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1 Voice mismatches


(1) Passive antecedent, active ellipsis
   a. This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did. <look into this problem>
   b. In March, four fireworks manufacturers asked that the decision be reversed, and on Monday the ICC did. <reverse the decision>
   c. The system can be used by anyone who wants to. <use it>

(2) Active antecedent, passive ellipsis
   a. Actually, I have implemented it [=a computer system] with a manager, but it doesn’t have to be. <implemented with a manager>
   b. Steve asked me to send the set by courier through my company insured, and it was. <sent by courier through my company insured>
   c. The janitor should remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it needs to be. <removed>
   d. The janitor must remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be. <removed>

Pseudogapping, on the other hand, does not permit such voice mismatches (aligning with sluicing, fragment answers, and gapping in this respect).

(3) Passive antecedent, active ellipsis
   a. *Roses were brought by some, and others did lilies. <bring>
   b. *Klimt is admired by Abby more than anyone does Klee. <admire>
c. *Hundertwasser’s ideas are respected by scholars more than most people do his actual work. <respect>

d. *More people were invited to Beth’s reception by her mother than Beth herself did to her wedding! <invite>

(4) Active antecedent, passive ellipsis

a. *Some brought roses, and lilies were by others. <brought>

b. *Abby admires Klimt more than he is by anyone else. <admired>

c. *Laypeople respect Hundertwasser’s actual work more than his ideas are by scholars. <respected>

d. *Beth’s mother invited more people to her wedding than were by Beth herself! <invited>

Why?

2 Voice heads and ellipsis sites

2.1 Permitting voice mismatches in VP-ellipsis

VP-ellipsis consists of deletion of the phrasal complement to the v head which determines the voice properties of the clause (v[Voil; see Kratzer 1996, and Collins 2005 for recent discussion).


(5) a. Bill shouldn’t remove the trash—the janitor should.

b. 

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP}_1 \quad \text{T'} \\
\text{the janitor} \quad \text{should} \\
\text{vP} \\
\quad t_1 \quad v' \\
\quad v[\text{Voil:Active}[E]] <\text{VP}> \\
\quad \text{remove} \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \text{the trash}
\end{array}
\]
(6) a. This problem was to have been looked into, but obviously nobody did.
   b. \([DP\] This problem \] was to have
      \[\begin{array}{c}
      \text{vP} \\
      \text{been} \quad \text{vP} \\
      \quad \text{v'} \\
      v\text{[Voi:Pass][E]} \\
      \text{look_into} \\
      \text{DP}_1 \\
      \text{this problem}
      \end{array}\]

c. \[\begin{array}{c}
      \text{TP} \\
      \text{DP}_2 \\
      \quad \text{nobody} \\
      \text{did} \\
      t_2 \\
      \quad \text{v'} \\
      v\text{[Voi:Active][E]} \\
      \text{look_into} \\
      \text{DP}_1 \\
      \text{this problem}
      \end{array}\]

(7) a. The janitor must remove the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be.
   b. \[\begin{array}{c}
      \text{TP} \\
      \text{DP}_1 \\
      \quad \text{the janitor} \\
      \quad \text{must} \\
      t_1 \\
      \quad \text{v'} \\
      v\text{[Voi:Active]} \\
      \text{remove} \\
      \text{DP}_2 \\
      \text{the trash}
      \end{array}\]

3
2.2 Ruling out voice mismatches in pseudogapping


Jayaseelan 2001 and Gengel 2006: movement of the remnant as movement to a clause-internal focus position (specifier of FocP; see Kim 1997 and Depiante 1999 for related proposals).

The requirement that movement to FocP be concomitant with ellipsis = this overt Foc0 head is listed in the English lexicon as having an E feature (unlike other ellipsis-licensing heads, on which E is optional).

E on Foc will therefore cause the deletion of the vP complement to Foc (and the movement of the remnant to specFocP may be driven by a strong [+contrastive] feature, as posited by Gengel 2006).

(8) a. Some brought roses, and others did lilies.
Pseudogapping is *dissimilar* to VP-ellipsis in that it involves deletion of the vP sister to Foc\(^\beta\), not of the VP sister to v as is the case in VP-ellipsis. This structural difference explains why voice mismatches are impossible in pseudogapping: in such cases, the antecedent vP and the elided vP are not identical—one has v[Vo:Active] and the other has v[Vo: Passive].

(9)  

a. *Roses were brought by some, and others did lilies.*

b.
3 Floated quantifiers

As first discussed in Sag 1976, floated quantifiers may co-occur with VP-ellipsis:

(10) Many of them have turned in their assignment already, but they haven’t yet all.

Floated quantifiers are impossible in pseudogapping, however, either before or after the remnant:

(11) Many of them have turned in their take-home already, but they haven’t yet (*all) their paper (*all).

This state of affairs is expected on the analysis presented above, if the floated quantifier all is situated in the specifier of (or adjoined to) vP: in such a position, it will survive VP-ellipsis, but not vP-ellipsis.
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