The eventive core is *not* special in ellipsis: A reply to Rudin 2019

Abstract

Rudin (2019) argues that the *eventive core* is privileged when calculating syntactic parallelism under ellipsis. This cannot be correct. First, if illicit mismatches under sluicing are characterized precisely, then the English data used by Rudin do not instantiate the type of mismatch that is ruled out. Second, mismatches above the eventive core are disallowed in Spanish, contra Rudin's expectations. Given my assessment of Rudin, I propose a condition for syntactic parallelism in ellipsis. I characterize the *type* of mismatch that is allowed, arguing that the relevant notion for calculating parallelism is featural *non-distinctness*, as opposed to featural identity.

Keywords: sluicing, parallelism, mismatches in ellipsis, Spanish, English, eventive core

1. Introduction

This paper argues against the characterization of syntactic parallelism under ellipsis in Rudin 2019.[1] I argue that a crucial aspect of Rudin's overall proposal is untenable. The condition argued for in Rudin 2019 is the following:

(1)   *Syntactic Condition on Sluicing (final)* (Rudin 2019: 269)
      Given a prospective ellipsis site E and its antecedent A, non-pronunciation of the
      phonological content associated with any head h ∈ E is licit if at least one of the
      following conditions hold
            a. h did not originate within E's **eventive core**
            b. h has a structure-matching correlate *i* ∈ A.

   The eventive core is defined as follows:

(2)   *Eventive Core (final definition)* (Rudin 2019: 271)
      The eventive core of a clause is its highest vP that is associated with an event introducing
      predicate.

   A structure-matching correlate is defined as follows:

(3)   *Correlate* (Rudin 2019: 264)
          A node n can be a correlate for a head h iff at least one of the following conditions holds:
                    a. n is a head and n and h are tokens of the same lexical item
                    b. n is coindexed with h

The entirety of the condition in (1) will not concern us here. We will focus instead on the idea that the eventive core is privileged:

(4)   *The eventive core (i.e. VoiceP/vP) is privileged* [2]
          In calculating syntactic parallelism in ellipsis, the eventive core is privileged; material outside of the eventive core can mismatch without causing a violation of syntactic parallelism.

Possible and impossible mismatches under sluicing in English are used in Rudin 2019 to justify the putative primacy of the eventive core. Specifically, the proposal in (4) is intended to capture an asymmetry regarding the availability of mismatches under sluicing. I will present contrasts in the behavior of tense and voice mismatches to illustrate the general flavor of the asymmetry, focusing on the specifics of the relevant data later. Representative examples of possible T(ense) mismatches are given below:[3]

(5) T^0 *mismatches* (Rudin 2019: 266; a.-b. from Merchant 2001)
          a. Sally **cooks** every night; she learned how <**to cook**> from her father.
          b. The baseball player went public with his desire **to be** traded. He doesn't care where <he {**is, will be**} traded>.
          c. Your favorite plant **is** alive, but you can never be sure for how long <your favorite plant **will be** alive>.

In (5)a-c, there is a mismatch at the T^0 level between the antecedent and ellipsis sites. The crucial takeaway is that, even though there is a tense mismatch, the examples are licit. In contrast, voice mismatches under sluicing are impossible (Merchant 2001, 2013):[4]

(6)   *Voice^0 mismatches*
          a. Someone **betrayed** Robin, but we don't know who <**betrayed** Robin>.
                                                            ✓Voice$_{\text{ACTIVE A}}$-Voice $_{\text{ACTIVE E}}$
          b. *Someone **betrayed** Robin, but we don't know by who/who by <Robin **was betrayed**>.   *Voice$_{\text{ACTIVE A}}$-Voice $_{\text{PASSIVE E}}$
          c. Robin **was betrayed**, but we don't know by who <Robin **was betrayed**>.
                                                            ✓Voice$_{\text{PASSIVE A}}$-Voice $_{\text{PASSIVE E}}$
          d. *Robin **was betrayed**, but we don't know who <**betrayed** Robin>.

$*\text{Voice}_{\text{PASSIVE}}\ \text{a-Voice}_{\text{ACTIVE}}\ \text{e}$

The analysis in Rudin 2019 capitalizes on one salient difference between the examples in (5) versus (6) to capture the asymmetry. In both cases, there exists a mismatch in the content of the ellipsis site relative to the antecedent clause. However, the mismatches occur at different layers of structure. Whereas the licit mismatch in (5) occurs at the T^0 level, the mismatch in (6) occurs at the Voice^0 level. Were we to assume that syntactic identity is calculated over the *entire* ellipsis site, we would predict that both these types of mismatches should be impossible, contrary to fact. It therefore seems to be the case that structure *up to a certain point* is relevant in calculating identity under ellipsis: Mismatches up to the eventive core (VoiceP/*v*P) level are intolerable, whereas mismatches above this domain are possible. To quote Rudin (2019):

(7)　*On privileging the eventive core*
　　"The fact that some aspects of the interpretation of the ellipsis site, such as the verb and its arguments, are fixed, but other aspects, like modality, are slippery and indeterminate, suggests that the explanation of these left-peripheral mismatches is that identity requirements on sluices apply only to some subset of the elements in the elided TP. Specifically, I claim that identity conditions on ellipsis apply only to elements that originate inside what I call the *eventive core* of the elided clause—roughly speaking, the verb and its arguments."　　　　　　(italics in original; Rudin 2019: 267)

In a nutshell, the proposal is that the eventive core is privileged when calculating parallelism under ellipsis, and material outside of this domain does not enter into the calculation.

However, I will show that the kind of data used in Rudin 2019 to argue for that position suffers a significant and consistent confound. Additionally, when we look beyond English, we find that mismatches above the eventive core are also disallowed, contra the predictions made by the proposal. I will show that these mismatches are disallowed when they instantiate a full featural clash. The reason why the English data in (5) are licit is not because material outside of the eventive core can mismatch. Rather, the data in (5) are simply not the *kind* of mismatch that is banned in ellipsis. Before discussing in detail why the data used by Rudin are inconclusive, let

us do a brief excursus into the logic of searching for a unified parallelism condition under ellipsis.

2. The condition on syntactic parallelism in ellipsis should be universal

If there is something deep about the eventive core's primacy in syntactic identity under ellipsis, we would not expect to find languages where the eventive core has no privileged status. The proposal in Rudin 2019 therefore makes strong empirical predictions: If we look beyond English, material outside the eventive core should be able to mismatch.

Let us reason briefly on the virtues of a unified parallelism condition under ellipsis. Imagine that after analyzing the parallelism requirements under ellipsis in a wide array of languages, we ended up proposing a descriptively adequate condition of the following nature:

(8)　　*Syntactic parallelism under ellipsis*
　　　　a.　In languages A, B, C, the ellipsis site and antecedent must be featurally identical.
　　　　b.　In languages D, E, F, the ellipsis site and antecedent must be featurally identical *up to XP*.

The condition in (8) is a parameterized condition of some sort, positing that the differences we find regarding parallelism under ellipsis are the result of languages respecting either (8)a or (8)b. While a condition like (8) may describe the facts and capture the observed data, it is undesirable from a theoretical perspective. Our reasoning is a classic poverty of the stimulus argument. Acquirers are never exposed to negative evidence regarding the kind of mismatches that are disallowed in their language under ellipsis—i.e., children are never taught that a passive sluice cannot be anteceded by an active clause. We would expect this logic to extend to other kinds of mismatches as well. We will assume therefore that the proposal in Rudin 2019 similarly does not lend itself to any kind of variation. Under that view, we must assume that UG encodes the syntactic parallelism condition under ellipsis and that this condition privileges the *eventive core* full-stop. If we took a different route and assumed that Rudin's (2019) proposal lent itself to

parameterization—i.e., English respects the identity condition in (8)b, but other languages respect a different identity condition— the explanatory power of the proposal would diminish considerably.

In the next section, I show that Rudin's prediction that material outside the eventive core should be able to mismatch is not borne out in Spanish. As a result, we must conclude that the eventive core is not a privileged domain when it comes to the syntactic parallelism condition on ellipsis.[5] Rather, the asymmetry regarding the availability of mismatches shown in (5)-(6) should be captured through a different route. I will provide such an account as well.

3. On arguing from the wrong data

Rudin 2019 relies on a wide array of English corpus examples illustrating mismatches in sluicing to propose an identity condition on ellipsis that can capture what he characterizes as an asymmetry in mismatch availability.[6] However, I contend that the kind of evidence that English provides for characterizing the range of possible mismatches under ellipsis is inconclusive— English is simply the wrong empirical source. Let us see why by analyzing the *nature* of the mismatches underlying (5) as opposed to (6).

The tense mismatches in (5) involve a mismatch between tensed and tenseless clauses, or between a tensed clause and another clause where the verb is bare, but the presence of the modal *will* results in a future interpretation. As we can see by the breakdown below, none of the English examples involve a *clash* between two *featurally specified* T^0 heads. Rather, the way to characterize these allowable mismatches is that (i) a clause containing a tensed verb can mismatch with a clause containing a tenseless verb, (9)a and (9)b (when the sluice contains a tensed *is*), (ii) a clause containing a tenseless verb can mismatch with a clause containing a tenseless verb and an additional modal (9)b (when the sluice contains a modal *will* and a bare

be), and (iii) a clause containing a tensed verb can mismatch with a clause containing a tenseless verb and an additional modal (9)c:

(9)   *Allowable mismatches at the T^0 level involve non-distinct T^0s (repeated from (5))*
      a. Sally **cooks** every night; she learned how <**to cook**> from her father.

$\text{T}_{\text{PRESENT A}}\text{-T}_{\emptyset\,\text{E}}$

      b. The baseball player went public with his desire **to be** traded. He doesn't care where <he {**is, will be**} traded>. $\text{T}_{\emptyset\,\text{A}}\text{-T}_{\text{PRESENT E}}\,/\,\text{T}_{\emptyset\,\text{A}}\,\text{-}\,\text{T}_{\emptyset\,\text{E}}+\text{modal}$
      c. Your favorite plant **is** alive, but you can never be sure for how long <your favorite plant **will be** alive>. $\text{T}_{\text{PRESENT A}}\,\text{-}\,\text{T}_{\emptyset\,\text{E}}+\text{modal}$

In none of the examples above does T^0 actually mismatch between the antecedent clause and the ellipsis site in the following sense: (9)a-c do not involve *full featural clashes* between the T^0 in the antecedent and the T^0 in the ellipsis, such that T^0 in the antecedent bears a feature that clashes with a feature borne by T^0 in the ellipsis and vice versa. I add the following example showing that an antecedent with a gerund can mismatch with an ellipsis site containing an infinitival:

(10)   I love **going** to the beach, I just don't know when <**to go** to the beach>.

$\text{T}_{\emptyset\,\text{A}}\,\text{-}\,\text{T}_{\emptyset\,\text{E}}$

In analyzing the status of the disallowed voice mismatches in (6), we notice that the nature of their mismatch is fundamentally different to the tense mismatches: In these examples, we *do* find a full featural clash between the Voice^0 specifications of both clauses in the sense articulated above—Voice^0 in the antecedent bears a feature that clashes with a feature borne by Voice^0 in the ellipsis and vice versa (see Merchant 2013). Let us assume that $\text{Voice}_{\text{ACT}}$ and $\text{Voice}_{\text{PASSIVE}}$ are feature bundles—i.e., a set of features within one syntactic atom—whose content differentiates them from each other, resulting thus in the properties that differentiate active clauses from passive clauses. It should be clear that the examples below instantiate a full featural clash then, in contrast to the examples in (5), where no such clash exists:

(11)   *Voice mismatches involve a full featural clash*
      a. *Someone **betrayed** Robin, but we don't know by who/who by <Robin **was
         betrayed**>.   *Voice$_{\text{ACTIVE A}}$-Voice $_{\text{PASSIVE E}}$
      b. *Robin **was betrayed**, but we don't know **who** <betrayed Robin>.
                                              *Voice $_{\text{PASSIVE A}}$-Voice$_{\text{ACTIVE E}}$

We observe therefore that there is an asymmetry between the *type* of mismatch in (5) versus

(6).[7] While the proposal in Rudin 2019 attributes the difference in status of these examples to a

fact about the structural domain that enters into the calculation of syntactic parallelism in ellipsis,

there is an alternative explanation. I argue for the following:

(12)   *Syntactic parallelism in ellipsis (to be revised)*
      Antecedent and ellipsis site must be featurally non-distinct.

The condition in (12) has its roots in Chomsky (1965), which argued that deletion under

identity in comparatives satisfies non-distinctness, as opposed to strict identity; e.g., '*I know

several more successful lawyers than Bill.*', where a plural feature in the antecedent does not

clash with singular, which is assumed to be unspecified for number (Chomsky 1965: 181; see

Lipták 2013 and Lasnik & Funakoshi 2019, as well as a brief discussion on number features in

section 5).

The condition in (12) allows featurally non-distinct antecedents and ellipsis sites only. As a

result, ellipsis is allowed (i) when there is a mismatch between the presence and absence of a

feature bundle, or (ii) when both antecedent and ellipsis lack a feature bundle. The data in (9)-

(10) are thus allowed. Conversely, featurally distinct antecedents and ellipsis sites are disallowed

given (12). In other words, ellipsis is impossible when there is a featural clash between a feature

bundle in an antecedent and a feature bundle in an ellipsis site. The data in (11) are thus ruled

out.[8, 9]

The approach defended here makes a strong prediction which is fundamentally at odds with

the predictions of Rudin 2019's condition. It predicts that a true featural clash at the T^0 level

should be disallowed, whereas Rudin predicts that such a clash should be possible, since T^0 is

outside of the eventive core. We can construct the necessary data in Spanish in order to test the

competing predictions. First, let us observe that temporal adverbs force the use of specific tenses

in Spanish. A past oriented adverb like *ayer* 'yesterday' requires the use of the past, while future

oriented adverbs like *mañana* 'tomorrow' allow the use of the present habitual or the future.

Using the present habitual or future with a past-oriented adverb is ill-formed (13)b; using the

past with a future oriented adverb is also illicit (13)d; using the past/future with an adverbial

necessitating a habitual present is also out (13)f. The presence of specific temporal adverbs

forces us, then, to use an appropriate tense. Note that tense marking in Spanish, including the

future, is synthetic, in contrast to the English future, which is formed via the use of a modal.

(13)　　*Tense and temporal adverbs in Spanish*
　　　　a. Ayer　　　comí　　　tortillas.
　　　　　 yesterday eat.1S.PAST tortillas
　　　　　 'Yesterday, I ate tortillas.'
　　　　b. *Ayer　　como/comeré　　　 tortillas.
　　　　　　yesterday eat.1S.PRES/eat.1S.FUT tortillas
　　　　c. Mañana　como/comeré　　　 tortillas.
　　　　　 yesterday eat.1S.PRES/eat.1S.FUT tortillas
　　　　　 'Tomorrow, I eat/will eat tortillas.'
　　　　d. *Mañana　comí　　　tortillas.
　　　　　　tomorrow eat.1S.PAST tortillas
　　　　e. En general, yo　como　　tortillas.
　　　　　 in　general　1S　eat.1S.PRES tortillas
　　　　　 'In general, I eat tortillas.'
　　　　f. *En general, yo comí/comeré tortillas.
　　　　　　in　general　1S eat.1S.PRES　 tortillas

　　Let us discuss now sluicing in Spanish. The example in (14) provides a baseline, where a

tense match between antecedent and ellipsis is naturally allowed:

(14)　　*Spanish sluicing—Tense match*
　　　　Context:　Two people are discussing who is in charge of repairing watches at shop. One
　　　　of the speakers tells the other who is in charge that day and the next.
　　　　a.　Hoy,　Ana **repara**　　　　los relojes, pero mañana,　no　sé　quién

today Ana **repair.3S.PRES** the watches but   tomorrow NEG know who
repara   los relojes.
repair.3S.PRES the watches
'Today, Ana repairs the watches. Tomorrow, I don't know who repairs the watches.'
b.   Hoy, Ana **repara**   los relojes, pero mañana,   no sé   quién
today Ana **repair.3S.PRES** the watches but   tomorrow NEG know who
<**repara**   los relojes>.
  repair.3S.PRES the watches
'Today, Ana repairs the watches. Tomorrow, I don't know who does.'
c.   Hoy, Ana **repara**   los relojes, pero mañana,   no sé   quién **lo**
today Ana **repair.3S.PRES** the watches but   tomorrow NEG know who **3S**
hace.
do.3S.PRES
'Today, Ana repairs the watches. Tomorrow, I don't know who does so.'

We will now modify the examples so that the presence of a temporal adverbial in the target

clause forces the use of the clashing tense inside the ellipsis site. Note that the intended

interpretation should be pragmatically recoverable, since the adverb is outside of the ellipsis site

and serves thus to specify the kind of interpretation that is intended by the speaker. However,

these sentences are illicit: When we force a tense mismatch between the antecedent and ellipsis,

sluicing is disallowed:

(15)   *Spanish sluicing—Tense mismatch disallowed*
Context: Two people are discussing who is in charge of repairing watches at a shop. One
of the speakers tells the other who is in charge on that day and who was the day before.
a.   Hoy, Ana **repara**   los relojes, pero ayer,   no sé   quién
today Ana **repair.3S.PRES** the watches but   yesterday NEG know who
reparó   los relojes.
repair.3S.PAST the watches
'Today, Ana repairs the watches, but yesterday, I don't know who repaired the
watches.'
b. *Hoy, Ana **repara**   los relojes, pero ayer,   no sé   quién
today Ana **repair.3S.PRES** the watches but   yesterday NEG know who
<**reparó**   los relojes.>
  repair.3S.PAST the watches
Intended: 'Today, Ana repairs the watches, but yesterday, I don't know who did.'
*T_{PRESENT A} − T_{PAST E}
c.   Hoy, Ana **repara**   los relojes, pero ayer,   no sé   quién **lo**
today Ana **repair.3S.PRES** the watches but   yesterday NEG know who **3S**

9

hizo.
do.3S.PAST
'Today, Ana repairs the watches, but yesterday, I don't know who did.'

The non-elided responses in (15)a and (15)b show that the unacceptability of the tense

mismatch under sluicing cannot be the result of some general pragmatic avoidance for switching

tenses across clauses. Furthermore, the only difference between the acceptable sluicing in (14)b

and the unacceptable sluicing in (15)b is the existence of a tense clash between antecedent and

ellipsis. The answer in (16)b shows that the effect is symmetrical as well: A T$_{PAST}$ antecedent is

not allowed to mismatch with a T$_{PRESENT}$ in the sluice:

(16)   *Spanish sluicing—Tense mismatch disallowed*
<u>Context:</u> Two people are discussing who is in charge of repairing watches at a shop. One
of the speakers tells the other who was in charge of making the repairs on the day before,
as well as who is generally in charge.
   a.   Ayer,   Ana **reparó**   los relojes, pero en general, no sé   quién
       yesterday Ana **repair.3S.PAST** the watches but in general NEG know who
       repara   los relojes.
       repair.3S.PRES the watches
       'Yesterday, Ana repaired the watches, but in general, I don't know who repairs the
       watches.'
   b.   *Ayer,   Ana **reparó**   los relojes, pero en general, no sé   quién
       yesterday Ana **repair.3S.PAST** the watches but in general NEG know who
     < **repara**   los relojes.>
       repair.3S.PRES the watches
       Intended: 'Yesterday, Ana repaired the watches, but in general, I don't know who
       does.'
                                     *T$_{PAST\ A}$ – T$_{PRESENT\ E}$
   c.   Ayer,   Ana **reparó**   los relojes, pero en general, no sé   quién
       yesterday Ana **repair.3S.PAST** the watches but in general NEG know who
       lo hace.
       3S do.3S.PRES
       'Yesterday, Ana repaired the watches, but in general, I don't know who does so.'

Under the approach defended here, the ungrammaticality of (15)b and (16)b is predicted,

since there is a featural clash between T$_{PRESENT}$ and T$_{PAST}$. In contrast, the results above are at

odds with the predictions of Rudin's (2019) approach: The relevant elements lie outside of the

eventive core, so it is not predicted that they are unable to mismatch under ellipsis. Finally,

appealing to some sort of pragmatic condition governing the impossibility of (15)b does not

seem fruitful, since the adverbial remnant makes clear what the speaker's intended interpretation

for the tense inside the sluice must be.

These data show that, upon broadening the empirical scope of our investigation, there is little

empirical justification for proposing that structure outside the eventive core is ignored in

calculating syntactic parallelism in ellipsis. As should be clear from the translations to the

examples above as well, we cannot construct parallel examples in English, since the use of VP-

ellipsis (VPE) would be required, regardless of whether we attempt to force a tense mismatch or

not.[10] The VPE examples are irrelevant to the discussion at hand, since the *do*-remnant bears the

tense specification that would clash with the antecedent in a well-controlled test case, whereas

the verb within the ellipsis is bare. VPE involving a remnant modal *will* is equally uninformative,

since the verb inside the ellipsis site is also tenseless.

(17)　　a. Today, Ana **repairs** the watches. Tomorrow, I don't know who does/will <**repair** the watches>.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*VPE*

　　　　b. *Today, Ana **repairs** the watches. Tomorrow, I don't know who <**repairs** the watches>.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*sluicing; T match*

　　　　c. Today, Ana **repair** the watches. Yesterday, I don't know who did <**repair** the watches>.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*VPE*

　　　　d. *Today, Ana **repairs** the watches. Yesterday, I don't know who <**repaired** the watches>.　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　*sluicing; T clash*

The Spanish facts just illustrated are also not merely a quirk of sluicing proper. Parallel

conclusions can be drawn from other types of ellipsis where the remnant in the target clause is an

element other than a *wh*-word. In what follows, I will consider TP-ellipsis where the remnant is

an element like *también* 'also', or a polarity marker. Before delving into the data specifically, I

will take for granted here that an analysis of the following sort is sound for these types of

constructions (see Depiante 2004, Saab 2008, 2010a 2016, Brucart & MacDonald 2012).[11] The

remnant is a clitic-left-dislocated element in the left periphery, whereas the E-feature on the

polarity head Σ (Laka 1990) licenses ellipsis in the syntax (see Merchant 2001 for this approach

to licensing):

(18)   *Spanish TP-Ellipsis*
        [$_{TopP}$ remnant$_i$ Top [$_{ΣP}$ Σ$_{[E]}$ [$_{TP}$ … C̶l̶$_i$+T̶…]]]

    With this sketch of the structure in place, let us now turn to the relevant mismatches. In (19)

below involving TP-ellipsis, *también* 'also' is the remnant. We observe the same effect as with

sluicing: If we force a tense within the ellipsis that clashes with the antecedent, ungrammaticality

ensues.

(19)   *Spanish TP-Ellipsis—Tense mismatch disallowed*
        a. Ayer   María **comió**   en el parque, y   anteayer   también
           yesterday María **eat.3S.PAST** in the park   and day.before.yesterday also
           comió   en el parque.
           eat.3S.PAST in the park
           'Yesterday, Maria ate in the park, and the day before yesterday, she ate in the park as
            well.'
        b. Ayer   María **comió** en el parque, y anteayer también <**comió** en el parque>.
           'Yesterday, María ate in the park, and the day before yesterday, she did as well.'
        c. Ayer,   María **comió**   en el parque, y   mañana   también **comerá**   en el
           yesterday María **eat.3S.PAST** in the park   and tomorrow also   **eat.1S.FUT** in the
           parque.
           park
           'Yesterday, Maria ate in the park, and tomorrow, she will eat in the park as well.'
        d. *Ayer, María **comió** en el parque, y mañana también <**comerá** en el parque>.
           Intended: 'Yesterday, Maria ate in the park, and tomorrow, she will as well.'
                                                                           *T$_{PAST\ A}$ − T$_{FUTURE\ E}$
        e. Ayer,   María **comió**   en el parque, y   mañana   también **lo hará**.
           yesterday María **eat.3S.PAST** in the park   and tomorrow also   **3S do.3S.FUT**
           'Yesterday, Maria ate in the park, and tomorrow, she will do so too.'

    As was the case with our discussion of (15) via (17), the translations show that we cannot

construct parallel examples testing a full mismatch in English, since VPE is again required. Now

observe the examples below, which bring out the same point. The data in (20) involve TP-ellipsis

as well, but the remnant is a polarity marker:

(20) *Spanish TP-ellipsis—Tense mismatch disallowed*
    a. Mañana   no **iré**   al   parque, pero pasado mañana sí **iré**   al
       tomorrow NEG **go.1S.FUT** to.the park   but   after   tomorrow yes **go.1S.FUT** to.the
       parque.
       park
       'Tomorrow, I won't go to the park, but the day after tomorrow, I will go to the park.'
    b. Mañana no **iré** al parque, pero pasado mañana sí <**iré al parque**>.
       'Tomorrow, I won't go to the park, but the day after tomorrow, I will.'
    c. Mañana   no **iré**   al   parque, pero ayer   sí   **fui**   al   parque.
       tomorrow NEG **go.1S.FUT** to.the park   but   yesterday yes **go.1S.PST** to.the park
       'Tomorrow, I won't go to the park, but yesterday I did go to the park.'
    d. *Mañana no **iré** al parque, pero ayer sí <**fui al parque**>.
       Intended: 'Tomorrow, I won't go to the park, but yesterday, I did. *$T_{FUTURE\ A} - T_{PAST\ E}$
    e. Mañana   no **iré**   al   parque, pero ayer   sí   **lo hice**
       tomorrow NEG **go.1S.FUT** to.the park   but   yesterday yes **3S do.1S.PAST**
       'Tomorrow, I won't go to the park, but yesterday I did go to the park.'

We observe thus that a wide array of ellipsis constructions disallow full-featural clashes occurring above the eventive core.

Lending more force to our empirical argument against Rudin 2019, we note that we are not the first to discuss the unavailability of T^0 level mismatches in Spanish. Brucart (1987) and Murguia (2004) have made the exact same point.[12] Most striking perhaps are the results stemming from Saab (2016), who argues forcefully against a semantic identity condition on ellipsis by showing that certain tense mismatches are impossible in Spanish TP ellipsis—*even* if the proposition in the antecedent *entails* the proposition in the target clause. The relevant examples involve a clash between a T$_{PRESENT}$ and a T$_{PAST}$. The relevant T$_{PRESENT}$ is the so-called historical/narrative present which has a past interpretation:[13]

(21) *Historical present in Spanish* (adapted from Saab 2016: 372)
    Adiviná qué me   pasó   ayer! Estoy   tomando una cervecita en
    guess.IMP what to.me happened yesterday 1S.be.PRESENT drinking a   beer.DIM in
    el bar y   entonces veo   a mi mujer besándose con mi mejor amigo.
    the bar and then   1S.see.PRESENT A my wife kissing   with my best friend
    'Guess what happened to me yesterday! I am drinking a beer at the bar and then I see my wife kissing my best friend.'

The crucial observation is that using the historical present is impossible in the kind of interruption illustrated below. Speaker B must use the formal past in her interruption:

(22)   *Constraints on the historical present in Spanish* (adapted from Saab 2016: 375)
  A: Adiviná qué me pasó ayer! **Estoy** tomando una cervecita en
   guess.IMP what to.me happened yesterday **1S.be.PRESENT** drinking a beer.DIM in
   el bar…
   the bar
   'Guess what happened to me yesterday! I am drinking a beer at the bar…'
  B: Qué casualidad! Ayer Juan también **estaba/#está** tomando una
   what coincidence yesterday Juan too **3S.be.PAST/3S.be.PRESENT** drinking a
   cervecita en el bar.
   beer.DIM at the bar
   'What a coincidence! Yesterday, Juan was also drinking a beer in the bar.'
   #'What a coincidence! Yesterday, Juan is also drinking a beer in the bar.'

We now have a relevant controlled environment in which to test whether TP-ellipsis is licensed when a full-featural mismatch between the T^0 in the antecedent and the T^0 in the sluice is forced. As is predicted by our approach, such a mismatch is impossible: A historical $T_{PRESENT}$ cannot serve as the antecedent for a sluice that must be interpreted with a T_{PAST}, even though the proposition in the historical present entails the proposition in the past:

(23)   *No historical $T_{PRESENT}$ and T_{PAST} mismatch in Spanish* (adapted from Saab 2016: 377)
  A: Adiviná qué me pasó ayer! **Estoy** tomando una cervecita en
   guess.IMP what to.me happened yesterday **1S.be.PRESENT** drinking a beer.DIM in

   el bar…
   the bar
   'Guess what happened to me yesterday! I am drinking a beer at the bar…'
  B: Qué casualidad! Ayer yo también <****estaba/#estoy** tomando una
   what coincidence yesterday I too **1S.be.PAST/1S.be.PRESENT** drinking a
   cervecita en el bar.>
   beer.DIM at the bar   *historical $T_{PRESENT\ A} - T_{PAST\ E}$
   Intended: 'What a coincidence! Me too.'

The relevance of Saab's examples should be clear: Mismatches above the eventive core are disallowed in Spanish, contra the predictions made by Rudin (2019).

To summarize this section: The empirical landscape in Spanish is relevant insofar as we can tease apart our proposal from the one advocated by Rudin (2019) to explain the mismatch asymmetry in (5)-(6). As we have observed, the proposal advanced here fares better on empirical grounds. The table below shows the T^0 mismatches that are allowed/disallowed under sluicing. While I have not illustrated every conceivable tense clash in Spanish, the contrast with the English cases should be clear:

(24)   *Summary of Tense mismatches in sluicing: English vs. Spanish*

Tense Mismatches in Sluicing

Status	Antecedent	Sluice	Language	Example
✔	$T_{PRESENT}$	no tensed T^0 (infinitival)	English	(5)a
✔	no tensed T^0 (infinitival)	$T_{PRESENT}$	English	(5)b
✔	$T_{PRESENT}$	no tensed T^0 + (modal *will*)	English	(5)c
✔	no tensed T^0 (gerund)	no tensed T^0 (infinitival)	English	(10)
*	$T_{PRESENT}$	T_{PAST}	Spanish	(15)B'
*	T_{PAST}	$T_{PRESENT}$	Spanish	(16)B'
*	T_{PAST}	T_{FUTURE}	Spanish	(19)d
*	T_{FUTURE}	T_{PAST}	Spanish	(20)d
*	historical $T_{PRESENT}$	T_{PAST}	Spanish	(23)

This asymmetry cannot be explained by the analysis put forward in Rudin 2019. In other words, the asymmetry we observe is not predicted by an identity condition that privileges the eventive core.

A question that arises at this juncture is whether cases of ellipsis beyond sluicing could provide evidence that *English* also disallows tense clashes above the eventive core. As suggested by an anonymous reviewer and discussed in Stockwell and Wong (2020), stripping seems to provide that evidence (Hankamer & Sag 1976, Johnson 2019; see Ortega Santos et.al 2014 for *wh*-stripping specifically). Consider the contrast between the examples below:

(25)   *Tense match in stripping*
        A: We meet in this building today.
        B: That's right! And where do we meet later today?
        B′: That's right! And where later today?

(26)   *Tense clash in stripping*
        A: We met in this building yesterday.
        B: That's right! And where do we meet later today?
        B′: *That's right! And where later today?

While a discussion of the precise nature of stripping would take us too far afield, the contrast between the examples above shows that some ellipsis types in English also provide support for the analysis defended here, casting further doubt on Rudin 2019's position.

In the following section, we will scrutinize the rest of the data discussed in Rudin 2019 and argue that it also need not be explained by assigning a privileged status to the eventive core.

4. Other mismatches above the eventive core

In section 3, I showed that in analyzing mismatches above the eventive core in Spanish, the interpretation defended here for the mismatch asymmetry in English is superior to Rudin 2019's. Our work is not yet done, however. Rudin uses other types of mismatches outside the eventive core to argue for his position, and we must account for these mismatches as well. In what follows, we discuss all these cases and suggest that they can indeed be handled by the featural non-distinctness approach.

At this juncture, readers might be concerned that the strategy that will be used in what follows is worryingly unrestrictive—couldn't we just assume that every mismatch that is allowed is encoded via the presence/absence of a dedicated projection/feature, and mismatches that are not allowed reflect value conflicts among extant features, in an entirely post hoc way? This concern is not unjustified, but it does not undermine the current proposal altogether. For one thing, the Spanish data in the previous section show that Rudin's proposal does not work when

the empirical domain is broadened, so an alternative is required to begin with. If our specific

alternative faces methodological challenges, this could only stand as a drawback relative to some

other extant competitor that also explained Spanish. I am not aware of one such alternative at this

time. More importantly, however, the maneuver of assuming presence/absence whenever a

mismatch is allowed is not as freely-available as the foregoing discussion might suggest. For

example, suppose we found that in Spanish, present and past clashes *were* allowed to mismatch.

We don't think that an account appealing to, e.g., PresentP and PastP, each present and absent in

a complementary set of clauses, would seem as reasonable as the JussiveP-based approach

which will be taken below as a response to illocutionary mismatches discussed by Rudin (see

(37) below). That is, it is not true that we have no priors regarding which features/projections are

privative, and which stand in the conflicting-features relation, prior to and independent of their

behavior under ellipsis.

Before discussing the relevant examples, I need to highlight a very important difference

between the Spanish mismatches discussed previously and the remaining English data. In all the

English cases we will now discuss based on Rudin 2019, it is impossible to know what the

content of the sluice *must* be. Whereas we were able to construct controlled examples in Spanish

via the manipulation of temporal adverbs or conversational turns, no such control is possible in

the English cases that Rudin presents. We must therefore follow him in characterizing the

content of the sluices through the possible interpretations we can conceive of assigning to the

sluices. As we will see, this limitation of the English mismatches will be important for our

conclusion that these cases are ultimately uninformative. First, we will observe how all of the

data satisfy featural non-distinctness. Then, at the end of this section, I will present an alternative

interpretation of a subset of the data that also argues against Rudin's proposal but is fully consistent with the analysis defended here.

I now present the examples as interpreted by Rudin and provide additional possible interpretations where needed. The first batch of examples instantiate mismatches in modality. Consider first cases in which there is no overt modal in the antecedent, but a modal interpretation is available for the sluice:

(27) *Mismatch Type: Appearance of modality in the sluice* (Rudin 2019)
Sally knows that there is always the potential for awful things **to happen**, but she doesn't know when <awful things {**will, might**} happen>.

We can account for this type of mismatch straightforwardly, since it instantiates another case of mismatches involving the presence versus absence of featural content. Whereas the antecedent has no ModP projection, the sluice does.[14]

(28) *Mismatch Type: Appearance of modality in the sluice (Version 1)*
Antecedent: [XP … [YP]]   *no Mod^0*
Sluice: [XP [ModP … [YP]]] *Mod^0*

A careful reader might wonder whether the presence of a modal in the sluice truly involves only the presence of a feature bundle heading ModP. For example, Chung (2006) argues from the unavailability of P-stranding under sprouting that the ellipsis site cannot contain lexical material that is not present in the antecedent (see van Craenenbroeck and Merchant 2013 for discussion):

(29) *No P-stranding under sprouting* (adapted from Chung 2006: 78)
a. *Last night he was very afraid, but he couldn't tell us what <he was afraid of.>
b. *We're donating our car, but it's unclear which organization <we are donating our car to.>
c. *She phoned home, but they weren't sure which city <she phoned from.>

If Chung's lexical constraint is indeed correct and a nebulous modal such as the one interpreted inside the sluice in (27) should not be treated as a feature bundle, then one could object that our approach is insufficient.

To this objection, I reply the following: The interpretations below seem entirely natural for the relevant examples, in addition to the ones provided in Rudin 2019. If these are possible sources for the sluice, then we have a mismatch involving a tenseless antecedent and a tensed sluice, parallel to the tense mismatches discussed previously. The point in providing the following additional interpretations for the sluice is important: As long as there is a single structure that could underlie the sluice that conforms to our condition in (12), *that* structure explains the availability of the sluice. The fact that we can construe alternative interpretations for the content of the sluice is irrelevant:[15]

(30)　*Mismatch Type: Appearance of modality in the sluice (additional interpretations)*
　　　Sally knows that there is always the potential for awful things **to happen**, but she doesn't know when <awful things **Ø/do** happen>.

The examples characterized by Rudin as involving the appearance of modality fall neatly under our account, then, and need not be explained via a recourse to a privileged status for the eventive core. These examples could be analyzed as follows: There is a mismatch between the absence of finite T^0 in the antecedent and a $T_{PRESENT}$ in the sluice. There is no full featural clash and the example is correctly ruled in:

(31)　*Mismatch Type: Appearance of modality in the sluice (Version 2)*
　　　Antecedent:　[TP [$T_{\emptyset}$ … [YP]]]　　　*no finite T^0*
　　　Sluice:　　　[TP [$T_{PRESENT}$ … [YP]]]　　*finite T^0*

Let us move on now to cases involving the disappearance of modality. In these cases, there is a modal in the antecedent and no modal in the sluice:

(32)   *Mismatch Type: Disappearance of modality in the sluice* (Rudin 2019)
         Although Sally sees that she **must** defeat her competitors, she relies on Susie to tell her
         how <**to defeat** her competitors>.

These examples are handled straightforwardly. The ellipsis site merely lacks the projection

hosting the modal, or the ModP projection has no content (see endnote 14). Once again, we are

dealing with a case where a mismatch is allowed because it instantiates a mismatch between the

absence and presence of a feature bundle:

(33)   *Mismatch Type: Disappearance of modality in the sluice*
         Antecedent: [[XP [ModP … YP]]] *Mod^0*
         Sluice: [XP … YP]]   *no Mod^0*

A final mismatch type related to modals is observed below. Rudin characterizes these

examples as involving "abstraction" of modality, a name that highlights the vague nature of the

modal interpretation within the sluice:[16]

(34)   *Mismatch Type: Abstraction of modality in the sluice* (Rudin 2019)
         Sally said that customers **should** be given lower rates, but Susie said it's hard to see how
         <customers **could** be given lower rates>.

While Rudin's interpretation gives rise to a modal mismatch in (34), there is another possible

source for the sluice, which I give below:

(35)   *Mismatch Type: Abstraction of modality in the sluice (additional interpretations)*
         Sally said that customers **should** be given lower rates, but Susie said it's hard to see how
         < customers **are to be given** lower rates>.

Were we to take Rudin's interpretation of the modal content of the sluice at face value, we

would think these examples involve a clash of ModPs between antecedent and sluice, thus

constituting a problem for our approach. However, (35) could be the underlying source for the

sluice, in compliance with featural non-distinctness. To informants' ears as well, it is not odd to

interpret the example as involving a modal *match* between antecedent and sluice:[17]

(36) *Mismatch Type: Abstraction of modality in the sluice (additional interpretation)*
      Sally said that customers **should** be given lower rates, but Susie said it's hard to see how
      <customers **should** be given lower rates>.

If this is indeed possible, then the relevance of this kind of example is even weaker, since we

are dealing with a full featural *match*. To repeat a point made earlier: If there exists a single

structure that licenses the sluice, then it is irrelevant if we can come up with contents for the

sluice that would create a mismatch.[18]

Another type of example involves illocutionary mismatches. In the example below, the

antecedent is an imperative, whereas the sluice is a declarative:

(37) *Mismatch Type: Illocutionary mismatch* (Rudin 2019)
      Always **save** a little from each paycheck. Once you're older, you'll understand why <**you
      should** always save a little from each paycheck>.

My informants judge that a sentence without a modal is possible here as the underlying

source for the sluice. Therefore, any complication stemming from the presence of *should* in (37)

need not concern us:

(38) *Mismatch Type: Illocutionary mismatch (additional interpretation)*
      Always **save** a little from each paycheck. Once you're older, you'll understand why <**you
      always save** a little from each paycheck>.

We can focus solely on the illocutionary mismatch then. Analyzing this type of example will

depend crucially on our particular approach to the featural content of different clause types (see

van der Wurff 2007 for a discussion on different approaches to imperatives). A recent proposal

takes imperatives to contain a JussiveP projection immediately above TP that is absent in

declaratives (Zanuttini et.al. 2012; see also Isac 2015 for a proposal that is similar in spirit). A

piece of evidence for this proposal is that second person pronouns can be bound in imperatives

(e.g., 'Wash yourself!'). Zanuttini et.al. propose that the second person feature that binds the

pronoun is introduced in the Jussive head. Were one to assume that illocutionary force is

encoded in a head within the A'-domain, the fact that second person pronouns can be bound in imperatives would be unexpected, since elements in the A'-domain are not possible antecedents for binding.

We will not delve into the details of this analysis, but highlight instead the main takeaway in relation to the discussion at hand: If imperatives are syntactically encoded via a phrase that is absent in declaratives, then Rudin's illocutionary mismatches instantiate (once again) a case where there is a mismatch between the presence and absence of a feature bundle. Since this mismatch type is allowed by our approach to syntactic parallelism in ellipsis, these examples are unproblematic:[19]

(39)   *Mismatch Type: Illocutionary mismatch*
         Antecedent: [JussiveP [XP … YP]]   *Jussive^0; imperative*
         Sluice: [XP … YP]   *no Jussive^0; declarative*

A final type of mismatch involves polarity. In the example below, the antecedent clause is affirmative, whereas the sluice contains negation:

(40)   *Mismatch Type: Polarity mismatch* (Rudin 2019)[20]
         Either **turn in** your final paper by midnight or explain why <you **didn't** turn it in by midnight>!
         In order to account for these data, let us take the view that clauses containing negation

project a ΣP phrase where the Σ^0 hosts a [+NEG] feature. Conversely, ΣP is absent in affirmative clauses (Laka 1990, 1991). Adopting this analysis, then, this type of data falls straightforwardly under the proposal defended here: data like (40) involve a mismatch between the absence and presence of a feature bundle, in this case Σ^0:[21]

(41)   *Mismatch Type: Polarity mismatch*
         Antecedent: [XP … YP]   *no Σ^0*
         Sluice: [ΣP [XP … YP]] Σ^0 [+NEG]

Taking our discussion beyond Rudin's own examples, our explanation of the polarity mismatches makes a testable prediction. Let us follow Laka 1991 in assuming that emphatic 'do'

in English involves a [-NEG] feature on Σ^0. We predict, then, that a clash between the $\Sigma^0_{\text{[-NEG]}}$ and

$\Sigma^0_{\text{[+NEG]}}$ under ellipsis should be ruled out as a violation of (12). As Stockwell & Wong 2020

discuss, this prediction is borne out:

(42)   *Mismatch Type: Polarity clash* (Stockwell & Wong 2020)
        a. Either he turned in his final paper by midnight or he explained why <he didn't turn it in
        by midnight>. $\emptyset - \Sigma^0_{\text{[+NEG]}}$
        b. ?? Either he DID turn in his final paper by midnight or he explained why <he didn't
        turn it in by midnight>. $\Sigma^0_{\text{[-NEG]}} - \Sigma^0_{\text{[+NEG]}}$

The condition in (12) correctly rules in the examples where there is no clash between Σ

features (40) and (42)a, while correctly ruling out data like (42)b, which involve a featural clash.

In contrast, Rudin's proposal would predict that (42)b should be acceptable, since ΣP is outside

the eventive core.

A question that arises now is whether additional explanations could be offered for the

acceptability of some of the mismatches. In other words, could there be different routes that

would lead us to the same conclusion, that the examples used by Rudin do not provide evidence

that material outside the eventive core is exempt from the parallelism condition? As suggested by

two anonymous reviewers independently, a way of reaching the same conclusion for a subset of

the examples involves proposing that the relevant features that mismatch are outside of the

ellipsis site. For example, consider a finiteness mismatch in Spanish sprouting:

(43)   *Spanish sprouting—finiteness mismatch allowed*
        a. Recuerdo   haber   arreglado el carro, pero no recuerdo   cuándo
          remember.1SG have.INF fixed   the car   but not remember.1SG when
        <arreglé   el carro>.
         fixed.1SG the car
        'I remember having fixed the car, but I don't remember when.'
        b. Juana finalmente arregló el carro, aunque   parecía no saber   cómo
          Juana finally   fixed.3S the car   although seemed not know.INF how
          <arreglar el   carro>.
           fix.INF   the car
        'Juana finally fixed the car, although she didn't seem to know how.'

These data are similar to the English in (9)a. As suggested by a reviewer, if one assumes that finiteness comes from FinP in the left periphery (outside the ellipsis site), then these mismatches are handled straightforwardly (see Saab 2019, Tanaka 2011). If this analysis is on the right track, then examples like (43), then, would not support Rudin 2019's proposal. However, they would be fully consistent with the analysis defended here.[22]

A similar explanation could be given for the illocutionary mismatches. If one is unconvinced by Zanuttini et.al. 2012's argumentation for a distinction between imperatives and declaratives based on the presence/absence of a JussiveP projection, one could assume instead that force is encoded in the left periphery (e.g. in Rizzi 1997's ForceP). Under this approach, the relevant features that mismatch are outside of the ellipsis site as well, so they naturally do not enter into the calculation of parallelism.

A type of example that has no parallel in English was brought up by a reviewer and involves other mood mismatches of the kind observed in stripping:

(44)   *Spanish stripping—mood mismatch*
        a. Ahorrá   plata,   no palabras$_1$ <[$_{TP}$ ahorrés t$_1$]>.
           save.IMP money not words   save.SUBJ
           'Save money, not words!'   (From an Argentine commercial)
        b. No ahorrés   plata,   pero sí   palabras$_1$ <[$_{TP}$ ahorrá t$_1$]>.
           not save.SUBJ money but   yes words   save.IMP
           'Don't save money, save words!' (approximate translation)

A way of analyzing these examples that is fully consistent with the proposal defended here is that the mood mismatch is an illusion. Harris (1998) argues that the syntax of imperatives and subjunctives is identical; the difference in spell-out of the relevant verbs that display "imperative" or "subjunctive" morphology is the result of an impoverishment rule that is post-syntactic. The featural content of imperatives and subjunctives under that proposal is therefore identical, and thus examples like (44) satisfy (12).

Let us summarize the purpose and conclusions of the discussion in this section. Previously, we used tense mismatches in Spanish to argue against privileging the eventive core in ellipsis. However, Rudin presents evidence from mismatches above the eventive core beyond tense to argue for his position. We evaluated these mismatch types here: (i) Appearance of modality, (ii) disappearance of modality, (iii) abstraction of modality, (iv) illocutionary mismatches, (v) polarity mismatches and (vi) mood mismatches. We have concluded that there is no need to appeal to Rudin's analysis to capture why these mismatches are possible. The mismatches involve either the kind of featural non-distinctness that we proposed *is* allowed under ellipsis, or it is unclear that the content of the sluice necessarily results in a full feature clash. We therefore see that the empirical foundation of the proposal in Rudin 2019 is not solid. Coupled with the results from Spanish, we see no reason to lend weight to privileging the eventive core in calculating syntactic parallelism under ellipsis. In the next section, we will expand the empirical coverage further. [23]

5. Extending the empirical domain further

In this paper, I have argued that the syntactic parallelism condition in ellipsis should be calculated on the basis of the notion of featural *non-distinctness*, as opposed to featural *identity*. As shown before, the contrast between tense mismatches in English and Spanish argues strongly that this conception is on the right track.

However, there is a type of mismatch that might, at first glance, appear to be problematic. In the examples below involving TP-ellipsis in Spanish, the verb in the antecedent inflects for a different person specification than the verb inside the ellipsis: There appears to be a clash between ϕ-features here. However, the examples are licit, contra expectations:

(45) *TP-ellipsis in Spanish—person inflection mismatch*
       a. José **fue**   al   parque, pero Julián no <**fue**   al   parque>.   ✓3_A-3_E

José go.3S.PST to.the park   but Julián NEG **go.3S.PST** to.the park

'José went to the park, but Julián did not.'

    b. José **fue**   al   parque, pero yo no <**fui**   al   parque>.   ✓3_A-1_E

        José go.3S.PST to.the park   but 1s NEG **go.1S.PST** to.the park

        'José went to the park, but I did not.'

    c. José **fue**   al   parque, pero vos no <**fuiste**   al   parque>.   ✓3_A-2_E

        José **go.3S.PST** to.the park   but 2s NEG **go.2S.PST** to.the park

        'José went to the park, but you did not.'

In (45)b-c, 3rd person features in the antecedent mismatch with local person features in the target clause. To begin assessing our options, there is one simple way that the examples above could fit into our proposal as it currently stands. If we considered 3rd person to actually be the *absence* of person features (Benveniste 1971, Harley & Ritter 2002), then these mismatches would be of the same nature as the others we previously discussed. This cannot be the correct analysis however, once we probe further and observe the examples below. In (46)a and (46)c, there is a featural clash between 1st and 2nd person features. We should therefore seek to account for these cases without appealing to the notion of featural non-distinctness directly.[24]

(46)   *TP-ellipsis in Spanish—local person features mismatch*

    a. Yo **fui**   al   parque, pero vos no <**fuiste**   al   parque>.   ✓$1S_A$-$2S_E$

       1S **go.1S.PST** to.the park   but 2S NEG **go.2S.PST** to.the park

       'I went to the park, but you did not.'

    b. Yo **fui**   al   parque, pero Julián no <**fue**   al   parque>.   ✓$1S_A$-$3S_E$

       1S **go.1S.PST** to.the park   but Julián NEG **go.3S.PST** to.the park

       'I went to the park, but Julián did not.'

    c. Vos **fuiste**   al   parque, pero yo no <**fui**   al   parque>.   ✓$2S_A$-$1S_E$

       2S **go.2S.PST** to.the park   but 1S NEG **go.1S.PST** to.the park

       'You went to the park, but I did not.'

    d. Vos **fuiste**   al   parque, pero Julián no <**fue**   al   parque>.   ✓$2S_A$-$3S_E$

       2S **go.2S.PST** to.the park   but Julián NEG **go.3S.PST** to.the park

       'You went to the park, but Julián did not.'

A couple of examples where number is manipulated as well are given below:

(47)   *TP-ellipsis in Spanish—local person features mismatch*

    a. Nosotros **fuimos**   al   parque, pero vos no <**fuiste**   al   parque>. ✓$1P_A$-$2S_E$

       1P   **go.1P.PST** to.the park   but 2S NEG **go.2S.PST** to.the park

'We went to the park, but you did not.'

b. Ustedes **fueron** al parque, pero yo no <**fui** al parque>. ✓2P$_A$-1S$_E$
   1S   **go.2P.PST** to.the park   but   1S NEG **go.1S.PST** to.the park
   'Y'all went to the park, but I did not.'

Let us not throw out the baby with the bathwater just yet and discard our proposal in (12)

given the existence of examples like (46)-(47). Instead, let us focus on one key difference

between these allowed person mismatches and the disallowed tense mismatches discussed

previously. Consider the following: In the tense mismatches, all of the elements bearing the

relevant clashing features are *properly contained* within the ellipsis site. In contrast, this is not

the state of affairs in person mismatches: One of the bearers of the clashing features is a remnant

outside of the ellipsis site. A schematic of this difference is shown below:[25]

(48)   *Proper containment of clashing features*
     a. *Tense mismatch*
     *Hoy, Ana **repara** los relojes, pero ayer, no sé quién <reparó los relojes>.

                                        (repeated from (15)b)

     Antecedent   *Ellipsis*
     [CP [C [TP [**T**…]]]]   [CP [C$_{[E]}$ [~~TP [T…~~]]]]

     b. *Person mismatch*
     Yo **fui** al parque, pero **vos** no <**fuiste** al parque>.

                                          (repeated from (46)a)

     Antecedent   *Ellipsis*
     [CP [C [TP **DP$_{SUBJ}$** [**T+V**…]]]]   [XP **DP$_{SUBJECTi}$** X [$_{\Sigma P}$ $\Sigma_{[E]}$ [~~TP DP$_i$ [T+V~~…]]]]

What is relevant is that in (48)b, there is a remnant DP in the target clause that is one of the

bearers of the relevant person features. In other words, the difference is the following: In tense

mismatches, all of the clashing features are inside of the ellipsis site; in person mismatches, one

of the person feature bearers is a remnant outside of the ellipsis site.[26]

Why should this asymmetry be relevant? Let us take a brief excursus into sprouting to see

where we are headed with this observation. As we mentioned before in section 4, sprouting

refers to cases of sluicing where there is no correlate in the antecedent for the *wh*-remnant in the

target clause. For example, there is no locative adjunct in the antecedent below, but a locative *wh*-word is a remnant in the target clause:

(49)   *Sprouting*
        Sebas went skiing, but he doesn't remember where$_1$ <he went skiing <where$_1$>>.

Now, any theory of syntactic parallelism under ellipsis must face the problem presented by sprouting: Why is it that in calculating parallelism, the copy of the *wh*-remnant inside of the ellipsis site is ignored? Here, we will make the following analytical claim which will then transfer straightforwardly to account for the person mismatches. The amended condition below now specifies precisely which elements the calculation of parallelism ranges over:

(50)   *Syntactic parallelism in ellipsis (final version)*
        Antecedent and material **properly contained within the ellipsis site** must be featurally non-distinct.

It seems perfectly reasonable to hypothesize that the calculation of parallelism ranges only over elements properly contained within the elided structure. The final version of our condition in (50) does the following work then: Elements that are not properly contained within the ellipsis site are ignored when calculating parallelism in ellipsis. This amendment allows us to make sense of the sprouting cases. In such cases, the *wh*-remnant is the highermost link of a *wh*-movement chain which is not properly contained within the ellipsis site. Therefore, the presence of one (or more) copies within the ellipsis site is ignored.[27]

Let us now see how our amendment applies to the person mismatches. Crucially, I assume that ϕ-feature agreement is the result of feature sharing (Pesetsky & Torrego 2001, 2007, Frampton & Gutmann 2000, 2006, Chung 2013b). What this means is that in cases of ϕ-feature agreement between a DP and T^0, DP and T^0 *share* a set of ϕ-features, rather than DP *assigning* features to T^0. In other words, the post-agreement representation is one where what is literally a

single object—the ϕ-feature bundle—is linked to two other syntactic objects: The DP and the ϕ-probe (T⁰):

(51)   *Agreement is feature-sharing*
        [CP [C [TP DP   [T+V …]]]]
                     └——[ϕ]——┘

Let us now return to the relevant type of example. In person mismatches, one of the person feature sharers in the target clause is a remnant. Given this, the person feature bundle is not properly contained within the ellipsis site. As a result of (50), the calculation of parallelism ignores the elements participating in the feature-sharing relation (i.e. T+V within the ellipsis site). Just like in cases of sprouting (where the lowermost *wh*-copy is ignored for the purposes of (50)), person features are ignored here as well.

(52)   *Person features are ignored; there is no mismatch*
        Yo **fui** al parque, pero **vos** no <**fuiste** al parque>.   (repeated from (46)a)
        Antecedent   Ellipsis
        [CP [TP **DP**   [**T+V**…]]] [XP **DPᵢ** X [ΣP Σ[E]   [T̶P̶ D̶P̶ᵢ̶ [̶T̶+̶V̶…]]]]
                 └—[ϕ: 1]—┘   *no clash*   └————[ϕ: 2]————┘

We can now understand why person mismatches of this kind are licit under ellipsis: Unlike in tense mismatches, person features are not properly contained within the ellipsis site. As a result, they do not enter into the calculation of syntactic parallelism at all.

A natural extension to be explored is suggested by an anonymous reviewer, who notes the behavior of number and gender features within the DP under ellipsis. Consider the following examples, which show that number can mismatch under NP-ellipsis, but gender cannot (see Saab 2010b, 2019b):

(53)   *NP-ellipsis in Spanish—number can mismatch*
        a. el   perro de María y   los   perros de Pedro
           the.SG.MASC dog   of María and the.PL.MASC dogs   of Pedro
           'María's dog and Pedro's dogs'
        b. el perro de María y los <perros> de Pedro

(54)   *NP-ellipsis in Spanish—gender cannot mismatch*
     a. el   tío   de María y   la   tía de Pedro
        the.SG.MASC uncle of María and the.SG.FEM aunt of Pedro
        'María's uncle and Pedro's aunt'
     b. * el tío de María y la \<tía\> de Pedro

The data above follow straightforwardly if [PL] is a feature in the syntax and singular is the

absence of number features (Harley and Ritter 2002, Preminger 2014). In contrast, gender is a

bivalent feature in languages like Spanish (Kramer 2015).

However, the behavior of gender under ellipsis is quite intricate. It appears that in several

languages, there are some noun pairs which disallow gender mismatches symmetrically, as seen

in (54), while other noun pairs *allow* gender mismatches symmetrically, and still others allow

mismatches *asymmetrically*, where a masculine noun is allowed in the antecedent, but not a

feminine noun (see Merchant 2014, Depiante & Masullo 2001, Donatelli 2019 for Spanish, c.f.

Saab 2010b; Merchant 2014, Alexiadou 2015, Sudo & Spathas 2016 for Greek; Bobaljik &

Zocca 2011 for Portuguese; Polinsky 2019 for Russian). I leave for future work how the proposal

advanced here can shed light on these patterns, suggesting that an additional component of

encyclopedic (i.e. semantic) gender encoded on certain roots should also be part of a full

analysis.

Let us summarize this section. Here, we discussed an additional type of mismatch, observing

initially that it seemed to create problems for our proposal: Unlike tense features, person features

appear to be able to clash. We provided a more nuanced version of our parallelism condition as a

result, amending it so that parallelism is only calculated over elements that are properly

contained within the ellipsis site. This natural amendment sheds light on why run-of-the-mill

cases of sprouting do not violate any parallelism condition. We then provided a conception of ϕ-

feature agreement as feature sharing that derived the possibility of person mismatches: Since

person mismatches involve a remnant DP that participates in the relevant feature sharing relation in the target clause, and is located outside the ellipsis site, then those features are ignored *in toto*. In other words, we proposed the following: When only some, and not all, of the feature sharers are properly contained within the ellipsis site, then those features are ignored in calculating parallelism under ellipsis, and furthermore, this is a particular subcase of the more general condition in (50).[28]

6. Conclusion and a methodological point

In this paper, I argued against the strong conclusion in Rudin 2019 that only material in the eventive core enters into the calculation of syntactic parallelism under ellipsis. One way to rephrase the discussion that led me to reject such a position is as follows: The English examples used by Rudin (2019) are the wrong data from which to make conclusions about mismatches above the eventive core, since the language's grammar conspires to prevent us from constructing the necessary controlled examples. Notice that the problem does not lie in English lacking the inventory of heads that is needed to test the mismatches (i.e., different flavors of tensed T^0). Rather, the controlled environment in which we could force a mismatch disallows the type of ellipsis (sluicing) that provides a window into the availability, or lack thereof, of the mismatch.

To reinforce the methodological problems that English brings about, consider once again the cases of modal mismatches used in Rudin 2019 to argue that mismatches above the eventive core are allowed full-stop:

(55)   *Modal mismatches (again)* (Rudin 2019)   (repeated from (27) and (30)
        Sally knows that there is always the potential for awful things **to happen**, but she doesn't
        know when <awful things **will/might/do/Ø** happen>.   (do/Ø *added by author*)

The problem with using data like the above is anticipated by Rudin when he discusses the nebulousness of the identity of the modal within the sluice. However, he does not consider how serious the problem of this nebulousness really is. There is no syntactic diagnostic whatsoever

that could help us determine what *must* be inside the sluice. Given the lack of structural control, we cannot be certain of the following two things: (i) Whether there even exists a problem in need of explanation and (ii) what the nature of the problem is. In contrast, consider once again the Spanish mismatch below. Here, the use of an adverbial remnant ensures that we know precisely what the content of the sluice *must* be. As a result, we know that there is a tense mismatch (that is disallowed, contra the predictions made by Rudin 2019) and a phenomenon to be explained:

(56)   *Spanish Tense mismatches (again)*   (repeated from (20)d)
       *Mañana   no   **iré**   al   parque, pero   ayer   sí <**fui**   al   parque>.
       tomorrow NEG **go.1S.FUT** to.the park   but   yesterday yes **go.1S.FUT** to.the park
       Intended: 'Tomorrow, I won't go to the park, but yesterday, I did.   *$T_{\text{FUTURE A}} - T_{\text{PAST E}}$

Crucially, we cannot construct English examples parallel to the Spanish ones. Observe my failed attempt below to create an environment where we could test full T^0 mismatches in English. The data show that this type of example is ill-formed even if we match the tense. Observe that VPE is required and sluicing is disallowed (see endnote 13). As we mentioned before, VPE is uninformative because tense is expressed in the remnant and not inside the ellipsis site. We therefore cannot test full tense mismatches whatsoever using English sluicing:

(57)   *English is the wrong empirical source*
       a. Two days ago, the mailman delivered the mail at noon, but yesterday, I don't know
          when he delivered the mail.   *baseline*
       b. *Two days ago, the mailman delivered the mail at noon, but yesterday, I don't know
          when <he delivered the mail.>   *sluicing*
       c. Two days ago, the mailman delivered the mail at noon, but yesterday, I don't know
          when he did <deliver the mail.>   *VPE*

Our main takeaway is the following then: There are languages whose grammars allow us to test mismatches under ellipsis to the necessary level of granularity and there are languages whose grammars do not allow such an investigation—at best, the latter languages create a mirage (modulo our brief excursus into English stripping above, which supports our proposal). Spanish

instantiates the former type of language and English the latter. We have shown that Rudin's (2019) conclusions were made based on the wrong type of data.

Let us summarize the positive proposals that have arisen as a result of our assessment of Rudin 2019. First, I showed that there existed a different generalization to be made regarding the English mismatch examples under discussion. Rudin 2019 advanced a basic partitioning between mismatches within the eventive core (banned) versus mismatches outside the eventive core (allowable). I showed that a separate generalization concerning the *type* of mismatch at play could handle the English facts equally well. I proposed the condition below, arguing that mismatches in the eventive core instantiate a full featural clash, whereas mismatches outside of the eventive core in English are all cases of featural non-distinctness and are therefore allowed:

(58)   *Syntactic parallelism in ellipsis (final version)*
       Antecedent and material properly contained within the ellipsis site must be featurally
       non-distinct.

I then showed that the proposal defended here makes the correct predictions for a language like Spanish, where examples can be properly constructed and material outside the eventive core can be forced to mismatch under ellipsis. Contra the predictions of Rudin 2019's proposal, these mismatches are illicit.

I ended the paper by extending the empirical domain under discussion to cases of person mismatches. While those examples appeared superficially problematic, we observed that a proper understanding of the elements that enter into the calculation of parallelism—only those properly contained within the ellipsis site—along with a conception of ϕ-agreement as feature sharing, could handle the data straightforwardly. I also laid out mismatches within the DP as a fruitful next step for the proposal defended here. I hope to continue such an investigation in the future.

References

Author. 2019. Removed for purposes of review.

Abels, Klaus. 2003. *Successive Cyclicity, Anti-locality, and Adposition Stranding*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2015. Gender and nominal ellipsis. In Nicholas LaCara, Keir Moulton & Anne-Michelle Tessier (eds.), *A Schrift to Fest Kyle Johnson.* 11-22.

Anderbois, Scott. 2008. *Sluicing and the Nature of the Antipassive in Yukatek Maya*. Ms., University of California, Santa Cruz.

Barros, Matt. 2014. *Sluicing and identity in ellipsis*. PhD Dissertation, Rutgers.

Bennett, Ryan, Emily Elfner & James McCloskey. 2019. Prosody, focus, and ellipsis in Irish. *Language* 95(1): 66-106.

Benveniste, Emile. 1971. The nature of pronouns. Problems in general linguistics, 217–22. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.

Bobaljik, Jonathan & Cynthia Levart Zocca. 2011. Gender markedness: the anatomy of a counterexample. *Morphology* 21: 141-166.

Brucart, José María. 1987. *La elisión sintáctica en español*. Barcelona: Bellaterra.

Brucart, José María. 1999. La elipsis. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe. 2787-2863.

Brucart, Josep María & Jonathan E. MacDonald. Empty Categories and Ellipsis. In José Ignacio Hualde, Antxon Olarrea & Erin O'Rourke (eds.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing. 579-601.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On Phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero & María Luisa Zubizarreta eds., *Foundational issues in linguistic theory. Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*. Cambridge, MA:MIT Press. 134-166.

Chung, Sandra. 2006. Sluicing and the lexicon: The point of no return. In Rebecca T. Cover and Yuni Kim (eds.), *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 31: 73–91. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Chung, Sandra. 2013a. Syntactic identity in sluicing: How much and why. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(1): 1–44.

Chung, Sandra. 2013b. The Syntactic Relations behind Agreement. In L. Cheng & N. Corver (eds.), *Diagnosing Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Citko, Barbara. 2014. *Phase Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen & Jason Merchant. 2013. Ellipsis phenomena. In Marcel den Dikken ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 701-45.

Deacon, Robert Joel. 2014. *Adpositions in Distributed Morphology: The Nature of Roots and Categorial Heads*. PhD Dissertation, University of Florida.

Depiante, Marcela. 2004. Dos casos de elipsis con partícula de polaridad en español. *RASAL* 1: 53–69.

Depiante, Marcela & José Masullo. Género y número en la elipsis nominal: consecuencias para la hipótesis lexicalista. Paper presented at the *1st Encuentro de Gramática Generativa.*

Donatelli, Lucia Elizabeth. 2019. *The morphosemantics of Spanish gender: Evidence from small nominals*. PhD Dissertation, Georgetown University.

Fiengo, Bob & Robert May. 1994. *Indices and identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Frampton Jon & Sam Gutmann. 2000. *Agreement is Feature Sharing*. Ms. Northeastern University.

Frampton, Jon & Sam Gutmann. 2006. How sentences grow in the mind: Agreement and selection in an efficient minimalist syntax. In C. Boeckx ed., *Agreement Systems*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 121-57.

Gallego, Ángel. 2014. Deriving Feature Inheritance from the Copy Theory of Movement. *The Linguistic Review* 31: 41-71.

Gribanova, Vera. 2013. Verb-stranding verb phrase ellipsis and the structure of the Russian verbal complex. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 31: 91-136.

Grinder, John & Paul Postal. 1971. Missing Antecedents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 2(3): 269-312.

Gribanova, Vera. 2018. Head movement, ellipsis, and identity. Ms., Stanford University.

Hankamer, Jorge & Ivan Sag. 1976. Deep and Surface Anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(3): 391-428.

Harley, Heidi. 2014. On the identity of roots. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(3/4). 225-276.

Harris, James. 1998. Spanish imperatives: syntax meets morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 34: 27-52.

Isac, Daniela. 2015. *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, Kyle. 2019. Gapping and Stripping. In J. van Craenenbroeck and T. Temmerman.(eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press

Kramer, Ruth. 2015. *The Morphosyntax of Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring eds., *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. 109-137.

Kroll, Margaret. 2018. Polarity reversals under sluicing. In Robert Truswell, Chris Cummins, Caroline Heycock, Brian Rabern and Hannah Rohde eds., *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 21*.

Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in syntax: on the nature of functional categories and projections*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Laka, Itziar. 1991. Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections. *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology (ASJU)* XXV-1: 65-136.

Landau, Idan. 2006. Severing the Distribution of PRO from Case. *Syntax* 9(2): 153-70.

Langacker, Ronald W. 1974. Movement Rules in Functional Perspective. *Language* 50(4): 630-64.

Lasnik, Howard (1995). Verbal morphology: *Syntactic structures* meets the Minimalist Program. In *Evolution and revolution in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Carlos Otero*, ed. Héctor Campos and Paula Kempchinsky, 251–268. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.

Lasnik, Howard. 1999. A Gap in an Ellipsis Paradigm: Some Theoretical Implications. *Linguistic Analysis* 27(3-4). 166-85.

Lasnik, Howard and Kenshi Funakoshi. 2019. Ellipsis in transformational grammar. In J. van Craenenbroeck and T. Temmerman.(eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press

Lipták, Anikó. 2013. Identity in ellipsis: An introduction. *Lingua* 166: 155-171.

Marantz, Alec. 1997. No Escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* Volume 4.2: 201-25.

McGinnis, Martha. 2005. On markedness asymmetries in person and number. *Language* 81(3): 699-718.

Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands and the theory of ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Merchant, Jason. 2013. Voice and ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(1): 77–108.

Merchant, Jason. 2014. Gender mismatches under nominal ellipsis. *Lingua* 151: 9-32.

Murguia, Elixabete. 2004. *Syntactic identity and locality restrictions on verbal ellipsis*. PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Murphy, Andrew. 2016. Subset relations in ellipsis licensing. *Glossa* 1(1):44. 1-34.

Ordóñez, Francisco. 1997. *Word order and clause structure in Spanish and other romance languages*. Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY.

Ortega-Santos, Ivan, Masaya Yoshida & Chizuru Nakao. 2014. On elipsis structures involving a wh-remnant and a non-wh-remnant simultaneously. *Lingua* 138: 55-85.

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2001. T-To-C Movement: Causes and Consequences. In M. Kenstowicz ed., *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 355-426.

Pesetsky, David & Esther Torrego. 2007. The syntax of valuation and the interpretability of feaures. In S. Karimi, V. Samiian, & W. K. Wilkins eds., *Phrasal and Clausal Architecture. Syntactic Derivations and Interpretation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 262-94.

Polinsky, Maria. 2019. Some puzzles in gender, agreement, and concord. Paper presented at *MultiGender Kickoff Workshop*. University of Oslo.

Potsdam, Eric. 1996. English verbal morphology and VP ellipsis. In *Proceeding of the* 27th *Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society* 27, 353-368. GLSA, University of Massachusetts. Amherst.

Potsdam, Eric. 2007. Malagasy sluicing and its consequences for the identity requirement on ellipsis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 577-613.

Preminger, Omer. 2011. *Syntactic identity in ellipsis favors feature-sharing over feature checking*. Ms, MIT.

Preminger, Omer. 2014. Agreement and its Failures. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman ed., *Elements of Grammar*. Springer: Dordrecht. 281-337.

Roberts, Ian. 1998. Have/Be Raising, Move F, and Procrastinate. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29(1): 113-25.

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In Robert Binnick ed., *Proceedings of the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago. 252-286.

Rudin, Deniz. 2019. Head-Based Syntactic Identity in Sluicing. *Linguistic Inquiry* 50(2): 253-283.

Saab, Andrés. 2008. *Hacía una teoría de la identidad parcial en la ellipsis*. Phd Dissertation, University of Buenos Aires.

Saab, Andrés. 2010a. Spanish TP-ellipsis and the theory of island repair. *Probus* 22(1): 73–116.

Saab, Andrés. 2010b. (Im)possible deletions in the Spanish DP. *Iberia: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2(2): 45-83.

Saab, Andrés. 2016. Ineffable narratives in Spanish: Another case of overgeneration by e-GIVENness. *Probus* 28(2): 367-89.

Saab, Andrés. 2019. Ellipsis: Its Way From Syntax to Morphology. Ms. CONICET-UBA. Version 2. Available at https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004522.

Stockwell, Richard & Deborah Wong. 2020. Sprouting and the structure of except-phrases. To appear in Proceedings of NELS 50.

Sudo, Yasutada & Giorgos Spathas. 2016. *Natural Gender and Interpretation in Greek*. Ms. University College London and Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin/Universität Stuttgart.

Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2011. Syntactic identity and ellipsis. *The Linguistic Review* 28: 79-110.

Thoms, Gary. 2015 Syntactic identity, Parallelism and accommodated antecedents. *Lingua* 166: 260-293.

Weir, Andrew. 2014. *Fragments and Clausal Ellipsis*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

van der Wurff, Wim. 2007. Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar: An Introduction. In Wim van der Wurff ed., *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar: Studies in Honour of Frits Beukema*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-94.

Zanuttini, Rafaella, Miok Pak & Paul Portner. 2012. A syntactic analysis of interpretive restrictions on imperative, promissive, and exhortative subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 30(4): 1231-274.

---

[1] By syntactic parallelism here, I mean how syntactically similar the ellipsis site must be to an antecedent in order for ellipsis to be licit. While this topic has generated considerable renewed interest in the recent literature, it is not our purpose here to survey and assess the range of proposals that are currently on offer. For a sample of recent approaches, see van Craenenbroeck & Merchant (2013), Merchant (2013), Chung (2013a), Barros (2014), Thoms (2015) and references therein.

[2] It is irrelevant to characterize precisely the topmost label within this eventive core is, whether *v*P or VoiceP. For our purposes here and ease of exposition, I will use Rudin's eventive core terminology.

[3] The data in (5)a-b are deemed finiteness mismatches in Rudin 2019, while (5)c is called a tense mismatch. We will refer to all of these data as T^0/tense mismatches for ease of exposition.

[4] To my knowledge, there are four languages that have been reported to *allow* voice mismatches under sluicing: Two Austronesian languages—Malagasy (Potsdam 2007) and Chamorro (Chung 2013a), and two Mayan languages—Yukatek (AnderBois 2008) and Kaqchikel ([Author] 2019). It is not our purpose to assess whether these cases involve true $Voice^0$ clashes or should be analyzed differently; see [Author] (2019) for discussion.

[5] The eventive core might form a unit of relevance in other domains. Rudin, in fact, delves into Langacker 1974's discussion of syntactic rules (e.g. raising, fronting, lowering) that target elements in the eventive core exclusively (Langacker's "objective content"). Rudin takes Langacker's observations as conceptual backing for his proposal that the eventive core is privileged in ellipsis. Rudin's argument boils down to the following: Since only material inside

the eventive core seems to be relevant for certain transformations, then it is natural that only material inside the eventive core matters for the calculation of identity in ellipsis. However, absent a well-founded and explicit proposal as to *why* the conditions regulating the rules discussed in Langacker should also be relevant for ellipsis, I consider this conceptual argument unconvincing. In any case, we will observe that Rudin's proposal is empirically inadequate, so whatever conceptual backing is argued to exist will be secondary in importance.

[6] The data in Rudin 2019 come from the UC Santa Cruz sluicing corpus, which provides natural language tokens of the kind of sluicing data that has been central to discussions on ellipsis since the seminal Ross 1969. It would be desirable, of course, to have a comparable repository of Spanish data, but we must rely on native speaker intuitions here until such a project is undertaken in the future. The Spanish data here represents the judgments of the author and three other speakers of Guatemalan Spanish; for English judgments, three native speakers have also been consulted.

[7] [X] asks me about cases like the following:

(i)   *The door closed, but I don't know who.

Just like Rudin and Merchant (2013), I assume that these examples involving the causative-anticausative alternation are out because of a clash in v^0 between antecedent and sluice. The same analysis holds for cases involving the ditransitive alternation and the causative/inchoative alternation.

[8] Note that this condition must be assessed per head, just like Rudin 2019's—i.e., the featural specification of Voice^0 will not clash with the featural specification of T^0. This seems to be a natural assumption to make. We leave for future work a proper formalization of how this comes to be enforced in the grammar.

[9] Notice that the condition is worded in relation to *features*. The condition has no bearing on disallowed ellipses of the following type:

(i)   She read something, but we're not sure by which author.

(ii)   ?*She read, but we're not sure by which author.   (Chung 2006: 84)

In a nutshell, there can be no lexical items in the sluice that are not present in the antecedent. We discuss this in relation to P-stranding under sprouting in section 4. We hypothesize that the issue with illicit mismatches of this type has to do with a separate component of parallelism calculation involving strict identity of syntactic roots (see Saab 2008; for a proposal that adpositions include a root, see Deacon 2014). Assuming that roots are not feature bundles, but instead abstract indices (Harley 2014), they fall outside of the domain of (12). An anonymous reviewer wonders whether Chung's generalization could be subsumed under the condition proposed here if we assume that every head in the ellipsis site must have a non-distinct correlate in the antecedent—this would be similar in spirit to Rudin's requirement that every head in the ellipsis site must have an identical correlate in the antecedent. While this is an interesting suggestion, [Author] (2019)'s discussion of voice mismatches under sluicing in Kaqchikel Mayan seems to argue against such an approach. In Kaqchikel, an ellipsis site containing an active Voice^0 can mismatch with an antecedent lacking Voice altogether. This suggests that subsuming Chung's generalization under the proposal suggested by the reviewer would be on the wrong track. [X] reminds me of the cases discussed in Lasnik (1995) involving non-identical forms of the English auxiliary verbs *to be* and *have*. To illustrate the issue, observe that *to be* requires strict identity:

(iii)   John slept here, and Mary will <sleep here> too.

(iv)   *John was here, and Mary will <be here> too.

Lasnik assumes that strict identity is required in ellipsis and takes the incompatibility observed above to arise because auxiliaries are pulled from the lexicon fully inflected, whereas other verbs attain their inflection derivationally. At one point in the derivation, lexical verbs are indeed identical, whereas auxiliaries never are. I would tentatively propose that finite and non-finite *be* are different roots, and therefore their incompatibility is of the same flavor as (ii) above. Much more needs to be said of course, but as far as I know, data like (iv) are problematic across the board for theories of identity in ellipsis, in particular if one assumes that elements cannot enter the derivation already inflected. We cannot delve into this in-depth here and leave a thorough exploration for future work. For alternatives to Lasnik, including empirical qualifications to the data in (iii)-(iv) see Potsdam (1996), Roberts (1998), and the reply in Lasnik (1999).

[10] Why this should be so is unclear to me. We leave a thorough investigation of this issue for future work. I simply wish to drive the point home that the grammar of English precludes us, for whatever reason, to test featural clashes at the T^0 level using these examples.

[11] There exists evidence that all the Spanish examples used here involve structure in the ellipsis site, as opposed to a null pronominal (see references in the main text). First, an anaphor can take its antecedent from within the ellipsis site (the Missing Antecedent Phenomenon; Grinder & Postal 1971, Hankamer & Sag 1976):

(i)   a. *Sebas no compró ningún libro$_1$. Dice que *pro$_1$* está muy interesante.
             Sebas not bought any   book   says that   is   very interesting
           Intended: 'Sebas didn't buy any book. He says it's very interesting.'

         b. Sebas no compró ningún libro, pero yo sí   compré un libro$_1$. pro$_1$ Está muy
            Sebas not bought any   book but I yes bought a book   is   very
            interesante.
            interesting
            'Sebas didn't buy any book, but I did buy a book. It's very interesting.'

         c. Sebas no compró ningún libro, pero yo sí   ~~compré un libro$_1$~~. pro$_1$ Está muy
            Sebas not bought any   book but I yes   is   very
            interesante.
            interesting
            'Sebas didn't buy any book, but I did. It's very interesting.'

Second, A'-extraction is possible from the ellipsis site:

(ii)   a. ¿Cuáles libros no compraste y   cuáles$_1$ sí compraste t$_1$?
             which books not bought   and which   yes bought
             'Which books didn't you buy and which did you buy?'

         b. ¿Cuáles libros no compraste y   cuáles$_1$ sí ~~compraste t$_1$~~?
             which books not bought   and which   yes

Additionally, the ellipsis types discussed here require syntactic control—i.e., they are surface anaphora in the sense of Hankamer & Sag 1976 (see Saab 2008). While this *in itself* is not a diagnostic for structure, it shows that these examples form a natural class with other ellipsis types that have been argued to involve structure in the ellipsis site.

[12] Murguia shows that the tense clashes are disallowed with constructions involving complex tenses (i.e. auxiliary plus verb constructions) as well:

(i)   *En el pasado, María **ha**   leído mucho y   Elena en el futuro <**habrá**   leído
          in the past   María **have.PRES** read a.lot   and Elena in the future **have.FUT** read
          mucho> también.
          a.lot   also

39

Intended: 'María has read a lot in the past, and in the future, she will have too.'

(adapted from Murguia 2004:86 *apud* Saab 2016)

[13] While I am not a speaker of Argentinean Spanish, I agree with the judgments presented in Saab (2016).

[14] Note that it would not matter whether we took a cartographic approach and assumed that all clauses project ModP—if the ModP in the antecedent is featurally empty, we would still not incur in a feature clash. For a proposal on the placement of modals in the clause, see Cinque (1999).

[15] The same point holds for the example in (9)c. I have consulted speakers who think that the non-ellipsis equivalent with a matching tense is acceptable, albeit slightly strange, while others find it completely unnatural:

(i)   %Your favorite plant is alive, but you can never be sure for how long your favorite plant is alive.

(ii)   Your favorite plant is alive, but you can never be sure for how long <your favorite plant is alive.>

I hypothesize that the strangeness here is related to the predicate 'to be alive' and is orthogonal to ellipsis. Examples parallel to the above with a different predicate seem perfectly natural with the tense match:

(iii)   Sally **is** at home, but you can never be sure for how long she **is/will be** at home.

(iv)   Sally **is** at home, but you can never be sure for how long <she **is/will be** at home>.

The takeaway should be clear, however: If there is a source for the sluice where there is no mismatch, then there is no problem to be explained, since we have no structural diagnostic that ensures that there *must* be a mismatch. Note as well that the Rudin example in (5)c cannot be considered a controlled manipulation which ensures that there must be a modal in the sluice. Compare the example to the Saab data we discussed. In the Saab data, the semantics/pragmatics governing the use of the historical present are strong enough that there is *no way* to fill in the content of the ellipsis site with a featural *match*. In contrast, I am assuming that the semantics/pragmatics governing the use of the predicate 'be alive' are *loose* enough that the feature match can license the sluice, even though such a match would not necessarily be the most natural in examples without ellipsis.

[16] To quote directly: "The case in (23c) [***author note***: the abstraction of modality mismatches], as well as the cases in (23a) and (21b), illustrate a common property of these left-peripheral mismatches under sluicing: their interpretation is somewhat nebulous." (Rudin 2019: 267)

[17] [X] asks whether we should be concerned that the two 'should' modals here differ in flavor. This is only a problem if we think that modal bases have to be syntactically differentiated. In any case, if this were a concern, the example in (35) provides a possible source for the sluice.

[18] An additional possibility is that examples of this sort actually involve a short source of the following kind and not ellipsis proper:

(i)   *A short source for abstraction of modality*

        a. Sally said that customers should be given lower rates, but Susie said it's hard to see how **it should be done.**

        b. Sally said that customers should be given lower rates, but Susie said it's hard to see how <**it should be done.**>

I do not explore this possibility here but note that Rudin does not explicitly argue against it either.

[19] Murphy (2016) in fact suggests an analysis of this flavor to account for this type of mismatch. We do not evaluate the merits and limitations of Murphy's proposal here, since it would take us

too far afield; observe, however, that polarity mismatches like (40) argue against Murphy, and so does [Author] (2019)'s analysis of voice mismatches in Kaqchikel slucing.

[20] Rudin attributes this example to Kroll (2018) but the data is not found there.

[21]Again, even if canonical affirmatives do project a polarity projection, it would be featurally empty and thus would not create a featural clash (see endnote 14). [X] asks me about the unacceptability of examples like the following:

(i)   *I know who came to the party, but I don't know who.

First, the sluice intuitively creates an outright contradiction, which means that we must be computing the sentence as involving a polarity *match*:

(ii)   *I know who came to the party, but I don't know who <came to the party>.

The question that arises is why we cannot interpret the sluice as having negation. In such a case, the sluice would have a $\Sigma^0_{[+NEG]}$ that is not present in the antecedent, satisfying featural non-distinctness:

(iii)   *I know who came to the party, but I don't know who <**didn't** come to the party>.

My response would be as follows: In examples like (iii), the elided negation carries contrastive focus. It has been argued that focused elements cannot be elided (Merchant 2001, Weir 2014, Bennett et.al. 2019, [Author] 2019). There are therefore independent reasons why examples like (iii) are out, even if featural non-distinctness is satisfied.

[22] An additional example that can be handled in this way involves mood mismatches of the following kind in Spanish. The antecedent verb here is in the indicative mood, whereas the verb in the ellipsis site shows subjunctive :

(i)   Juan no irá a la fiesta, pero es posible que María sí <vaya a la fiesta>.
           Juan not go.FUT to the party but is possible that María yes go.SUBJ to the party
           'Juan will not go to the party, but it's possible that María will.'

                                                                (Adapted from Brucart 1999)

As pointed out by a reviewer, the example above can be handled straightforwardly if Mood features are generated on C (hence outside the E-site) and lower onto T. One way of analyzing this would be via Feature Inheritance (Chomsky 2008; see Gallego 2014).

[23] Readers might wonder whether all the relevant mismatches discussed for English can be constructed in Spanish as well, and whether they behave like English. As far as I can tell, some of the modality mismatches result in the same nebulousness and there is no diagnostic to ensure which, if any, modal expression must occur inside the sluice. The illocutionary mismatches do not result in a mismatch, much like the English. Below we observe an imperative antecedent and a bare infinitival in the sluice; the example is a translation of the English we assessed before:

(i)   Siempre **guardáIMP** algo de cada cheque! Cuando seas grande, entenderás por qué
           <**guardarINF** algo de cada cheque>.

The polarity mismatches are simply impossible (ii), since the negative marker must be outside of the sluice (iii), at least according to my judgments and informants'. The examples below are a direct translation of the English data we discussed:

(ii)   *O entregás tu ensayo final a medianoche, o explicás por qué <no entregaste tu ensayo
           final a medianoche>.

(iii)   O entregás tu ensayo final a medianoche, o explicás por qué no <entregaste tu ensayo final
           a medianoche>.

[24] Under some proposals, however, 2nd person pronouns *are* a featural subset of 1st person pronouns (Harley & Ritter 2002, McGinnis 2005; see endnote 28). Whether this featural decomposition of

pronouns maps directly onto agreement, and is thus relevant for the mismatch observed here, is unclear to me, which I pursue an alternative explanation.

[25] The details of where the subject sits in the antecedent in (48)b is irrelevant for our purposes, but we place it in SpecTP for ease of exposition; see Ordóñez (1997).

[26] The proposal that proper containment within the ellipsis site is relevant to parallelism calculation is found in Preminger (2011). I am indebted to [X] for suggesting that I incorporate that proposal into the overall analysis advanced here. Rudin's proposal itself encodes a similar intuition, which is why the object in an example like the following is ignored:

(i)   Sally ate, but I don't know what <Sally ate>. (Rudin 2019)

See Rudin 2019: 260.

[27] My proposal suggests as well an avenue for eliminating the necessity of carving out an exception for focus marked constituents in calculating parallelism. In run-of-the-mill cases of sluicing, any theory runs into issues when determining how a correlate in the antecedent counts as the same item (in some sense) to the *wh*-remnant. Under the approach pursued here, we avoid needing to develop a theory of how the sister of V in the antecedent (someone, some metal bands) is parallel to the sister of V in the target clause (who, which metal bands) in the following examples:

(i)   a. Al likes **someone**. Do you know **who**?
       b. Al likes **some metal bands**. Do you know **which metal bands**?

We can simply assume that the *wh*-chain is ignored when calculating parallelism, since it is not properly contained within the ellipsis site. We leave a more thorough exploration of this issue for the future. Thank you to [X] for discussing this possible consequence with me.

[X] asks me about verb stranding VP-ellipsis (VVPE) in languages such as Russian, where the stranded verb remnant (which is part of a head movement chain) must be identical in some cases with an antecedent verb (Gribanova 2018; cf. Gribanova 2013). The fact that strict identity is of verbs is required in some cases might challenge the proposal that members of movement chains do not enter into the calculation of the condition in (50). I cannot delve into the intricacies of the VVPE facts here but refer the reader instead to Saab 2019 and references therein for discussion of the fact and an alternative that would be compatible with the proposal forwarded here.

[28] [X] reminds me of cases like the following:

(i)   A: No one in the department likes **you**$_i$!
       B: That's not true! Leslie does <like **me**$_i$>!

Rudin (2019) captures cases like these by stipulating their acceptability in his definition of correlates in (3)b. These cases could be accommodated under my approach given a fine-grained featural decomposition of pronouns, as in Harley & Ritter (2002) and McGinnis (2005). As long as 3rd person is the absence of certain features, and 1st and 2nd person are differentiated only by the additional presence of a feature (i.e., [Author] for 1st as opposed to 2nd), then these cases satisfy featural non-distinctness. Evidence that this is on the right track comes from examples like the following:

(ii)   A: No one here likes **y'all**!
       B: Lies! Ethan does <like us/***me**>.

Abstracting from possible pragmatic reasons why the pronoun in the ellipsis cannot be understood as being 1s, a featural breakdown of 2P versus 1s à la Harley & Ritter would show that neither pronoun is in a proper featural subset relation with the other, thus violating featural non-distinctness. I leave a thorough analysis of these examples for future work, noting merely that they suggest that we are on the right track. More challenging are cases like the following in (iii), which

Rudin also stipulates as acceptable via his definition of correlates in (3)b (see Rudin's footnote 13). These cases have come to be known as "vehicle change" (Fiengo & May 1994):

(iii)   They arrested Alex$_1$, though he$_1$ thought they wouldn't. (Merchant 2001: 24)

Examples like the above pose a problem for some approaches to syntactic identity in ellipsis, since they should incur in a Principle C violation, contrary to fact. I leave for future work whether an explanation of this phenomenon can be accommodated into the proposal advanced here, or whether additional machinery is needed.