

PART I
THE SUBJECT SYSTEM AND
THE INFLECTIONAL LAYER

2

Register-specific subject omission in English and French and the syntax of coordination

Liliane Haegeman and Elisabeth Stark

2.1 Introduction

Among the Romance languages, many are so called *pro*-drop languages, i.e. languages in which the subject pronoun of a finite clause can remain non-overt; Italian and Spanish are *pro*-drop languages. English and French are not *pro*-drop languages and the subject pronoun cannot be non-overt (cf. Zribi-Hertz 1994, for a more nuanced view on French). In (1) we represent subject omission pretheoretically by a gap (___).

- (1) a. Italian ___ Arriverò stasera.
 arrive.FUT.ISG tonight
 b. Spanish ___ Llegaré esta tarde.
 arrive.FUT.ISG tonight
 c. English * ___ Will arrive tonight.
 d. French * ___ Arrive ce soir.
 arrive tonight

Nevertheless, both English and French display some degree of subject omission. First, both languages allow ellipsis of a subject of a second conjunct when it is coreferential with the subject of the immediately preceding conjunct. This is illustrated in English (2a) and French (2b). See Van Valin (1986) for a first discussion in generative terms.

- (2) a. He has eaten a lot of meat and (he) has drunk a lot of wine.
 b. Il a mangé beaucoup de viande
 He has eaten a lot of meat
 et (il) a bu du bon vin.
 and (he) has drunk good wine.
 ‘He has eaten a lot of meat and drunk good wine.’

In addition, in specific oral and written registers, the subject of a finite clause may be absent.

- (i) In informal spoken English, referential and non-referential subjects may be omitted subject to phonological and prosodic constraints (Schmerling 1973; Thrasher 1977; Napoli 1982; Weir 2012).
- (ii) In informal spoken French, subject omission is by and large restricted to non-referential subjects; again, a phonological account has been formulated (Berthelot 2017). For referential subject omission see also Berthelot (2017) and §2.2.2.2.
- (iii) Both for English and French writing, it has been reported that subject omission is prototypically attested in what has sometimes been called abbreviated registers (see Massam & Stowell 2018). One example is the register of diary writing, in which English and French allow omission of both non-referential and referential subjects. Other examples include various types of digital communication, such as Facebook posts, Twitter posts, text messages, and WhatsApp messages (see Robert-Tissot 2018, Stark & Robert-Tissot 2017, Tagg 2007)

We do not discuss subject omission in spoken registers; for writing, we focus only on subject omission in English and French diary-writing and the written registers that pattern similarly.

The following attested data are just a few illustrations of subject omission in diary-writing.

- (3) ___ Believe I saw the first shoot of bindweed today. ___ Scythed down a patch of nettles to see the result. It is said one can eradicate them if they are scythed down 3 or 4 times in the year. Those treated with the sodium chlorate are dying.

___ Sowed broccoli, savoys, leeks, sprouts, cos lettuce.

(Orwell 2010: 141, 21 April 1936)

- (4) 11 April 1957

___Ai commence [sic] *Le guet*.

___have.1SG started *Le guet*

Ce matin en ouvrant la porte, pour la première fois depuis

this morning upon opening the door, for the first time since

que j' habite ici,

that I live here

___ ai fait s'envoler du jardin un admirable couple de

___ have.1SG made fly away from-the garden an admirable pair of

chardonnerets.

goldfinches

___ Ai voulu y lire un heureux présage.
___ have.1SG wanted there read a lucky warning
'Started *Le guet*. Upon opening the door this morning, for the first time since
I have been living here, made a pair of goldfinches fly from the garden.
Wanted to see this as a lucky sign.' (Laporte2000: 67)

Another written register that typically displays third-person subject omission is what Matushansky (1995: 19–20) calls 'global topic contexts', such as encyclopaedic entries, profile texts, etc. in which one salient entity is the topic of the entire text. (5) is a profile text on footballer Phil Neville; (6) is a profile text on Brigitte Macron. Profile texts are typically set apart typographically from the main body of the text.

(5) Potted profile (*The Guardian*)

Career Defender for Man United and Everton; ___ represented England 59 times. ___ Worked as TV pundit. ___ Has coaching licence and ___ worked in backroom teams for United and Valencia. ___ Co-owns Salford City.

(*Guardian*, 27 January 2018, <https://www.pressreader.com/uk/the-guardian/20180127/282144996776266>, website accessed 21 December 2018)

(6) Profile of Brigitte Macron (*Le Temps*)

2000: ___ Enseigne à Paris au lycée privé Saint-Louis de Gonzague.
_ Divorce. ___ Emménage avec Emmanuel Macron alors que celui-ci étudie à l'ENA (promotion 2004)[...].

2000: Teaches in Paris at the private *lycee* Saint-Louis de Gonzague.
Divorces. Moves in with Emmanuel Macron while he's a student at the ENA (promotion 2004).

(*Le Temps*, 17 April 2017; website accessed 20 April 2018: <https://www.letemps.ch/monde/brigitte-macron-professeure-politique>)

Haegeman (2013) demonstrates that English and French display strikingly similar regularities with respect to register-specific subject omission, and moreover, that these regularities are identical to the regularities in subject omission in early L1 production (Rizzi 2006a). The phenomenon might at first sight be due to some 'extragrammatical' stylistic convention which is culturally or functionally determined, with recoverability the key factor. As shown in Haegeman (2013), though, the distributional restrictions on the pattern suggest that register-specific subject omission is subject to precise syntactic constraints. While recoverability certainly plays a role in restricting subject omission, the observed distributional patterns do not follow entirely from a purely functional account according to which all recoverable subjects can be omitted. Given the distributional restrictions on register-specific

subject omission, the strategy in formal analyses of the phenomenon has been to postulate some idiosyncratic property differentiating the grammar of the relevant registers from the core grammar of English and French. Implementations of this proposal include postulating topic drop (Haegeman 1990; Matushansky 1995; Wexler & Matushansky 2002; Sigurdsson & Maling 2010; Sigurdsson 2010, 2011), or structural truncation (Haegeman 1999, 2013, 2018), or a combination of these two options.

Leaving aside differences of implementation, which are determined by the theoretical framework adopted, most formal analyses assume that the property underlying register-specific subject omission is unavailable in what we could label the core grammar of the corresponding languages. However, as pointed out by Wilder (1994), and developed in Haegeman (2013, 2018), at first sight, register-specific subject omission like that in diary writing and profile texts, which we take as our core examples, finds a close parallel in second-conjunct subject ellipsis. Obviously, if register-specific subject omission could be fully assimilated to second-conjunct subject ellipsis, this would constitute a major finding: it would entail that register-specific subject omission can—and should—be syntactically derived by whatever mechanism underlies second-conjunct subject ellipsis, and hence that no specific grammatical property is required to capture register-specific subject omission. Establishing whether register-specific subject omission and second-conjunct subject ellipsis fully converge will clarify to what extent the grammar of the specific registers must be differentiated from that of the core grammar at all.

We first illustrate the parallelisms between the French and English (i) for register-specific subject omission and (ii) for second-conjunct subject ellipsis. Further examination of the two patterns reveals discrepancies between register-specific subject omission and second-conjunct subject ellipsis, entailing that distinct accounts remain warranted.

The chapter is organized as follows. §2.2 introduces the interpretive and distributional properties of register-specific subject omission. §2.3 shows where second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission overlap and introduces Wilder's (1994) analysis. §2.4 presents divergences between second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission. §2.5 introduces some novel empirical data with respect to second-conjunct subject ellipsis in the registers under investigation and §2.6 is a summary of the chapter.

2.2 Register-specific subject omission: an overview

Haegeman (1997, 1999, 2013, 2018) lists the core properties of register-specific subject omission in English in what we label the 'conservative' or 'restrictive' variety of diary writing, the variety typically found in published diaries and profile

texts, and which most closely matches native-speaking informants' judgements. As discussed in Haegeman and Ihsane (1999, 2002), there exists a more liberal variety of diary style writing instantiated very prominently in Helen Fielding's (1996) fictional *Bridget Jones's diary*, in which subject omission is more pervasive. See §2.2.4.2 for discussion.

2.2.1 The omitted subject is syntactically active

In examples without an overt subject such as (3) and (4), the subject is implicit and it can be shown to be syntactically active. In English, the implicit subject determines the agreement on the finite verb (7a), it provides a subject for a secondary predicate (7b), and it can control the non-overt subject of a non-finite clause (7c):

- (7) a. Here ___ studies under David Daiches
(Plath 06.03.1956 1998: 126)
- b. ___ Awoke rested at the Mels Packing and the temples with Terence.
(Smart 1992: 144)
- c. ___ Walked there – feeling light and airy
(Smart 1992: 115)

In French (4), the form *ai* 'have' is the first-person singular, it contrasts with first-person plural *avons* 'have' in (8a); in (8b), the non-overt third-person singular subject binds the reflexive *se* 'herself', and the past participle *arrêtée* 'stopped' shows agreement with the feminine implicit subject; in (8c), the implied first-person subject controls the subject of the non-finite clause.

- (8) a. 9 Avril 1959
___ Avons assez longuement parlé de Heidegger.
___ have-1PL rather long talked about Heidegger
'Talked about Heidegger for rather a long time.'
(Laporte 2000: 64)
- b. La copine de Louisette a eu un abcès à la gorge
the friend of Louisette has had an abscess on the throat
___ s'est arrêtée 5 jours
___ REFLEXIVE-is stopped-FSG 5 days
'Louisette's friend had an abscess at the throat. Stopped work for 5 days.'
(Weil 1951: 47)
- c. ___ N'arrive pas à ___me rattraper.
___ne manage not to ___REFLEXIVE catch-up
'Don't manage to catch up.'
(Weil 1951: 43)

The register-specific implicit subject differs crucially from the implicit demoted agent in the ‘agentless’ short passive. Familiar arguments for postulating an implicit agent in the passive include, for instance, its capacity for controlling into a non-finite clause or for controlling manner adjuncts. The implicit agent in the passive does not control verb agreement, which is determined by the nominal promoted to subject position, nor does it control a floating quantifier, as illustrated in English (9a,b) and in French (9c,d).

- (9) a. The text was (*all (of them)) analysed (*all of them).
b. The proposal was (*each of them) accepted (*each of them).
c. Le texte a été (*tous) analysé (*tous).
the text has been (*all) analysed (*all)
‘The text was analysed.’
d. La proposition a été (*chacun) acceptée (*chacun).
the proposal has been (*each) accepted (*each)
‘The proposal was accepted.’

In contrast, the register-specific implicit subject controls agreement (4), (7), (8a) and floating quantifiers: (10a,b) illustrates English, (10c,d) French.

- (10) a. ___ Have all (of them) signed up for weekend duties.
b. ___ Have each of them accepted the proposal.
c. ___ Avons tous pris la parole successivement.
___ have all taken the floor successively
‘All took the floor one after the other.’
d. ___ Avons chacun lu un extrait de notre texte.
have.1PL each read an extract of our text
‘Have each read an extract from our text.’

Our hypothesis is that while there is an implicit argument both in agentless passives and with register-specific subject omission, only in the second case is this argument syntactically represented as a subject. As shown in §2.2.3, register-specific subjectless sentences pattern with sentences with overt subjects in terms of clausal functional structure. Hence, we assume that the register-specific implicit subject is a non-overt nominal in the canonical subject position of the finite clause, which means that register-specific subjectless sentences are projected up to at least the functional level associated with the canonical subject position. For the representation of the implicit subject in the agentless passive we refer to Collins (2005, 2018).

Observe that though in the specific written registers under discussion here subject omission does arise, with varying frequency, omission of object pronouns is not attested (but see §2.2.4.2). For instance, while contextually recoverable, object pronouns are systematically overt in the following extracts. Object omission, as represented by the parenthesis and which might involve a fronted object that is subsequently deleted,¹ is not attested.

- (11) a. Seagulls about – one does not usually see *(them) here.
(Orwell 2010: 23 July 1939; <https://orwelldiaries.wordpress.com/2009/07/23/23739>)
- b. Puis ___ suis allée cisailier les trop gros,
then ___ am gone cut the too big (ones)
ce pourquoi Bret m'a marqué 1/2 h (effectivement).
this for which Bret me has put down ½ hour (effectively)
À 9 h 1/4 ___ suis allée *(les) découper, jusqu'à 9 h 1/2.
At 9.15 ___ am gone them cut, until 9.30
'Then went to cut up the bigger ones, for which Bret has marked up half an hour (effectively). At 9.15 went to cut them up from nine fifteen till nine thirty.'
- (Weil 1951: 39)

2.2.2 Interpretive properties: grammatical person

2.2.2.1 Third-person subject omission

Subject omission in diary-writing is sometimes said to be limited to first-person subjects. This generalization is incorrect, as already shown in (7a) and (8b,c). Based on a 30-page excerpt from the 1940 *Diary of Virginia Woolf* (1986), Ihsane (1998) reports that out of 111 omitted referential subjects 53 are first-person singular, 17 first-person plural, 36 third-person singular, and 5 third-person plural (Ihsane 1998: 24, table F).

Because speaker coordinates are always available, first-person subject omission can arise 'out of the blue'. On the other hand, third-person subjects will only be interpretable provided there is a contextually salient referent (cf. Teddiman & Newman 2007). If a referent is highly topical in the discourse context, a diary

¹ If topic drop were available, example (11a) could come out roughly as in (i), analogous to Germanic topic drop in (ii), in which the fronted demonstrative *das* ('that') is omitted (thanks to an anonymous reviewer for this volume for pointing out the type of example required here):

- (i) *(Those) one does not normally see here.
(ii) (Das) Habe ich auch gesehen.
(that) have I also seen

22 LILIANE HAEGEMAN AND ELISABETH STARK

entry may start out with an ‘out of the blue’ third-person null subject. This is illustrated by Léautaud’s diary, *Le Fléau*: the 29 March 1929 entry starts off with a third-person null subject which corresponds to the overall topic of this diary.

(12) Lundi 29 mars 1920

___ Arrive au *Mercur*e à cinq heures. ___ A été voir Gina.
___ arrives at the *Mercur*e at 5 o’clock. ___ has been see.INF Gina
‘Arrives at the *Mercur*e at five o’clock. Had been to see Gina.’

(Léautaud 1956: 71)

Register-specific omission of non-referential third-person subjects is also attested. Such subjects obviously do not need an antecedent and can be omitted ‘out of the blue’. (13) provides English and French examples.²

(13) a. ___ Rained again in the night, fine today & reasonably warm.

(Orwell 2010: 228, 29 November 1939)

b. ___ Seems clear that Parliament will adjourn as usual with no previous arrangements for recall before October.

(Orwell 2010: 227, 30 July 1939)

c. ___ Seems to have been a little rain last night.

(Orwell 2010: 240, 15 April 1940)

d. ___ Faut les soutenir avec la main
___ must them keep with the hand
pour les enfler dans la matrice.
for them put in the matrix

‘You have to support them with your hand to fit them in the matrix.’

(Weil 1951: 47)

2.2.2.2 Second-person subject omission

So far, second-person pronoun omission has not been found attested in diary-style writing, but as such the absence of second-person pronoun omission need not entail that register-specific subject omission is incompatible with a second-person subject.³ This is so because in diary-style writing, second-person subjects are extremely rare, if at all present. For instance, Nyanan (2013)’s 5.469-word sample drawn from Harry S. Truman’s 1947 diary (<https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/>) contains only two examples with second-person subjects. In Nyanan’s corpus,

² French seems more restricted than English, with subjects of atmospheric verbs less likely to be omitted. This requires further study.

³ Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for this volume for bringing up this point, which has proven to be another distinctive property that singles out subject omission in the written registers of English and French.

subject omission runs at between 60 per cent for first person and 6 per cent for third person; hence the absence of second-person subject omission may be a by-product of the rarity of this subject type in the register. We will add some further comments on this point; a full exploration of the person restriction awaits further research.

In relation to the English abbreviated writing style of notes (see Janda 1985), Andrew Weir (p.c.) points out that for him second-person subject omission is unavailable in the written register: '[14] is fine on a 1p or 3p reading – it's only 2p which is ungrammatical.'

(14) *In this section, ___ should provide a more detailed argument.

For French, Berthelot (2017: 84–5) signals the following register-specific contrast: in some varieties of informal spoken French, second-person plural omission is available, as illustrated in (15a) (Berthelot 2017: 84, (230)); in informal spoken French as well as in informal notes, second-person singular omission (Berthelot 2017: 85, (234)) is not, as shown in (15b) and (15c). For (15c), a first-person singular reading is available ('I should write'). As an account, Berthelot (2017) suggests that the relatively 'rich' morphology of the second-person plural in (15a) might be involved in licensing subject omission; however, such an account cannot be invoked for English (14), given the poverty of inflectional marking in English.⁴

- (15) a. (Vous) R'prendrez bien un petit verre, Commissaire, non?
(you) will-have-2PL well a drink, boss, *non*
'You'll have another drink, won't you, Boss?'
- b. ___Ai fait les courses. Tout est au frigo.
___have done the shopping. Everything is in the fridge.
'Went shopping. All is in the fridge.'
- * ___As plus qu' à mettre la table.
___have-2SG just got to lay the table
'*(You) only have to lay the table.'
- c. (as a note stapled to a folder addressed to a collaborator)
___ Te ferai part de mes commentaires
___you-ACC will-do part of my comments
lundi au plus tard.
Monday at the latest
'I'll let you have my comments Monday at the latest.'

⁴ Because (15a) originates in the spoken variety and (15b) and (15c) are from the written variety, the precise scope of the effect of number is unclear. See also (16).

* ____ Devrais rédiger une note de synthèse.
____ should write a note of synthesis
'(You) should write a synthesis note.'

For French text messages, Robert-Tissot (2018) notes that second-person subject omission usually coincides with omission of the finite auxiliary, as illustrated in (16a). (16b) (her (497)) is the only token in which a second-person plural subject is omitted with a finite verb.

- (16) a. Ø Ø Bien rentrés. On vs. appelle demain. Becs (14444)
Ø Ø well returned. We you call tomorrow. Becs
'Returned home safely. We'll call you tomorrow.'
(Robert-Tissot 2018: 251, her (110))
- b. Ø pouvez passer nun autre jours Ok merci (18692)
Ø can come-by another day. OK thanks
'You can come another day. OK thanks.'
(Robert-Tissot 2018: 251, her (110))

While it is not obvious that subject omission in text messaging is subject to the same constraints as that in written registers, the fact that (16b) is second-person plural is potentially of interest.

The observed second-person restriction, if confirmed, entails that English and French register-specific subject omission cannot be assimilated to the left-peripheral subject omission in German illustrated in (17) from Trutkowski (2016: 9, adapted from her (19)), in which both first- and second-person subjects can be omitted 'out of the blue':

- (17) a. Ø Komme/Kommst leider immer zu spät.
[I/You-SG] come unfortunately always too late
- b. Ø Kommen/Kommt leider immer zu spät.
[We/You-PL] come unfortunately always too late

This conclusion was also reached on independent grounds by Trutkowski (2016: 194–5).⁵ For German first- and second-person subject omission, Trutkowski (2016) suggests an analysis according to which the null subjects are licensed by the inflection of the finite verb in C. While the role of inflection might profitably be invoked to set

⁵ Trutkowski (2016: 193) gives (i), her (13c), as an example of second-person diary drop.

(i) ____ Shouldn't have took more than you gave. (Song title of the band 'Traffic'.)

Note, though, that it is likely that this example replicates subject omission in spoken English, which has been shown to differ from that in the written registers (Napoli 1982; Weir 2012).

apart second-person plural verb forms in French (as in Berthelot 2017), it is clear that such an account would carry over to English, given its paucity of inflection.

2.2.3 Against a non-sentential analysis

For some cases of register-specific subject omission, one might propose that the subjectless configurations are non-sentential fragments (cf. Paesini 2006). Thus, for instance, (18a) might be analysed as a vP. However, given the availability of finite modal (18b) and aspectual (18c) auxiliaries, as well as the negation marker (18d) in English subjectless sentences, this analysis is insufficiently general.

- (18) a. ___ Planted 3 lupin roots.
(Orwell 2010: 241, 20 April 1940)
- b. (___ may possibly take but not flower this year).
(Orwell 2010: 241, 20 April 1940)
- c. ___ has thrown her wedding ring into the cauldron too.
(Woolf 1986: 6, 10.1.1936)
- d. ___ Don't know whether they will survive.
(Orwell 2010: 240, 13 April 1940)

This argumentation carries over to French: subjects of finite aspectual auxiliaries can be omitted (19a). Indeed, in French, the very presence of the finite lexical verb is evidence for the presence of functional material because, since Pollock (1989), the consensus has been that French finite verbs invariably exit the VP and move to a higher functional layer (say TP). So, even without an auxiliary, examples with lexical verbs only such as (19b)–(19c) constitute evidence against a non-sentential analysis. The presence of the object clitic *me* in (19b) and that of the preverbal negation marker *ne* in (19c) also argues against an analysis in which the structure is reduced to vP.

- (19) a. Par contre ___ suis allé rouler hier
on the other hand ___ be.1SG go.PTCP ride yesterday
'On the other hand, went for a ride yesterday.'
- b. ___ M'accompagne au Mercure, puis à la gare.
___ me accompanies to the Mercure, then to the station.
'Accompanies me to the Mercure, then to the station.'
(Léautaud 1956: 69–70, 20.3)
- c. La nuit, ___ne dors pas (mal de tête);
the night ___ne sleep-.SG not (headache);
'Don't sleep at night (headache).'
- (Weil 1951: 56)

2.2.4 Distributional restrictions

In the ‘restrictive’ dialect (see §2.2.4.2), register-specific subject omission is restricted to the leftmost edge of the clause. Here we go over some distributional restrictions on subject omission that follow from this constraint.

2.2.4.1 Left-edge material

Register-specific subject omission is not available to the right of an inverted auxiliary. In (20a), the overt subject *I* is preceded by an auxiliary; our informants agree that it cannot be omitted. (20b) reproduces a note composed in the abbreviated style compatible with subject omission. The omitted subject of the auxiliary *would* is interpreted as *we*, that is to say the authorities issuing the firearms licence. In the next sentence, the same subject follows a fronted auxiliary, *have*, and has not been omitted.

- (20) a. Shall *(I) now continue this soliloquy?
(Woolf 1982: 190, Sunday 12 August 1928)
- b. A note attached to Atherton’s first application for a firearms licence in 2006 said:
‘[...] ___ was cautioned for assault. ___ Still resides with partner and son and daughter. ___ Would like to refuse, have *(we) sufficient to refuse re public safety?’
(quoted in *Guardian* 9.3.13: 22, col 1–2)

The same restriction holds for French: when an auxiliary inverts with the pronominal subject (clitic), the latter is always overt. In (21), the root clause subject is omitted. Given the context and given the specialized inflectional form, the first-person singular subject of the inverted auxiliaries *ai* (‘have’) and *suis* (‘am’) would be fully recoverable, and yet, the pronoun is systematically overt.

- (21) 7 October 1950
Aujourd’hui, malgré la fatigue et des ennuis matériels,
today, despite the tiredness and the worries material
___ viens de passer un bon moment...
___ come.1SG from passing a good moment
‘Today, in spite of the tiredness and my material worries, have spent a nice time.’
[...]
Tout d’un coup, ___ ai vu un bateau me faire face;
suddenly ___ have.1SG seen a boat in front of me

auparavant ___ regardais le tableau plutôt de gauche à droite.
before ___ watch.PST.1SG the painting rather from left to right
[...]

‘Suddenly saw a boat facing me; before, had been looking at the painting from left to right.’

(Pourquoi ne l’ai- *(je) pas encore fait, me suis- *(je) dit.
why ne it have.1SG *(I) not yet done, me be-1SG *(I) said
Pourquoi n’y ai- *(je) pas encore pensé?...
why ne there have.1SG *(I) not yet thought

‘Why haven’t I done it yet, I told myself. Why didn’t I think of that?’

(Laporte 2000: 38)

The subject is also systematically overt when preceded by a fronted *wh*-phrase or a fronted argument. In English (22a), the subject of *hate* is the diary-writer, but nevertheless the subject is not deleted to the right of *how*.⁶ In (22b) and (22c), an overt subject (*one*, *I*) is preceded by a fronted complement nominal (*this*, *him*, *her*) and the subject cannot be omitted. Similarly, in (22d), while the subject of *filmed* is deleted in a position to the right of the fronted adjunct *in the afternoon*, it is not omitted to the right of the fronted argument *all this*.

(22) a. Waiting for Gumbo [Marjorie Strachey] – how *(I) hate waiting for anybody! Can’t settle, read, think.

(Woolf 1982: 182, 24 April 1928)

b. One remembers old lovelinesses: ___ knows that it is now looking ugly; ___ waits to see it light up; ___ knows where to find its beauty; how to ignore bad things. This *(one) can’t do the first time of seeing.

(Woolf 1982: 192, 14 August 1928)

c. And here was I, the intellectual, the labour woman, doing just the same. And there were the Russell Cookes; her *(I) liked; him *(I) hated.

(Woolf 1982: 197, 22 September 1928)

d. In the afternoon ___ filmed some very bizarre pieces, including the death of Gengis Khan, and two men carrying a donkey past a Butlins redcoat, who later gets hit on the head with a raw chicken by a man from the previous sketch, who borrowed the chicken from a man in a suit of armour. All this *(we) filmed in the 80° sunshine with a small crowd of holiday-makers watching.

(Palin 2007: 3, 11 July 1969)

⁶ Andrew Radford (2018: 257) points out that colloquial English allows subject omission after *how come*. We refer to this work for an analysis.

(22d) already reveals an argument-adjunct asymmetry: a fronted argument blocks subject omission, but subject omission remains compatible with the initial adjunct *in the afternoon*. (7a) and (23) are additional illustrations of subject omission in the context of an initial adjunct, both for English and for French.⁷

- (23) a. With a sigh of relief ___ saw a heap of ruins.
(Woolf 1986: 330, 1940; Ihsane 1998, 40j))
- b. Tout de suite ___ m'a parlé de ma visite chez elle.
immediately ___ me have-3sg talk-part about my visit to her
'Immediately, talked to me about my visit to her.'
(Léautaud 1956: 45)
- c. A l'arrêt, ___ sens tout le poids de la fatigue
at the end ___ feel all the weight of the tiredness
'At the end, am feeling the full weight of my tiredness.'
(Weil 1951: 51)

2.2.4.2 The root restriction

Register-specific subject omission is a root phenomenon. Typically, in contexts where the subject is omitted in a matrix clause, an embedded subject remains overt, even when coreferential with the matrix subject or contextually recoverable, and omission of the embedded subject is judged unacceptable. (24) provides examples from English. In (24a), all root clauses display an understood first-person singular subject. It is clear from the context that the subject of the embedded verb *damaged* is also the

⁷ For completeness'sake note that we also found one example of French diary-writing in which a null subject appears to be preceded by *moi*, the strong pronoun that reduplicates the subject:

- (i) Moi, en fureur contre moi-même
me in rage against myself
(sans raison, car personne ne m'avait dit que je ne frappais pas assez fort),
(without reason, for no one *ne* me-had said that I *ne* hit not enough hard)
___ avais le sentiment stupide
___ had the sentiment stupid
que ça ne valait pas la peine de faire attention à me protéger.
that this was not worth paying attention to protect myself

(Weil 1951: 31)

Initial *moi* co-occurring with a null subject are also reported for text messages by Robert-Tissot (2018) and Stark and Robert-Tissot (2017).

The analysis of this—admittedly rare—pattern remains unclear. If *moi* is located in the left periphery of the subjectless sentence, this would defy various hypotheses such as truncation or non-spell-out of the left periphery (§9.2.5). One interpretation of (i) might be that the string *moi en fureur contre moi-même* constitutes a small clause, and that the subjectless string is parsed as a new sentence. One might also propose that *moi* in (i) patterns with adjuncts; or that *moi* is analysed as a main clause external constituent. Finally, yet another option would be to postulate that *moi* occupies Spec-SubjP, i.e. that *moi* is the canonical subject. It has been pointed out that from a diachronic perspective as well *moi* might be on its way to replace *je* as the canonical subject in some registers (see Detges 2013, for *moi je*-combinations in spoken corpus data where the *je*-element has almost disappeared). We leave this speculation for future research.

first-person singular and yet this subject is overt and for the speakers consulted it cannot be omitted. See also Nariyama (2004: 246–9). In (24b), the embedded finite verb *is* is unambiguously third-person singular.

- (24) a. ___ Finished digging limed patch. ___ Transplanted apple tree. ___ Had great difficulty uprooting it & fear *(I) damaged its roots seriously. ___ Cut down remaining Michaelmas daisies & transplanted one clump.
(Orwell 2010: 227, 24 November 1939)
- b. ___ Says *(he) has been struck by the number of more or less ordinary Conservatives *(he) has met who are becoming perturbed by the Government's foreign policy.
(Orwell 2010: 110, 22 November 1938)

The French data in (25) confirm the root character of register-specific subject omission. (25a) is partially repeated from (4); in (25b) and in (25c), the finite form *ai* 'have' is unambiguously first-person singular; nevertheless the subject must be overt. In a pilot study, no attestations of embedded subject omission were found in the diaries of Gide (1954), Weil (1951), and Roud (1982).

- (25) a. 11 April 1957
Ce matin en ouvrant la porte, pour la première fois depuis
this morning upon opening the door, for the first time since
que *(j') habite ici,
that I live here
___ ai fait s'envoler du jardin un admirable couple de
___ have.1SG made fly away from-the garden an admirable pair of
chardonnerets.
goldfinches
'Upon opening the door this morning, for the first time since I have been living here, made a pair of goldfinches fly from the garden.'
(Laporte 2000: 69)
- b. 7 October 1956
___ Ai pensé que un chantier naval était
___ have.1SG thought that a wharf maritime was.3SG
le type de lieu que *(je) devais visiter.
the type of place that *(I) must PST.1SG visit
'Have been thinking that what I should visit is a maritime wharf.'
(Laporte 2000: 38)
- c. ___ Explique à Chatel que *(j)'ai perdu 2h la veille.
___ explain to Chatel that *(I) have.1SG lost 2h the night before
'Explain to Chatel that I lost 2 hours the night before.'
(Weil 1951: 49)

For completeness' sake we add that description of the data above is, however, not fully representative of all attested diary-writing. Haegeman & Ihsane (1999, 2002) discuss the discrepancy between the 'restrictive' diary-writing, described above, in which embedded subject omission is rare to non-existent, and some recent and isolated fictional diary-writing with prolific omission of the embedded subject. (26) is from Helen Fielding's fictional *Bridget Jones's Diary*. The subject is also omitted in embedded *wh*-clauses (26c) and in adverbial clauses (26d). In (26d) the omitted subject of the main clause is 'the phone', while that of the adverbial clause is *I*. In other words, the embedded null subject is not coreferential with the matrix subject in this example.

- (26) a. ___ think ___ will cross that last bit out as ___ contains mild accusation
(Fielding 1996: 25)
- b. ___ realise ___ was using telly remote control by mistake.
(Fielding 1996: 153)
- c. ___ understand where ___ have been going wrong.
(Fielding 1996: 79)
- d. Then ___ started ringing again when ___ went away.
(Fielding 1996: 130)

As illustrated in Haegeman & Ihsane (1999: 138, (39)), this text also instantiates object omission. Haegeman & Ihsane (1999, 2002) interpret the pattern of generalized register-specific argument omission as pronoun ellipsis. We refer to their work for further discussion and examples.

- (27) a. Toy with idea of flirting energetically with anyone I think might be induced to send me one, but dismiss ___ as immoral.
(Fielding 1996: 42; Koutsandreou 1998: 41)
- b. Get second and find hole on back of leg. Throw ___ away.
(Fielding 1996: 92)

In our chapter we assume that in the 'restrictive' registers focused on here, subject omission is a root phenomenon and that varieties of English or French with prolific embedded subject omission constitute different registers. At this point it is not clear what the extent of the spread of this more liberal dialect is. Attestations are mainly associated with fictional diary-writing,⁸ but we do not exclude that

⁸ At the purely anecdotal level, Brigid Brophy reproduces a diary of one of the characters in her novel *The Snow ball* (published 1964, Cardinal edition 1990: 48, 55, 61, 65) with fairly systematic omission of embedded subjects. (i)–(iii) are some examples drawn from Brophy (1990: 64):

- (i) Felt ___ had seen something disgusting as if it was her tongue.
(ii) Admit ___ am jealous of Anna K.
(iii) When ___ went into ballroom felt as if ___ had been shot through heart.

native speakers do have a more liberal variety, possibly also influenced by other the linguistic traits of other varieties of digital communication. See Radford (2018: 259–60) for illustrations. We will not address this material and its spread in our chapter.

2.2.5 The analyses: subject omission as a register-specific property

One assumption prevalent in research on register-specific subject omission is that the pattern reflects a register-specific grammatical option unavailable in the core grammar.

2.2.5.1 Topic drop

Haegeman (1990) analyses register-specific subject omission as the result of topic drop along the lines of Raposo's (1986) account for Portuguese object drop (cf. Matushansky 1995; Wexler and Matushansky 2002). Topic drop is familiar from the Germanic languages, with German and Dutch typically discussed in the literature. We refer to Trutkowski (2016) for a recent discussion and overview of the literature. As discussed extensively in Haegeman (2013, 2017), the obvious drawbacks of a topic drop analysis are that (i) it fails to predict that non-referential subjects, which are unlikely as topics, can also be omitted, as shown in §2.2.2, and, more importantly, (ii) it wrongly predicts the availability of generalized object omission. Trutkowski (2016) argues against a topic drop analysis for first- and second-person subject omission in German (as illustrated in 17). We refer to her work for details.

2.2.5.2 Truncation

Alternative analyses of subject omission attribute the phenomenon to a deficiency of the left periphery. For instance, following work by Rizzi & Shlonsky (2006) on subject omission in the early L1 production, Haegeman (2013, 2018) proposes that register-specific subject omission arises as the result of a structural truncation according to which sentences with implicit subjects lack some of the upper functional layers of the left periphery, effectively meaning that the canonical subject position qualifies as the specifier of the root. Concretely, she proposes that the clausal projection can terminate with SubjP, the layer hosting the canonical subject position. Her analysis predicts omission of both referential and non-referential subjects, while continuing to exclude object omission, and omission of subjects in embedded domains. Haegeman (2018: 240) speculates 'that these specialized communicative contexts [of the specific registers, LH&ES] serve to set up a global and invariable interface with the discourse which remains constant for the entire text and whose coordinates therefore need not be encoded for each

utterance. The invariant discourse coordinates of these registers are common to all the utterances of the specific discourse and the intuition would be that, for reasons of economy, such fixed and shared coordinates allow for a truncation of the left periphery, i.e. the interface between the proposition and its discourse context, in the specific utterances’.

The unavailability of register-specific second-person subject omission, to the best of our knowledge first noted for French by Berthelot (2017), has not been discussed or accounted for in the truncation approach, nor—as far as we know—in any of the other analyses. We offer here some suggestions which could be explored for a full account. Assuming that person features are licensed in left-peripheral functional projections, be it by a functional head or by some licensing features (as in Sigurdsson 2010, 2011), let us pursue the truncation approach. One might speculate that the unavailability of the left-peripheral licensing projections leads to a default setting of either third person, in the presence of an accessible antecedent, or of the first person, i.e. Sigurdsson (2010, 2011)’s ‘logophoric agent’. In French, second-person plural interpretation, with its distinct morphology, could be taken to become available thanks to the finite morphology of the verb (as in Berthelot 2017).

In recent work, De Lisser et al. (2016: 279) reinterpret structural ‘truncation’ as a reflex of the non-spell-out of higher structural layers. They say:

The possibility we would like to explore is to shift the idea of truncation from structure building to the spell-out mechanism, as Fitzpatrick (2006) proposes in his treatment of (adult) aux-drop in colloquial English. Suppose that main clauses always are structurally complete structures (CPs), but their special property resides in an option of partial spell-out that is never available in embedded domains:

[24] In root clauses, spell-out can stop at SubjP.

Under this view, the privilege of the root would not consist in the possible radical absence of external layers in root clauses, but in the fact that the spell-out mechanism could leave external layers unpronounced in otherwise complete structures.

The authors do not fully explicitize the consequences of their proposal, nor do they compare its empirical consequences (if any) with those of the truncation account. A full comparison of the empirical coverages of both accounts is yet to be done.

In this chapter we will not pursue the analysis of register-specific subject omission further; we tentatively assume that an account in terms of a left-peripheral deficiency is the more promising.

2.2.5.3 Second-conjunct subject ellipsis

Second-conjunct subject ellipsis undeniably belongs to the core grammar. Wilder (1994) has proposed that register-specific subject omission and second-conjunct subject ellipsis should be analysed in the same way, effectively cancelling the need for postulating a register-specific add-on to account for subject omission. The next sections examine overlapping and contrasting properties of second-conjunct ellipsis and register-specific subject omission so as to determine to what extent it is necessary to invoke a register-specific grammatical property to capture register-specific subject omission.

2.3 Parallelisms between second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission

Second-conjunct subject ellipsis, illustrated in English (28a) (Godard 1989: 499, 1), and in French (28b) (Godard 1989: 499, 4), is uncontroversially taken to be part of the core grammar.

- (28) a. John talked to Mary today and ___ will ask her for a date.
b. Jean a parlé avec Marie aujourd'hui
Jean have.3SG talk-PTCP with Marie today
et ___ lui demandera un rendez-vous.
and ___ her ask.FUT.3SG an appointment
'Jean saw Marie today and will ask her for an appointment.'

2.3.1 Left-edge material

Both in English and French, the constraint on left-edge material associated with register-specific subject omission is replicated for second-conjunct subject ellipsis (Wilder 1994; Haegeman 1990, 1997, 1999). (29a) shows that second-conjunct subject ellipsis is incompatible with auxiliary fronting; (29b) (te Velde 2005: 231) shows that it is incompatible with argument fronting; (29c) shows that second-conjunct subject ellipsis remains compatible with the presence of an initial adjunct. Similar patterns obtain for French: subject auxiliary inversion (30a) and argument fronting (in terms of CLLD, (30b)) are incompatible with second-conjunct subject ellipsis, while adjunct fronting remains available (30c).

- (29) a. *Did you go home and did ___ find anything?
b. *That book, I like and this book, ___ do not approve of.
(Wilder 1994: 80)⁹
*This wine Bill has always drunk but that one ___ has never served to anyone.
(te Velde 2005: 231, (111b))
- c. They are dedicated golf fans and for years ___ have travelled to the Open.
- (30) a. Accepterais-tu les exemples ci-dessous
accept.COND.2SG-you the examples below
et pourrais-*(tu) éventuellement me donner des alternatives?
and can.COND.2SG you possibly me give of-the alternatives
'Would you accept the examples below and could you possibly provide alternatives?'
- b. *Le prisonnier a attaqué la première victime dans la cuisine
the prisoner has attacked.PTCP the first victim in the kitchen
et la seconde victime ___ l'a menacée
and the second victim ___ him have.3SG threaten.PTCP
dans la bibliothèque du prison.
in the library of the prison
'The prisoner attacked the first victim in the kitchen and threatened the second victim in the prison library.'
- c. L'animal restera 7 jours à l'hôpital,
the animal stay.FUT.3SG 7 days in the hospital
et après ___ partira en refuge ...
and afterwards ___ leave.FUT.3SG for the shelter ...
'The animal will remain at the hospital for seven days and after that will leave for a rescue shelter.'

2.3.2 Wilder's generalized left-edge ellipsis

The striking parallelisms between second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission shed doubt on the hypothesis that register-specific subject omission ought to be analysed in terms of a register-specific grammatical option. If the parallelism first uncovered by Wilder (1994) is complete, any 'core grammar' account for second-conjunct subject ellipsis should ideally capture

⁹ Andrew Radford (p.c.) accepts (i):

(i) This book, definitely do not approve of.

We speculate that this type of omission would be found in the more liberal variety of subject omission discussed in Haegeman and Ihsane (1999, 2002) and briefly presented in §9.2.4.2.

register-specific subject omission, entailing that register-specific subject omission is no longer set aside from the ‘core grammar’ of English and French.

The analysis of second-conjunct subject ellipsis has led to wide-ranging proposals (i.a. Camacho 2003; Goodall 1987; Bjorkman 2013, 2014). We do not review these, and we focus only on two broad analytical options for the representation of (31a), explored by Wilder (1994), which we schematize in (31b) and (31c). The simplified representations ignore further articulation of the functional structure.

- (31) a. Mary came in and sat down.
 b. [_{CP} [_{TP} Mary [_{VP} t came in]]] and [_{CP} [_{TP} ~~Mary~~ [_{VP} t sat down]]]
 (cf. Wilder 1994: 61, (9b))
 c. [_{CP} [_{TP} Mary [_{VP} t came in] and [_{VP} t sat down]]]
 (cf. Wilder 1994: 61, (9c))

In (31b), two full-fledged clauses (labelled CP) are coordinated; both include the functional layer that hosts the canonical subject position (TP). In Wilder’s analysis, forward ellipsis deletes the subject in the canonical subject position of the second conjunct under identity with that of the first conjunct. (31c) represents the ‘small conjunct analysis’, according to which the unique occurrence of the subject *Mary* in coordination is the result of the coordination of smaller constituents (vP) contained in one clausal domain in which the nominal *Mary* occupies the ‘shared’ canonical subject position, SpecTP, which scopes over both conjuncts. Assuming that the subject *Mary* originates vP internally, this analysis entails postulating across the board extraction of *Mary* from both vPs.

Wilder (1994) argues for the forward ellipsis analysis (31b). Crucially, his argument goes, left-edge ellipsis is independently needed to capture register-specific subject omission as in (32a). Second-conjunct ellipsis in (32b) is then taken to be the outcome of the coordination of two full-fledged clauses, the first with an overt subject and the second in which the subject has been deleted by left-edge ellipsis.

- (32) a. [_{CP} [_{TP} Mary [_{VP} t came in]]].
 [_{CP} [_{TP} ~~Mary~~ [_{VP} t sat down]]]
 b. [_{CP} [_{TP} Mary [_{VP} t came in]]] and [_{CP} [_{TP} ~~Mary~~ [_{VP} t sat down]]]

As mentioned, if fully confirmed, the parallelism between register-specific subject omission and second-conjunct subject ellipsis offers a challenge to any approach attributing register-specific subject omission to a register-specific grammatical property. However, it turns out that upon further scrutiny, the two patterns cannot be assimilated. In §2.4, we discuss some areas in which second-conjunct

subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission diverge. The data discussed in §2.4 will lead us to propose that, adopting the hypothesis of an articulated subject field, second-conjunct subject ellipsis can best be captured by a specific implementation of the small conjunct coordination analysis (31c).

Anticipating somewhat, §2.5 will show that the clausal coordination analysis summarized in (32b) can capture novel empirical data related to register-specific subject omission.

2.4 Asymmetries between second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission

This section illustrates divergences between second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission.

2.4.1 No root restriction for second-conjunct subject ellipsis

The root restriction on register-specific subject omission does not carry over to second-conjunct subject ellipsis: in the coordinated embedded clauses in (33a), the subject of the second conjunct is deleted. In (33b), second-conjunct subject ellipsis is ungrammatical not because of a root restriction but rather because of the presence of left-edge material, i.e. the overt complementizer *that*, which is incompatible with the ellipsis of the subject to its immediate right. Similar patterns are found with, for instance, embedded interrogatives (34) or adverbial clauses (35).

- (33) a. They said that he should go home and ___ would be informed of their decision later in the week.
b. *They said that he should go home and that ___ would be informed of their decision later in the week.
- (34) a. I wonder why they went home and ___ did not contact the police.
b. *I wonder why they went home and why ___ did not contact the police
- (35) a. He decided to visit the shop himself when he had been denied access to the website and had tried calling their agency.
b. *He decided to visit the shop himself when he had been denied access to the website and after/when ___ had tried calling their agency.

Replicating the patterns in French is impossible for independent reasons: conjunction of clauses (matrix and embedded) takes place at the CP level, rather than

the TP level, as shown in (36). Given that the subordinating conjunction (*si, quand, que*) cannot be omitted in the conjoined embedded clause, the presence of the left-edge material will always block subject ellipsis.¹⁰

- (36) a. Si demain il fait beau et *(si/que) j'ai le temps,
 if tomorrow it do.3SG nice and *(if/that) I have.1SG the time,
 j'irai skier à St. Moritz.
 I go.FUT.1SG skiing in St. Moritz
 'If tomorrow the weather is nice and if I have time I will go skiing in
 St. Moritz.'
- b. Quand tu seras en congé
 when you be.FUT.2SG on leave
 et *(quand/que) je le serai aussi,
 and *(when/that) I it be.FUT.1SG also,
 on ira skier
 one go.FUT.3SG skiing
 'When you are on holiday and I will be too, we'll go skiing.'

2.4.2 The interpretation of the implicit subject

2.4.2.1 Second-person subjects

As mentioned in §2.2.2, given the appropriate context, both first- and third-person register-specific subject omission is available even in the absence of an overt 'antecedent' for the omitted subject. As discussed in §2.2.2.2, however, the data suggest that register-specific second-person subject omission is highly restricted. Though further research is required for full confirmation, the restriction seems to be valid both for English (see (14)) and for French second-person singular (see (15)–(16)).

As discussed in §2.4.2.2, second-conjunct subject ellipsis depends on an identity requirement with the subject of the first conjunct. As long as this is satisfied, second-person subject ellipsis is possible (thanks to Andrew Radford (p.c) for help with the data). Note that the presence of a finite auxiliary in the second conjunct in (37) excludes an analysis in terms of vP-coordination:

- (37) a. You should take the first road on the right and ___ will be able to see the museum on the top of the hill.
 b. You have to register for the conference now and ___ should then get the updates by email.

¹⁰ Thanks to Jean-Marc Authier's discussion and for help with the data.

The pattern in (37) carries over to French (2b) (though there are some restrictions on second-conjunct ellipsis which we don't address here, cf. Rizzi 1986; Zribi-Hertz 1994; Sportiche 1998; Haegeman 2018). For reasons of space we do not illustrate the French patterns.

2.4.2.2 The identity restriction

In second-conjunct ellipsis, the subject of the second conjunct is coreferential with that of the first conjunct. This condition is categorical in the core grammar. In (38a), the third-person referential subject in the first conjunct, *the deadline*, controls the interpretation of the non-overt subject in the second conjunct; in (38b) the subject in the second conjunct is interpreted as identical to the first-person subject in the first conjunct; in French (38c), the subject of the second conjunct is obligatorily read as being 'Jean', the subject of the first conjunct.

- (38) a. The deadline for submission was tomorrow but ___ has now been postponed till next week.
b. I am working on my application and ___ will submit it after the weekend.
c. Jean avait du retard
Jean had.3SG delay
et ___ n'avait pas mon numéro de téléphone.
and ___ n-had.3SG not my number of phone
'Jean was late and did not have my phone number.'

Ellipsis of a subject of the second conjunct with a construal different from that of the first conjunct is ungrammatical in the core grammar, as shown in (39).

- (39) a. *My train was late and ___ had forgotten my phone.
b. *Mon train avait du retard
my train had.3SG delay
et ___ avais oublié mon téléphone.
but ___ had.1SG forgotten my phone

In contrast, in a diary context a sentence with an overt subject can be followed by one that has a null subject which, crucially, is not coreferential with the subject of the preceding clause, as seen in (40):

- (40) Hares are mating. ___ Saw sparrow-hawks courting in the air.
(Orwell 2010: 239, 9 April 1940)

2.4.3 Quantified antecedents

2.4.3.1 The pattern

In (41a), second-conjunct ellipsis is licit in a configuration with the bare quantifier *no one* as the subject of the first conjunct. In the second conjunct, the pronoun *his* is bound by the quantifier *no one*. As a diary-style entry, on the other hand, (41b) cannot have the reading in which the omitted subject of *has felt* would be ‘no one’ and in which *his* has a bound reading. (41b) conveys that (i) the message was not read and (ii) some contextually salient male person did not feel it his duty to react. We interpret this to mean that with a thematic subject, register-specific subject omission is ultimately dependent on the availability of a referential antecedent.

- (41) a. No one has read this message and ___ has not felt it his duty to react.
b. No one has read this message. ___ has not felt it his duty to react.

French (42) replicates the pattern with the bare quantifier *chacun* ‘each’ as the subject (Lena Baunaz p.c.). In (42a), second subject conjunct ellipsis is licit with *chacun* as the subject of the first conjunct. The pronoun *son* (‘his’) in the second-conjunct is bound by the quantifier *chacun*. In contrast, as a diary entry, (42b) cannot have the reading in which the omitted subject of *est dévoué* is ‘everyone’ and in which *son* receives a bound reading.

- (42) a. Chacun fait son devoir et ___est dévoué à son université.
each does his duty and ___is devoted to his university
‘Everyone does his duty and is devoted to his university.’
b. Chacun fait son devoir. ___ est dévoué à son université.
each does his duty. ___ is devoted to his university
‘Everyone does his duty. Is devoted to his university.’

Observe that it is not the presence of the conjunction *and/et* that determines the difference between second-conjunct subject ellipsis and register-specific subject omission. As shown by (41c) and (42c) below, subject ellipsis with binding of the relevant pronoun remains available in a second asyndetic conjunct (thanks to Lena Baunaz for signalling these data):

- (41) c. No one spends 4 years at university, ___ passes all his exams, and ___ does not expect to get his degree.

- (42) c. Chacun fait son devoir, ___ s'est dévoué à son université,
each does his duty. ___ is devoted to his university
et ___ arrive à trouver un emploi après.
and ___ manages to find a job afterwards
'Everyone does his duty, is devoted to his university and expects to find a
job at the end.'

2.4.3.2 A shared SubjP

The small-conjunct analysis can capture second-conjunct subject ellipsis with a quantificational subject in the first conjunct (43a): in this configuration, one shared quantified subject will scope over the two conjuncts. To isolate the subject from the remainder of the clause, which also comprizes the finite auxiliary in English, we adopt the cartographic view of the subject domain according to which the properties of the subject are spread over several projections. In line with Cardinaletti (1997, 2004), and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006), we assume that the articulated subject field comprises a projection, SubjP, the locus for the subject of predication or the aboutness topic; SubjP dominates TP, the locus for agreement and case checking of the subject. In the case of second-conjunct subject ellipsis, we postulate that one shared subject occupies the specifier of the unique, shared, SubjP. The idea is that in coordination the subject is extracted in across-the-board (Ross 1967) fashion from both conjuncts, transiting through SpecTP. (43b) is a schematic representation.

- (43) a. No one has read the message and has not felt it his duty to react.
b. [_{SubjP} No one [_{TP} t has [_{vP} t read the message]] and [_{TP} t has not [_{vP} t felt it his duty to react]]]

To summarize: quantificational, i.e. non-referential, nominals may appear as the shared subject in a coordinate clause. Observe that if a small-conjunct analysis with shared SubjP is invoked for such cases, then it also becomes available for cases with a referential subject in the first conjunct. (44a) would have the representation in (44b) (see Haegeman 2013).

- (44) a. George has read the message and has not felt it his duty to react.
b. [_{SubjP} George [_{TP} t has [_{vP} t read the message]] and [_{TP} t has not [_{vP} t felt it his duty to react]]]

This raises the question whether the full clausal coordination configuration is ever available for second-conjunct subject ellipsis. In §2.5, we show that one context in which such an analysis is required relates to second-conjunct ellipsis in registers allowing register-specific subject omission. Crucially, the relevant pattern diverges from that in the core grammar.

2.5 Second-conjunct subject ellipsis in the diary register

As discussed in §2.4.2, second-conjunct subject ellipsis depends on identity of the deleted subject with the subject of the first conjunct. In (45), a constructed example, second-conjunct ellipsis is not available with the subject of *found* construed as first person.

- (45) *The big crab tree in the lane has failed to produce any apples, but ___ found others with fruit.

However, while non-coreferential second-conjunct subject ellipsis (45) is unacceptable in the core usage, examples like those in (46),¹¹ which have not been discussed in the literature, show that the pattern is available in the diary register. In (46a), for instance, the subject of the first conjunct is *the big crab tree in the lane*, while the understood subject of the second conjunct is the diary-writer, *I*. (46d) was provided by Andrew Radford (p.c) and (46e), which contains two relevant examples, was found on a blog. (47) presents an analogous French example from a WhatsApp message (cf. Stark, Ueberwasser, & Göhring 2014–).¹²

- (46) a. The big crab tree in the lane has failed to produce any apples, but ___ found others with fruit.
(Orwell 2010: 185, 6 August 1939)
- b. By evening 7 ducks; the eighth shows no signs of hatching but ___ have put it under the hen for the night.
(Orwell 2010: 154, 29 June 1939)
- c. Posts are not long enough for gate posts, but ___ can have an extra piece fitted on if I can get hold of some timber.
(Orwell 2010: 221, 25 October 1939)
- d. It was cold, but ___ decided to get myself out of the house out anyway.
(Andrew Radford, p.c)
- e. Made this for a dinner party dessert as one person was dairy intolerant. ___ Was absolutely delicious and ___ was asked for the recipe. ___ Didn't have an ice cream maker but ___ was simple to do by hand.
(<https://www.bbcgoodfood.com/recipes/1791/banana-ice-sundaes-with-fudge-sauce>, consulted 9 December 2019)

¹¹ All attestations are considered acceptable as diary entries by Andrew Weir and by Andrew Radford (p.c).

¹² Becquet (2000) signals the pattern in the 'liberal' variety of diary-writing illustrated by Helen Fielding's *Bridget Jones's Diary* (cf. §9.2.4.2).

- (47) Elle a marqué 3 goals...
she have.3SG marked 3 goals
mais Ø sont pas qualifiées
but Ø be.3PL not qualified.3.F.PL
'Scored three goals but did not qualify.'

(Stark, Ueberwasser, & Göhring 2014–, 296998)

Some provisional comments are in order: so far, all attestations except one (in 46e) have *but* or *mais* ('but') as their coordinating conjunction; so does the constructed (46d). Furthermore, this pattern is judged unacceptable in informal spoken registers of English that allow subject omission (Andrew Radford, Andrew Weir, p.c.), introducing an additional contrast between spoken subject omission and written subject omission that to the best of our knowledge was not noted before. For a recent comparison between spoken and written registers see Weir (2012).

A natural account suggests itself. Register-specific subject omission is not dependent on the presence of a linguistic antecedent in the (local) context. Specifically, while third-person subject omission ultimately depends on an accessible discourse antecedent, 'out of the blue' ellipsis of first-person subjects is possible (see §2.2.2). The data in (46) and (47) can be analysed as resulting from the coordination of two full-fledged clauses, each with its own canonical subject position; the second of these displays register-specific subject omission. Precisely because subject omission is register-specific, second-conjunct ellipsis of unlike subjects remains excluded in the core grammar.

2.6 Conclusion

In English and French, two non-*pro*-drop languages, subjects can be omitted in configurations of second-conjunct subject ellipsis in the core grammar and as a result of register-specific subject omission. The two languages are strikingly similar in terms of the distributional and interpretive properties of these two patterns.

At first sight, the similarities between register-specific subject omission and second-conjunct ellipsis present a challenge for accounts which ascribe register-specific subject omission to a register-specific grammatical property. However, this chapter shows that the two phenomena cannot be assimilated. Mainly based on patterns with a shared quantificational subject, we tentatively adopt the small conjunct coordination analysis for second-conjunct subject ellipsis. For register-specific subject omission, a register-specific account remains needed to derive finite clauses without an overt subject.

The availability in the diary-style register (and in French WhatsApp messages) of ellipsis of a second-conjunct subject which is not coreferential with the subject of the first conjunct can be analysed as the output of the coordination of two full-fledged clauses, the second of which has a null subject.

Acknowledgements

This research was partly funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation, projects ‘SMS Communication in Switzerland’ (project number CRSIII_136230) and ‘Whats up, Switzerland?’ (project number CRSIII_160714). This chapter was presented as a paper at the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Linguistics Association of Great Britain at Queen Mary University London, 9–12 September 2019. We thank the audience for their comments. We also thank the following colleagues for discussion and for their generous help with examples: Jean-Marc Authier, Lena Baunaz, Patricia Cabredo Hofherr, Andrew Radford, Andrew Weir, and Anne Zribi-Hertz. We also thank Larissa Binder for help with the French data.

Primary sources

- Brophy, Brigid (1990). *The Snow Ball*. First published by Secker & Warburg (London), 1964, Indianapolis: Cardinal.
- Fielding, Helen (1996). *Bridget Jones’s Diary*. London: Picador.
- Gide, André (1954). *Journal 1939–1949. Souvenirs*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard [Bibliothèque de la Pléiade].
- Laporte, Roger (2000). *Variations sur des Carnets*. Portiragnes: Éditions Cadex.
- Léautaud, Paul (1956). *Le Fléau. Journal Particulier 1917–1930*. Paris: Mercure de France.
- Orwell, George (2010). *Diaries*, edited by Peter Davison. London, Harmondsworth: Penguin Modern Classics.
- Palin, Michael (2007). *Diaries 1969–1979. The Python Years*. London: Phoenix.
- Plath, Sylvia (1998). *The Journals of Sylvia Plath*. New York: Anchor Books, paperback.
- Roud, Gustave (1982). *Journal (1916–1971)*. Vevey: Bertil Galland.
- Smart, Elizabeth (1992). *Necessary Secrets*. New York: Harper Collins/Paladin.
- Stark, Elisabeth, Simone Ueberwasser, and Anne Göhring (2014–). *Corpus «What’s up, Switzerland»*, University of Zurich. www.whatsup-switzerland.ch.
- Weil, Simone (1951). ‘Journal d’Usine (1934–1935)’, in *La Condition ouvrière*. Paris: Les Éditions Gallimard, 29–64.
- Woolf, Virginia (1982). *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, vol. III. Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics.
- Woolf, Virginia (1986). *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, vol. V. Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics.