Camelia Bejan

On Gapping Constructions in English and Romanian

Gapping constructions typically involve two conjoined clauses where the second clause lacks the verb (John likes grapes and Jane, oranges). There have been two competing analyses in the literature on gapping, which has been viewed either as a type of VP-ellipsis (Wilder 1994, Lin 2002, Coppock 2001) or as an instance of across-the-board movement (Johnson 1996, 2004). Starting from the literature on gapping in English, we bring to attention gapping constructions in Romanian and focus on the licensing environments and on the categories and the strings affected by gapping. The paper is structured in two sections. First we briefly overview the previous research on gapping in English, then we examine the structure of the gapped conjunct and the status of the remnants in Romanian and we look at the types of conjuncts that allow gapping.

Key words: *gapping, coordination, ellipsis, conju.ncts, remnant*

1. Previous studies

Gapping is a syntactic process that removes a string from the second conjunct under identity with some previously occurring string:

1) John likes dogs and Jane, cats.

The first clause in the coordinate structure is known as the antecedent clause, while the second, which contains an unpronounced verb *likes*, is called the gapped clause. The terminology used to refer to the different parts of the gapping construction, is the following: gap refers to any missing material in a conjunct; remnant refers to any element which remains in a gapped conjunct and correspondent or correlate refers to the elements in the non-gapped conjunct which correspond syntactically and semantically to remnants in the gapped conjuncts:

2) John	likes	dogs	and	Jane	__	cats.
correspondent$_1$		correspondent$_2$		remnant$_1$	gap	remnant$_2$

The analysis of gapping as a result of a deletion process has a long tradition, starting with Ross (1967: 250), who argued that gapping is a rule 'that operates to delete indefinitely many occurrences of a repeated main verb in a conjoined structure'. His proposal was supported by Sag (1976) who suggested that the remnants move out of the clause before deletion of the verb takes place. Wilder (1994) argues that gapping is an instance of Forward Deletion, affecting a finite verb and medial constituents in non-initial conjuncts.

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

The deletion hypothesis has been rejected by Johnson (1996) who provides an alternative proposal, involving across-the-board movement. He has elaborated a theory of gapping in which there is no sentential coordination followed by deletion, but VP coordination followed by across-the-board raising of the verb to T. He argues that gaps are traces of movement, and the verb is moving across-the-board from both conjuncts:

3) John likes$_1$ [$_{VP}$ [$_{VP}$ t$_{subj}$ [t$_1$ dogs] and [$_{VP}$ Jane t$_1$ cats]]]

To support his account of gapping, he draws attention to a number of empirical differences between VP-ellipsis and gapping.

The traditional ellipsis-based account of gapping has been revived by Coppock (2001) who counters Johnson's analysis. Her proposal differs from the preceding ones in that she assumes that remnants adjoin to VP rather than at sentence level. The strike-through indicates the gap's lexical content:

4) John likes dogs and [$_{VP}$ Jane$_1$ [$_{VP}$ cats$_2$ ~~[$_{VP}$ t$_1$ likes t$_2$]~~]]

Another supporter of the deletion account of gapping, Lin (2002) examines various structures which involve the presence of shared material and concludes that gapping is the result of a deletion operation that is triggered in a sharing structure.

In broad lines, most deletion approaches have attempted to show that gapping has the same syntactic properties as other types of ellipsis, while those who argue against deletion have tried to underline the differences.

While the mechanism of the gapping process is a matter of an on-going debate, we believe that remarks on the individual languages concerning the length and type of conjuncts and the targets of gapping may prove to be useful to the general theoretical debate. We will contribute to this discussion by examining the data concerning gapping structures in Romanian.

2. The structure of the gapped conjunct

Standard instances of gapping have the shared material inside the first conjunct. The second conjunct signals the absence of the shared material by means of a comma placed between the subject NP and the complement of the clause. In spoken language this would be marked by a break in intonation:

5) He read the book and she, the magazine.

The material left in the conjunct with the gap, the remnants, are in a contrastive focus relation to parallel terms in the other conjunct. This is reflected in the intonation characteristic of gapping, which requires that both remnants and correlates be stressed. The remnants and their correlates must both represent new information. This reduces the number of remnants to two. However, occasionally it is possible to find more remnants as in the following example (cf. Johnson: 2004, 2):

6) Who gave what to whom?

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

Nick gave apples to Susie, Jack gave oranges to Helen and Tim gave grapes to Liz.

The answer to this multiple *wh*-question indicates that the situational context hosts additional new information.

In what follows we will look at the data concerning the targets of gapping and the nature of the remnants in gapping structures in English and Romanian.

2.1. The targets of gapping

Gapping allows a verb to go unpronounced, if its content can be recovered from the initial conjunct. Gapping may involve single unpronounced verbs or unpronounced verbs accompanied by other material, hence the distinction between simple and complex gapping respectively. An intriguing property of gapping is that by allowing the verb to be gapped, it affects the constituent structure of the sentence, hence the debate on whether gapping affects constituents or strings.

Usually a finite verb is viewed as a prerequisite for gapping, which is also understood as medial deletion. This is illustrated here with identical examples for English and Romanian:

7) [E] [He wrote a long essay today] and [you _ yesterday].
   [R] [El a scris un eseu lung astăzi] şi [tu _ ieri].

It logically follows that in both languages gapping does not allow a main verb to be part of the remnant in the second conjoint structure:

8) [E] *[He wrote a long essay today] and [you wrote _ yesterday].
   [R] *[El a scris un eseu lung astăzi] şi [tu ai scris _ ieri]

The ungrammaticality of these examples arises from the fact that the finite main verb is preserved in the non-initial conjunct, while the object is removed.

Generally, a main verb cannot be gapped unless INFL has also been gapped. To put it in other words, when the verbal form includes a finite verb (auxiliary or modal), the non-finite verb goes unpronounced together with the finite verb:

9) a) [He will/can write a long essay next week] and [you _ next month].
   b)*[He will/can write a long essay next week] and [you will _ next month].

Similar effects can be shown for Romanian, which also requires the removal of the auxiliary verb in present perfect, present conditional and future, as illustrated below:

10) a)*[El va scrie un eseu săptămâna viitoare] şi [tu vei_ luna viitoare].
He will write an essay next week and you will_ next month.

b)*[El a scris un eseu săptămâna trecută] şi [tu ai_ luna trecută].
He has written an essay week last and you have_ last month.

c)*Dacă ar fi necesar,[el ar scrie un eseu luni] şi [eu aş _ marţi].
If it were necessary, he would write an essay on Monday, and I would _ on Tuesday.

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

d)*Dacă ar fi fost necesar,[el ar fi scris un eseu luni] şi [eu aş fi _ marți].
If it had been necessary, he would have written an essay on Monday, and I would have _ on Tuesday.

Thus the presence of the auxiliaries marking future tense (*vei* 'will'), the present perfect (*ai* 'have'), the present conditional (*ai* 'would') or the perfect conditional (*ai fi* 'would have') renders the second conjunct ungrammatical. The same restriction of occurrence holds for the auxiliary *a fi* 'be' inflected for all tenses in the passive voice:

11) Eseurile sunt scrise de studenți, şi comentariile, de profesori.
The essays are written by the students and the comments, by the teachers.

*Eseurile sunt scrise de studenți, şi comentariile sunt, de profesori.
*The essays are written by the students and the comments are, by the teachers.

The ungrammatical sentences in both languages are disallowed because the finite verb has not gapped along with the non-finite verb in the past participle.

Special attention deserves a particular type of gapping in Romanian, the one applied to clitic constructions in the conjuncts. In Romanian personal pronouns in the accusative or in the dative have two sets of forms: the stressed, non-clitic pronouns and the non-stressed, clitic pronominal forms. Clitics take part in the clitic doubling process, they are assigned the dative or the accusative case by the verb and they are marked for the same number and gender as the object, direct or indirect, which they double (cf. GLR, 2005). Clitic doubling is of two types depending on the positions occupied by the clitic and the nominal: the anticipatory doubling when the clitic precedes the nominal and the resumptive doubling, when the nominal precedes the clitic:

12) **Pe Ion** **l**-am văzut.
John.Acc him.Cl.Acc- have (I) seen
L-am văzut **pe Ion**.
Him.Cl.Acc-have (I) seen PE John.Acc

The weak pronominal form *l* marking the 3rd person singular masculine is typically cliticized on the left side of the auxiliary verb *am* 'have'. It should be noted that [+human] Direct Objects in Romanian are always preceded by the preposition *pe*, as a marker of accusative case. On the other hand, the clitic *o* indicating the 3rd person singular feminine has a slightly different distribution. It occurs in preverbal position with verbs in simple tenses, but in postverbal position with verbs in complex tenses or in the conditional:

13) Eu **o** văd pe Ana si tu **o** vezi pe Ema. (present tense)
I her.Cl.Acc see Ann and you her.Cl.Acc see PE Emma
Eu am văzut-**o** pe Ana şi tu ai văzut-**o** pe Ema. (present perfect)
I have seen-her.Cl. Ann and you have seen-her.Cl.Acc PE Ema

When gapping applies to conjuncts with clitic constructions, preverbal clitics are gapped along with the main verb in the simple tense (present, past or future):

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

14) a) El **te** salută pe tine şi ea ~~**mă** salută~~ pe mine.
He you.Cl.Acc greets you.Acc and she ~~me.Cl.Acc greets~~ PE-me.Acc.
b) El **îți** răspunde ție şi ea ~~**îmi** răspunde~~ mie.
He you.Cl.Dat answers you.Dat and she ~~me.Cl.Dat answers~~ me.Dat.

When the verb is in a complex tense (present perfect or future) or in the conditional mood (present or perfect), the clitic forms in the dative or in the accusative are attached to their host, the auxiliary verb, and gapping results in the omission of the clitic, the auxiliary and the main verb:

15) a) El **te**-a salutat pe tine şi ea ~~**m**-a salutat~~ pe mine.
He you.Cl.Acc-has greeted you.Acc and she ~~me.Cl.Acc-has greeted~~ PE me.Acc.
b) El **ți**-a răspuns ție şi ea ~~**mi**-a răspuns~~ mie.
He you.Cl.Dat-has answered you and she ~~me.Cl.Dat- has answered~~ me.Dat

In both instances the target of gapping includes the clitic, while the non-clitic pronoun in the accusative or in the dative is preserved as a contrasting remnant. Thus, conjuncts that contain clitic constructions observe the same principle, the clitic goes unpronounced with the governing verb.

Another constraint on the verb to be gapped is that in both conjuncts the finite main verb should be in the same voice: active, as in all previous examples, or passive, as below:

16) [E] John was invited by Ann and Michael ~~was invited~~ by Helen.
[R] Ion a fost invitat de Ana şi Mihai ~~a fost invitat~~ de Elena.

Thus the main verb in the initial conjunct licenses gapping in the second conjunct, only when the gapped verb and its antecedent are in the same voice. Furthermore, gapping does not tolerate an active vs. passive mismatch between antecedents and elided phrases, a restriction noticed by Osborne (2006) for English. The same holds true for Romanian: the passive main verb in the first conjunct does not license the deletion of the active main verb in the second conjunct:

17) [E]*The essays will be written by the students, and the teacher ~~will write~~ the comments.
[R]*Eseurile vor fi scrise de studenți şi profesorul ~~va scrie~~ comentariile.

In both languages the ungrammatical voice mismatches derive from the lack of semantic and syntactic identity between the remnants and their correspondents.

A further remark to be made on the verbal target of gapping is that there seems to be no restriction concerning the agreement relationship between the main verb and the subject of each conjoined clause.

The simplest structure is the one in which the subjects of both conjuncts are in the same person and number and the shared lexical verb agrees therefore with both subjects. This holds true for both languages:

18) [E] $\text{He}_{3\text{rd.sg.}}$ $\text{drinks}_{3\text{rd.sg.}}$ coffee, but $\text{she}_{3\text{rd.sg.}}$, milk.
[R] $\text{El}_{3\text{rd.sg.}}$ $\text{bea}_{3\text{rd.sg.}}$ cafea, iar $\text{ea}_{3\text{rd.sg.}}$, lapte.

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

However, gapping allows the shared verb to vary morphologically across conjuncts. Wilder (1994: 308) argues that the possibility of gapping a verb carrying a different inflection from its antecedent illustrates that it is not form-identity that is required, but syntactic and semantic identity. This is exemplified below for both languages:

19) [E] They live in London and she, in Berlin. (She lives in Berlin)
[R] Ei locuiesc în Londra şi ea, în Berlin. (Ea locuieşte în Berlin)

When gapping affects the structure of several conjuncts, the verb in the antecedent clause licenses deletion of the same verb in all subsequent conjuncts:

20) He drinks coffee, we drink milk and they drink tea.
He$_{3rd.sg.}$ drinks$_{3rd.sg.}$ coffee, we$_{1st.pl.}$, milk and they$_{3rd.pl.}$, tea.

Thus, the verb *drinks* in the initial conjunct with a 3rd person singular subject licenses the deletion of *drink* with a 1st person plural subject in the second conjunct and with a 3rd person plural subject in the third conjunct.

The same agreement pattern holds in Romanian, which is a language with a rich paradigm of verbal inflections:

21) El$_{3rd.sg.}$ bea$_{3rd.sg}$ cafea, noi$_{1st.pl.}$ bem$_{1st.pl}$ lapte, iar ei$_{3rd.pl.}$ beau$_{3rd.\ pl.}$ ceai.
El$_{3rd.sg.}$ bea$_{3rd\ pers.\ sg.}$ cafea, noi$_{1st.pl.}$, lapte, iar ei$_{3rd.pl.}$, ceai.

The shared verb *a bea* 'to drink' is morphologically marked for the 3rd person singular in the initial conjunct, while the subsequent occurrences of the same verb are in the 1st person plural and in the 3rd person plural. Just as in English, in Romanian the 3rd person singular form of the verb in the initial conjunct licenses the deletion of the 1st person and 3rd person plural form in the non-initial conjuncts. Thus gapping requires only identity of grammatical relation and content, not morphological identity.

A particular manifestation of gapping is the one involving subject deletion besides the omission of the middle part in the second conjunct. In both languages the subject of the second conjunct can be omitted under identity with the subject of the first conjunct. Furthermore since the subject remnant is deleted, Romanian allows the pronominal subject in the first conjunct to be dropped, as well:

22) [E] [He will recite a stanza for Mary], or [a whole poem].
[R] [(El) va recita o strofă pentru Maria], sau [un întreg poem].

23) [E] [He will recite a stanza for Mary], or [for Emily].
[R] [(El) va recita o strofă pentru Maria], sau [pentru Emilia].

The grammaticality of these examples points to the fact that in both languages the identical subject also becomes target of medial deletion. The only remnant preserved in the gapped conjuncts is the Object, direct in (22) or indirect in (23).

A special type of configuration which involves gapping is that known in the literature as conjoined topicalization (cf. Wilder 1994:324). In Romanian topicalization in sentences with transitive verbs involves the presence of the clitic as in (24b), which is not required in the non-topicalized contexts (24a). When gapping applies to conjuncts with topicalized

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

constituents, the clitic is gapped along with the main verb or with the auxiliary and the main verb as in (24c):

24) a) El bea cafeaua şi eu beau laptele.
He drinks the coffee and I drink the milk.

b) Cafeaua **o** bea el şi laptele ~~**îl beau**~~ eu.
The coffee it.Cl.Acc drinks he and the milk ~~it.Cl.Acc drink~~ I.

c) Cafeaua a băut-**o** el şi laptele ~~**l am băut**~~ eu.
The coffee has drunk-it.Cl.Acc he and the milk ~~it.Cl.Acc have drunk~~ I.

Topicalization in gapping conjuncts with ditransitive verbs yields ungrammatical sentences in English both in the oblique object construction as shown in (25) and in the double object construction as in (26):

25) He gave the letter to me and she gave the copy to the secretary.
The letter, he gave to me, and the copy, she *~~gave~~ to the secretary.
To me, he gave the letter, and to the secretary, she *~~gave~~ the copy.

26) He gave me the letter and she gave the secretary the copy.
*The letter, he gave me, and the copy, she ~~gave~~ the secretary.
*Me, he gave the letter, and the secretary, she ~~gave~~ the copy.

It is obvious that the oblique object construction allows topicalization but it does not license gapping in the second conjunct. In contrast, the double object construction blocks both syntactic processes, possibly on account of the fact that the contrasting indirect object remnant lacks a preposition.

However, constructions resulting from gapping and subject deletion are acceptable, but left dislocation is only allowed in the oblique object construction in English, which permits either the DO or the IO to be fronted to topic position:

27) He gave the letter to me and ~~he gave~~ the copy to the secretary.
The letter, he gave to me, and the copy, to the secretary.
To me, he gave the letter, and to the secretary, the copy.

In Romanian ditransitive verbs also allow the direct and indirect object to change positions, in a kind of inverted double object construction. In the example below the indirect object is anticipated by a clitic:

28) El **mi-**a dat **mie** scrisoarea. IO + DO
He me.Cl.Dat-has given me.Dat the letter.
El **mi-**a dat scrisoarea **mie**. DO + IO
He me.Cl.Dat-has given the letter me.Dat

Furthermore in Romanian, omission of the DO requires the presence of a second clitic, an Accusative one, besides the dative clitic that anticipates the IO. In the example below the Accusative clitic *o* for the 3rd person, singular, feminine gender is added to the right of the non-finite verb:

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

29) El **mi-**a dat-**o** **mie**.
He me.Cl.Dat-has given-it.Cl.Acc me.Dat
'He has given it(fem.) to me'

Topicalization of either the DO or the IO applied to ditransitive patterns in gapped conjuncts produces ungrammatical results in Romanian. The left-dislocation of the DO requires the obligatory presence of a second clitic that reiterates the topicalized constituent:

30) El **mi-**a dat scrisoarea **mie** şi ea **i-**a dat copia **secretarei**.
He me.Cl-has given the letter me and she her.Cl-has given the copy the secretary

***Scrisoarea mi**-a dat-**o** el **mie** şi **copia** ~~i-a dat-o~~ ea secretarei.
The letter me.Cl-has given-it.Cl. he me and the copy ~~her.Cl-has given~~ she the secretary.

***Mie**, mi-a dat el scrisoarea şi secretarei ~~i-a dat~~ ea copia.
Me, meCl.Dat-has given he the letter and the secretary ~~her.Cl.Dat-has given~~ she the copy

With verbs in the present tense, the dative and the accusative clitics converge in a hyphenated form and occur in preverbal position:

31) *Scrisoarea el **mi-o** dă mie şi copia ea ~~**i-o** dă~~ secretarei.
The letter he me.Cl.Dat-it.Cl.Acc gives me and the copy, she ~~her.Cl.Dat-it.Cl.Acc gives~~ the secretary.

However, topicalization of the DO or the IO is allowed in gapping conjuncts with deleted subject. As expected, in conjuncts with left-dislocated indirect objects, the Accusative clitic doubles the topicalized object. Gapping in the non-initial conjunct affects the verb and both clitics:

32) El mi-a dat scrisoarea mie şi (el) ~~i-a dat~~ copia secretarei.
He me.Cl.Dat-has given the letter (to)me and he ~~her.Cl.Dat-has given~~ the copy (to) the secretary.

Mie, **mi**-a dat (el) scrisoarea şi secretarei ~~i-a dat~~ (el) copia.
(to)me me.Cl.Dat-has given (he) the letter and (to) the secretary ~~her.Cl-has given~~ (he) the copy.

However, when the direct object is moved to topic position, besides the preverbal clitic in the dative, a second clitic is attached in postverbal position:

33) **Scrisoarea**, el **mi**-a dat-**o** **mie**, şi copia (el) ~~i-a dat-o~~ secretarei.
The letter he me.Cl.Dat-has given-it.Cl.Acc (to)me and the copy (he) ~~her-Cl.Dat-has given-it.Cl.Acc~~ (to) the secretary.

In the emphatic constructions based on topicalization given in (32), (33), one of the remnants, either the DO or the IO is fronted to pre-subject position in both conjuncts, while the other remnant remains in situ.

Gapping in conjuncts involving the presence of prepositional verbs leave prepositional remnants in the final conjunct:

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

34) [R] El contează pe prietenii lui, şi ea ~~contează~~ pe fratele ei.
[E] He relies on his friends and she ~~relies~~ on her brother.

Thus as far as the gapped verbal string is concerned, the main observation is that in both languages the auxiliary verb, as a marker of complex tenses or of the passive voice is gapped along with the main verb. Syntactic and semantic identity of the main verbs is required, not morphological identity, a fact which accounts for the free agreement patterns, in non-initial conjuncts whose subject remnants are in a different person and number. The gapped string may also include the subject of the second conjunct, deleted under identity with the subject in the antecedent clause.

In Romanian clitic constructions to which gapping applies, the clitic is always gapped along with its verbal host. Topicalization in gapped conjuncts is blocked except for instances when the subject of the final conjunct is also deleted.

2.2. The remnants

The typical gapping construction has at least two remnants which must be in a contrastive relation to their correspondents. Hudson (1976) argues that each remnant in a gapped conjunct must be referentially distinct from its parallel in the initial conjunct. In complex gapping, the referentially identical remnants preserved in the second conjunct render such structures ungrammatical both in English and in Romanian:

35) [E] *He sells [computers at home] and she _ [computers abroad].
He sells computers [at home] and she _ [abroad].

[R] *El vinde [calculatoare în țară] şi ea _ [calculatoare în străinătate].
El vinde [calculatoare în țară] şi ea _ [în străinătate].

In both languages the deletion of the shared object *computers /calculatoare* leaves the contrasting adverbial modifier as an acceptable remnant in the second conjoint clause. Similarly, in the next example, the shared Indirect Object *for the children/ pentru copii* cannot be preserved in the gapped conjunct in either of the two languages:

36) [E] *He brought [cakes] [for the children] and she _ [toys] [for the children].
[R] *El a adus [prăjituri] [pentru copii] şi ea _ [jucării] [pentru copii].

Such gapping instances are disallowed because a remnant in the gapped conjunct does not contrast with its parallel in the initial conjunct.

Remnants are of the same phrasal category (NP, PP, AdvP) as the corresponding part in the initial conjunct, i.e. the remnant and its antecedent are syntactically identical.

The first remnant in a gapped conjunct is the subject, whose presence is obligatorily required. Being a pro-drop language, Romanian allows the subject to be absent when its reference is recoverable from the verbal inflection. However, since gapping can only apply to conjuncts with overt subjects, the presence of the subject becomes obligatory in Romanian gapping constructions. Absence of the subject blocks gapping:

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

37) Am scris un eseu astăzi şi ai scris un eseu ieri.
Have$_{1st.sg}$ *written an essay today and have*$_{2nd.sg}$ *written an essay yesterday*
*Am scris un eseu astăzi şi ~~ai scris un eseu~~ ieri.

The second remnant may be either an argument or an adjunct of the verb. In Romanian the second remnant may function as a direct, indirect or prepositional object or it may be a predicative in the final conjunct:

38) El a cumpărat casa şi ea _ [$_{NP}$ mobila]. Direct Object
He bought the house and she _ the furniture.

El m-a chemat pe mine şi ea _ [$_{PP}$ pe tine]. Direct Object
He called me and she _ you.

El mi-a răspuns mie şi ea _ [$_{NP}$ ție]. Indirect Object
He answered me and she _ you.

El depinde de mine şi ea _ [$_{PP}$ de tine]. Prepositional Object
He depends on me and she _ on you.

El este doctor şi ea _ [$_{NP}$ profesoară]. Predicative
He is a doctor and she _ a teacher.

In both languages adverbial modifiers of various types are also allowed to function as remnants in simple and complex gapping constructions, i.e. in contexts where besides the main verb some other medial constituent is removed:

39) El va veni cu avionul luni şi ea, marți.
He will come by plane on Monday and she, on Tuesday.
(Adverbial Modifier of Time in complex gapping)
El vorbeşte franceza rar şi ea, repede.
He speaks French slowly and she, quickly.
(Adverbial Modifier of Manner in complex gapping)
El pleacă la Viena şi ea, la Paris.
He leaves for Vienna and she, for Paris.
(Adverbial Modifier of Place in simple gapping)

Thus the two main requirements on remnants: referential contrastivity and syntactic identity argued for in English are relevant for Romanian as well. Besides the finite verb, a further prerequisite for gapping to apply in Romanian, is the obligatory presence of the overt subject.

2.3. Types of conjuncts that allow gapping

Gapping is a syntactic process that occurs not only in coordinate main clauses but also in coordinate clauses embedded. Gapping in coordinate main clauses has been exemplified in the previous sections by means of affirmative sentences. This syntactic process also operates in *wh*-questions:

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

40) Ce a trimis el de la Paris şi ce, ea de la Londra?
What has he sent from Paris and what she from London?

When gapping applies to coordinate subject *wh*-questions, the interrogative pronoun is understood as being non-coreferential in the two conjoined clauses and therefore it cannot be elided:

41) Cine **te**-a sunat **pe tine** după prânz şi cine ~~**m**-a sunat~~ **pe mine** după cină?
Who you.Cl-has called you after lunch and who ~~me-has called~~ PE.me after dinner?

Ion **te**-a sunat **pe tine** după prânz şi Ana ~~m-a sunat~~ **pe mine** după cină.
John you.Cl-has called you after lunch and Ann ~~me-has called~~ PE.me after dinner.

When the interrogative pronoun in the gapped conjunct is co-referential with that in the antecedent, it is omitted and the resulting structure is an instance of gapping and subject ellipsis:

42) Cine **te**-a sunat **pe tine** după prânz şi ~~cine **m**-a sunat~~ **pe mine** după cină?
Who has called you after lunch and ~~who me.Cl.Acc-has called~~ PE.me after dinner?

Ion **te**-a sunat **pe tine** după prânz şi ~~Ion **m**-a sunat~~ **pe mine** după cină.
John called you after lunch and ~~John me.has called~~ PE.me after dinner.

Similarly coordinate non-subject *wh*-questions also allow ellipsis of the shared material (the auxiliary and the main verb). *Wh*-questions can be addressed to the shared verbal form as in (43), to the objects as in (44) or to the adverbial modifiers as in (45):

43) [E] What will John do and what, Mary?
[R] Ce va face Ion şi ce, Maria?

44) [E] What has John written and what, Mary?
[R] Ce a scris Ion şi ce, Maria?

45) [E] When did John call you and when Mary, me?
[R] Când te-a chemat Ion pe tine şi când, Maria, pe mine?

Furthermore, conjoined non-subject *wh*-questions also allow subject deletion under identity with its correspondent in the initial conjunct. The subject is thus included in the target of medial deletion in both languages:

46) [E] Who did you meet today, and who, yesterday?
What did you do today and what, yesterday?

[R] Pe cine ai întâlnit azi şi pe cine, ieri?
Ce ai făcut astăzi şi ce, ieri?

Gapping can also operate in conjuncts embedded in the structure of the same superordinate clause, for example in conjoined indirect questions:

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

47) [E] We asked [$_{CP}$ if [$_{IP}$ he would go to Paris] and [$_{IP}$ she _ to Vienna].
[R] Noi am întrebat [$_{CP}$ dacă [$_{IP}$ el va pleca la Paris] şi [$_{IP}$ ea _ la Viena].

Note that in both languages the presence of the complementizer prevents gapping, which points to the fact that gapping takes place lower than the CP. As argued in Johnson (1994, 1997) the gapped conjunct in indirect questions is actually a vP, not a CP:

48) [E] I know that John often eats cakes but (*that) seldom cheese.
[R] Ştiu că Ion adesea mănâncă prăjituri, dar (*că) rareori brânză.

In a similar manner, coordinate relative clauses allow the removal of the verbal string in the second conjunct. As expected, in Romanian the clitic goes unpronounced together with the auxiliary verb hosting it or with the inflected main verb:

49) [E] The lecture notes [$_{CP}$ which [$_{IP}$ he copied yesterday] and [$_{IP}$ I _ today]] are there.
[R] Notele de curs [$_{CP}$ pe care [$_{IP}$ el le-a copiat ieri] şi [$_{IP}$ eu _ astăzi]] sunt acolo.

As with indirect questions, gapping is blocked by the presence of the complementiser (the relative pronoun *which* in English, *pe care* in Romanian) in coordinate relative clauses:

50) [E] *The lecture notes [$_{CP}$ which he copied yesterday] and [$_{CP}$ which I_today] are there.
[R] *Notele de curs [$_{CP}$ pe care el le-a copiat ieri] şi [$_{CP}$ pe care eu _ astăzi] sunt acolo.

The evidence given so far has shown that gapping operates not only in main but also in embedded conjuncts. The main points of the analysis in this section have been illustrated with identical examples in the two languages. The parallelism of the illustrative material points to the similarities between gapping structures in the two languages.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of gapping constructions in English and Romanian has shown that this syntactic phenomenon is to a large extent identical in the two languages.

We have brought empirical evidence that the structure of the gapped clause is the same in English and Romanian: the gapped material obeys the syntactic and semantic identity constraint and the remnants must be in a semantic contrast. Furthermore, in both languages gapping has been shown to operate in coordinate main clauses and in embedded conjuncts.

The distinctive patterns of gapping in Romanian concern constructions with clitics. Gapping involves the removal of the clitic together with the main verb or of the clitic, the auxiliary verb hosting it and the main verb. In broad lines, Romanian gapped constructions observe the same restrictions as those discussed in the literature for the gapped structures in English.

Ovidius University, Constanţa

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)

References

Coppock, Elizabeth (2001): Gapping: In Defense of Deletion in *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society Conference*, 37, ed. Mary Andronis, Christopher Ball, Heidi Elston and Sylvain Neuvel, 133-148. University of Chicago.

Hudson, Richard, A. (1976): Conjunction reduction, gapping and right-node raising in *Language* 52, 535-562.

Johnson, Kyle (2006): Gapping isn't (VP) Ellipsis to appear in *Linguistic Inquiry*. Also available at:http://people.umass.edu/kbj/homepage/index_johnson.htm.

Johnson, Kyle (1996/ 2004): In Search of the Middle Field, unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Available at:http://people.umass.edu/kbj/homepage/index_johnson.htm

Lin, Vivian (2002): *Coordination and sharing at the interfaces*, Doctoral dissertation, Linguistics Department, MIT. Also available at: http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/8151

Osborne, Timothy (2006): Parallel Conjuncts, in *Studia linguistica*, vol. 60, Nr.1, 64-96.

Radford, Andrew (2004): *English Syntax*. Cambridge University Press.

Ross, John (1967): *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.

Sag, Ivan, A. (1976): *Deletion and logical form*. Doctoral dissertation. MIT.

Wilder, Chris (1994): Coordination, ATB and ellipsis in C. Jan-Wouter Zwart (ed.), *Gröninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik*, vol.37, 291-329. Also available at: http://gagl.eldoc.ub.rug.nl/root/1994-37.

Winkler, Susanne/Lopez, Luis (2003): Variation at the Syntax-Semantics Interface. Evidence from Gapping in (ed) Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler: *The Interfaces: Deriving and Interpreting Omitted Structures*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Linguistik Aktuell/ Linguistics Today 61, 227-248

***(2005): *Gramatica limbii române, Enunțul*. Vol. II, Editura Academiei Române. Institutul de lingvistică "Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti".

BDD-A3698 © 2007 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.9.170 (2026-09-04 19:35:44 UTC)