

Not Voice but Case Identity in VP Ellipsis of English

Myung-Kwan Park
 Department of English
 College of Humanities
 Dongguk University
 Seoul, Korea
 parkmk@dgu.edu

Sunjoon Choi
 Department of English
 College of Humanities
 Dongguk University
 Seoul, Korea
 Sunjoo3008@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper develops a Case/case-theoretic account for what Merchant (2008) calls voice mismatch in ellipsis constructions of English. Merchant (ibid.) reports that VP ellipsis as an elision of smaller size VP allows voice mismatch, but Pseudogapping and Sluicing as an elision of bigger size vP/TP do not. However, Tanaka (2011) argues against Merchant's dichotomy in voice mismatch between VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping, reporting that voice mismatch in both types of ellipsis is permissible or not while interacting with what Kehler (2000) calls discourse coherence relations between ellipsis and antecedent clauses. Departing from Kehler's (2000) insight, we suggest that vP undergoes ellipsis in a resemblance discourse relation, but VP does so in a cause/effect discourse relation. Given the asymmetry in the size of ellipsis in tandem with discourse relations, we argue that since Accusative as well as Nominative Case is checked outside VP, the VP to be elided can meet the identity condition on ellipsis with its antecedent VP as the object element in the former and the subject one in the latter or vice versa have not been Case-checked yet, thus being identical in terms of Case-feature at the point of derivation building a VP.

1 Introduction

According to Merchant (2008), VP ellipsis (VPE) in English allows mismatch between the voice of an elided constituent and that of its antecedent, whereas Sluicing and Pseudogapping do not. This

holds for either direction of voice alternation between an elided constituent and its antecedent. This is illustrated in (1) through (3) ((1) and (3), taken from Merchant (2008: 169-170); (2), taken from Merchant (2013: 81)).

(1) *Active antecedent, passive ellipsis (VPE)*

- a. The janitor must <remove the trash_i> whenever it is apparent that [it]₁ should be [~~vP-removed~~ t_i].

Passive antecedent, active ellipsis (VPE)

- b. [The system]₁ can be <used t_i> by anyone who wants to [~~vP-use it~~ t_i].

(2) *Sluicing (TPE)*

- *<[Joe was murdered t]>, but we don't know [who]₁ [~~TP-t_i-murdered Joe~~].

(3) *Pseudogapping*

- *Roses were brought by some, and others did ~~bring~~ lilies.

This paper examines the very issue of voice mismatch in the above three types of ellipsis in English. The next section reviews Merchant's (2007, 2008) analysis of voice mismatch in ellipsis by postulating the functional category of Voice in the syntactic structure of a clause, and the subsequent rebuttal of Merchant's analysis by Tanaka (2011). Departing from the empirical generalization made by Tanaka, section 3 proposes a not Voice- but Case/case-theoretic account for apparent voice mismatch in VP ellipsis and

Pseudogapping. Section 4 investigates argument structure mismatch and its interaction with Pseudogapping. Section 5 explores a Case/case-theoretic account for voice mismatch in Sluicing. Section 6 wraps up with a conclusion.

2 No asymmetry in voice match between VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping

Consider the examples in (4) and (5). It seems clear that voice mismatch is disallowed only in some of elliptical structures like VP ellipsis, Pseudogapping and Sluicing. Unlike in the ellipsis structure of (4), voice mismatch is permissible in the non-elliptical structure of (5).

- (4) *Roses were brought by some, and others did ~~bring roses~~, too.
 (5) Roses were brought by some, and others brought roses, too.

Merchant's (2008) explanation for the contrast in voice mismatch between VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping in (1) and (2) hinges on the following assumptions:

- (6) Syntactic isomorphism is required for ellipsis.
 (7) The *v* head hosts the feature [voi(ce)] responsible for active versus passive voice.
 (8) VP ellipsis deletes a VP, but Pseudogapping deletes a *vP*.

Like most previous studies on ellipsis, Merchant first takes ellipsis to be subject to a syntactic identity condition demanding that an elided constituent be identical syntactically to its antecedent. Given syntactic isomorphism for ellipsis, the uneven distribution in voice mismatch between VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping in (1) and (2) follows from the two specific components in (7) and (8). Merchant (2008) argues that Pseudogapping elides a *vP* rather than a VP. The elided constituent in Pseudogapping then includes the little *v* that has the value of the feature [voi] determined either as active or passive. When the ellipsis and the antecedent clauses are not identical in voice, Pseudogapping won't meet identity in ellipsis, hence being ruled out. In VPE, however, the little *v* hosting the feature [voi] is not included in the VPE site. In other words, the head *v* is external to the VPE site. Thus, voice mismatch

does not matter for VP ellipsis, not being able to exert its effects on identity in ellipsis.

Though Merchant (2008) provides an effective account for the distributional generalization in voice mismatch between VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping, his account confronts several problems. The first problem concerns the size of ellipsis for Pseudogapping. The previous works on Pseudogapping such as Jayaseelan (1990), Lansnik (1999: chap 3), Levin (1978), and Takahashi (2004) argue that Pseudogapping is an operation of VP ellipsis rather than *vP* ellipsis, as typical examples of Pseudogapping in (9) and (10) show.

- (9) *Roses were brought by some, and others did ~~bring~~ lilies.
 (10) *Some brought roses, and lilies were ~~brought~~ by others.

Merchant (2008) in fact brings forth the examples in (11) and (12) to support his thesis that Pseudogapping applies to a larger category than VP ellipsis. The judgements reported in (11) and (12) are Merchant's.

- (11) Many of them have turned in their assignment already, but they haven't yet all.
 (12) Many of them have turned in their assignment already, but they haven't yet (*all) their paper (*all).

Merchant assumes with Sportiche (1988) that a floating quantifier like *all* can be dropped off in the specifier position of any functional category it has moved through. *All* in (11) presumably moves through [spec, *vP*]. Since the constituent elided in VP ellipsis, by assumption, is smaller than *vP* and *all* is external to ellipsis site, the sentence in (11) is received as acceptable. By contrast, the sentence in (12) involving Pseudogapping, according to Merchant, is ruled out because Pseudogapping elides a *vP* that includes the position *all* moves through; thus, the floating quantifier *all* should have been included in the portion elided by Pseudogapping.

Tanaka (2011), however, consulted three native speakers to verify the acceptability of (13) and (14), which are identical to (11) and (12), but except for one modification by placing the aspectual adverb *yet* not before but after the

floating quantifier all:

- (13) Many of them have turned in their assignment already, but they haven't all yet.
- (14) ?Many of them have turned in their assignment already, but they haven't all yet their paper

None of the native speakers that Tanaka consulted ruled out these two sentences. Tanaka (2011) takes the acceptability of these examples to indicate that both VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping may delete a VP. It may also be the case that all in (13) and (14) occupies a position outside a vP, in which case the entire vP can be deleted (See Tanaka (2011: 473)).

Second, Merchant (2008: 170) notes that such Pseudogapping examples with voice mismatch as (15)-(16) are unacceptable.

- (15) *Roses were brought by some, and others did ~~bring~~ lilies.
- (16) *Some brought roses, and lilies were ~~brought~~ by others.

Importantly, however, Tanaka (2011: 475) reports that their VP ellipsis counterparts in (17)-(18) are also unacceptable:

- (17) *Roses were brought by some boys, and some girls did ~~bring roses~~, too.
- (18) *Some brought roses, and lilies were ~~brought by some~~, too.

Since ungrammatical Pseudogapping examples remain to be ungrammatical even under VP ellipsis, it may safely be concluded that there is no asymmetry between the two constructions in terms of the size of ellipsis.

Tanaka (2011: 476) also notes that the opposite situation also holds: If voice mismatch in VP ellipsis is acceptable in a certain structure, that in Pseudogapping is so, too. The following pair of examples shows that Pseudogapping behaves in a parallel fashion to VP ellipsis in terms of voice mismatch. Unlike the preceding two sets of Pseudogapping and VP ellipsis examples, however, both (19) and (20) are acceptable.

- (19) This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did ~~look into this~~

~~problem.~~

- (20) ?My problem will be looked into by Tom, but he won't ~~look into~~ yours.

The additional pairs in (21)-(22), which are taken from Tanaka (2011: 476), do not display asymmetry in voice mismatch between Pseudogapping and VP ellipsis:

- (21) Actually, I have implemented a computer system with a manager, but it doesn't ~~have to be implemented with a manager~~.
- (22) ?Actually, I have implemented a computer system with a manager, but it should have been ~~implemented~~ by a computer technician.

Third, the additional rebuttal of Merchant's (2008) analysis comes from the experimental work by SanPietro et al. (2012: 309), who uses the following set of examples:

- (23) Jean was trying to sell her car. I know that someone bought it,
 - a. and Lisa knows who.
 - (big, resemblance, matched)
 - b. and Lisa knows by who.
 - (big, resemblance, mismatched)
 - c. because she told me who.
 - (big, cause/effect, matched)
 - d. because she told me by who.
 - (big, cause/effect, mismatched)
 - e. and Lisa also knows that someone did.
 - (small, resemblance, matched)
 - f. and Lisa also knows that it was.
 - (small, resemblance, mismatched)
 - g. because she told me that someone did.
 - (small, cause/effect, matched)
 - h. because she told me that it was.
 - (small, cause/effect, mismatched)

The results of the experiment (cited from SanPietro et al. (2012: 310)) are: first, the interaction between ellipsis size (small VP vs. big TP) and discourse relations (resemblance vs. cause/effect relations, which we will turn to shortly in the next section) shows that in the small elliptical conditions only, cause/effect conditions (conditions (g) and (h) of (23); mean rating of 4.94 out of the highest score 7) were rated higher than resemblance conditions (conditions (e) and (f) above; mean rating of 4.32). Second, most

critically, pairwise comparisons show a significant difference ($p < .001$) between the mismatched cause/effect condition (condition (h) above; mean rating of 4.42) and the mismatched resemblance condition (condition (f) above; mean rating of 3.69), but only in the VP ellipsis conditions. No effect of coherence (i.e., discourse relation) is found in the big elliptical conditions (conditions (a-d) above).

These results of the experiment show that voice mismatch in VP ellipsis is not always permissible, unlike what Merchant (2008) argues. Instead, discourse relations are a determining factor in ruling in or out voice mismatch in VP ellipsis.

The conclusion drawn from the review of Merchant (2007, 2008) and Tanaka (2011) is that the former analysis based on the different sizes of ellipsis for VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping over-generates and under-generates. It over-predicts that all the examples involving voice mismatch in VP are acceptable, and at the same time it cannot predict that some of those involving voice mismatch in VP ellipsis are unacceptable. In the next section, building on Kehler's (2000) insight into discourse relations between ellipsis and antecedent clauses, we argue that sizes of ellipsis for both VP ellipsis and Pseudogapping interact with such discourse relations.

3 Towards an analysis

Kehler (2000) argues that sentences/clauses in a discourse are linked together by (discourse) coherence relations. Coherence refers to the ways in which the hearer attempts to link together the sentences/clauses that form a discourse (Kehler (2000: 539)). For example, in a discourse, the hearer does not interpret the two sentences in (24a) to be unrelated, but he/she infers that Mary is upset at Bill because Bill forgot her birthday. Because it is more difficult to infer how the two sentences in (24b) could be linked together, the discourse is less coherent.

- (24) a. Mary is upset with Bill. Bill forgot her birthday.
 b. Mary is upset with Bill. #Jupiter has 63 moons.

Kehler (2000) discusses two types of coherence relations relevant to ellipsis: resemblance and

cause/effect. When a resemblance relation holds, the entities or properties in the elided material are interpreted as in some way parallel to those in its antecedent. For example, in (25), John and Bill are the entities, and they are parallel in that they both went to the store.

- (25) John went to the store because Bill did ~~<go to the store>~~.

There is a class of connectives and adverbs which serve as markers for the resemblance coherence relation, including *and*, *also*, *as well*, *too*, *likewise*, etc.

When a cause/effect relation holds, by contrast, the proposition expressed by the elided material has some sort of causal relationship to the proposition in the antecedent. For example, in (26), the fact that Bill went to the store is the cause for John to do so.

- (26) John went to the store because Bill did ~~<go to the store>~~.

As with the resemblance relations, certain adverbs and connectives regularly occur in cause/effect sentences which can serve as markers of this coherence relation, including *but*, *even though*, *because*, *as a result*, *therefore*, *so*, *consequently*, etc.

Kehler (2000) argues that when there is a voice mismatch in ellipsis, sentences where there is a cause/effect relation between antecedent and ellipsis sites are licit, while sentences where there is a resemblance relation are illicit. The contrast can be found in (27a) and (27b) below, where the acceptable (27a) contains a cause/effect relation, and the unacceptable (27b) contains a resemblance relation.

- (27) a. In March, four fireworks manufacturers asked that the decision be reversed, and on Monday, the ICC did ~~<reverse the decision>~~.
 (Dalrymple et al. 1991)
 b. * This problem was looked into by John, and Bob did ~~<look into the problem>~~, too.
 (Kehler 2000: 551, example 34)

Kehler (2000: 543-46) ascribes this contrast to the fact that cause/effect relations require only

semantic identity, which tolerates voice mismatch, while resemblance relations require syntactic identity in addition to semantic identity.

We depart from Kehler (2000), suggesting that a cause/effect relation as well as a resemblance relation requires syntactic identity in ellipsis, but that they are distinguished in terms of the category that undergoes ellipsis. In particular, when a resemblance relation holds, the bigger category vP is a target of ellipsis. By contrast, when a cause-effect relation holds, the smaller category VP can be elided, as schematized below:

- (28) a. vP ellipsis in "parallel resemblance (or contrast) relations"
 $[_{TP} <_{vP} [_{VP} \quad] >] \dots [_{TP} [_{vP} [_{VP} \text{————}]]]$
 b. VP ellipsis in "non-parallel cause-effect relations"
 $[_{TP} [_{VP} <_{VP} \quad >]] \dots [_{TP} [_{VP} [_{VP} \text{————}]]]$

The difference between the two types of relations in terms of the category of ellipsis is justified on the basis of the following reasoning. First, a parallel resemblance relation relates two clauses/sentences; the ellipsis clause and its antecedent clause. The proposition of the former clause holds true, in a parallel fashion as that of the latter clause does. Now the wisdom we have about the syntax of a clause is that a small clause vP, as a proxy of a full clause CP/TP, may have a parallel relation with another small clause vP. This is exactly what happens in the case of vP ellipsis when a resemblance relation holds. The ellipsis of a vP is the only option to respect the full clause-to-small clause correspondence in the case of a resemblance relation between the ellipsis and the corresponding antecedent clauses.

When a cause/effect relation holds, it also relates two clauses. However, the two clauses involved are non-parallel. Thus, no full clause-to-small clause correspondence is called for. Since the two clauses involved are non-parallel, one clause may relate not to another clause but to a constituent inside it. In other words, it is possible that one clause may, for example, modify the constituent inside another clause. This is the reason that VP ellipsis instead of vP ellipsis is permissible when a cause/effect relation holds, even though two clauses are related. The cause/effect, non-parallel relation gets away with not respecting the full

clause-to-small clause correspondence.

Given the asymmetry between resemblance and cause/effect relations in terms of the size of ellipsis, we are now in a position to account for their contrast in voice mismatch when a verbal domain (VP or vP) undergoes ellipsis. The ideas we rely on are summarized below:

- (29) **Identity condition on VP or vP ellipsis:**
 a. Case/case mismatch (between the copy of the survivor/remnant and its correlate) is not allowed for ellipsis (as part of syntactic isomorphism in ellipsis).
 b. Nominative and Accusative Case are checked outside VP, whereas inherent case is checked inside VP.
 c. vP undergoes 'VP ellipsis' in a resemblance relation.

The key ingredient we rely on in this analysis is Case/case (mis)match in ellipsis. Simply stated, Case/case mismatch is not allowed between a survivor/remnant and its antecedent constituent (or correlate). This means that in the following structure one argument element A inside the ellipsis constituent and its correlate A' inside the antecedent constituent are required to be identical in terms of Case/case feature.

- (30) $..[_{\text{antecedent constituent}} \quad A'] \dots [_{\text{ellipsis constituent}} \quad A]$

Now a question is what happens when A and A' are base-generated inside the ellipsis and antecedent constituents, but they participate in Case-checking relation outside them. We suppose that this situation holds exactly in such examples as (19) and (20), repeated below (31) and (32):

- (31) ?My problem will be looked into by Tom, but he won't ~~look into~~ yours. PG
 (32) This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did ~~look into this problem~~. VPE

As stated in (29b), in English either Nominative or Accusative Case is checked outside VP (cf. Chomsky (1995)). Thus, if in (31) and (32) the ellipsis clause has a cause/effect relation with its antecedent clause and what is elided is VP (as stated in (29c)), the apparent Case mismatch

between the object element in the ellipsis clause and its correlate subject element in the antecedent clause is not harmful at all. This is because at the point of derivation where VP is elided, the former and the latter have not yet have its Case feature valued, thus being not distinct in form.

Now, we turn to the examples of Pseudogapping and VP ellipsis in a resemblance relation. (15) and (17), repeated below as (33) and (34), represent those examples:

- (33) *Roses were brought by some, and others did ~~bring~~ lilies. PG
 (34) *Roses were brought by some boys, and some girls did ~~bring roses~~, too. VPE

As argued above, both Pseudogapping and VP ellipsis in a resemblance relation involve an elision of vP rather than VP. Since vP is a domain where Accusative Case is checked, the object in the ellipsis clause is bound to relate to its correlate object in the antecedent clause. The unacceptability of (33) and (34) follows from the fact that in the examples, the object element in the ellipsis clause which is Case-checked in Spec of vP relates to its correlate in the antecedent clause, which is the subject element that cannot be Case-checked in Spec of vP. Therefore, there is bound to arise a Case mismatch in both Pseudogapping and VP ellipsis in a resemblance relation that holds for (33) and (34). In other words, voice mismatch for vP ellipsis in a resemblance relation is not permissible, because it always invites Case mismatch between an object element and its corresponding subject or vice versus, ultimately infringing on the syntactic isomorphism on ellipsis.

We now turn to the examples where a VP-internal element is assigned not structural Case but inherent case.

- (35) a. *She embroiders peace signs on jackets more often than she does ~~<embroider jackets>~~ with swastikas.
 b. ?She embroiders peace signs on jackets more often than she does ~~<embroider peace signs on>~~ shirt sleeves.
 (36) a. *He'd give Yale money more readily than he would ~~<give money>~~ to charity.
 b. ?He'd give money more readily to Yale than he would ~~<give money to>~~ charity.

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

Note that unlike structural Accusative Case that is checked outside VP but inside vP, inherent case is presumably determined by a verbal head inside VP and realized with an appropriate preposition. All the examples in (35)-(37) involve Pseudogapping because we cannot test out case forms of VP-internal argument elements inside the portion elided by VP ellipsis. The (b)-examples of (35)-(37) are a little bit degraded (we conjecture that, as noted by Levin (1979/1986) and Lasnik (1995), the degradedness of these examples are due to the general degradedness of Pseudogapping), but they are still acceptable. This is because in these examples, the VP in the ellipsis clause is identical to that in the antecedent clause in terms of inherent case realization of the argument elements inside them. Unlike these (b)-examples of (35)-(37), however, their (a)-examples are ruled out owing to case mismatch between a VP-internal argument element in the ellipsis clause and its correlate in the antecedent clause. For example, in (35a) neither jackets nor with swastikas inside the VP of the ellipsis clause matches with on jackets and signs in terms of case/Case feature, thereby inviting a violation of the syntactic isomorphism on ellipsis.

In leaving this section, let us note that Takita (2015: 14) proposed the revised Case condition on ellipsis, which states that a DP must be Case-licensed in the ellipsis site by a head identical to the corresponding head that Case-licenses the correlating DP in the antecedent. Simply speaking, Takita (ibid.) argues that a Case-licensing head rather than the Case/case form of a DP determined by it is critical in meeting the syntactic isomorphism on ellipsis. Takita's analysis works fine for (37b). Since in (37b) the same verb flirt Case-licenses Ryan and its correlate Ben with the realization of the preposition with, it meets the revised Case condition on ellipsis. To rule out (37a), however, Takita has to say that the verb flirt in the ellipsis clause is different from the verb flirt in the antecedent clause. Unlike Takita's analysis, we have argued that the Case/case form of a DP matters for ellipsis.

4 Consequences

If causative and unaccusatives also differ in their *v* (cf. Chomsky (1995)), it is surprising that the following examples are always unacceptable where VP ellipsis applies to the causative-unaccusative alternating verbs in an antecedent and ellipsis pair:

(38) *Causative-Unaccusative Alternations:*

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

(39) a. This can freeze. Please freeze this.

- b. Bill melted the copper vase, and the magnesium vase melted, too.
- c. Maria still tried to break the vase even though it wouldn't break.

Note that (38b) involves a resemblance relation, but (38a) and (38c) involve a cause/effect relation. The prediction is that if the subject element in (38) derived from an object position, just like subject elements of passives, and if the VP of (38c) in a cause-effect relation underwent ellipsis, (38c) would be acceptable, contrary to fact.

Transitive-middle alternating verbs behave in a parallel fashion as causative-unaccusative alternating verbs. The following two sets of examples show transitive/middle alternations.

(40) *Transitive-Middle Alternations:*

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

(41) a. Ethanol markets well in the Midwest.

- b. Hyundais don't sell in Greece.
- c. This kind of movie generally releases in the summer.

No such alternations are found between antecedent and ellipsis pairs, as follows:

(42) a. *They market ethanol well in the Midwest, but regular gas doesn't.

- b. *They sell Hyundais in Greece because

Hondas don't.

- c. *Studios generally release action films in the summer, and big-name comedies generally do as well.
- (43) a. *Ethanol markets well in the Midwest, though they don't in the South.
- b. *Hyundais don't sell in Greece because dealers don't.
 - c. *This kind of movie generally releases in the summer, though a studio might in the winter if it's Christmas-themed.

Why is there a contrast between passives, on the one hand, and unaccusatives and middles, on the other hand? We saw that passive-active alternation (i.e., voice mismatch) in the antecedent and ellipsis pair is permissible in a cause/effect relation. However, neither causative-unaccusative nor transitive-middle alternation in the antecedent and ellipsis pair is allowed. We suggest on the basis of the following do so replacement that in English, passives involve syntactic movement, but neither unaccusatives nor middles do so.

(44) *Passive:*

- a. *This cat was adopted, but that one was not **done so**.
(from Thompson (2012))
- b. *The vase was broken by the children, and the jar was **done so**, too.
(from Houser (2010))

(45) *Unaccusative and Middle:*

- a. %John told Steve to hang the horseshoe over the door, and it **does so** now.
- b. %I was told that this new peanut butter spreads very easily, and I am very excited to **do so**.
((12a-d) from Thompson (2012))
- c. %Mary claimed that I closed the door, but it actually **did so** on its own.
(from Thompson (2012))

The contrast between (44) and (45) can be accounted for by the assumption that the VP-replacing anaphor *so* (while the light verb *do* or *do so* occupies the little *v* position (cf. Stroik (2001), among others) cannot replace a VP that contains a gap left behind by A or A'-movement. This account implies that passive verbs are potentially transitive verbs, thus being able to meet the identity condition on ellipsis with transitive verbs.

However, unaccusative and middle verbs are in fact intransitive verbs, thus not being able to meet the identity condition on ellipsis with causative or transitive verbs. This is how we account for the unacceptability of (38), (42), and (43). All these examples are ruled out independently of Case/case mismatch but because of verb-type mismatch between intransitive and causative/transitive verbs.

There is an additional alternation between an implicit argument-taking verb and its passive variant in an antecedent and ellipsis pair. This mismatch is not allowed, as follows:

- (46) a. *I heard John ate in the cafeteria. But I don't know what was [~~eaten by John in the cafeteria~~].
 b. *I watched John win in the last Olympics. But I don't know which medal was [~~won by John in the last Olympics~~].
 c. *I saw John read in the library. But I don't know what book was [~~read by John in the library~~].

However, their Sluicing counterparts are acceptable, as in (47):

- (47) a. I heard John ate in the cafeteria. But I don't know what.
 b. I watched John win in the last Olympics. But I don't know which medal.
 c. I saw John read in the library. But I don't know what book.

We assume that the implicit argument selected by verbs such as eat, win, and read implicitly carries Accusative-like inherent case. This inherent case is lexically assigned by such verbs to the implicit argument in-situ within VP without moving to [Spec, vP]. This assumption accounts for the contrast in acceptability between (46) and (47). In (46), the lexical-case-carrying implicit argument within the VP of the antecedent clause cannot meet a Case/case match with the complement of the passive verb within that of the ellipsis clause. In (47), by contrast, the wh-survivor/remnant in the ellipsis clause and its correlate implicit argument in the antecedent clause are understood to carry the same feature of Case/case, meeting syntactic isomorphism on ellipsis.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we first started with reviewing Merchant's (2008) analysis of voice mismatch in ellipsis constructions and Tanaka's (2011) reply to this analysis. We took Tanaka's rebuttal of Merchant's dichotomy in voice mismatch between VP and Pseudogapping to be valid. Departing from Kehler's (2000) insight that the distinction between resemblance vs. cause/effect discourse coherence relations rather than between VP and Pseudogapping come into place in apparent voice mismatch, we argued that VP undergoes ellipsis in a resemblance relation, whereas vP does so in a cause/effect relation. Given the different sizes of ellipsis interacting with discourse relations, we went further to argue that apparent voice mismatch in VP ellipsis is attributed to the fact that structural Accusative Case is checked not within the VP domain that undergoes ellipsis. Thus, the object element in the ellipsis clause and the subject element in the antecedent clause, or vice versus, count as identical within a VP in terms of Case feature, meeting the identity condition on ellipsis. Unlike structural Case, however, a difference in case feature or argument structure (or verb type) within a VP always invites a violation of identity in ellipsis. In addition, Case/case mismatch in the case of an elision of a larger constituent such as TP under Sluicing was shown to induce fatal effects on the acceptability of sentences involving such a type of ellipsis.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to the three anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions on the earlier version of the paper. All the remaining errors are, of course, ours. This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2013S1A5A2A03044783).

References

- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
 Dalrymple, Marry, Stuart M. Shieber, and Fernando CN Pereira. 1991. Ellipsis and Higher-order Unification. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 14, 399-452.

- Houser, Michael J, Line Mikkelsen, and Maziar Toosarvandani. 2007. Verb Phrase Pronominalization in Danish: Deep or Surface Anaphora? Ms., University of California, Berkeley.
- Houser, Michael J. 2010. On the Anaphoric Status of Do So. URL http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~mhouser/Papers/do_so_status.pdf.
- Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil A. 1990. Incomplete VP Deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis*, 20, 64-81.
- Johnson, Kyle. 2004. How to Be Quiet. In *Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 40, 1-20. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Kehler, Andrew. 2000. Coherence and the Resolution of Ellipsis, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23, 533-575.
- Kehler, Andrew. 2002. *Coherence, Reference, and the Theory of Grammar*. CSLI Publications, Stanford.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1995. A Note on Pseudogapping. *MIT working papers in linguistics*, 27, 143-163.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1999. *Minimalist Analysis*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Levin, Nancy. 1978. Some Identity-of-sense Deletions Puzzle Me. Do They You?. In *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 14, 229-240. Chicago, Ill.
- Levin, Nancy. 1979/1986. *Main Verb Ellipsis in Spoken English* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus. [Published in 1986 by Garland, New York]).
- Merchant, Jason. 2007. *Voice and Ellipsis*. Ms., University of Chicago, Chicago.
- Merchant, Jason. 2008. An Asymmetry in Voice Mismatches in VP-ellipsis and Pseudogapping. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 39(1), 169-179.
- Merchant, Jason. 2013. *Voice and Ellipsis*. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 44, 77-108.
- Sag, Ivan. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- SanPietro, Steve, Jason Merchant, and Ming Xiang. 2012. Accounting for Voice Mismatch in Ellipsis. In *Proceedings of the 30th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by Nathan Arnett and Ryan Bennett, 303-312.
- Sportiche, Dminique. 1988. A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and its Corollaries for Constituent Structure. *Linguistic inquiry*, 19, 425-451.
- Stroik, Thomas. 2001. On the Light Verb Hypothesis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 362-369.
- Takahashi, Shoichi. 2004. Pseudogapping and Cyclic Linearization. In *Proceedings of NELS*, 34(2), 571-586.
- Takita, Kensuke. 2015. *Strengthening the Role of Case in Ellipsis*. Ms., Mie University.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2011. Voice Mismatch and Syntactic Identity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 42, 470-490.
- Thompson, Anie. 2012. *Categorizing Surface Proforms in the Typology of Anaphora*. A talk given at Ellipsis 2012, Universidade de Vigo.