

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334294663>

Coordinate Ellipsis in EkeGusii: An Overview

Article · July 2019

CITATIONS
0

READS
84

3 authors, including:



Robert Omari
Kisii University

1 PUBLICATION 0 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Evans Gesura Mecha
Kisii University

17 PUBLICATIONS 4 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



The Description and Documentation of EkeGusii [View project](#)



Semantics of Natural Languages [View project](#)



Coordinate Ellipsis in EkeGusii: An Overview

Robert Omari Otieno, Evans Gesura Mecha, David Ogoti Ongarora

Kisii University, Kenya

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 28/05/2019
Received (revised form) NA
Accepted 29/06/2019

Keywords:

Coordinate Ellipsis;
Phase theory;
Phase Sliding;
Conjunct Reduction;
Bare Argument Ellipsis;
Right-Node Ellipsis;
Gapping;

ABSTRACT

This paper gives the distributional characteristics of coordinate elliptical constructions in EkeGusii. The syntax of the constructions is given using a Phase theoretic approach, one of the current theoretical constructs within the Minimalist Program. The Phase sliding theory is then tested for its efficacy to handle some cases of coordinate ellipsis.

1.0 Introduction

The idea of there being elliptical constructions is a major linguistic puzzle. In the literature, derivational accounts of ellipsis are diverged variously into structural (Fiengo and May, 1995) and non-structural (Jacobson, 2008) or conjunct reduction (or PF Deletion) or sharing (Multidominance) accounts. The structural approach assumes that ellipsis [e] has syntactic structure whereas the latter dispense with the notion of there being any structural correlate to it. In this paper we stay shy of the controversies involved with the study of elliptical constructions and adopt the structural account of ellipsis in coordinate constructions.

The derivation of coordinated constructions is traditionally assumed to involve an optional licensing of gaps or ellipsis and has led to the construal of the notion of coordinate ellipsis¹ (Klein, 1993) as one of the main categories of ellipsis as opposed to phrasal ellipsis (viz: NP-Ellipsis, VP Ellipsis and Sluicing). The phenomenon of coordinate ellipsis is the main focus of this paper because it is understudied in the EkeGusii Language as far as is known to us, and so the researchers give a preliminary analysis of it using data gathered in the field by Omari Robert and some from introspective data by the researchers, being native speakers of the language. This study will consider questions such as: what licenses ellipsis in coordinate elliptical constructions or Conjunct Reduction (henceforth CR) such as Stripping (or Bare Argument Ellipsis), which involve forward CR and Right Node Raising (or backward CR)? Are they derived due to syntactic or semantic identity?

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2.0 gives a quick glimpse of the coordinators and some

¹ Coordinate Ellipsis was introduced into the literature by Klein (1993) to refer to a constellation of elliptical constituents that are realized in coordinate structures.

examples of coordination constructions that realize ellipsis in EkeGusii. Section 3.0 discusses how coordination and ellipsis interact in EkeGusii. Section 4.0 critically examines how current minimalist accounts deal with the issues how coordinate ellipsis is derived and licensed in relation to the EkeGusii data.

2.0 Coordinate Ellipsis

In this section we seek to examine the distributional characteristics of coordinate ellipsis. Symmetrical coordination occurs across a number of phrasal categories in EkeGusii. A construction is considered symmetrical if the two syntactic elements that are articulated are of the same category, e.g. determiner phrases, verb phrases, adjective phrases etc. The attested symmetrical conjunct constructions in EkeGusii, however, exhibit distinct derivational profiles in relation to which gaps are licensed in the derivation process. The constructions involve the deletion of one or more phrasal constructions before they converge in the A-P interface. A number of coordinate ellipsis constructions have been stipulated in the literature, namely stripping or Bare Argument Ellipsis, Right Node raising, Phrasal Cluster Ellipsis. So far little is known as to whether these categories are viable in relation to Bantu languages, with specific reference to EkeGusii. Coordinate ellipsis is considered to be a form of Non-Phrasal ellipsis that obeys the following set of features given in (1) below:

- (1.) (i.) It can delete non-constituents
 (ii.) It cannot occur in subordination
 (iii.) It obeys parallelism conditions (cf.)

The lexemes: *na/naende/ne* “and”, *gose* “or” and *korende* “but” typically function as coordinators in EkeGusii. They also form constructions which may involve conjunction reduction that is ellipsis or sharing of some elements. Examples of coordinated sentences that involve conjunction reduction are given in (2) below.

- (2.) a. *Ogeto na-nchet-e end-agera na Mokeira boigo* Δ.
Ogeto 3SG-like fv C9 PL-food and Mokeira also
 “Ogeto likes food and Mokeira also”
 (Δ=*nanchete endagera*)
 b. [IP Ogeto [VP nanchete endagera] [BOOL na [IP Mokeira [boigo [VP ~~nanchete endagera~~]]]
 c. [IP Ogeto [VP nanchete endagera] [BOOL na [IP Mokeira [VP ~~nanchete-endagera~~]]] boigo
- (3.) a. *Inche nabo n-ko-go-ak-a naende* Δ *n-gwa-kan-e*.
I can foc- Pres-Inf-hit-fv and foc/Sagr-Pres-pay-fv
 “I can hit you and pay you”
 (Δ=*inche*)
 b. [IP Inche [VP nabo ngokoaka [BOOL naende [IP inche] [VP [nabo] ngwakane.]
- (4.) a. *Chi-sese n-chi-a-nch-te ko-minyok-a korende chi-ombe ti-chi-anche-ti* Δ
NC10 dogs ...like tns infl run fv but NC 10 cows ..NC10 like neg ..run
 “Dogs like to run but cows don’t.”
 (Δ=*kominyoka*)
 b. [IP Chisese [VP nchianchete kominyoka] [BOOL korende [IP chiombe [VP tichianchete kominyoka]]

If two items are coordinated then the coordinator or coordinating conjunction must come between the two conjuncts. If there are more than two conjuncts in the coordination, then the coordinator must appear between the last two conjuncts or between all the conjuncts.

2.1 The Syntactic Projection of the Coordinate Phrases

In accounting for the syntactic structure of the coordinated clauses, two predominant perspectives have

been proposed, namely the flat and binary structure. The proponents of the flat structure assume that there is some symmetry between the first conjunct and the second conjunct, whereas the latter group consider them to be asymmetrical (cf. Zhang, 2009).

In giving the syntax of the coordinator, it will be assumed that it is a branching node of the BoolP which is given as Bool' using the bar conventions and has a Bool⁰ as its head.

(5.) **Projection of BoolP**

BoolP= [BoolP [Bool' [Bool⁰ ...]]

3.0 The Ontology of Coordinate Ellipsis in EkeGusii

Coordinate ellipsis is considered to be a universal phenomena. The coordinate ellipsis constructions have elicited interest in generative grammars due to the fact that they involve economy principles in that they involve the deletion of matching syntactic objects to avoid redundancy on the surface. In the literature it is assumed that coordinate ellipsis in human language consists of subtypes such as Gapping (section 3.1), Stripping or Bare argument ellipsis (section 3.2), right node raising (RNR) (3.2) and Phrasal Cluster Ellipsis (section 3.4). In this paper we give examples of the coordinate ellipsis constructions that are realized in EkeGusii and give their syntactic analysis.

One of the issues raised in the minimalist literature is as to how they are derived. The derivation profile is then assumed to be driven by the same syntactic process and principles in a bid to unify the syntax of the phenomena (subtypes).

3.1 Gapping

The term *gapping*² was used to refer to the deletion of the verb (cf. Jackendoff, 1971; 1972) and has over the years been considered to be a cover term for a number of subcategories, viz: T-gapping (coordination of two TPs), C-gapping (coordination of two CPs) and V-gapping (coordination of two VPs) (Hernández, 2007). In Gapping constructions the verb with/ without its arguments or adjuncts is deleted. Consider the following examples in EkeGusii given in (6-7) below:

(6.) a. *Mokaya n-a-gor-et-e o-mo-gati na Bosire*

(Gapping)

Mokaya Foc-CL1-buy-PERF-FV AUG-CL-bread and Bosire

ama-bere.

AUG-CL-milk

“Mokaya bought bread and Bosire Milk.”

b. LF:

[_{IP}Mokaya [_{V'P} nagorete omogati [_{Bool}na [_{IP}Bosire [_{V'P} ~~nagorete~~ amabere]]]]]

(7) a. *O-mo-mura o-mo-taabe na o-mo-nyerere* (**Backward v-gapping**)

AUG-NC1-boy AUG-NC1-tall and AUG-NC1-slim NC1

to-tag-et-e.

CI1-PL-want-PERF-fv

“A boy tall and slim we want”

b. [_{IP} [_{DP} Omomura omotambe [_{V'P} ~~totagete~~ [_{Bool} na [_{IP} [_{DP} Omomura omonyerere [_{V'P} totagete]]]]]]]]

² Gapping as a subcategory coordinate ellipsis was first introduced by Jackendoff (1971) as an empty category that specifically occurs in coordinate clauses which is not a kind of ellipsis. However, the first use of the term can be accredited to Ross (1970)

3.2 Bare Argument Ellipsis / stripping

Bare argument ellipsis (henceforth BAE) can be considered to be a case of forward conjunct ellipsis which targets only one syntactic category in the second conjunct. Kolokante (2008) subcategorizes Bare Argument ellipsis into three elliptical predicate constructions, viz: stripping, negative-contrast and yes/no ellipsis. In his analysis BAE is syntactically derived by moving the remnant to the left periphery of the clause before the Inflectional Phrase (IP) is deleted in the Phonetic form (PF) or in Minimalist terms in the Articulatory-Perceptual Interface.

3.2.1 Stripping

- (8) a. Mokaya n-'o-mw-egarori na Δ o-mo-tiindi

Mokaya is AUG-CL1-proud and AUG-CL1-harsh

‘Mokaya is proud and harsh’

- b. [IPMokaya [_{v'p} n'omwegarori [_{Bool}na [IP~~Mokaya~~ [_{v'p} n' omotiindi]]]]]

- (9) a. Mokaya nagorete amabere na Bosire boigo. (**Stripping**)

‘Mokaya bought and Bosire also.’

- b. [IPMokaya [_{v'p} nagorete amabeere [_{Bool} na [IPBosire [_{v'p} ~~nagorete amabere~~ boigo]]]]]

The distribution of coordinate ellipsis in simple coordination, involving one subject, as given above is not the same as in the case of coordinated subjects. The construal of a coordinate construction such as (10a) below can be considered to be a coordinate ellipsis island, if it is assumed that it is base generated and selects the arguments and moves them to the subject position then the coordinator is merged.

- (10.) a. Mokaya na Boera m-ba-gor-et-e ebi-koroto.

Mokaya and Boera CL1-PL-buy-PERF-FV

‘Mokaya and Boera bought shoes.’

- b. * [IP Mokaya [_{vp} ~~mbagorete ebikoroto~~ [_{BoolIP} [_{Bool} na Boera mbagorete ebikoroto]]]]]

The derivational history of the construction in (10 a & b) above does not include a step in which the predicate *mbagorete ebikoroto* is deleted as shown in (10b) in order for the construction to surface. The construction can only be considered to licence a form of Right Node Raised gap if the predicate involves reconstruction of a parallel merged predicate *nagorete ebikoroto* as given in (10') below:

- (10') IP Mokaya [_{vp} ~~nagorete ebikoroto~~ [_{BoolIP} [_{Bool} na Boera nagorete ebikoroto]]]]]

However, in sentences such as are given in (11-13) below, the coordinated compound subject constitutes one of the deleted constituents in coordinate ellipsis.

- (11.) a. Mokaya na Boera n'-ebe-garor-i na Δ Δaba-tiindi

Mokaya and Boera are CL1-PL-proud and CL1-harsh

‘Mokaya and Boera are proud and harsh’

(Δ=Mokaya na boera Δ=na)

- b. [IP[_{DP}Mokaya na Boera [_{v'p} n'ebegarori [_{Bool}na [IP[_{DP}~~Mokaya na Boera~~ [_{v'p} n'abatiindi]]]]]]]

- (12.) a. Mokaya na Boera m-ba-gor-et-e na Δ ko-oni-a

Mokaya na Boera Foc-CL1 PL-buy-PERF-FV and INF-sell-FV

ebi-koroto

CLPL-shoes

‘Mokaya and Boera bought and sold shoes’

- b. * [IP [DP Mokaya [_{Bool} na [DP Boera [_{v'p} mbagorete ~~ebikoroto~~ [_{Bool} na [DP ~~Mokaya~~ [_{Bool} na [DP Boera [_{v'p} koonia ebikoroto]]]]]]]]]

- c. * [IP [DP Mokaya [_{Bool} na [DP Boera [_{v'p} mbagorete ~~ebikoroto~~ [_{Bool} na [DP

Mokaya [_{Bool} na [_{DP} **Boera** [_{vP} mbaonetie ebikoroto]]]]]]]]

The compound subjects in the coordinate clauses we have seen so far exhibit the same characteristics as a single subject. This can be demonstrated further by considering examples (13 and 14), the subject Boera and Mokaya and just Boera have the same pattern of coordinate ellipsis generated in the second conjunct.

(13.) a. Boera na Mokaya n-igo ba-ch-et-e na ΔΔko-iran-a

Boera Foc-PTL SM-come-PERF-FV and INF-return-FV

kegima igoro

immediately yesterday

“Boera and Mokaya came and returned immediately yesterday.”

b. [_{IP} [_{DP}Boera and Mokaya [_{vp} nigo achete ~~igoro~~ [_{BoolP} [_{Bool} na [_{IP} [_{DP}**Boera** [_{vp} ~~nigo~~ koirana kegima igoro]]]]]]]]]]

(14.) a. Boera n-igo a-ch-et-e na ΔΔko-iran-a

Boera Foc-PTL SM-come-PERF-FV and INF-return-FV

kegima igoro

immediately yesterday

“Boera came and returned immediately yesterday.”

b. [_{IP} [_{DP}Boera [_{vp} nigo achete ~~igoro~~ [_{BoolP} [_{Bool} na [_{IP} [_{DP}**Boera** [_{vp} ~~nigo~~ koirana kegima igoro]]]]]]]]]]

Some of cases of forward ellipsis examined in this section all exhibit the tendency of deleting elements which are not equal to a constituent, which is a characteristic feature of coordinate ellipsis.

3.3 Right-Node Raising

Right-Node Raising is one of the constructions that occurs cross-linguistically which has been associated with coordinate ellipsis since it was stipulated in Ross (1967) though was so called by Postal (1974). It is considered to either involve the raising of an argument at the right periphery of conjunct constructions (hence its name) (cf. Postal 1974, Sabbagh, 2012) or the pivot is assumed to be external to the coordinate construction (cf.). In this paper we follow the former view to the generation of RNR constructions in Ekegusii since it explains how the interpretation of the first conjunct is fulfilled. The first conjunct may be incomprehensible if the copy of the shared argument is not raised. The coordination of two verbs yields cases of right node raising in EkeGusii as shown in (14) below.

(14) a. *Mokua n-igo a-gor-et-e na Δ ko-oni-a chi-anga*

Mokua FOC-PTL SAGR-buy-PERF-FV INF-sell-FV CL-PL-cloth

chi-ngiya.

OAGR-good

“Mokua bought and sold good clothes”

b. *Mokua nigo agorete ~~chianga chingiya~~ na Mokaya nigo koomia chianga chingiya*

c. *Mokua nigo agorete ~~chianga chingiya~~ na Mokaya nigo aonetie chianga chingiya*

(15) a. *Nabo eraabe Δ na ndeenga Δ Onserio nare omokori egaasi omuya*

May be and Foc-suppose Onserio Foc-is AUG-CL1-doer Work good

(Δ=Onserio nare omokori egaasi omuya)

b. [_{IP} [_{DP} Ø [_{vp} nabo araabe [_{IP} ~~Onserio nare omokori egaasi omuya~~]_{BoolP} na [_{IP} [_{DP} Ø [_{vp} ndeenga [_{IP} Onserio nare Omokori egaasi omuya]]]]]]]]]]

3.4 Phrasal Cluster ellipsis

Coordinate cluster ellipsis targets more than one categorial element for deletion in either or both of the conjuncts.

- (16.) a. A-ba-mura a-ba-taabe na a-ba-nyerere
AUG-CL1-PL-boy AUG-CL1 PL-tall and AUG-CL1-slim
to-tag-et-e.
CLPL-want-PERF-FV
“Boys tall and slim we want”
- b. [IP [DP abamura abatambe [v^Ptotagete [Bool na [IP [DP abamura abanyerere [v^P totagete
]]]]]]]
- (17) a. *Onserio Nabo a-ra-abe Δ na nd-eenga Δ n-are o-mo-kori*
Onsero May CL1-MOD-be and FOC-suppose foc-is AUG-CL1-doer e-gaasi
omuya
Cl-work CL1-good
‘Onserio may be and supposedly is a good worker’
(Δ=omokori egasi omuya Δ=Onserio)

4.0 minimalist accounts of coordinate ellipsis

The derivation (a)symmetrical coordinated constructions is a controversial issue since it is challenged on the basis of what a given theory within the minimalist Program, which consist of a number of theories as per Putnam and Stroink (2009), assumed to be the syntactic computational process, such as the operational mechanisms involved : Phases (Gallego,), or copy (); internal merge () or parallel merge(Citko, 2005) and survive (te Velde, 2009). the tendency is to construe the mechanisms as if they apply autonomously. The derivational process actually involves nearly the entire repertoire of mechanisms already mentioned. In this paper we examine the derivation of coordinate ellipsis constructions by reference to the notion of Phases introduced by Chomsky (2000) in section 4.1 below.

4.1 Phase-Theoretic Account

In this section we consider some cases of Coordinate ellipsis in relation to the stipulations of the standard Phase-theoretic account (Chomsky, 2008) and Phase Sliding theory (Gallego, 2007) in order to establish their empirical efficacy in handling EkeGusii data. We argue that one needs to consider more factors than just the nature of the coordinated phrases in symmetrical constructions to determine how the output was generated.

4.1.1 Standard Phase Theory

Phase theory is basically the assumption that syntactic derivation proceeds in small chunks constrained by the memory capacity of persons which are referred to as phases. the notion of phases accomodates the notion of cyclicity, the idea that phrases longer than the matrix clause are derived in independent chunks i.e phase by phase (cf. Chomsky 2001;2004;2007 and 2008)..

Phase-hood is constrained by a number of constraints, such as the Phase impenetrability constraint (henceforth PIC) given in (18) below. The PIC can be handy in determining how far phasal effects determine the derivational history of constructions.

(18) Phase Impenetrability Constraint (PIC):

In phase α with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside α ; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations (Chomsky 2000:108)

Coordinate ellipsis is triggered after the coordinator is introduced in second syntax in order to merge the already merged matrix clauses. The phases are rendered open to further application of syntactic processes, in this case the deletion of redundant features in the two conjuncts. Consider the sentence in (19) below

(19) *Moraa n-a-ri-et-e ri-toke na Boera boigo Δ.* (Δ=nariete ritoke)

Moraa Foc-SM-eat-PERF-FV CL-banana and Boera also

‘Moraa ate a banana and Noera also’

The sentence in (19) above allows for the reconstruction of the second conjunct by the insertion of a focal element *boigo* ‘also/too’ after the deletion of the predicate thus violating the PIC. The construction challenges the argument that ellipsis is entirely determined by the mere matching of syntactic categories of the conjuncts and deleting them on either the first conjunct in the cases of RNR and Cluster coordinate ellipsis, or on the second conjunct in Gapping and Stripping constructions.

4.1.2 Phase Sliding Account

Gallego (2006) proposes that some constructions that involve displacement of lower copies involve what he refers to as phase sliding. Elliptical construction in the EkeGusii language involve the sliding of phases which feeds the ellipsis transformation. The ellipsis occurs to delete the two copies of the predicate or the verb phrase and its complement, which are shared by the first and second conjunct. The cases of EkeGusii constructions cannot converge after the application of the two transformations (phase sliding and VP-ellipsis) which occur on transfer to the articulatory-perceptual interface. In case the constructions are articulated after the phase sliding and deletion rule applies they will yield a construction that will crash at the interfaces.

Consider the NP-conjunct construction in which the object in both conjuncts that are used in deriving it bear the same compliment to the verb phrase given in example (20) below:

(20) *Maria na Mochama m-ba-gore-et-e e-getaabu.*

Maria and Mochama Foc-CL1PL-buy-PERF-FV CLSG-book

‘Maria and Mochama bought book’

(20’) Derivation Cycle in Second Syntax

(a.) [IP_{BooIP}[DP *Maria* [_{v’p} *nagorete egetabu*]] [BooL *na* [IP_{DP} *Mochama* [_{v’p} *nagorete egetabu*]]]]

(b.) [IP_{BooIP}[DP *Maria* [BooL *na* [IP_{DP} *Mochama* [_{v’p} *nagorete egetabu*]] [_{v’p} *nagorete egetabu*]]]]

(c.) [IP_{BooIP}[DP *Maria* [BooL *na* [IP_{DP} *Mochama* [_{v’p} *nagorete egetabu*]] [_{v’p} *nagorete egetabu*]]]]

(d.) [IP_{BooIP}[DP *Maria* [BooL *na* [IP_{DP} *Mochama* [_{v’p} *mbagorete egetabu*]]]]]]]]

The sentence in (20) above can be derived using a transformational cycle in which two symmetrical constructions are formed in the second syntax in which the coordinator *na* “and” is introduced before phase sliding occurs as in (20’a) above. The illustration in (20’) above indicates that the lower copy and the verb phrase of the first conjunct are available for the application of the ellipsis rule. The main concern as to which conjunct is available for deletion is determined by effects of phase sliding. The theoretical solution in determining the condition for deletion involves the Antecedent Contained rule, this opens up the first conjunct for further application of transformational rules which violates the Phase Impenetrability Principle (cf. Chomsky,) and the No tampering condition.

The NP conjunction clause in (20) above involves the phase sliding of the the copy of the Boolean clause *na mochama nagorete egetabu* ‘and Mochama bought a book’ as a result of the second conjunct, which is a phasal object, being pied piped along with the conjunct *na* ‘and’ and moved is into the first conjunct as shown I (20’b). The v’p in the first conjunct is displaced and is deleted as shown in (20’c) before final spell out at the Conceptual-Intentional and the perceptual-articulatory interfaces. The final step in the derivation involves the substitution of the plural morpheme *-ba-* which induces a phonological change of the focus marker from {*n-*} to {*m-*} before the construction converges at the interfaces. This also violates the minimalist principle of Inclusivity and the No Tampering Condition.

The derivation process goes for the symmetrical NP-coordinated constructions that take a distributive reading, that is, each of individuals in the NP conjunct is considered to have bought a book. However, for the case where we have a collective reading, in which both bought the same book, the ellipsis rule does not apply as a derivational rule in the cyclist. The coordinator is provided for as part of first syntax, that is, it is part of the merge rules of the IP phase and not a result of sliding up of another phase.

The proposal of using Phase Sliding to account for the derivation of coordinate constructions is empirically limited in so far as EkeGusii data is concerned. The derivation process that entails the use of the phase sliding rule of the second conjunct in symmetrically coordinated-NP that yields the conjunct construction in (20) above is blocked by the two compliments of the verb phrase in Ekegusii. Consider the coordinated clause in (21) below.

(21) *Bundi n-anch-et-e ama-tunda na Kerubo ama-bere*

Bundi Foc-like-PERF-FV CL7-oranges and Kerubo CL7-milk

‘Bundi likes oranges and Kerubo milk’

(21’) [_{IP}[_{BOOLP}*Bundi n-anch-et-e ama-tunda* [_{BOOL}*na* [_{IP}*Kerubo n-anch-et-e ama-bere*]]]]

In (21) above the construction cannot involve any phase sliding because the objects serving as compliments are distinct. The ellipsis in the second conjunct is determined by a structural identity of the verbal element of the first conjunct and the second conjunct as shown in (21’) above. In the cases (20 and 21) the focus was on the placement of the conjunct between two clauses that are structurally equal in which either the compound NP is generated or fails to be generated. The generation of coordinated constructions in which the objects are compound NPs is also possible in Ekegusii as in the example in (22) below:

(22) *Mokeira n-agor-et-e e-bunda na e-ngoko.*

Mokeira Foc-buy-PERF-FV CL-donkey and CL-Chicken

‘Mokeira bought a donkey and a chicken’

The ellipsis is as shown in (22’) below.

(22’) [_{IP}*Mokeira n-agor-et-e e-bunda* [_{BOOL}*na* [_{IP}*Mokeira n-agorete e-ngoko*]]]]

The construction in (22) is generated by the meeting the ACE criteria which induces the deletion of the equivalent subject, which is typically replaced with PRO in control theory, and the verbal in the VP, hence a case of mixed ellipsis.

The derivational rules for symmetrical VP-coordination involve both a verb compliment-ellipsis rule which a sub-type of VP-ellipsis and a canonical case of equi-subject deletion (a control construction). Consider the example in (23) below.

(23) *Mochama n-a-bwat-et-e na ko-nyeny-a e-ngoko.*

Mochama Foc-CL1-catch-PERF-FV and INF-slaughter-FV CLSG-chicken

‘Mochama caught and slaughtered a chicken.’

The example in (23) above involves the deletion of the object *engoko* in the first conjunct and the equivalent subject in the second conjunct.

(23’) *? [_{IP}[_{BOOLP}*Mochama n-a-bwat-et-e engoko*] [_{BOOL}*na*

Mochama Foc-CL1-catch-PERF-FV ~~ehicken~~ and

[_{IP}*Mochama n-a-nyeny-et-ee e-ngoko.*]

Mochama Foc-CL1-slaughter-FV CLSG-chicken

‘Mochama caught a ~~chicken~~ and Mochama slaughtered a chicken.’

Such a case of mixed-ellipsis can be accounted for by invoking the notion of deletion at the articulatory-perceptual interface after the application of the coordination rule. The sentence in (23’) is well-formed in the CI interface but undergoes further morphological transformations before it is externalized as in (23) above. The derivation involves the move of a copy of the object *chicken* to the

ellipsis site in first conjunct, covertly, in the CI interface for interpretation. The deletion of the constituents involves two distinct processes: the subject of the second conjunct is deleted by matching the syntax of the first conjunct with the second, as is the case of the deletion in the first conjunct, though the latter violates the Antecedent constraint. The semantic interpretation of the backward deleted elliptical constraint involves raising whereas for the second elliptical element there is no movement involved. Hence the construction involves two distinct deletion processes occurring simultaneously. In such case, assuming a case in which the first conjunct IP phase sliding down in order to licence the deletion of the subject in the second conjunct, and the second conjunct doing so to licence the deletion of the object in the first conjunct is not only expensive derivationally but also counterintuitive.

5.0 Conclusion

In this paper we have demonstrated the ontology of coordinate ellipsis in EkeGusii in order to set up a basis for further analyses of the phenomenon. Coordinate ellipsis is an optional process in the language, and can be accounted for using the Minimalist Programme stipulations, however, we argue that the application of a phase sliding account cannot account for most of the derivation of the constructions in the language. Further research can be done on the semantics of the coordinate constructions.

References

- Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, M. Kenstowicz (ed.), 1-52. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- _____ (2004). Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. In *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol 3, A. Belletti (ed.), 104-131. Oxford:OUP.
- _____ (2007). Approaching UG from below. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the view from Syntax-Semantics*, U. Sauerland & H-M. Gartner (eds.), 1-30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- _____ (2008). On phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, C. Otero et. Al. (eds.), 134-166. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Gallego, A. J. (2007). *Phase Theory and Parametric Variation*, Ph.D. dissertation, UAB.
- _____ (2006). Phase Sliding. Ms UMD.
- Hernández, C. A. (2007). Gapping as a syntactic dependency. *Lingua*.
- Jung, W. (2016). The Non-Unity of Gapping. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of the Basque Country.
- Kolokonte, M. (2008). Bare Argument Ellipsis and Information Structure. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Newcastle University.
- Postal, P. M. (1974). *On Raising*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Putnam, T, M. & Stroink. (2009). Travelling without moving: The conceptual necessity of survive-minimalism. In (ed.) Michael T. Putnam. *Towards a Derivational Syntax: Survive Minimalism*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. Pp. 3-20.
- Sabbagh, J. (2012). Right Node Raising. LLC.
- Wilder, C. (2018). Conjunction Reduction and Right-Node Raising. (Eds.) Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Tanja Temmerman. *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*. Oxford.
- Zhang, N. N. (2009). *Coordination in Syntax*. Cambridge University Press.