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This paper will critically examine whether deletion is sensitive to syntactic identity conditions. Merchant (2008, 2013) recently argued that VP-Deletion, Pseudogapping, and Sluicing are all sensitive to voice mismatches. Moreover, Tanaka (2011a) argues that VP-Deletion and Sluicing are also sensitive to category mismatches. Providing several counter-examples to Merchant’s and Tanaka’s arguments, I will argue that deletion is insensitive to voice and category mismatches. I will also sketch an alternative semantic account for those mismatch phenomena. Lastly I will briefly discuss a conceptual problem Merchant’s and Tanaka’s arguments have under the Minimalist assumption that the faculty of language has no representation other than LF on which syntactic identity conditions are imposed.*
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1. Introduction

The study of ellipsis phenomena has played an important role in linguistic theory. On the one hand, Ross’s (1969) observation on island amelioration under Sluicing is now discussed extensively in relation to important theoretical issues concerning operator-variable formation, the derivational vs. representational view of linguistic computation, and the mechanism of ellipsis itself. On the other hand, Sag’s (1976) observation on voice (mis)matches in VP-ellipsis initiates the controversy over the existence of the syntactic identity between the antecedent and its deletion site and the representation on which it is treated. Tackling the latter issue, this paper argues in empirical and conceptual terms that Sluicing, Pseudogapping, and VP-ellipsis,

* I am very grateful to anonymous EL reviewers, Nobu Goto, Kensuke Takita, Hiroko Kimura, Yoshiaki Kaneko, Etsuro Shima, Masako Maeda and the participants of the workshop for their invaluable comments and suggestions. This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) (25770181). All remaining errors are my own.
(hereafter VP-Deletion) are insensitive to the identity of voice and syntactic category, contrary to the recent arguments developed in Merchant (2008, 2013) and Tanaka (2011a).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 will demonstrate that Sluicing, Pseudogapping, and VP-Deletion are all insensitive to voice and category mismatches. Moreover, I will also discuss and suggest an alternative semantic account for those (mis)match phenomena. Section 3 will conclude the paper by giving a conceptual support to the alternative accounts given in section 2. It will be pointed out that the alleged syntactic identity conditions cannot be formulated under the current conception of the architecture of the faculty of language.

2. Syntactic Identity Conditions

In this section, I will critically examine Merchant’s (2008, 2013) and Tanaka’s (2011a) arguments that deletion is sensitive to syntactic identity, by providing several counter-examples, mainly collected from Davies (2008–) Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). I will also outline how those examples that are used to argue for or against the existence of syntactic identity are accounted for without recourse to such arguments.


Merchant (2008, 2013) proposes that (i) Sluicing and (ii) Pseudogapping target constituents involving a Voice head while (iii) VP-Deletion targets VP, layering below the Voice head, as shown in (1), where XP corresponds to a pseudogapped remnant and \( beP \) is not projected unless required.

\[
(1) \quad \text{CP} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{wh-XP} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Subj} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{FP} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{be} \\
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{[Act/Pas]} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

Given that deletion obeys morphosyntactic identity conditions, it is predicted that Sluicing and Pseudogapping are sensitive to voice mismatches. The
prediction appears to be borne out, as shown in (2) and (3).

(2) a. *Joe was murdered (by someone), but we don’t know who <murdered Joe>.
   b. *Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know by whom <Joe was murdered>.

(Merchant (2013: 81))

(3) a. *Roses were brought by some, and others did lilies <bring>.
   b. *Some brought roses, and lilies were by others <brought>.

(Merchant (2008: 170))

Since the target of VP-Deletion does not contain a Voice head, on the other hand, VP-Deletion is not sensitive to voice mismatches, as shown in (4).

(4) a. The system can be used by anyone who wants to <use it>.
   b. The janitor must remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be <removed>.

(Merchant (2008: 169))

In this way, Merchant (2008, 2013) argues for a syntactic approach for voice mismatch phenomena.

However, Merchant’s proposal is refuted by the following examples of Sluicing and Pseudogapping:

(5) a. Not so much whether to teach the Bible in public schools, but how? And by whom <the Bible should be taught>?
    b. ?My problem will be looked into by Tom, but he won’t into yours <look>.

(COCA)  
(Tanaka (2011b: 476))

Moreover, beP deletion, which contains VoiceP in (1), is also insensitive to voice mismatches:

(6) a. “Do I have to talk to these people?” “They will want to <be talked to by you>,” Scarborough said.¹

¹ An anonymous EL reviewer suggests an alternative analysis in which no offending voice mismatch context is involved from the start. It is given in (i).

    (i) “Do I have to talk to these people?” “They will want to <you talk them>,” Scarborough said.

If an EPP requirement can be lifted up in the deletion context, the alternative analysis depicted in (i) accounts for the example in question by eliminating a voice mismatch context. If this analysis is correct, it is predicted that wanna contraction should not be blocked when the embedded subject undergoes wh-movement, as in the case where the embedded object does. I have checked this type of example with one informant but no definitive answer was attained: extraction from a deletion site degrades the acceptability of wanna contraction evenly in both cases. Thus it is left for future research whether the analysis in (i) is preferred over the one given in the main text.
b. We tried to move him to a nicer place, but he didn’t want to
<be moved to a nicer place>.²

(COCA)

Lastly, Nakamura (2013) demonstrates that VP-Deletion is still insensitive to
voice mismatches even when the target VP contains the Voice head stranded
by the deletion of an embedded VP, i.e. in a Sloppy VP-Ellipsis context (see
Hardt (1999), Schwartz (2000), and Tomioka (2008) for discussion). Let us
consider the example in (7).

(7) A: When John had to praise a student, he didn’t want to <praise
a student>.

B: ?When John had to be scolded by a dean, he didn’t <want to
be <scolded by a dean>>, either.

The following schematic representations illustrate how VP-Deletion applies
in (7).

² An anonymous EL reviewer points out that the deleted part might be an unaccusative
vP instead. It will then indicate that VP-Deletion also permits what Merchant (2013)
calls a subject/non-subject alternation, which deletion should also be sensitive to under
his syntactic analysis.
As indicated in (8) and (9), a series of VP-Deletion operations applies: the most crucial one is (iii). After VP-Deletion (ii) applies, the passive Voice head layering above the target VP is stranded within the target of VP-Deletion (iii). Since the antecedent VP want to <praise a student> in (8) contains the active Voice head stranded by VP-Deletion (i), here arises a voice mismatch. However, the (B) sentence is acceptable. Thus, VP-Deletion is still insensitive to voice mismatches.

We have seen that Merchant’s syntactic analysis of voice mismatch phenomena faces numerous counter-examples. Now I will outline an alternative semantic account for voice (mis)match phenomena. Why is deletion sensitive to voice mismatches in some cases while being insensitive in others?

According to Kertz (2008, 2010), VP-Deletion is sensitive to which remnant is focused or accented, the subject or the auxiliary. When the subject remnant is focused, it forms a topic that is contrastive with the subject in the antecedent sentence due to the topic property assigned to the subject po-

---

3 An anonymous EL reviewer objects that instead of VP-Deletion (iii), the beP deletion of be scolded by a dean is involved so as to eliminate the offending voice mismatch context. There are two reasons why I do not assume such an analysis. First, as already shown in (6), beP deletion itself is insensitive to voice mismatches. Second, as will be shown below, a slight but significant change degrades voice mismatch phenomena even in sloppy VP ellipsis contexts. It then is not clear how beP deletion is prevented from applying in such a case. Thus, I conclude in this paper that beP deletion is not a viable option.
sition. Then, the two subjects are required to share the same property so as to satisfy a certain discourse congruence condition (see also Büring (2003), where a contrastive topic sentence is treated as forming a (partial) answer to what Roberts (1996) calls the question under discussion). This accounts for the fact that VP-Deletion does not permit a voice mismatch in (10).

(10) *This problem was looked into by John, and (similarly) Bob did, too. (Tanaka (2011b: 478))

Since the subject remnant Bob is focused, it is required to share the same property as the subject this problem in the antecedent sentence. However, this requirement is not met: the auxiliary did is used as a code. Thus, the example is unacceptable. On the other hand, auxiliary focus, typically signaled with a subject pronoun, does not impose the discourse congruence condition in the same way as in the case of subject focus. Thus, voice mismatches are allowed. The relevant examples are repeated below.

(4) The system can be used by anyone who wants to <use it>.
(7) A: When John had to praise a student, he didn’t want to <praise a student>.
B: ?When John had to be scolded by a dean, he didn’t <want to be <scolded by a dean>>, either.

In both cases the subject is a (relative) pronoun: the semi-modal wants (to) is focused in (4); the negated auxiliary didn’t is focused in (7B). Thus, VP-Deletion permits a voice mismatch in those cases. As further confirmation, consider the following example of sloppy VP-Ellipsis, where subject focus is involved:

(11) A: John had to praise a student and Bill wanted to <praise a student>.
B: *John had to be scolded by a dean, and Bill did <want to be <scolded by a dean>>.

Because the two subjects John and Bill are contrasted in (11B) when the lower VP is deleted, the two Bill’s are required to share the same property

---

4 A subject focus example of VP-Deletion forms a partial answer to the question under discussion, as shown in (i).

(i) Can Jack and Bill come to tea?—BILL<sub>CT</sub> can. (Büring (2003: 532))

5 The following example indicates that the subject pronoun in the antecedent sentence also signals auxiliary focus:

(i) They fired Sheila, though really Amanda should’ve been <fired>.
(Merchant (2008: 172, fn 2))
(up to the lower VP’s) when the upper VP is deleted.\(^6\)

The same point can also be made for the Pseudogapping and beP deletion examples (see Kertz (2010: 106), where Stripping is also included into the same group). While subject focus is involved in the unacceptable examples in (3), the auxiliaries are focused in the acceptable examples in (5b) and (6). These examples are repeated below.

1. a. *Roses were brought by some, and others did lilies \(<\text{bring}>\).
   b. *Some brought roses, and lilies were by others \(<\text{brought}>\).

2. a. “Do I have to talk to these people?” “They will want to \(<\text{be talked to by you}>\),” Scarborough said.
   b. We tried to move him to a nicer place, but he didn’t want to \(<\text{be moved to a nicer place}>\).

The auxiliary won’t is focused in (5b). Though the following pseudogapped remanant can also be focused, the crucial factor here is still the subject/aux focus distinction. Likewise, the modal sequence \(\text{will want } (\text{to})\) and the negated semi-modal \(\text{didn’t want } (\text{to})\) are focused in (6a, b), respectively. Moreover, this alternative account could be extended to Sluicing cases, contrary to Kertz (2010: 106, fn 1).

Given the Hamblin (1973)/Kartunnen (1977) style approach to the semantics of questions, the denotation of a question is a set of propositions with true (possible) answers. Then, the sluiced questions in (2), for example, will be taken for a set of declarative sentences:

\[
\text{(2')} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{i. } & \text{ *Joe was murdered (by someone), but we don’t know who } \langle \text{murdered Joe}\rangle. \\
\text{ii. } & \text{ Joe was murdered by someone,} \\
& \text{ but we don’t know } \begin{cases} \text{Bob murdered Joe} \\
& \text{Mary murdered Joe} \\
& \ldots
\end{cases}.
\end{align*}
\]

\(^6\) An anonymous \textit{EL} reviewer wonders whether deletion is sensitive to defocusing/deaccenting, rather than focusing/accenting. In fact, defocussing/deaccenting permits a certain degree of “sloppiness” such as implicational bridging (see Chomsky (1995) Merchant (2001), Rooth (1992), and Tancredi (1992)). Then, the same reviewer asks how deaccenting a remnant auxiliary yields a deviance. Though it might be possible to recast Kertz’s observation in the way suggested by the reviewer, the data so far indicate that a relevant factor is the formation of the contrastive topic discourse, which is in turn encoded through focusing and contrasting subjects.
b.  i. *Someone murdered Joe, but we don’t know by whom <Joe was murdered>.

ii. Someone murdered Joe, 

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Joe was murdered by Bob} \\
\text{but we don’t know Joe was murdered by Mary}.
\end{align*}
\]

In these derived representations, either the answers to the *wh* phrases or their correlate *someone* occupies the subject position. Given that the subjects in the antecedent and sluiced sentences are contrasted here, the examples in (2) are ruled out by the same discourse congruence condition that rules out voice mismatches in VP-Deletion: they are prevented from sharing the same property. On the other hand, the *wh*-phrases themselves are contrasted in the acceptable case in (5a). The same point is also made for the example in (12).

(5a) Not so much whether to teach the Bible in public schools, but how? And by whom <the Bible should be taught>?

(12) GE Capital and Xerox in Stamford responded to inquiries about their use of extended-stay hotels by saying that they use them from time to time, but they were not sure how much or by whom <they are used>. (The New York Times, Aug 9, 1998)

Since the *wh*-phrases, or their answers themselves, are contrasted, the discourse congruence condition is irrelevant as in the case of auxiliary focus. Thus, the examples in (5a) and (12) are acceptable. These examples also suggest that voice mismatches in sluicing are also conditioned by discourse factors such as contrast.

In this section, I have argued that deletion is insensitive to voice mismatches. Based on Kertz’s (2008, 2010) observation, it has also been shown that discourse factors such as focus, contrastive topic, and congruence, should be taken into account to deal with voice (mis)match phenomena.

2.2. Tanaka (2011a)

Next let us turn to category mismatches dealt with in Tanaka (2011a). Arguing against Merchant’s (2001) semantic approach, Tanaka (2011a) argues that deletion is sensitive to category mismatches. To support his argument, he provides the following contrast:
(13)  a. I remember shooting the scene, but I don’t remember when <I shot the scene>.
    b.*I remember the shooting of the scene, but I don’t remember when <I shot the scene>.
    c. *I remember the/my destruction of the document, but I don’t remember when <I destroyed the document>.

   (Tanaka (2011a: 83–84))

Given that the gerund in (13a), a PRO-Ing gerund, contains TP but the one in (13b), an Ing-Of gerund, and the derived nominal in (13c) do not (see Abney (1983) and Reuland (1983) among others), the contrast in (13) indicates that Sluicing, or TP-Deletion, is sensitive to the syntactic categories of the deletion site and its antecedent. The same point can also be made for VP-Deletion under the assumption that the Ing-Of gerund and derived nominal also do not contain VP. Let us consider the contrast in (14).

(14)  a. I remember shooting the scene, although I didn’t want to <shoot the scene>.
    b.*I remember the shooting of the scene, although I didn’t want to <shoot the scene>.
    c. *I remember the/my destruction of the document, although I didn’t want to <destroy the document>.

   (Tanaka (2011a: 84))

In this way, Tanaka (2011a) argues that deletion is sensitive to category mismatches.

As already pointed out in the literature, however, VP-Deletion is permitted even when its antecedent is a derived nominal.

(15)  a. This letter deserves a response, but before you do <respond>, ….   (Kehler (2002: 54))
    b. Today there is little or no OFFICIAL harassment of lesbians and gays by the national government, although autonomous governments might <harass lesbians and gays>.

   (Hardt (1993: 35))

Moreover, the following example further suggests that sluicing also permits a category mismatch:

(16)  a. But killing was wrong, no matter by whom <anyone was killed>.

   7 An anonymous EL reviewer points out that what is deleted could be it was, instead of anyone was killed. The alternative analysis is given in (i).
b. She is permitted one visitor a month—but even then, she must sit behind the double set of bars. No touching, no hugging, no kissing—no matter who she would touch, hug, and kiss.

(COCA)

Based on these facts, I conclude that VP-Deletion and Sluicing are insensitive to category mismatches.

As in the case of voice mismatch phenomena, a question arises: What else degrades category mismatch phenomena in (13) and (14)? To this question, I suggest that deletion is sensitive to which ontological type of denotation is assigned to a gerund, a proposition or event, i.e. semantic type mismatches.

According to Parsons (1990) and Vendler (1967), gerunds denote either propositions or events, depending on the predicate of which they are an argument. Typical examples of propositional gerunds and event gerunds are given in (17).

(17)

a. i. John’s singing is possible.
   ii. It is possible that he sings.

b. i. John’s singing is slow.
   ii. John sings slowly.

(Vendler (1967: 137–138))

As shown in (17a), the sentence containing a propositional gerund can be paraphrased with a that clause. On the other hand, the sentence containing an event gerund should be paraphrased with a manner adverb, which modifies an event. In this respect, it should be noted that according to Vendler (1967) the following sentence containing an *Ing-Of* gerund is ambiguous in that it denotes a proposition (18bi) or an event (18bii):

(i) But killing was wrong, no matter by whom it was.

If this is the case, the alleged category mismatch is avoided. However, it is not clear then why the example in (iib) is acceptable but the one in (iic), i.e. (13b), is not.

(ii)

a. The shooting of the scene was in December.

b. I remember the shooting of this scene but I don’t remember when it was.

   c.*I remember the shooting of the scene, but I don’t remember when.

Unless the analysis given in (i) is prevented from applying in (iib), the sluiced counterpart in (iic) should also be acceptable, contrary to fact. Therefore, I conclude that the alternative analysis raised by the reviewer is excluded from available options.
(18)  a. John’s singing of the Marseillaise surprised me.
b.  i. That he sang the Marseillaise surprised me.
   ii. That he did it in a pleasant voice surprised me.

    (Vendler (1967: 140))

He further notes that derived nominals can also denote either propositions or events as in (19).

(19)  a.  i. The collapse of the Germans is unlikely.
      ii. That the Germans will collapse is unlikely.
b.  i. The collapse of the Germans was gradual.
      ii. *That the Germans collapsed was gradual.

    (Vendler (1967: 132))

Thus, gerunds and derived nominals either denote propositions or events, depending on the predicate of which they are an argument.

With this in mind, let us now return to Tanaka’s category mismatch phenomena. Assuming with Merchant (2001) that VP-Deletion and Sluicing elide the constituent that is translated into a proposition, it is possible to develop an alternative semantic account for the phenomena. If gerunds and derived nominals denote a proposition, they can be the antecedent of the deletion site due to their propositional character. If they denote an event instead, they cannot be due to their eventive character. As already shown above, since gerunds and derived nominals can denote a proposition irrespective of their categorial status, the acceptable cases of category mismatch, as well as the unacceptable ones, are now dealt with by examining whether the semantic types of the deletion site and its antecedent match each other. Though detailed examination is still necessary, preliminary research suggests that the semantic approach is on the right track. Let us consider the following contrast, where the same Ing-Of gerund is used but as an argument of different predicates.

(20)  a. *John’s singing of something was slow but I don’t remember what <John sang>.
b.  ?John’s singing of something surprised Mary, but I don’t remember what <John sang>.

I have checked the examples with one informant and he found the contrast as indicated. This can be accounted for by the semantic approach as follows. While the gerund, an argument of was slow, denotes an event in (20a) and thus cannot be the antecedent of the sluiced part, the one in (20b), an argument of surprised Mary, can denote a proposition and thus
can be the antecedent.\footnote{As an anonymous EL reviewer correctly points out, it is predicted that the semantic account discussed in this section rules out the case where the antecedent and the deletion site have different denotations but they receive the same syntactic category. The prediction seems to be borne out by the following examples:}

Furthermore, I have checked whether a proposition reading is preferred for the examples of VP-Deletion in (14b, c) with one informant. The result is that an event reading is preferred for the Ing-Of gerund and the derived nominal in (14b, c).\footnote{I have also checked the examples of VP-Deletion in (15) with the same informant. Though the result is not definitive, a proposition reading is less preferred. Thus, it needs further investigation. I leave it for future research.}

2.3. Summary

To sum up, I have argued, based on several pieces of data, that deletion should be insensitive to voice and category mismatches. Moreover, I have outlined alternative semantic analyses for those mismatch phenomena.

3. Conclusion

Let us conclude this paper by briefly discussing a conceptual problem Merchant’s and Tanaka’s arguments have. The Minimalist Program for linguistic theory no longer offers any syntactic representation other than LF, which is only composed of the features and relations that are interpretable by the Conceptual-Intentional Interface, due to the principle of Full Interpretation or the Bare Output Condition (see Chomsky (1986, 1995)).

Though whether categorial features are interpretable or not is yet unclear, at least Tanaka’s argument for category mismatches can be reconsidered in terms of whether the antecedent expression denotes a proposition or event. Since this type of approach has been customarily done in the analysis of coordination (see Williams (1978, 1981)), it is worthwhile pursuing also in the analysis of deletion.

Merchant (2008, 2013) assumes that the information encoded by Voice

(i) a. *I have $[\text{VP } \text{have a good doctor}]$, and my brother is $[\text{VP } \text{is a good doctor}]$.
   b. *I am not $[\text{VP } \text{am a good doctor}]$, but I have $[\text{VP } \text{have a good doctor}]$.  

(Goldberg (2005: 167))

Though Goldberg cites the examples to argue for her Verbal Identity Requirement, the unacceptability might be attributed to the fact that the DP’s a good doctor have different denotations in the antecedent and the deletion site. I would like to thank an anonymous EL reviewer for bringing this point to my attention.
head, or the active-passive alternation, does not affect truth conditions.\textsuperscript{10} Thus, he argues for the existence of syntactic identity. Given his assumption and the above-mentioned architecture of the faculty of language, the information encoded by Voice head cannot survive the C-I interpretation, which then requires Merchant to assume another syntactic level of representations where the identity of Voice is checked.\textsuperscript{11} Thus, Occam’s razor

\textsuperscript{10} One might wonder what else is encoded by Voice head, under the assumption that the Voice information does not survive the C-I interpretation. In this respect, an anonymous EL reviewer wonders how the following active-passive pair of examples is accounted for:

(i) a. Beavers build dams.  
   b. Dams are built by beavers.

\textsuperscript{(Chomsky (1975: 97))}

The active example in (ia) means that it is generally true of beavers that they build dams. On the other hand, the passive one in (ib) means that it is generally true of dams that they are built by beavers. \textsuperscript* At first site, it indicates that the active-passive alternation affects truth conditions. As pointed out by Abbot (2010) among others, however, this kind of truth conditional difference is yielded not by the active-passive alternation \textit{per se}, but by the interaction of genericity, topicality, and prosody. If those conditions are controlled, e.g. by accenting \textit{either} beavers \textit{in} (ia) \textit{or} dams \textit{in} (ib), the truth conditional difference mentioned above disappears. This fact suggests that the active-passive alternation does not directly affect truth conditions.

Another reviewer also points out that the active-passive alternation sometimes affects acceptability. Let us consider the following contrast:

(ii) a. John reached N.Y.  
    b. *N.Y. was reached by John.

The contrast is usually accounted for in terms of so-called affectedness (see Anderson (1977)). However, this does not mean that this “semantic” notion must be directly encoded by Voice head. As is well known, affectedness can be controlled by factors such as tense, polarity, or adverbs. Let us consider the following gradience of acceptability:

(iii) a. *The couple next door is known by John.  
    b. ?The couple next door was known by John.  
    c. ?The couple next door is not known by John.  
    d. The couple next door is thoroughly/barely/only known by John.

\textsuperscript{(Rice (1987: 428–429))}

If affectedness was exclusively encoded by Voice head, we could not easily account for the gradience in (23). Thus, the affectedness is also not encoded by Voice head.

The discussion so far indicates that what appears to be a “semantic” effect directly produced by Voice head is, in large part, attributable to an interaction of several factors other than the information encoded by Voice head. We thus have no evidence that any piece of information encoded by Voice head at hand survives the C-I interpretation. Therefore, the consideration here also leads us to the conclusion that the \textit{subject/aux} focus distinction is the crucial factor of the voice (mis)match phenomena.

\textsuperscript{11} An anonymous EL reviewer wonders how then children could develop the functional category Voice if it is devoid of semantic information. Though it is beyond the scope
prefers the semantic approach outlined in this paper.

In this way, there is no empirically and conceptually motivated reason why we should deal with the two mismatch phenomena discussed in this paper in terms of syntactic identity. In this respect, Takita (this volume) should also be kept under scrutiny. Though he adopts and also supports the idea that ellipsis can be licensed derivationally, the syntactic identity condition on which his approach is based does not seem to apply derivationally. Thus, it would be still required to assume that the required condition is imposed on certain points of derivation but like a filter. Therefore, the author’s argument that deletion is insensitive to syntactic mismatches should be well taken both empirically and conceptually.

Lastly, let us briefly discuss what consequence the conclusion of this paper has for the mechanism of ellipsis. As an anonymous EL reviewer correctly points out, semantic information such as focus, contrastive topic, and ontological types is, in principle, not available to PF-deletion under the inverted Y model of architecture of grammar. This seems to suggest that the mismatch phenomena discussed in this paper argue against the PF-deletion approach. Though I agree in large part with the reviewer’s comment, Merchant’s (2001) E-feature based approach might solve this problem by adding additional conditions to the definition of E-givenness. Thus, I leave it for future research to investigate whether the LF-copying approach is, in fact, preferred over the PF-deletion approach.

of this paper to answer this question, we should investigate, for example, whether phonological information suffices, the “constructional” meaning helps children to acquire Voice, and so on. I would like to thank the reviewer for bringing this point to my attention.

12 As an anonymous EL reviewer points out, deletion is still sensitive to voice or category mismatches in some cases, which in turn suggests that those cases be dealt with in terms of syntactic identity. It would not be plausible overall under the usual assumption that syntactic conditions are not violable (see, for example, Chomsky’s (1957: 15) discussion of “grammaticalness”). As the same reviewer suggests, however, it might be possible to recast at least part of the voice mismatch phenomena in terms of minimality/locality. First, Johnson (2001) argues that the derivation of VP-Deletion involves VP-Topicalization (see also Aelbrecht and Haegeman (2012)). Second, it has been proposed in the literature that discourse factors such as focus and (contrastive) topic, to which deletion is sensitive, be encoded in terms of features or syntactic positions (see, for example, Rizzi (1997, 2004)). Third, minimality/locality violations can be circumvented (see Stark (2001)). Then, it might be possible to deal with, in syntactic terms, the voice (mis)match phenomena in VP-Deletion discussed in this paper (see Maeda and Nakamura (in progress)). I would like to thank the reviewer for suggesting this possibility.
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