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Abstract

Elided VPs and their antecedent VPs can mismatch in voice, with passive VPs being elided under apparent identity with active antecedent VPs, and vice versa. Such voice mismatches are not allowed in any other kind of ellipsis, such as sluicing and other clausal ellipses. These latter facts appear to indicate that the identity relation in ellipsis is sensitive to syntactic form, not merely to semantic form. The VP-ellipsis facts fall into place if the head that determines voice is external to the phrase being elided, here argued to be vP; such an account can only be framed in approaches that allow for the separation of syntactic features from the heads on which they are morphologically realized. Alternatives to this syntactic, articulated view of ellipsis and voice either undergenerate or overgenerate.
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1 Introduction

The conditions that regulate the distribution of ellipsis have long held a central place in linguistic theory because of the possibility they raise for shedding light on fundamental questions about the form–meaning mapping. Various theories in the last four decades have used elliptical constructions as testing grounds for exploring the nature of the various posited components of the grammar, both syntax–phonology interactions and syntax–semantic ones. Elliptical phenomena were, and continue to be, a central point in the debate over the nature of linguistic representations as well, with two strands distinguishable, broadly speaking: those that take ellipsis to be entirely a semantic phenomenon, and those that posit that ellipsis is sensitive to syntactic form (either in lieu of semantic form or as a supplement to it). The question is important because how it is answered has straightforward implications for the fundamentals of linguistic theory. If syntactic form is implicated, grammar formalisms that eschew unpronounced syntactic structures must be amended or abandoned, and grammars must countenance a degree of abstractness in their representations which at first sight may appear to be at odds with folk intuitions about the structure of phrases and clauses.

It is in this light that the contrasts between voice mismatches in varying kinds of ellipses loom large. Deviance from identical values for voice on a verbal head can occur in VP-ellipses in English, but not in other elliptical structures (sluicing, fragment answers, gapping, stripping, and pseudogapping). The generalization that emerges is that when the target of ellipsis is a small amount of structure, such as a VP, mismatches in voice appear to be possible, but when more structure is targeted, as in sluicing and the like, no voice mismatch is allowed. The first part of the paper presents in detail the data underlying these empirical assertions. The rest then presents an analysis of these data in terms of the size of the elided constituent, crucially turning on the question of whether the head that determines voice is or is not included in the ellipsis site. Voice mismatch turns out to be an illusion: the identity relation that regulates ellipsis does not tolerate differences in value for the feature voice. It is only apparently so for VP-ellipsis, because the head bearing the syntactic feature that determines the voice morphology on the verb is external to the verbal projection targeted by ellipsis. When this voice head is internal to the elided projection, apparent voice mismatch is seen to be impossible.
2 Voice mismatch tolerance in ellipsis: The data

2.1 Low/Little ellipsis: Voice mismatches possible

It is a well established fact that mismatches in the voice of an elided verb phrase and that of its antecedent are tolerated, provided that certain discourse relations hold (see Kehler 2002 for discussion of this further requirement). This holds both for antecedents in the active voice with elided passive verbs and vice versa. The examples in (1) and (2) are typical (see Sag 1976, 2006, Dalrymple et al. 1991, Hardt 1993, Fiengo and May 1994, Johnson 2001, Kehler 2002, Frazier and Clifton 2006, Arregui et al. 2006, Kertz 2010, Kim et al. 2011, and San Pietro et al. 2012 for further examples, discussion, and important qualifications). In these examples, I indicate the understood ellipsis with added material in angled brackets following the example itself.

(1) Active antecedent, passive ellipsis
   a. The janitor must remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be. <removed>
   b. It engaged them in a way that I did not think they could be that early in the morning. <engaged>¹
   c. “No-one can hypnotize me.”
      “Usually the people who are certain they can’t be are the easiest to do it to.” <hypnotized>²
   d. ... there was really no one at the meeting who could answer the question the way it should be. <answered>³
   e. [Prison guards deserve their good salaries] Proposing to reduce their numbers to save money would be endangering them even more than they are. <endangered>⁴
   f. Actually, I have implemented it [=a computer system] with a manager, but it doesn’t have to be. <implemented with a manager>⁵

⁵Kehler 2002:53.
g. Steve asked me to send the set by courier through my company insured, and it was. <sent by courier through my company insured>  
6
h. “Nevertheless, I shouldn’t have brought you into this.”  
It seems I already am, thought the piano tuner, but he was silent. <brought into this>  
7
i. I was disappointed that the author did not include as a source Polish-American Jesuit Walter Ciszek, who spent 23 years in Stalin’s prisons and camps, although the memoirs of American Alexander Dolgun are. <included>  
8
j. We also use the xpdf package in our examples, so you may want to install that now if it isn’t already. <installed>  
9

(2) Passive antecedent, active ellipsis

a. The system can be used by anyone who wants to. <use it>
b. A: Has this ever been tested? B: There’s never been a reason to. <test it>
c. Curacao lies outside the hurricane belt, but can still occasionally be smitten by hurricanes, as for example Omar did in 2008. <smite it>  
10
d. ‘Slippery slope’ arguments can be framed by consequentialists (though I wouldn’t in this case). <framed a slippery slope argument>  
11
e. This obviously has never been faced or solved properly before and somehow we have to. <solve it properly>  
12
f. The members are, technically speaking, separate lexemes since partly idiosyncratic morphological changes mark the verbal forms, and must therefore be listed separately in any truly informative dictionary, as indeed Jacobson’s dictionary does. <list them>  
13

---

6 Kehler 2002:53.  
9 Thanks to Jim McCloskey for supplying this example.  
12 Richard Williams, Memo to all animators, Who framed Roger Rabbit?, Re: eye lines, August 1987.  
g. This guy’s tape obviously should be scrutinized more than you did.  
<scrutinize it>\textsuperscript{14}

h. [The Watch was] Bad food, eaten when you could. <eat it>\textsuperscript{15}

i. This information could have been released by Gorbachev, but he chose not to. <release it>\textsuperscript{16}

j. This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did.  
<look into this problem>\textsuperscript{17}

k. Please read the message, phrased better than I could, below, as we look for respondents for a workshop with Prof Michael Fishbane. <phrase it>\textsuperscript{18}

In earlier investigations, it was usually claimed that voice mismatches were not possible in VP-ellipsis. A representative claim is that of Sag 1976:17, who gives the following examples with the judgments he reports.

(3)  
a. *Paul denied the charge, but the charge wasn’t by his friends.

b. *John had observed many of the enemy’s soldiers, but hadn’t been by them.

These examples are indeed unacceptable, but they are not representative of the full class of relevant data. Sag himself noted counterexamples in his footnote to the above example (Sag 1976:75, footnote 2). This footnote is worth quoting in full:

(4) Although this observation [that voice mismatches are unacceptable, — JM] is surely in general correct, I have nevertheless noted the following peculiar examples of VPD [VP deletion, —JM] ignoring the difference between active and passive.

(i) Botanist: That can all be explained.  
Mr. Spock: Please do.

(ii) It should be noted, as Dennett does, that... (Lust (ms.))

Also note the following general type of discourse:

\textsuperscript{14}Director’s commentary, \textit{King of Kong}, 2007, 00:52:59.


\textsuperscript{16}Hardt 1993:37.

\textsuperscript{17}Kehler 2002:53.

\textsuperscript{18}Thanks to Jerry Sadock for forwarding me this example.
(iii) Speaker A: Someone mugged Tom yesterday.
   Speaker B: Oh yeah?
   Speaker C: You know, the same thing happened to Mary.
   Speaker B: Wow!
   Speaker A: You know, now that I think of it, Sandy was, too.

This last kind of discourse, which I suspect is rather common, probably shows more about memory (or processing) than it does about grammar. It’s clear that there is much more going on here than can be explained at the moment.

What seems to be going on here is that Sag’s original examples involve pseudogapping, a special subcase discussed in detail in Merchant 2009; in pseudogapping, as Stump 1977 originally noted, voice mismatches are indeed generally impossible, and contrast in this respect with examples of VP-ellipsis tout simple (though see Tanaka 2011b for important qualifications). The examples in Sag’s footnote are in fact the more representative ones, and show that voice mismatches in VP-ellipsis are found and must be accounted for.¹⁹

¹⁹Voice mismatches are also found with other kinds of VP-anaphora, such as do so, as in (i)-(iii); see Dalrymple et al. 1991, Kehler and Ward 1999, and especially Houser 2010 for many more examples.

(i) On stage they have often ridiculed that idea by comparing it to songs such as “The Star-Spangled Banner” that could also be construed as drug songs if the listener were of a mind to do so. ['Puff, the Magic Dragon’, Wikipedia, accessed 11/6/2007]
(ii) To the extent that victory can be achieved with a minimum of personal sacrifice, the Bush administration will try to do so. ['The long, cost-free war,’ Ted Koppel, New York Times, 11/6/2006, p. A23]

See Tanenhaus and Carlson 1990 for the seminal work showing differences between Hankamer and Sag 1976’s ‘deep’ and ‘surface’ anaphora: surface anaphors (in their experiments, VPE, but including do so, which is a surface anaphor according to Hankamer and Sag, vs. do it, which is a deep anaphor) are judged not to ‘make sense’ between 23-30% of the time with voice mismatched antecedents, significantly more so than deep anaphors (which are so judged only 9-11% of the time with the same antecedents). See especially Sag and Hankamer 1984 for a revision of the distinction, and Houser 2010 for extensive arguments that do so should be reclassified as a ‘deep’ (or ‘model theoretic’) anaphor.
2.2 **High/Big ellipses: No voice mismatches possible**

It has not previously been systematically observed, however, that larger ellipsis types are much more resistant to voice mismatches. In sluicing, fragment answers, gapping, and stripping, the elided material and the antecedent phrase must match in voice.

Examples of voice mismatch in sluicing were to my knowledge first discussed in Merchant 2001, and recent years have seen a number of contributions to the literature on this topic, especially Chung 2006, 2013, and Tanaka 2011a, 2011b, who cite earlier versions of the present paper. The data are given here for English and for German; German shows the contrasts particularly clearly, since it marks the relevant case morphologically—nominative indicates the subject of an active transitive clause.

(5) English
   a. *Joe was murdered, but we don’t know who.
   b. *Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know who by.

(6) Illicit German voice mismatches, intended nonsubject correlate: act$_A$$\sim$pass$_E$; pass$_A$$\sim$act$_E$
   a. * Erika hat jemanden ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht, wer.
      * Erika has someone murdered but they know not who.
      ‘(lit.) Erika murdered someone, but they don’t know who.’
   b. * Peter wurde von jemandem ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht,
      * Peter was by someone murdered, but they know not who.
      ‘(lit.) Peter was murdered by someone, but they don’t know who.’

(7) Illicit German voice mismatches, intended subject correlate: act$_A$$\sim$pass$_E$; pass$_A$$\sim$act$_E$
   a. * Jemand hat Peter ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht, von
      * someone has Peter murdered but they know not by whom.
      ‘(lit.) Someone murdered Peter, but they don’t know by whom.’
   b. * Jemand wurde von Erika ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht,
      * someone was murdered by Erika, but they know not who.
‘(lit.) Someone was murdered by Erika but they don’t know whom.’

Parallel facts hold in fragment answers, which derive from movement of the fragment to a clause-external position followed by ellipsis of the clause (Merchant 2004, Arregi 2011, Temmerman 2012). English cannot show the entire paradigm, since it does not reliably mark case on fragments (that is, case on fragments tends to be accusative regardless of their origin site) and since English allows preposition stranding. In other words, in a pair like *Q: Who were you sent by? A: Marcus,* we cannot be sure whether *Marcus* is the underlying object of the preposition *by* in a passive clause (corresponding to the voice of the question) or whether *Marcus* is the subject of an active clause (a potential voice mismatch). Only the possibility of pied-piping the passive *by* in an answer to a question in the active voice permits the relevant test to be run in English, as seen in (8).

(8) Q: Who is sending you to Iraq? A: *By Bush.

Such confounding factors do not affect a language like German, in which fragment answer DPs bear the case assigned at their origin site, and in which preposition stranding is barred. In German, active/passive mismatches like (9a) are barred, as are passive/active mismatches as in (9b).


   *who.NOM has the boy examined? by a

   Psychologin.

   *psychologist

   ‘Q: Who examined the boy? A: [intended:] (He was examined) by a psychologist.’


   *by who.DAT was the boy examined a

   Psychologin.

   *psychologist.NOM

   ‘Q: Who was the boy examined by?’ A: [intended:] A psychologist (examined him).’

Gapping similarly does not tolerate voice mismatches, as noted in Stump 1977 and Johnson 1996, 2009 (who also notes that gapping in general is much less tolerant of mismatches than VP-ellipsis or sluicing; this follows from his analysis of these as instances of across-the-board movement, not ellipsis).
a. *Some bring roses and lilies by others.
b. *Lilies are brought by some and others roses.

It comes as no surprise, then, that stripping or Bare Argument Ellipsis, commonly analyzed as a subspecies of gapping, also fails to allow voice mismatch. Again, because of the case and preposition-stranding properties of English, the possibility of examples like *The roses were bought by MAX on credit, not AMY shows nothing, since nothing can guarantee that AMY in such an example is the subject of an elliptical active clause, and is not the object of an elided passive by. German again shows that once these potential confounds are controlled for, it is clear that voice mismatch in stripping is disallowed.

**Stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis**

a. *MAX brought the roses, not by AMY!
b. * Der Junge wurde von einer Psychologin untersucht, und ein
   the boy was by a psychologist examined, and a
   Kinderrahrz auch.
   pediatrician.NOM too.
   ‘The boy was examined by a psychologist, and a pediatrician examined him, too.’

All of the examples in this section would be irrelevant to the theory of ellipsis if their ill-formedness could be attributed to some other component; the most likely candidates would be some more general constraints on connected discourse sequences or more specific constraints on focus across discourse-trees. Such constraints certainly exist, and have been investigated by, among others, Lambrecht 1994, Kehler 2002, and Büring 2003. As always, it is therefore crucial to compare the above examples from sluicing, fragment answers, gapping, and stripping to their putative non-elliptical counterparts. If general principles of discourse well-formedness or specific principles of focus were to rule out voice switches among such clauses, then the elliptical cases would simply form a proper subdomain of the application of such principles, and nothing about the nature of ellipsis itself could be gleaned from the attested contrasts.

The following set of examples, from English and from German as necessary, provide the relevant controls. All produce well-formed discourses, despite the voice switch. While these may not be ideal or even optimal discourse sequences, their status is significantly better than their elliptical counterparts above.

**Nonelliptical counterparts to sluicing: English**

(12) a. *Some bring roses and lilies by others.
b. *Lilies are brought by some and others roses.
a. Joe was murdered, but we don’t know who murdered Joe.
b. Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know who Joe was murdered by.

(13) Nonelliptical counterparts to sluicing: German
a. Erika hat jemanden ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht, wer von
   Erika has someone murdered but they know not who.NOM by
   ihr ermordet wurde.  
   her murdered was
   ‘Erika murdered someone, but they don’t know who was killed by her.’
b. Peter wurde von jemandem ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht,  
   Peter was by someone murdered but they know not
   wer ihn ermordet hat.  
   who.NOM him murdered has
   ‘Peter was murdered by someone, but they don’t know who murdered him.’
c. Jemand hat Peter ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht, von wem
   someone has Peter murdered but they know not by whom.DAT
   er ermordet wurde.  
   he murdered was
   ‘Someone murdered Peter, but they don’t know who he was murdered by.’
d. Jemand wurde von Erika ermordet, aber sie wissen nicht,  
   someone was by Erika murdered, but they know not 
   wen sie ermordet hat. 
   who.ACC she murdered has
   ‘Someone was murdered by Erika but they don’t know who she murdered.’

(14) Nonelliptical counterparts to fragment answers
a. Q: Who is sending you to Iraq? A: I’m being sent by Bush.
b. i. Q: Wer hat den Jungen untersucht? A: Er wurde von einer
   who.NOM has the boy examined? he was by a
   Psychologin untersucht. 
   psychologist examined
‘Q: Who examined the boy? A: He was examined by a psychologist.’


‘Q: Who was the boy examined by?’ A: A psychologist examined him.’

(15) Nonelliptical counterparts to gapping
   a. Some bring roses and lilies are brought by others.
   b. Lilies are brought by some but others bring roses.

(16) Nonelliptical counterparts to stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis
   a. MAX brought the roses–they weren’t brought by AMY!

‘The boy was examined by a psychologist, and a pediatrician examined him, too.’

In sum, voice mismatches are ruled out in all cases of ellipsis other than VP-ellipsis and this fact must be derived from the theory of ellipsis itself.

3 Triggering ellipsis

Ellipsis of a phrase XP is subject to two major requirements, known as the ‘licensing’ requirement and the ‘identification’ requirement, following Lobeck 1995. The first refers to the local, idiosyncratic syntactic features of a head that ‘licenses’ the ellipsis (see Johnson 2001 for an exemplary discussion of the licensing requirements for VP-ellipsis, and Winkler 2005 and Aelbrecht 2010 for important related points). For VP-ellipsis, this requirement usually reduces to the claim that a missing VP must be locally c-commanded by a T node (hosting an auxiliary of some sort, including do, or to, or the null T found with negation in embedded subjunctives). For sluicing, the licensing head is the complementizer found
in constituent questions in English. These requirements can be implemented as structural conditions on a transformation (as in Sag 1976), as a kind of ECP-like filter (as in Lobeck 1995 and Johnson 2001), as *sui generis* restrictions on phrase structure rules or constructions (as in theories like those of Ginzburg and Sag 2000 or Culicover and Jackendoff 2005), but none of these alternatives are particularly palatable in the more ontologically restrictive theories under the Minimalist umbrella, in which the locus of all variation is posited to be the lexicon. Taking this lexicalist idea seriously requires us to posit a lexical feature or family of features that can encode these requirements. Such an approach is developed in Merchant 2001, Merchant 2004, van Craenenbroeck 2010, van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, Toosarvandani 2009, Vicente 2006, Ha 2008, Aelbrecht 2010, and Temmerman 2012, among others: in this analysis, the English lexicon contains a feature E which must be merged with an appropriate head (certain Ts or auxiliary vs for VP-ellipsis, C[+wh, +Q] for sluicing), due to its morphosyntactic deficiency (much in the spirit of certain analyses of clitics, for example). For example, in its simplest instantiation, the E feature that occurs in sluicing will be joined with the C, notated C[E], and will trigger the non-pronunciation ('PF-deletion') of its complement, TP. This is illustrated in the following tree, where angled brackets enclose the TP node which fails to undergo lexical insertion due to the effects of the E feature on its sister; this can be viewed as a kind of morphosyntactic syncope of the PF-relevant features of the complement.\footnote{A reviewer asks the important question whether there is a relevant difference between a conception of ellipsis as failure to pronounce at the PF interface vs. failure of lexical insertion (in a Distributed Morphological view of the derivation, for example). For the contrasts analyzed here, we can remain agnostic, but see Baltin 2012 for arguments that these may not be equivalent in all guises.}

(17)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know who.
\item CP
\begin{itemize}
\item who
\item C[E] \begin{itemize}
\item $<$TP$>$
\item t$_1$ murdered Joe
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

Syntactically, on this view, the elided material is fully present in the derivation, both before and after Spell-Out, and indeed in sluicing contains the trace of the
fronted wh-phrase in specCP (the origin and properties of which require additional analysis on approaches that eschew syntactic structure inside the ellipsis site; see van Craenenbroeck 2010 for a review of the arguments for and against this position).

For VP-ellipsis, on a widespread version of an endocentric clause structure, E would be on T, yielding the following.

(18)  

a. Abby didn’t see Joe, but Ben did.  
b.  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
TP \\
\text{Ben} \\
\text{T[E]} \\
\text{did} \\
\text{see Joe}
\end{array}
\]

In sluicing, then, a larger amount of structure is elided, while in VP-ellipsis, a smaller amount is.

4 Analyzing the uneven distribution of voice mismatch

The empirical contrasts found in the data above are puzzling for current theories of the identity relation between an elided phrase and its antecedent. The fundamental difficulty is that voice mismatch has an uneven distribution: it is found in some, but not all, kinds of ellipsis. For theories that posit only semantic identity (such as Merchant 2001) or none at all (such as inference-based theories like Hardt 2005, Sag 2006, and Culicover and Jackendoff 2005), the puzzle is why voice mismatches should be disallowed in so many cases, since active and passive clauses are mutually entailing and allow for the relevant inferences. For theories that posit syntactic identity (whether implemented as LF-copy as in Fiengo and May 1994, Chung et al. 1995, Fortin 2007 and others, or as the trigger of syntactic or PF ‘deletion’, as in Sag 1976, Baltin 2012), the puzzle is why voice mismatches are sometimes allowed, given that the syntax of actives and passives is not identical.

It is important to remember that mismatches in voice between similarly related nonelliptical clauses in discourse are permitted. Note that the improvement found in such examples cannot simply be attributed to the fact that the extra pronounced
material allows the hearer to ‘accommodate’ in some way a perhaps strictly speaking infelicitous voice switch. Such a theory is posited in Fox 2000 for unrelated examples: working within a theory of LF-identity for ellipsis, Fox shows that under certain circumstances, the LF of an elided phrase marker can be non-parallel to its antecedent, but just in case a parallel LF can be accommodated from the non-parallel antecedent. He posits that such accommodation is possible only when the clause containing the ellipsis contains some ‘accommodation-seeking material’ (namely, some material that would indicate that the elided clause deviates in some way from its antecedent, and triggers the accommodation of a parallel LF for ellipsis resolution). While Fox shows that such a mechanism is necessary to derive the full range of narrow scope readings inside ellipsis sites, it must not be allowed to apply to voice mismatches. Examples like (5b), repeated here in (19), could otherwise be generated—the preposition by in the sluiced clause could function as ‘accommodation-seeking material’, triggering the creation via accommodation of a passive antecedent LF to license the ellipsis of Joe was murdered. Theories that allow inferences to unavailable antecedents must similarly be reined in—Webber 1978, Hardt 2005, and Sag 2006, for example, propose that inferences can be used to resolve ellipsis, but that “only inferences triggered by violations are possible” (Hardt 2005). Despite the violation in e.g. (19), marked by by, such examples remain unacceptable, and, as far as I have been able to determine, unattested. (Similar remarks hold for the unexpected, and ungrammatical, morphological case in the German examples above; Hardt notes such data but leaves their account open.)

(19) *Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know who by. <Joe was murdered>

The conclusion to draw, I think, is that the notion of accommodation or inferential triggering as typically conceived of in the literature cannot account for the facts with voice mismatches.

Since theories that posit semantic or inferential equivalence as the identity condition on ellipsis overgenerate, we must look elsewhere for the solution to the distribution of voice mismatches in ellipsis. What I would like to suggest is that the direction of the uneven distribution points the way to the solution. In all cases, a lower node can be elided, but a higher node cannot, under the same circumstances. I take it that this fact is not accidental, and can be accounted for best if the voice morphology of a clause reflected in English on the verb is merely a morphological reflex of a syntactic agreement relation with a separate head which asymmetrically c-commands the verbal head V. This idea is commonplace since
the work of Kratzer 1996, who identifies this head as \(v[\text{Voice}]\) and uses it to introduce external arguments. For reasons that will become clearer in section 4.2 below, I will follow the more recent proposal of Collins 2005 that Voice is a separate head from the head that determines the transitivity (or unergativity or unaccusativity) of the VP, including introducing its external argument if one is present (see also McCloskey 1996 for an argument that subjects originate lower than their pronounced position in Irish: I suspect we may identify his FP with VoiceP in Collins’s sense.) In other words, I adopt the proposal that the clause structure of (20a) is that given in (20b).

(20)  
   a. Someone murdered Joe.  
   b.  
      \[
      \begin{array}{c}
      \text{TP} \\
      \text{DP}_1 \\
      \text{Someone} \\
      \text{T'} \\
      \text{T} \\
      \text{VoiceP} \\
      \text{Voice[Active]} \\
      \text{\(v\)P} \\
      t_1 \\
      v \\
      v_{\text{trans}} \\
      \text{VP} \\
      \text{murder}_v \\
      \text{DP} \\
      \text{Joe} \\
      \end{array}
      \]

Various differing assumptions about the role of the syntax in determining the morphological form are compatible with this structure. If \(v\) is the locus of all relevant features, and if Voice is a morphological feature on \(v\) needing a value (as would be compatible with one analysis of languages like Greek and Swahili), then with head movement of the verb murder to the transitive \(v_{\text{trans}}\), and with an application of Agree between Voice[Active] and the unvalued Voice[\_] feature on \(v\), the resulting complex \([\text{murder} + v_{\text{trans}}[\text{Voice[Active]}]]\) will be spelled out by the morphology as the active form murdered. On the other hand, if the participial form murdered simply lacks a Voice feature (as Collins 2005 proposes for English), no application of Agree is necessary and \([\text{murder} + v]\) is spelled out as murdered. Either implementation is compatible with the analysis here.
This clausal architecture allows the desired structural distinctions to be drawn. If the identity relation between an elided phrase $XP_E$ and its antecedent $XP'_A$ is one of syntactic featural identity (and not morphological), then any elided Voice head will necessarily be the same (that is, have the same value for the feature $\text{Voice, Voice}[[\text{Active|Passive}}])$ in the elided structure and in its antecedent. On Voice, this feature is a categorial feature; as such, its value is fixed in the lexicon and cannot be altered by any process or operation (it is ‘interpretable’ in some uses of that term). By contrast, the Voice feature on $v$ is a morphological (or ‘inflectional’) feature which is unvalued in the Numeration; its value is assigned by $\text{Agree(\text{Voice, \text{\_v;Voice}})}$ (where $\text{Agree}$ is a relation between a head $X$ and another head $Y$ with respect to a categorial feature $F$ on $X$ and a matching morphological feature $F'$ on $Y$, resulting in $F'$’s value being set to that of $F$).

In VP-ellipsis, then, the Voice head must not be included in the target of ellipsis. Since it is not, it is not subject to the elliptical identity requirement. In other ellipses, which target larger clausal nodes necessarily containing VoiceP, Voice will be part of the elided structure and thus subject to elliptical identity, which requires that its antecedent have the same value for the feature, namely Active or Passive consistently. The simplest way to capture this distinction, then, is to posit that in VP-ellipsis, it is the verbal projection which is the complement to Voice that is elided, while in sluicing and the like, what is elided is a clausal node. Schematically, the basic idea is represented in the tree in Figure 1: eliding a node which contains Voice, such as $XP$, will rule out voice mismatches, while eliding a node to which Voice is external, such as $YP$, will allow voice mismatches.

![Figure 1: The basic geometry of licit vs. illicit voice mismatches](image-url)
Specifically, for examples of licit voice mismatch in VP-ellipsis, such as (21a), the structural analysis is that in (21b,c). The elided VP, notated VP<sub>E</sub> in (21c) is *look into this problem*. The antecedent VP, labelled vP<sub>A</sub> in (21b) is identical to vP<sub>E</sub>, assuming that movement of the underlying object into subject position leaves a copy.<sup>21</sup> Non-pronounced copies—traces, that is—I will represent either with the traditional *t* or, when it is helpful to see the content of the copy, as the phrase itself superscripted with *t*, as with DP<sub>t</sub> in (21b). Following Baker et al. 1989, Emonds 2001, Collins 2005, and others (see Bhatt and Pancheva 2006 for a recent overview), I assume that the indefinite subject of a passive, if not expressed in a *by*-phrase, is syntactically present, here as a null indefinite argument I will express as *Arg*; it satisfies the selectional features of heads it combines with via Merge, though it is inaccessible to Move, and like all other null indefinite arguments, it takes a fixed narrow scope (see Fodor and Fodor 1980 and Mittwoch 1982 for the scopal observations, and see Lees 1963, Grinder 1976, and Gillon 2009 for discussion). While it would be simpler, and sufficient for the data seen thus far, to assume that VP, not vP, is the target of ellipsis, we will see in section 4.2 below why the more complex structure is needed.

(21) a. This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did.
   b. [DP This problem]₁ was to have vP

   ![Diagram](attachment:diagram.png)

<sup>21</sup>In general, copies of moved elements in antecedents behave as their unmoved counterparts for the purposes of ellipsis resolution unless the moved element contrasts with a corresponding element in the clause containing the ellipsis (that is, syntactic identity is identity of phrase markers modulo focussed elements whose focus alternatives are given by an element in the elided clause). I will sidestep this complication here, but see Merchant 2001 and Lipták and Griffiths 2011 for discussion.
These structures shed light as well on the details of how the syntactic identity condition must ultimately be formulated (details to which I return below). Note for the moment that while featural identity is crucial on Voice, it is not for elements which have moved out of the ellipsis site—here for example the vP-internal trace of the moved subject nobody is structurally equivalent to the unexpressed agent of the passive (Arg in specvP in (21b)). The generalization is that the traces of elements moved out of elided phrases must have structural equivalents in the antecedents, though these correlates (here, Arg) need not be featurally identical if the differing featural content can be recovered by elements outside the ellipsis site (here, in other words, by nobody). The contents of traces is crucial, however, for understanding why the elided vP is understood as look into this problem and not simply something like look into something. Because there is no supplementary material in the elided clause that corresponds in position (or whose trace would correspond in position) to the trace of this problem in the antecedent clause, the content of that trace must be understood in the ellipsis site.

The same analysis applies when the voice mismatch is [active \textsubscript{A} : passive \textsubscript{E}], with an active antecedent and a passive elided verb phrase. In the following trees, I suppress some structural details for simplicity, such as the representation of the PP adjunct; I also assume that have to is a raising predicate, but avoid representing this in any detail—of consequence here are only the structures under VoiceP.

(22) a. I have implemented it with a manager but it doesn’t have to be.
For sluicing (and the other clausal ellipses), the node targeted by ellipsis contains VoiceP; in sluicing, this node is TP. No voice mismatch will be possible, in either direction. This is shown in (23) for [passive<sub>A</sub> : active<sub>E</sub>] mismatch and in (24) for [active<sub>A</sub> : passive<sub>E</sub>] mismatch.

(23) a. *Joe was murdered (by someone), but we don’t know who.
(24) a. *Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know by whom.
It is important to note that it is impossible on this analysis to imagine a language which would be the inverse of English, which would allow voice mismatches in TP, but not VP, ellipses. The fact of the uneven distribution of voice mismatches is captured by the variable height of ellipsis, and clausal ellipses will always elide more structure than VP ellipses. This negative prediction stands in
contrast to a conceivable alternative to the above analysis framed in terms of con-
structions (construed as first-order objects in the ontology of linguistic descript-
ion). Proponents of such construction-employing theories might simply claim
that the construction of VP-ellipsis is subject to a weaker identity relation (say, the
ones proposed by Culicover and Jackendoff 2005 or Sag 2006), but that the
sluicing construction makes use of a different identity relation, one that is sensi-
tive to the voice of its antecedent (when there is one). Besides the fact that there
is no other known reason for positing different identity relations for the different
ellipses studied here, note that such theories would be equally able to account for
the ‘inverse’ English just described.

In all such theories, voice is simply a feature on the verb (which may or may
not be projected to the featural complex of that verb’s clause), and is not a separate
head or projection in the syntax. There is therefore no way to separate the voice
of the verb from the verb’s use in a particular structure. Only an articulated syntax
in which Voice is external to the ellipsis site in ‘VP’-ellipsis can directly capture
the uneven distribution of apparent voice mismatches across ellipsis types.

4.1 VoiceP is crucial, not the passive auxiliary

Besides the differences in the Voice heads between the antecedents and elided
phrases in the sluicing examples above, there is also a difference in whether or not
the auxiliary be occurs. One might equally take the presence of this auxiliary to
be the distinguishing characteristic that rules out identity in the cases of sluicing,
since its presence does indeed ensure a structural, syntactic difference between
e.g. active antecedent TPs and elided passive TPs (assuming as I will for simplic-
ity that it is always full TPs are elided; see Nakao et al. 2006 and Yoshida 2010
for an importantly more complex view of the situation). While it would be con-
sistent to follow this line of thinking for the cases examined thus far (and it would
allow one to claim that voice switches in VP-ellipsis simply show that voice is
irrelevant, generally), such a tack fails more generally. This can be seen, first, by
noting that the facts are identical in a language which marks the passive/active
distinction entirely synthetically through morphological means on the verb itself,
such as Greek, and second, by the case of pseudogapping in English, in which
voice mismatches are ruled out despite the auxiliary being external to the ellipsis
site.

Sluicing in Greek, which shares a wide range of properties with its congeners
in other languages and in English in particular (see Merchant 2000, 2001), also
forbids voice mismatches between the antecedent clause and the elided one, as
seen in the examples in (25).

(25) Illicit Greek voice mismatches

a. * O Jannis skotose kapjon, ala ðen kserume
   the Giannis.NOM killed.ACT someone.ACC but not we.know
   pjos.
   who.NOM
   ‘(lit.) Giannis killed someone, but we don’t know who.’

b. * O Jannis skotoðike, ala ðen kserume pjos.
   the Giannis.NOM killed.PASS but not we.know who.NOM
   ‘(lit.) Giannis was killed, but we don’t know who.’

As always, it is crucial to run the nonelliptical controls; these show that, while
the voice switch may sometimes be dispreferred as somewhat awkward (hence
the stigma ‘?’ on (26a)), the examples are significantly more acceptable than their
elided counterparts in (25).

(26) Nonelliptical controls

a. ? O Jannis skotose kapjon, ala ðen kserume
   the Giannis.NOM killed.ACT someone.ACC but not we.know
   pjos skotoðike.
   who.NOM killed.PASS
   ‘Giannis killed someone, but we don’t know who was killed.’

b. O Jannis skotoðike, ala ðen kserume pjos ton
   the Giannis.NOM killed.PASS but not we.know who.NOM him.ACC
   skotose.
   killed.ACT
   ‘Giannis was killed, but we don’t know who killed him.’

With only a synthetic active/passive in Greek, the presence or absence of an
auxiliary is not at issue; the deviance must be due to the differing values on Voice
itself.

Another instructive example in this respect comes from Danish, which has
both a synthetic and an analytic passive, in roughly complementary distribution.
As Houser et al. 2007 show, the voice morphology on the synthetic passive can
be ignored for the purposes of licensing VP-anaphora in an analytic passive, as in
the following example (their (12b)):
I know that both Palle and Susan wanted to be elected chairman, but I don’t know which of them was.’

These data show, as Houser et al. argue, that the varying realizations of passive morphology, here -s on vælges versus the participial form replaced by the VP-anaphor det, are irrelevant to the licensing of the anaphoric computation that allows for det to surface, under circumstances that are not plausibly merely accidentally similar to those for VP-ellipsis in English.

That it is Voice itself at issue, and not merely the presence or absence of an auxiliary, can be seen in English pseudogapping as well, as Merchant 2008 argued. I will not repeat those arguments here (see Tanaka 2011b for caveats), but merely note that, as a reviewer points out, the present analysis predicts that what is elided in pseudogapping should be something larger than a vP (namely, a node that is or includes VoiceP), and that this fact may well follow if the remnant in pseudogapping must be extracted from the VP by some kind of A′-movement, as is often supposed.

4.2 Argument structure alternations under ellipsis

Argument structure alternations involve apparently different syntactic realizations of a verb or predicate’s semantic or thematic arguments. They fall into two broad classes of interest here. The first are those that involve an argument appearing in some contexts as a subject of a verb (such as of an intransitive unaccusative or anticausative, as in The ice melted), and in other contexts as a non-subject of the same verb (as a direct object, for example, as in The sun melted the ice). The second kind of argument structure alternation is between two differing kinds of internal argument expression, such as the ‘dative’ alteration, or other kinds of direct object/prepositional object alternations (like Max passed the ball to Sheila/Max passed Sheila the ball). Such argument structure alternations are not found between an antecedent and an elided phrase in ellipsis of any type. If one diathesis variant is found in an antecedent phrase, then that same variant must be in the elided phrase, under sluicing, VP-ellipsis, or any of the other ellipsis types that target clausal syntax. This fact is well-known for sluicing (see Chung et al. 1995,
Merchant 2001) and gapping (Johnson 1996), but is equally true of VP-ellipsis, as for example Sag 1976, Johnson 2004, and Houser et al. 2007 point out.

4.2.1 Subject/non-subject alternations

Certain transitives (sometimes called causatives) alternate with intransitives (anti-causatives or unaccusatives), in one of the most well-known alternations in modern linguistics (see Perlmutter 1978 for the original observations and analysis and Alexiadou et al. 2004 for recent approaches and references). Pairs such as the following are typical, given for English and Greek.

(28) a. This can freeze. Please freeze this.
    b. Bill melted the copper vase, and the magnesium vase melted, too.
    c. Maria still tried to break the vase even though it wouldn’t break.

(29) a. Eklisan ena ἀρμόμο.  
    closed.3p a.ACC road.ACC
    ‘They closed a road.’
    b. Ενα μετάλλιο ἀρμόμο έκλεισε.  
       a.NOM road.NOM closed.3s
    ‘A road closed.’

Such alternations are not found under ellipsis, however. This is illustrated first for VP-ellipsis with examples from Sag 1976, Johnson 2004, and Houser et al. 2007, and second for sluicing. The sluicing example in (31a) comes from Greek, where the case morphology on the wh-phrase indicates whether the wh-phrase is a subject (of the unaccusative alternant) or an object (of the transitive alternant); the poor morphological case resources of English make seeing this in English impossible. A Greek control case (where the sluiced clause is transitive, and the wh-phrase accordingly properly marked accusative) is given in (31b).

(30) a. This can freeze. *Please do. (Johnson 2004:7)
    b. *Bill melted the copper vase, and the magnesium vase did, too. (Sag 1976:160 (2.3.48))
    c. *Maria still tried to break the vase even though it wouldn’t. (Houser et al. 2007)

(31) a. * Eklisan ena ἀρμόμο, ἀλλὰ δὲν κατάλαβαν πρός. <eklise>
    closed.3p a.ACC road.ACC but not know.1s which.NOM closed.3s
    (intended: ‘They closed a road, but I don’t know which one (closed).’)
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b. Eklisan ena ṃomo, alla ḏen ksero pjon.  <eklisan>
closed.3p a.ACC road.ACC but not know.1s which.ACC closed.3p
‘They closed a road, but I don’t know which one.’

If causative and anticausative/unaccusatives differ in their *v* (as Mokilese and other languages may show morphologically, and as may be required to state the selectional restrictions of the passive Voice head to capture Perlmutter’s generalization; see Legate 2003 for arguments that even unaccusatives have a *v*), then Voice takes as its complement the *vP* which may introduce the external argument. The insightful account Johnson suggests for these cases carries over to the present system, *mutatis mutandis*: Voice selects *vP*; Voice hosts the E feature; *vP* elides; and *vtrans* ≠ *vanacc*, so in Johnson’s example, *vPA* in (32a) will not license the deletion of *vPE* in (32b).

(32) a. TP
   └—————————————————
     This₁
     can
     VoiceP
     └—————————————————
       Voice[Act]
       └—————————————————
         |                         |          
         vPA                          vvanacc  
       └—————————————————
         |                         |                  
         VP                          VP    
       └—————————————————
         freeze this₁
The crucial element involved in these accounts is the separation of the head that determines voice from the head that determines the external valency of the predicate. There is in fact no conceptual reason these two should go together, and the ellipsis facts argue directly against this assumption.

Another well-studied alternation involving subjects and non-subjects is the middle. In languages like English, while the morphology of the verb remains constant (namely, active), the argument realization changes:

(33)  
   a. They market ethanol well in the Midwest.
   b. They sell Hyundais in Greece.
   c. Studios generally release action films in the summer.

(34)  
   a. Ethanol markets well in the Midwest.
   b. Hyundais don’t sell in Greece.
   c. This kind of movie generally releases in the summer.

No such alternations are found between antecedent-ellipsis pairs, however:

(35)  
   a. *They market ethanol well in the Midwest, but regular gas doesn’t.
   b. *They sell Hyundais in Greece because Hondas don’t.
   c. *Studios generally release action films in the summer, and big-name comedies generally do as well.

(36)  
   a. *Ethanol markets well in the Midwest, though they don’t in the South.
   b. *Hyundais don’t sell in Greece because dealers don’t.
c. *This kind of movie generally releases in the summer, though a studio might in the winter if it’s Christmas-themed.

This follows, again, if the heads which regulate this alternation are internal to vP, under Voice. (And indeed if lexical, non-syntactic, approaches to middle formation are correct as well.)

4.2.2 Internal argument alternations under ellipsis

If internal argument alternations are regulated by syntactic heads (or even lexical rules operating on V entries) that are lower in the clausal structure than the heads that introduce external arguments, and lower than the Voice head, then we expect that all such alternations, even perfectly meaning-preserving ones, will be illicit across antecedent-ellipsis pairs. This is in fact the case. This was pointed out for sluicing in Chung et al. 1995, and discussed further in Merchant 2001 and Chung 2006.

This holds for the ditransitive diathesis illustrated by *serve* in (37): as (38) shows, all combinations of the internal arguments can serve as *wh*-remnants in sluicing, but if one alternant occurs in the antecedent clause—for example, *serve*₁—, the same alternant must occur in the elided clause. Thus while (38c) is possible, since *who* originates as the first object of *serve*₁, in (39a), the PP *to whom* is ruled out, since *serve*₁, present in the antecedent, does not license a PP complement. Any attempt to use the other alternant, *serve*₂, as in (39b), fails.

(37)  
   a. They served₁ someone something.
   b. They served₂ something to someone.

(38)  
   a. They served₁ the guests something, but I don’t know what.
   b. They served₂ something to the guests, but I don’t know what.
   c. They served₁ someone the meal, but I don’t know who.
   d. They served₂ the meal to someone, but I don’t know (to) who(m).

(39)  
   a. *They served₁ someone the meal, but I don’t know to whom.
   b. *... to whom <they served₂ the meal ≥t>

The absence of internal argument alternations under ellipsis also holds for null argument/prepositional phrase alternations. In such cases, a stranded preposition must have a correlate in the antecedent. These facts are examined at length in Chung 2006, who concludes that the identity relation in ellipsis must be in part stated over syntactic representations.
(40) Mary was flirting, but they wouldn’t say with who < Mary was flirting t>.

(41) *Mary was flirting, but they wouldn’t say who <Mary was flirting with t>.

(42) a. They sent the package—find out who to <they sent the package>!
   b. *They sent the package—find out who <they sent the package to>!

This observation does not concern only stranded prepositions: object alternations that involve two different obliques are equally impossible, even when the alternating preposition is pied-piped (and hence not stranded internal to the ellipsis site in violation of elliptical identity stated over only otherwise non-null distinct morphemes), as is the case with predicates such as *embroider, *issue, *provide, and others. The examples in (43)–(44) illustrate this for sluicing: (43) gives the alternation in question (*embroider X with Y/embroider Y on X), and (44) demonstrates that the elided phrase must contain the same alternant as the antecedent.

(43) a. They embroidered something with peace signs.
   b. They embroidered peace signs on something.

(44) a. *They embroidered something with peace signs, but I don’t know what on <they embroidered peace signs t>.
   b. *They embroidered something on their jackets, but I don’t know with what <they embroidered their jackets t>.

(On image impression reading of with what, not manner reading.)

The same can be seen in other elliptical phenomena, such as pseudogapping.

(45) *She embroiders peace signs on jackets more often than she does with swastikas.

(46) a. *Abby flirted more often in general than Beth did <flirt with> Max.
   b. ?Abby flirted with Ben more often than she did <flirt with> Ryan.

(47) a. *He’d give Yale money more readily than he would <give money> to charity.
   b. ?He’d give money more readily to Yale than he would <give money to> charity.

The lack of argument structure alternations (whether or not they involve stranded prepositions) follows if all such alternations reflect distinct heads in the numeration (Hale and Keyser 1993, 2002, et multi alii ante postque). Here I use $v_{trans}$

---

22 Miller 1991 gives an example of a diathesis switch under pseudogapping which he marks as acceptable; I cannot account for the judgment he reports.
from Kratzer 1996 to introduce the external argument, $v_{obj}$ from Jelinek 1998 (what she calls $v_{[trans]}$; cf. Bowers 1993, 2002, Basilico 1998, and Hallman 2004) to introduce the direct object, and $v_P$ to introduce arguments that are marked with various prepositions, following the line of work that introduces oblique arguments as selected by ‘applicative’ vs of various sorts (see Anagnostopoulou 2003, Pylkkänen 2008 for recent approaches). The latter sort of $v$ will be coded as selecting the appropriate preposition; for example $v_{with}$ selects a PP headed by $with$, etc. Note that by the test in Levin 2003 (possible cooccurrence with a ‘fake’ object $X$’s way into $Y$ as in she embroidered her way into the record books), embroider has a simple event structure: \([x \text{ ACT}<\text{MANNER}>]\); I take this to mean that it has no selectional feature of its own.

(48)  a. *They embroidered something with peace signs, but I don’t know what on <they embroidered peace signs t>.

b. 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{they} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} } v_{trans} \\
\text{something} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} } v_{obj} \\
\text{PP} \\
\text{with peace signs} \\
\text{\hspace{1cm} } v_{with} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{embroider}
\end{array}
\]
The complete lack of such argument structure alternations regardless of the size of the elided category follows from the syntactic identity condition if there is simply no location for the ellipsis-triggering E feature low enough in the structure to exclude the v heads that regulate these alternations. This is in contrast to the situation with voice, where VP-ellipsis can target the sister to Voice. The fact that even causative~inchoative/unaccusative alternations are ruled out is further evidence that the heads which determine this alternation (namely \(v_{trans}\) vs. \(v_{unacc}\)) are not the same as the head which determines the voice properties of the clause (namely Voice). This was demonstrated for sluicing, VP-ellipsis, and pseudogapping, but holds as well of fragment answers, gapping, and stripping. I have also omitted for reasons of space the nonelliptical controls: such nonelliptical controls show that the deviances found above are due to the ellipsis—while stylistically awkward, diathesis alternations across clauses without ellipsis does not give rise to ungrammaticality.

The above conclusions are also consistent with another set of facts raised in Johnson 2004. Following a substantial literature, he points out that \(\text{again}\) has two readings, one in which it indicates repetition of an event (the repetitive reading, given in (49a), and one in which it operates on the internal state (the restitutive reading, available in (49b)).

\[(49) \quad \begin{aligned} 
\text{a.} & \quad \text{The door was open. Ben closed it. It blew open. Maribel closed it again. (repetition)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{The door was closed. The wind blew the door open and no-one closed it. Finally, Maribel closed it again. (restitution)} 
\end{aligned} \]
Johnson shows convincingly that these two readings reflect two different possible attachment positions for again: the repetitive reading arises when again is adjoined high in the structure (to vP/VoiP or higher), and the restitutive reading arises when again is adjoined low (to VP).

The novel observation that Johnson 2004 makes is that the restitutive reading is absent in VP-ellipsis, and correctly concludes that this fact indicates that ellipsis in these cases is targeting a node which excludes a low-adjoined again from surfacing. On the structures proposed here, this fact follows because the boxed [VP\textsuperscript{1}] in (50b) is not a possible target for deletion (since it is not the sister to a head with the E-feature), so (50a) cannot be generated.

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(50) } & \text{a. The door was closed. The wind blew the door open and no-one closed it. Finally, *Maribel did again.} \\
\text{b.} & \\
\end{array}
\end{equation}

In sum, no argument structure alternations are possible under any kind of ellipsis: with the exception of voice, both sluicing and VP-ellipsis require antecedents that match in the exact syntactic expression of their arguments. This fact is compatible with either lexical or structural approaches to these alternations; on the latter approach, it merely requires that the heads that regulate the alternations be identical in the elided phrase and its antecedent.
5 Conclusions

I have tried to show not only that we must posit syntactic structures internal to ellipsis sites, but also that the identity relation that licenses ellipsis is sensitive to syntactic form, and cannot be plausibly stated over linguistic representations in which the difference between active and passive expressions is neutralized. If voice mismatch had been uniformly possible in both low ellipses such as VP-ellipsis and in high ones like sluicing, we would have concluded that ellipsis identity is not sensitive to such syntactic information. If voice mismatch had been uniformly impossible in both kinds of ellipsis, we would have reached the conclusion that syntactic matching was required. Previous work on these questions has addressed only one or the other of the kinds of ellipses examined here, and so has generally reached one or the other conclusion, on the reasonable assumption of uniformity of the identity relation across ellipsis types. But it is precisely the uneven distribution of voice mismatches that proves such an analytical puzzle, since on its surface, it seems to require a non-uniform theory of ellipsis licensing—a conclusion that seems otherwise entirely unwarranted.

The uneven distribution of voice mismatches in high vs. low ellipses, coupled with the uniform ban on argument structure mismatches in all kinds of ellipsis, can be accounted for by a syntactic identity condition, as long as the relevant difference—here posited to be located in Voice—is external to the ellipsis site in low ellipses but internal to it in high ellipses. This distribution thus provides evidence that ellipsis identity is calculated over syntactic structures. On approaches that posit them, it appears that semantic or ‘argument structure’ or ‘conceptual structure’ representations are either too coarse-grained (entailment-based or inference-based approaches) or too fine-grained (‘argument structure’ in the HPSG sense) to make the necessary distinctions.

This analysis crucially relies on the assumption that surface differences can be due to different morphological realizations of what are syntactically the same items. These differing realizations are conditioned by the co-presence in the structure of elements outside the ellipsis site which triggers or determines the values of the features that the morphological realization rules are sensitive to. Specifically, these conclusions rely on a separation of traditional verbal information, with some of that information being encoded on (possibly unpronounced) higher nodes in the extended projection of the verb, though realized synthetically on the verb by the morphology of English. Frameworks which do not countenance such forms of distribution of features or which subscribe to some version of surface lexicalism cannot easily accommodate these data.
My goal here has not been to formulate the syntactic identity condition, but rather merely to present a set of data that indicate that some such condition is necessary, no matter what form it may take in detail. There are several other syntactic identity phenomena that will be relevant to the eventual formulation of the identity condition, and much work devoted to the details of such formulations; the facts from voice mismatches show that voice must be included as a factor in any such identity condition.
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