CONTR</sub> Mary hung  
 (go) na wieszaku.  
 (it)<sub>ACC</sub> on hanger
- b. Zdjęłam mu płaszcz i Maria powiesiła  
 took-off<sub>1.FEM.SG</sub> him<sub>DAT</sub> raincoat<sub>ACC</sub> and<sub>COORD</sub> Mary hung  
 go/\*[e] na wieszaku.  
 it/\*[e]<sub>ACC</sub> on hanger  
 'I took his coat (off of him) and Mary hung it on a hanger.'
- (46) a. Jan się umył, a Piotr (się) ogolił.  
 John się<sub>REFL</sub> washed and<sub>CONTR</sub> Peter (się<sub>REFL</sub>) shaved
- b. Jan się umył i Piotr się/\*[e] ogolił.  
 John się<sub>REFL</sub> washed and<sub>COORD</sub> Peter się<sub>REFL</sub>/\*[e] shaved  
 'John washed up and Peter shaved.'
- (47) a. Jan się potknął, a Tomek (się) przewrócił.  
 John się<sub>INH</sub> stumbled and<sub>CONTR</sub> Tom (się<sub>INH</sub>) fell-down
- b. Jan się potknął i Tomek się/\*[e] przewrócił.  
 John się<sub>INH</sub> stumbled and<sub>COORD</sub> Tom się<sub>INH</sub>/\*[e] fell-down  
 'John stumbled and Tom fell down.'
- (48) a. Janowi dobrze się pisze książki, a Marii  
 John<sub>DAT</sub> well się<sub>IMPERS</sub> write<sub>3.SG</sub> books<sub>ACC</sub> and<sub>CONTR</sub> Mary<sub>DAT</sub>  
 przyjemnie (się) je czyta.  
 with-pleasure (się<sub>IMPERS</sub>) them<sub>ACC</sub> read<sub>3.SG</sub>
- b. Janowi dobrze się pisze książki i Marii  
 John<sub>DAT</sub> well się<sub>IMPERS</sub> write<sub>3.SG</sub> books<sub>ACC</sub> and<sub>COORD</sub> Mary<sub>DAT</sub>  
 przyjemnie się/\*[e] je czyta.  
 with-pleasure się<sub>IMPERS</sub>/\*[e] them<sub>ACC</sub> read<sub>3.SG</sub>  
 'John enjoys writing books and Mary enjoys reading them.'
- (49) a. Drzwi się otworzyły, a okna (się) zamknęły.  
 door się<sub>MID</sub> opened and<sub>CONTR</sub> windows (się<sub>MID</sub>) shut
- b. Drzwi się otworzyły i okna się/\*[e]  
 door się<sub>MID</sub> opened and<sub>COORD</sub> windows się<sub>MID</sub>/\*[e]  
 'The door opened and the windows shut.'



- (50) a. Maria zdjęłaby mu buty, a Jola  
 Mary take-off<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub>-*by* him<sub>DAT</sub> shoes<sub>ACC</sub> and<sub>CONTR</sub> Jola  
 ściagnęła(*by* mu) czapkę.  
 take-off<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub>(*by* him<sub>DAT</sub>) cap<sub>ACC</sub>
- b. Maria zdjęłaby mu buty, i Jola  
 Mary take-off<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub>-*by* him<sub>DAT</sub> shoes<sub>ACC</sub> and<sub>COORD</sub> Jola  
 ściagnęła(*by* mu) czapkę.  
 take-off<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub>(*by* him<sub>DAT</sub>) cap<sub>ACC</sub>
- 'Mary would take off his shoes and Jola would take off his cap.'

The (a) variants, which are more natural and common than the (b) variants, focus on the logical contrast between two different actions carried out by two different people or things. In order for ellipsis to be possible, marked contrastive intonation should be employed.<sup>37</sup> It is the combination of contrastive semantics and contrastive intonation that permits ellipsis in the (a) variants. The (b) variants are semantically quite different: rather than convey simple coordination, as might be expected considering the use of *i*, they imply "and then...", "and therefore...", or "after that...".<sup>38</sup> This different semantic twist along with the lack of ellipsis-promoting intonational support impedes ellipsis in the (b) variants.

It is not the case, however, that the use of *i* in a CP/IP coordinate structure *always* blocks ellipsis. Consider in this respect (51–52) below:

- (51) Gdy Jacek się umyje i Marek (się)  
 when Jacek<sub>NOM</sub> się<sub>REFL</sub> bathes<sub>3.SG</sub> and Marek<sub>NOM</sub> (się<sub>REFL</sub>)  
 przebierze, znow będą wyglądali jak ludzie.  
 changes-clothes<sub>3.SG</sub> again will<sub>3.PL</sub> look like people  
 'When Jacek bathes and Marek changes his clothes, they'll look like human beings again.'
- (52) Żeby się ojciec nie denerwował i matka  
 so-that się<sub>REFL</sub> Father<sub>NOM</sub> NEG upset<sub>3.FEM.SG</sub> and Mother<sub>NOM</sub>  
 (się) nie martwiła, nie powiemy im, co się  
 (się<sub>REFL</sub>) NEG worry<sub>3.SG.MASC</sub> NEG will-tell<sub>1.PL</sub> them<sub>DAT</sub> what się  
 naprawdę stało.  
 really happened  
 'So that Father doesn't worry and Mother doesn't get upset, we won't tell them what really happened.'

<sup>37</sup> For a discussion of intonation as it relates to discourse analysis, see Yokoyama 1986.

<sup>38</sup> The fickle semantics of "and" applies not only to Polish but to other languages as well, including English. See Carston 1993 for discussion.

These sentences are semantically much closer to “pure” coordination than the (b) variants of the sentences that preceded; that is, there is no implication of a temporal or cause-effect relationship. Under these semantic conditions, use of coordinating *i* does not block ellipsis in CP/IP coordinate structures.

There is yet another way for CP/IPs to be coordinated in Polish: using paired conjunctions like *i...i* and *ani...ani*. Such paired conjunctions emphasize the parallel nature of the conjuncts and thereby promote ellipsis.<sup>39</sup>

- (53) I Jan się umył, i Piotr (się) ogolił.  
and John *się*<sub>REFL</sub> bathed and Peter (*się*<sub>REFL</sub>) shaved  
'John bathed *and* Peter shaved.'

- (54) Ani się Piotr nie umył ani (się) Jan nie ogolił.  
neither *się*<sub>REFL</sub> Peter NEG bathed nor (*się*<sub>REFL</sub>) Jan NEG shaved  
'Peter didn't bathe and John didn't shave either.'

The above data suggest the following generalizations about sentences containing coordinated CP/IPs:

In sentences expressing a contrast, the contrastive conjunction *a* is preferably employed, along with contrastive intonation. In such sentences, ellipsis is possible.

In sentences expressing a contrast, the conjunction *i* may be employed, but it is less common and tends to express temporal or cause-effect relations between conjuncts. In such sentences, ellipsis is not possible.

In sentences expressing semantically “pure” coordination, *i* is generally employed and ellipsis is often possible.

The use of paired conjunctions (*i...i* or *ani...ani*) emphasizes the parallel nature of the conjuncts, thus facilitating ellipsis.

<sup>39</sup> A similar phenomenon exists in Russian with respect to various types of paired elements (see McShane 1998, 2002b, 2002c). For example, paired adverbs like *first...then* promote DO ellipsis even when the antecedent has non-ACC (i.e., non-ideal) case-marking:

- (i) Snačala razberites' v svoix ošibkax, a potom ispravljajte (ix).  
first figure-out in self's mistakes<sub>LOC</sub> and then correct them<sub>ACC</sub>  
'First figure out your mistakes, then correct them.'

One final property of CP/IP coordinate structures deserves mention. In order for ellipsis to be permitted, the conjuncts must show a highly typical, natural semantic relationship—a requirement that is met in all of the above sentences. It is not, however, met in (55): although the sentence is perfectly logical, it expresses neither a strong contrast nor a particularly natural combination of events. Therefore, ellipsis is semantically blocked.

- (55) Przecież **dziką kaczkę** dostaliśmy także jako podarunek,  
 after-all **wild duck**<sub>ACC</sub> got<sub>1.PL</sub> also as gift  
 a tak strasznie **ją**/\*[e] · pokochałam.<sup>40</sup>  
 and<sub>CONTR</sub> how terribly **it**<sub>ACC</sub>/\*[e] came-to-love<sub>1.FEM.SG</sub>  
 'After all, we got the wild duck as a gift, and I came to love it  
 dearly.'

#### 4.2. R-Expression versus Pronominal Antecedents

As discussed earlier, because of phonetic parallelism, DO ellipsis is facilitated in VP coordinate structures that have a pronominal rather than an R-expression antecedent. The same holds for CP/IP coordinate structures. Compare (56a), which has an R-expression antecedent and resists ellipsis, with (56b), which has a pronominal antecedent and permits ellipsis.

- (56) a. Matka rozebrała **dziecko**, a ojciec **je**?[e] wykapał.  
 Mother undressed **child**<sub>ACC</sub> and Father **it**<sub>ACC</sub>?[e] bathed  
 'Mother undressed the child and Father bathed it.'
- b. Matka **je** rozebrała, a ojciec (**je**) wykapał.  
 Mother **it**<sub>ACC</sub> undressed and Father (**it**<sub>ACC</sub>) bathed  
 'Mother undressed it and Father bathed it.'

However, even a pronominal antecedent cannot save an elliptical structure if the conjuncts are not sufficiently semantically matched, as shown by (57) (to be compared with 55).

- (57) [About a duck]  
 Dostaliśmy **ją** jako podarunek, a tak strasznie **ją**/\*[e]  
 got<sub>1.PL</sub> **it**<sub>ACC</sub> as gift and so terribly **it**<sub>ACC</sub>/\*[e]  
 pokochałam.  
 came-to-love<sub>1.FEM.SG</sub>

<sup>40</sup> From *Dzika kaczka*: 93.

'We got it as a gift, and I came to love it dearly.'

### 4.3. Matching versus Non-Matching *się*

In examples (46–49), the instances of *się* within each sentence matched: both were reflexive, both were inherent, etc. If the sources of *się* do not match, ellipsis is not permitted, as noted in Kupść (1999: 108).

- (58) Jan *się* elegancko ubrał i Maria uśmiechnęła  
 John *się*<sub>REFL</sub> elegantly dressed and Maria laughed  
*się*/\*[e], gdy go zobaczyła. (Kupść: 108)  
*się*<sub>INH</sub>/\*[e] when him<sub>ACC</sub> saw<sub>FEM.SG</sub>  
 'John got dressed up and Mary smiled when she saw him.'

- (59) Drzewa *się* połamały, ale gałęzie szybko zazieleniły  
 trees<sub>NOM</sub> *się*<sub>MID</sub> broke<sub>3.PL</sub> but branches<sub>NOM</sub> quickly greened<sub>3.PL</sub>  
*się*/\*[e] od nowa. (Kupść: 108)  
*się*<sub>INH</sub>/\*[e] again  
 'The trees broke but their branches quickly became green again.'

### 4.4. Conclusions about Ellipsis in Syndetic CP/IP Coordinate Structures

DOs, *się*, and *by* can sometimes be elided in CP/IP coordinate structures if the semantic relationship between conjuncts is highly typical and certain restrictions regarding conjunction selection and intonation are observed. DO ellipsis is facilitated when the antecedent is a pronoun. *Się* ellipsis is permitted only when the function of *się* is the same in both conjuncts.

## 5. Repetition Structures

One type of non-coordinate configuration that permits, and often favors, ellipsis of all three types of elements under discussion is what I call Repetition Structures. Repetition Structures consist of two consecutive clauses that contain two identical verbs that select identical objects. Repetition Structures can be divided into Strict Repetition, in which the verb alone is repeated for emphasis, and Modified Repetition, in which the verb is repeated with a modifier.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>41</sup> McShane 1998, 2002a, 2002c show that Repetition Structures in Russian include still other variations on the repetition theme, which might prove to be valid for Polish as well.

### 5.1. Strict Repetition

In contexts showing strict repetition, the ellipsis of DOs, *się*, and *by* is generally preferred, as shown in (60–62).

- (60) Powiedz coś śmiesznego, błaznie. Rozbaw mnie,  
 say<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> something funny jester<sub>VOC</sub> amuse<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> me<sub>ACC</sub>  
 rozbaw [e]/!mnie!  
 amuse<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> [e]/!me

'Say something funny, jester. Amuse me, amuse me!'

- (61) Uspokój się, uspokój [e]/!się.<sup>42</sup>  
 calm-down<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> się<sub>REFL</sub> calm<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> [e]/!się<sub>REFL</sub>

Calm down, calm down.

- (62) Gdybyś stracił ukochaną, płakałbyś, oj płakał[e<sub>byś</sub>]/!płakałbyś!  
 if<sub>2.SG</sub> lost beloved<sub>ACC</sub> cry-by<sub>2.SG</sub> oh cry[e<sub>by-2.SG</sub>]/!cry-by<sub>2.SG</sub>

'If you lost your beloved you'd cry, oh, how you'd cry!'

The preference for ellipsis clearly derives from the identical nature of the clauses.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, strict repetition often occurs in imperative utterances, which themselves promote ellipsis because of the discourse effects of close speaker-listener contact.<sup>44</sup> The absolute parallelism of strict repetition structures can, however, be broken in the case of DOs, since the antecedent can be an R-expression, which does not match the EC phonetically. In such instances, having an overt second DO is stylistically acceptable.

- (63) Szanuję swojego ojca. Szanuję (go), ale go  
 respect<sub>1.SG</sub> self's father<sub>ACC</sub> respect<sub>1.SG</sub> (him)<sub>ACC</sub> but him<sub>ACC</sub>  
 nie koçam.  
 NEG love<sub>1.SG</sub>

'I respect my father. I respect him, but I don't love him.'

---

The verb may be repeated in a different tense, mood, and/or aspect; the verb+object(s) may be repeated with a different subject, etc.

<sup>42</sup> This example is from *Niemcy*: 75.

<sup>43</sup> I do not use the word "conjunct" with respect to Repetition Structures because "conjunct" is generally reserved for coordinate structures, which these are not.

<sup>44</sup> See McShane 1998, 2000d for discussion of how imperative verbs promote DO ellipsis in Russian.

## 5.2. Modified Repetition

Modified repetition structures contain a modifier in the second conjunct, which offsets precise repetition and reduces the stylistic clash of having repeated elements.

(64) Kocham **cię**, kocham (**cię**) tak bardzo!  
 love<sub>1.SG</sub> **you**<sub>ACC</sub> love<sub>1.SG</sub> (**you**)<sub>ACC</sub> so much  
 'I love you, I love you so much!'

(65) Uspokój **się**, uspokój (**się**) natychmiast.  
 calm<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> **się**<sub>REFL</sub> calm<sub>IMPER.SG</sub> (**się**)<sub>REFL</sub> at-once  
 'Calm down, calm down at-once.'

(66) Gdyby mąż **się** z nią rozwiódł, umarłaby,  
 if husband<sub>NOM</sub> **się** with her<sub>INSTR</sub> divorced<sub>MASC.SG</sub> die<sub>FEM.SG</sub>-**by**  
 umarła(**by**) na pewno.  
 die<sub>FEM.SG</sub>(-**by**) for sure  
 'If her husband divorced her, she'd die, she'd just die.'

Two additional ways to reduce perceived parallelism, and thereby permit natural-sounding overt realization of elements in Repetition Structures, are the following: have an R-expression antecedent for DO ellipsis, as in (67); or have a different order of elements in each clause, as in (68).

(67) Znam **twoją siostrę**, naprawdę (**ją**) znam!  
 know<sub>1.SG</sub> **your sister**<sub>ACC</sub> really (**her**)<sub>ACC</sub> know<sub>1.SG</sub>  
 'I know your sister, I really do!'

(68) Gdyby go **kiedykolwiek** zdradziła, oszalałby,  
 if him<sub>ACC</sub> ever betrayed<sub>FEM.SG</sub> go-crazy<sub>MASC.SG</sub>-**by**  
 po prostu (**by**) oszalał.  
 simply (**by**) go-crazy<sub>MASC.SG</sub>  
 'If she ever betrayed him, he'd go crazy, he just go crazy.'

Of course, combinations of DOs, *się* and/or *by* can occur in Repetition Structures. In such instances, ellipsis of all coreferential elements in the

second conjunct tends to be preferred because having all overt would be too repetitive, and eliding some but not the others would be unbalanced.<sup>45</sup>

- (69) a. Ożenił**by**m się, po prostu ożenił[e<sub>by</sub>m] [e<sub>się</sub>].  
 marry<sub>MASC.SG</sub>-**by**<sub>1.SG</sub> się simply marry<sub>MASC.SG</sub>[e<sub>by-1.SG</sub>] [e<sub>się</sub>]  
 b. ! Ożenił**by**m się, po prostu ożenił**by**m się.  
 c. \*Ożenił**by**m się, po prostu ożenił**by**m [e<sub>się</sub>].  
 d. \*Ożenił**by**m się, po prostu ożenił[e<sub>by</sub>m] się.  
 'I'd get married, I'd simply get married!'

- (70) Gdy**by**s długo nie miał od niej listu,  
 if for-a-long-time NEG had<sub>MASC.SG</sub> from her letter<sub>GEN</sub>  
 a. denerwował**by**s się, oj denerwował[e<sub>by</sub>s] [e<sub>się</sub>].  
 worry<sub>MASC.SG</sub>-**by**<sub>2.SG</sub> się oh worry<sub>MASC</sub>[e<sub>by-2.SG</sub>] [e<sub>się</sub>]  
 b. ! denerwował**by**s się, oj denerwował**by**s się.  
 c. \*denerwował**by**s się, oj denerwował**by**s [e<sub>się</sub>].  
 d. \*denerwował**by**s się, oj denerwował[e<sub>by</sub>s] się.  
 'If you didn't get a letter from her for a long time, you'd get worried, oh how you'd get worried.'

- (71) a. Kochał**by** ją do końca swego życia, naprawdę  
 love<sub>MASC.SG</sub>-**by** her<sub>ACC</sub> to end self's life really  
 kochał[e<sub>by</sub>] [e<sub>ją</sub>].  
 love<sub>MASC.SG</sub>[e<sub>by</sub>] [e<sub>her</sub>]  
 b. ! Kochał**by** ją do końca swego życia, naprawdę kochał**by** ją.  
 c. !! Kochał**by** ją do końca swego życia, naprawdę kochał**by** [e<sub>ją</sub>].  
 d. \*Kochał**by**ją do końca swego życia, naprawdę kochał[e<sub>by</sub>] ją.  
 'He'd love her till the end of his days, really love her!'

The ellipsis judgments for the four variants of (69–71) are identical except for one: whereas (69c) and (70c) are unquestionably impossible, (71c) is not quite as bad. In other words, the judgments for *się* are more distinct for pattern (c) than the judgments for *ją*. One possible source of this contrast lies in the differing status of these elements: whereas *się* is clearly a clitic, *ją* does not have to be.<sup>46</sup> This suggests that that a theory of ellipsis dependencies must consider the fundamental nature of each element in

<sup>45</sup> As earlier, variants in which one component of [*by* + PN] is overt and the other is elided are not presented since they are always ungrammatical.

<sup>46</sup> For discussion of the complex nature of certain Polish clitics, see especially Franks 1998 and Franks and Bański 1999.

question, with special attention to the behavior of clitics, non-clitics, and elements with mixed status.

## 6. Summary and Conclusions

This paper has shown that three unrelated grammatical entities—DOs, *się*, and *by*, undergo identical patterns of ellipsis when subject to the same types of parallelism effects. The parallel configurations under discussion were syndetic VP coordinate structures, syndetic CP/IP coordinate structures, and Repetition Structures. The data presented provide strong evidence for the existence of language-wide elliptical mechanisms in Polish and suggest that ellipsis must be viewed in global rather than category-specific terms. In addition, they show that ellipsis, when permitted, is not always purely optional: it is often required in order to produce a stylistically neutral utterance. Finally, it has been shown that linguistic theory needs a component devoted to dependencies among elided elements.

## References

- Borsley, Robert D. and María Luisa Rivero. (1994) "Clitic auxiliaries and incorporation in Polish". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 12: 373–422.
- Bresnan, Joan and Hoskuldur Thráinsson. (1990) "A note on Icelandic coordination". Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen, eds., *Syntax and semantics* 24: 355–65. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc. (*Modern Icelandic Syntax*.)
- Carston, Robyn. (1993) "Conjunction, explanation and relevance". *Lingua* 90: 27–48.
- Cole, Peter. (1987) "Null objects in universal grammar". *Linguistic inquiry* 18(4): 597–612.
- Farrell, Patrick. (1990) "Null objects in Brazilian Portuguese". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 8: 325–46.
- Franks, Steven. (1995) *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (1998) "Clitics in Slavic". *Workshop on comparative Slavic morphosyntax*, Spencer, Indiana (currently available at <http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/index.html>).
- Franks, Steven and Piotr Bański. (1999) "Approaches to 'schizophrenic' Polish person agreement". *Annual workshop on formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Seattle meeting, 1998*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 123–43.



- Gazdar, Gerald. (1981) "Unbounded dependencies and coordinate structures". *Linguistic inquiry* 12: 155–84.
- Gazdar, Gerald, Geoffrey K. Pullum, Ivan A. Sag, and Thomas Wasow. (1982) "Coordination and transformational grammar". *Linguistic inquiry* 13: 663–76.
- Goodall, Grant. (1987) *Parallel structures in syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hajičová, Eva. (1994) "Topic/focus and related research". Philip A. Luelsdorff, ed., *The Prague School of structural and functional linguistics: A short introduction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 245–75.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994) *An introduction to functional grammar*. New York: Arnold.
- Hankamer, Jorge. (1973) "Unacceptable ambiguity". *Linguistic inquiry* 4(1): 17–68.
- Hudson, Richard A. (1989) "Gapping and grammatical relations". *Journal of linguistics* 25: 57–94.
- Huang, C. T. James. (1984) "On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns". *Linguistic inquiry* 15: 531–74.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. (1971) "Gapping and related rules". *Linguistic inquiry* 2: 21–35.
- Kupść, Anna. (1999) "Haplology of the Polish reflexive marker". Robert D. Borsley and Adam Przepiórkowski, eds., *Slavic in head-driven phrase structure grammar*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Lillo-Martin, Diane C. (1986) "Two kinds of null arguments in American sign language". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 4: 415–44.
- . (1991) *Universal grammar and American Sign Language: setting the null argument parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lobeck, Anne C. (1995) *Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing, and identification*. NY, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Massam, Diane and Yves Roberge. (1989) "Recipe context null objects in English". *Linguistic inquiry* 20 (1): 134–39.
- McShane, Marjorie J. (1998) *Ellipsis in Slavic: The syntax-discourse interface*. Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University.
- . (1999) "The ellipsis of accusative direct objects in Russian, Polish and Czech". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 7(1): 45–88.
- . (2000) "Verbal ellipsis in Russian, Polish and Czech" *Slavic and East European journal* 44(2): 195–233.
- . (2002a, in press) "Unexpressed oblique objects in Russian". *Journal of Slavic linguistics*.
- . (2002b, submitted) "A competition-based approach to determining the ellipsis potential of Russian objects." *Language*.

- McShane, Marjorie J. (2002c, in progress) *Russian roulette: Where's the bullet?*
- . (2000d, in progress) *What's missing in Russian?*
- Mithun, Marianne. (1988) "The grammaticalization of coordination". John Hainman and Sandra A. Thompson, eds., *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*, pp. 331–59. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Neijt, Anneke. (1979) *Gapping: a contribution to sentence grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- . (1981) "Gaps and remnants: Sentence grammar aspects of gapping". *Linguistic analysis* 8(1): 69–93.
- Nillson, Barbro. (1982) *Personal pronouns in Russian and Polish: a study of their communicative function and placement in the sentence*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. [Translated from the Swedish by Charles Rougle.]
- Quirk, Randolph et al. (1972) *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Raposo, Eduardo. (1986) "On the null object in European Portuguese". Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalan, eds., *Studies in Romance linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Roberge, Yves. (1990) *The syntactic recoverability of null arguments*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Rögnvaldsson, Eiríkur. (1990) "Null objects in Icelandic". Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen, eds. *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 24 (Modern Icelandic Syntax), pp. 367–79. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Rooryck, Johan. (1985) "Gapping-zeugma in French and English: a non deletion analysis". *Linguistic analysis* 15: 187–229.
- Ross, John R. (1967) *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sag, Ivan A., Gerald Gazdar, Thomas Wasow, and Steven Weisler. (1985) "Coordination and how to distinguish categories". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 3(2): 117–72.
- Stillings, Justine T. (1975) "The formulation of gapping in English as evidence for variable types in syntactic transformations". *Linguistic analysis* 1: 247–73.
- Suñer, Margarita and Maria Yépez. (1988) "Null definite objects in Quiteño". *Linguistic inquiry* 19(3): 511–19.
- Wilder, Chris. (1997) "Some properties of ellipsis in coordination". Artemis Alexiadou and T. Alan Hall, eds., *Studies on universal grammar and typological variation*, pp. 59–107. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Yokoyama, Olga (1986) *Discourse and word order*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

## Literary Sources

- Conan Doyle, Arthur. (1995) *Pies Baskerville'ów*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. (1994) *Wielki Gatsby*. Tłumaczył Jędrzej Polak. Poznań: SAWW, 1994.
- Galsworthy, John (1992) *Nowoczesna komedia*. Tłumaczył Jerzy T. Czaplicki. Warsaw: Da Capo.
- Garwood, Julie. (1996) *Pożądanie*. Przełożyła Małgorzata Kicana. Warsaw da Capo.
- Herbert, Zbigniew (1976) "Drugi pokój". *Antologia Dramatu*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Ibsen, Henrik. (1994) *Dzika kaczką*. Tłumaczył Jacek Frühling. Poznań: Zys i S-ka wydawnictwo.
- Korczak, Janusz. (1923) *Król Maciuś pierwszy*. Bielsko-Biała: Beskidzka Oficyna Wydawnicza.
- Kruczkowski, Leon. (1973) "Niemcy". *Dramaty*. Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.
- Lagerlöf, Selma. (1992) *Cudowna podróż*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Mrozek, Sławomir. (1989) *Tango, Stoń, Wesele w Atomicach, Woda*. Warsaw: Młodzieżowa Agencja Wydawnicza.
- Nurowska, Maria. (1991) *Listy miłości*. Warsaw: Alfa.
- Szaniawski, Jerzy. (1961) *Profesor Tutka*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- . (1992) "Adwokat i róże". *Dramaty wybrane*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Szczypiorski, Andrzej. (1994) *Autoportret z kobietą*. Poznań: SAWW.
- Warneńska, Monika. (1991) *Drzewo sprawiedliwości*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Lubelskie.

New Mexico State University  
Campus Box CRL 3  
Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001 USA  
marge@crl.nmsu.edu

Received: February 1999  
Revised: March 2000