

## Gapping in Hijazi Arabic: an LFG Approach

Muhammad Swaileh Alzaidi (University of Essex)

Gapping occurs in coordinate structure where the initial conjunct is syntactically complete and the non-initial conjunct is incomplete. (1) is a basic example of gapping in Hijazi Arabic (HA).

- (1) [ *al-bint* <sup>ʔ</sup>*kal-at*      *ar-ruz* ] *w* [ *al-walad ad-diġaġ* ].  
the-girl eat.PFV-3SF the-rice and the-boy the-chicken  
'The girl ate the rice and the boy the chicken.'

This study identifies and provides an analysis to account for the facts of Gapping in HA. One of the facts is that the missed verb in the second conjunct in (1) is not morphologically identical to the one that is explicitly spelt out in the first conjunct. In other words, if the second conjunct is completed, the verb must be <sup>ʔ</sup>*kal* 'eat'. The difference is in terms of the gender agreement. Since verbs in HA agrees with its subject in gender, number and person, the verb <sup>ʔ</sup>*kal* must agrees with its own subject *al-walad* whose features are *singular* and *masculine*. Any analysis of gapping in HA must take account of this partial non-parallelism. Another fact is that gapping is not possible in the initial conjunct in a coordinate structure: the 'missing' elements of the non-initial conjuncts must be spelt out in the initial conjunct, and not vice versa. Working within LFG, we adopt a function spreading approach to Gapping in HA within this framework and show how it is able to account for the facts of Gapping in HA identified in this study, using mechanisms proposed independently for other construction types.

To my knowledge, there is no previous description or analysis of gapping in HA. Approaches to gapping proposed in other languages (e.g. English, Russian) fall into four major types: Gapping as a result of *deletion*, *a trace of movement*, *non-constituent coordination in LFG*, and *linearization theory in HPSG*. We show that none of these approaches succeeds to accounting for Gapping in HA and hence they fail to capture the facts of gapping in this language.

Briefly, within the Minimalist framework, Johnson (2004) claims that Gapping in English (e.g. as in *Some people speak to Sal and others to Henry*) is a result of A(cross)-T(he)-B(oard) movement of the verbs from each member of a coordinate structure. Ross (1970), Neijt (1979), Coppock (2001) and among others on the other hand claim that gapping is a rule that deletes the elements in the non-initial conjuncts that are overtly spelt out in the initial conjunct. Within LFG framework, Maxwell and Manning (1996) propose the use of F(inite)-S(tate)-A(utomata) in a surface based approach to non-constituent coordination, suggesting that such an account might afford an analysis of gapping as a case of non-constituent coordination.

We show however that none of these approaches account for the facts of HA Gapping. Since HA displays a morphological agreement between the verb and its subject in gender, and number, Johnson (2004)'s approach fails to predict the difference in gender agreement required on the first and second conjuncts in the HA example in (1). As

for Maxwell and Manning (1996)'s LFG approach, it will interact with the LFG theory of coordination to predict that the subject in the first conjunct will distribute into the f-structure of the second conjunct, leading to a violation of LFG Wellformedness Conditions (Dalrymple, 2001).

For accounting for the linguistic facts about HA Gapping and capturing the generalization clearly and accurately, this study adopts a function-spreading approach within LFG. Frank (2002) and Sadler (2006) adopt this approach straightforwardly and accurately to account for Subject Gap in German and Asymmetrical Sentential Coordination in Welsh respectively. In this study, this approach is extended to cover Gapping in HA in a way that allows us straightforwardly and accurately to distribute the overtly-spelt-out element(s) in the initial conjunct over the members of the coordinate structure, yielding a well-formed and a well-explained structure. This approach leads us to solve the problems of the previous analyses identified above and other problems this study identifies as well.

## References

- Coppock, E. (2001). Gapping: in defense of deletion. *In Mary Andronis, C. B., Heidi Elston, and Syivain Newl (eds.) CLS 37: the main session*, 133–148.
- Dalrymple, M. (2001). *Lexical Functional Grammar*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press,.
- Frank, A. (2002). A (discourse) functional analysis of asymmetric coordination. *In M. Butt and T. H. King (eds.), Proceeding of LFG02 Conference*.
- Johnson, K. (2004). In search of the english middle field. *MS*.
- Maxwell, T. T. and C. D. Manning (1996). A theory of non-constituent coordination based on finite state-state rules. *In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King (ed.), Online Proceeding of the First LFG Conference*.
- Neijt, A. (1979). *Gapping: a contribution to sentence grammar*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publication.
- Ross, J. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in syntax*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Ross, J. (1970). gapping and the order of constituents. *In M. Bierwisch and K. heidolph*, 249–259.
- Sadler, L. (2006). function spreading in coordinate structure. *Lingua 116*, 1777–1806.