Salvation and non-salvation of defectiveness under ellipsis

Gesoel Mendes (UMD) & Andrew Nevins (UCL/UFRJ)

1. Introduction

We propose *salvation by deletion* (see Ross 1969, Chomsky 1972, Merchant 2001, Lasnik 2001; among many others) as a way to investigate the locus of lexical gaps within the grammar. Salvation by deletion occurs when certain otherwise illicit outputs are made available if some relevant portion of the structure is obscured by ellipsis. It has been previously demonstrated that ineffable gaps in a verbal paradigm seem to be able to appear inside ellipsis sites. Thus, the Russian stripping examples shown in (1) are good, despite the fact that neither *buzit'* 'to make a fuss' nor *šelestet'* 'to rustle' have a proper form for first person singular non-past, which would be required in the ellipsis site:

(1) On {buzit / šelestit}, a ja net _.
he makes.a.fuss / rustles and I not
'He {makes a fuss/ rustles} but I don't.' (Russian, adapted from Abels 2018)

Similar observations have been made for lexical gaps in other domains; cf. Kennedy and Merchant 2000; Kennedy and Lidz 2001; Merchant 2015; Adamson 2019 (see Baerman, Corbett, and Brown 2010 for discussion of defectiveness in several languages). The intuition behind these works is that lexical gaps, such as the 1SG non-past for the verbs above, arise from the lack of a proper allomorph. Crucially, if ellipsis prevents morphophonological realization, the problem doesn't arise inside the ellipsis site. This logic, we will show, is only partially correct, as some lexical gaps *cannot* be saved by ellipsis.

In this squib we present what we contend are bona-fide cases of salvation and non-salvation by deletion in the domain of defectiveness: (i) defectiveness that can be saved by deletion, which we take to lack an eligible allomorph for certain environments within

a language (Vocabulary Insertion failure), and (ii) defectiveness that cannot be saved by deletion, which we take to signal the lack of an eligible alloseme on the Encyclopedic list. We present several case studies, drawing from Brazilian Portuguese, Russian, Greek, and English, in the domains of both verbs and nouns. Our findings regarding lack of repair also have implications to the theory of ellipsis more generally, to which we return in the conclusion.

2. PF defectiveness: salvation by deletion

2.1. Brazilian Portuguese defective verbs

To illustrate the cases of salvation by deletion in Brazilian Portuguese, consider the defective verb *demol-i-r* ($\sqrt{\text{DEMOLISH}}$-THEME.VOWEL-INF) 'to demolish', which lacks first person singular present indicative and all forms of present subjunctive. These gaps arise precisely where non-defective verbs lose their thematic vowel in the verbal paradigm, as shown in the following table in which each verb form is split in three slots ROOT-TV-T/AGR. In this table, *V indicates a gap.[1]

It is instructive to compare the patterning of non-defective verbs against defective verbs.

	PRESENT INDICATIVE		PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE	
1sg	vot-Ø-o	*V	vot-Ø-e	*V
2sg, 3sg, 1pl	vot-a-Ø	demol-e-Ø	vot-Ø-e	*V
2pl, 3pl	vot-a-m	demol-e-m	vot-Ø-em	*V
infinitive	vot-a-r 'to vote'	demol-i-r 'to demolish'	vot-a-r 'to vote'	demol-i-r 'to demolish'

Table 1: Brazilian Portuguese: comparison between the non-defective verb *vot-a-r* ($\sqrt{\text{VOTE}}$-TV-INF) 'to vote' and the defective verb *demol-i-r* ($\sqrt{\text{DEMOLISH}}$-TV-INF)

Taking the absence of the theme vowel to be a result of *v* obliteration,[2] we assume that the root of *demol-i-r* 'to demolish' can only be realized in the presence of *v* (see Arregi

and Nevins 2014; Nevins, Damulakis, and Freitas 2014, and references therein for further discussion):[3]

(2) $\sqrt{\text{DEMOLISH}} \leftrightarrow$ /demol/ / [$_v$ __ v] (no elsewhere item)

Defectiveness here is the lack of a proper allomorph due to the lack of an elsewhere item. With this background, let's look at what happens in ellipsis sites.

Consider, for example, gapping, which we take to involve ellipsis of some portion of structure that includes the verb.[4]

(3) a. Você votou *(n)o Pedro, e eu ~~votei~~ *(n)a Maria.
you voted on-the Peter and I voted on-the Mary
'You voted for Peter, and I for Mary.'

b. Você demole a casa, e eu ~~*V~~ o prédio.
you demolish the house and I demolish the building
'You demolish the house, and I demolish the building.' (Brazilian Portuguese)

(3a) shows the remnant portion corresponding to the complement of the verb in the gapped clause preserves the selectional properties of the verb inside the ellipsis site. This selectional connectivity implies that the root in the ellipsis has to be isomorphic with the one in the antecedent. The fact that the gapped verb has to be isomorphic with the one in the antecedent suggests that in (3b) the gap is syntactically active.[5] The very same pattern arises in other types of ellipsis in which the relevant testing environments are possible to construct, e.g. stripping constructions (Depiante 2000, Merchant 2004, Nakao 2009) and comparative deletion (Chomsky 1977, Kennedy 2002, Lechner 2018).

2.2. Russian defective verbs

The cases of salvation by deletion in Russian will be exemplified by two defective verbs: *pret-i-t'* ($\sqrt{\text{REPULSE}}$-TV-INF) 'to repulse' and *oščut-i-t'* ($\sqrt{\text{SENSE}}$-TV-INF) 'to sense'.[6] Typically, Russian defective verbs belong to the second conjugation (-*i*- theme vowel) in the non-past paradigm with a verb stem ending in a dental consonant. The gaps fall in the first person singular non-past cell of the paradigm, where other verbs of the same conjugation ending a dental consonant have alternations.[7] This is shown in the following table by comparing their non-past paradigm with that of two non-defective verbs *sokrat-i-t'* ($\sqrt{\text{SHORTEN}}$-TV-INF) 'to shorten' and *met-i-t'* ($\sqrt{\text{AIM}}$-TV-INF) 'to aim', in which the verbal forms are divided into two slots, with the verb stem followed by the theme vowel plus inflectional morphology (šč = /ɕ/ and č = /tʃ/):

	NON-PAST			
1sg/ 1pl	*V/ pret-im	*V/ oščut-im	sokrašč-u/ sokrat-im	meč-u/ met-im
2sg/ 2pl	pret-iš/ pret-ite	oščut-iš/ oščut-ite	sokrat-iš/ sokrat-it	met-iš/ met-it
3sg/ 3pl	pret-it/ pret-^{j}at	oščut-it/ oščut-^{j}at	sokrat-it/ sokrat-^{j}at	met-it/ met-^{j}at
infinitive	pret-it' to repulse	oščut-it' 'to sense'	sokrat-it' 'to shorten'	met-it' 'to aim'

Table 2: Russian second conjugation - comparison between defective and non-defective verbs

In the 1.SG, *sokrat-it'* 'to shorten' undergoes the *t* /t/ → *šč* /ɕ/ mutation (*sokrašč-u*), inherited from Old Church Slavonic; whereas *met-it'* 'to aim' undergoes the *t* /t/ → *č* /tʃ/ mutation (*meč-u*), inherited from Old Russian. We take these alternations to be morphophonological and the defectiveness of verbs like *pret-i-t'* 'to repulse' and *oščut-i-t'* 'to sense' to arise through competition between the forms reflecting these two mutations (see Gorman and Yang, 2019, for a similar proposal), which we implement in terms of *lethal competition* between vocabulary entries (Nevins 2014), where essentially, the Subset Principle (Halle, 1997) for Vocabulary Insertion (or what Fodor 1972 calls 'posttransformational lexical in-

sertion') cannot resolve a tie between equally specified entries.

(4) a. $\sqrt{\text{REPULSE}} \leftrightarrow$ /preɕ/ / [$_{\text{T}}$ [$_{v}$ __ v] 1SG.NPST]

b. $\sqrt{\text{REPULSE}} \leftrightarrow$ /pretʃ/ / [$_{\text{T}}$ [$_{v}$ __ v] 1SG.NPST]

c. $\sqrt{\text{REPULSE}} \leftrightarrow$ /pret/

(5) a. $\sqrt{\text{SENSE}} \leftrightarrow$ /oʃuɕ/ / [$_{\text{T}}$ [$_{v}$ __ v] 1SG.NPST]

b. $\sqrt{\text{SENSE}} \leftrightarrow$ /oʃutʃ/ / [$_{\text{T}}$ [$_{v}$ __ v] 1SG.NPST]

c. $\sqrt{\text{SENSE}} \leftrightarrow$ /oʃut/

The presence of two competitors equally fit for 1.SG non-past leads to ineffability, since the system cannot decide between the two alternant forms in the context of first person singular non-past.

In Russian the evidence that the lexical gap is syntactic active is more direct, since the verbs under discussion assign different cases to their complements. One can thus see case-connectivity in the very examples where the lexical gaps are inside the ellipsis site. Consider now the following pair:

(6) a. Na veršine étoj gory ty oščutiš radost', a ja ~~*V~~ strakh.
on top this mountain you sense happiness.ACC and I sense fear.ACC
'At the top of this mountain, you will sense happiness, and I fear.'

b. Ty pretiš mne, a ja ~~*V~~ tebe.
you repulse me.DAT and I repulse you.DAT
'You repulse me, and I you.' (Russian)

In both examples, the gapped verb corresponds to a gap in the paradigm. From the verbs exemplified here, *oščut-it'* 'to sense' assigns accusative and *pret-it'* 'to repulse' assigns dative. The case of the verb complement in the gapped clause is dependent on the verb inside the ellipsis site, again implying that the verb inside the ellipsis site is isomorphic

with the one in the antecedent. As in Brazilian Portuguese, the same effect is found in other types of ellipsis.

The patterns found in the examples above all suggest the lexical gaps in question can be syntactically active. That suggests that in these cases, syntax can build the relevant structure that correspond to lexical gaps. If the source of defectiveness here is lack of a proper allomorph, and ellipsis prevents lexical insertion (modeled either as structure obliteration or simply as an instruction to forgo lexical insertion to account for case and selectional connectivity shown our examples; see Ross 1969, Bartos 2000, Lasnik 2001, Lipták and Saab 2016, Banerjee 2020, Saab forthcoming, and references therein), the prediction is that defective verbs like these can appear inside ellipsis sites.[8]

2.3. Defective nouns: genitive plurals in Russian and Greek

In this subsection, we present two examples of salvation by deletion in the nominal domain. One of them occurs in Russian, and the other occurs in Greek, both arising the genitive plural form of nominals and its relation to stress assignment.

In Russian, the repair effect can be demonstrated with the defective noun *mečt'-a* 'dream'. Post-stressing nouns like this lack a genitive plural form, but are saved by ellipsis:[9]

(7) U nego byli máčty, a u menja ne bylo ~~mačt~~.
by he.GEN were mast-PL.GEN and by I.GEN not were mast.PL.GEN
'He had masts, but I had not.'

(8) U nego byli mečtý, a u menja ne bylo ~~*N~~.
at him.GEN were dreams-PL.NOM and at me.GEN not were dream.PL.GEN
'He had dreams, but I hadn't.' (Russian)

The gaps with nouns of this type arise when stress would be forced to retreat to the stem

because the genitive plural inflection, where the stress would otherwise fall, ends up being phonetically null in this declension class (Jakobson 1957, Pertsova 2005, Bailyn and Nevins 2008). To capture this, we assume that the root of *mečt'-a* is inherently unstressed:

(9) $\sqrt{\text{MEČT}} \leftrightarrow$ /metʃt/ [−stress]

When the rhizotonic form is required because the genitive plural ending is null, there is a clash in the stress specification of the stem, resulting in ineffability. Given its PF nature, such a problem is neutralized under ellipsis and thus repair effects are again predicted to occur.

We have confirmed that salvation by deletion further obtains with defective nouns such as Modern Greek *kot-a* 'hen', which are also defective in the genitive plural (Sims 2006 and references therein):

(10) Efaga ta podia mias kotas, oxi trion ~~*N~~.
ate.1SG the legs one.GEN.SG hen.GEN.SG not three.GEN hen-GEN.PL
'I ate the legs of one hen, not three.' (Greek)

We take the nominal stems of defective nouns like *kot-a* 'hen' as inherently stressed. When combined with a stress attracting genitive form, the stem and the genitive ending will lethally compete for primary stress (i.e. culminativity), leading to ineffability. Again, phonological properties such as stress assignment are not at stake when relevant portion of the structure goes unpronounced and the repair effect is again correctly predicted.

Thus, salvation by the deletion in the case of PF-defective elements can apply to either verbs or nouns. Nonetheless, as shown in the next section, when LF-defectiveness is at stake, both verbs and nouns will not escape a crash, even with the help of ellipsis.

3. LF defectiveness: non-salvation by deletion

3.1. Idiomatic Pluralia Tantum: *High jinks*

The first type of non-salvation by deletion to be presented is related to expressions such as *high jinks*, a phrasal idiom used only in plural contexts, which will provide the basis for our further analyses in this section:

(11) a. high jinks *mischief*

b. *high jink

The important point here is that **jink* (in the singular) does not have an independent life (inside or outside the construction). Following Harley (2014), we take the gap above to signal the the lack of an Encyclopedic entry for the relevant morphosyntactic context. The implementation here is similar to our previous cases in the sense that we propose the existence of the gap is captured the lack of an *elsewhere item*. The crucial difference, however, is that this happens now on the LF side of the grammar:

(12) $\sqrt{\text{JINK}} \leftrightarrow$ mischief′ / $[_{\text{DP}}$ high $[_{\#\text{P}}$ $[_{n\text{P}}$ __ n] [+plural]]] (no elsewhere item)

If ellipsis is seen as non-pronunciation of terminals in PF, the prediction is that ellipsis will not be able to help the absence of a proper alloseme. The resulting structure will still be deprived of an appropriate denotation for this element in combination with a [−plural] environment. This prediction is borne out:

(13) a. *I don't care for these high jinks, not even one __.

b. *I don't care for John's high jinks, especially the last __.

With the lack of an elsewhere alloseme as a basis for the analysis of (13), let us consider other cases of non-salvation by deletion that can receive an analogous treatment.

3.2. Russian *pluralia tantum* nouns

In Russian, *pluralia tantum* nominals lack a form for the paucal genitive of quantity used with numerals from *one and a half* ('poltora') to *four* ('četyre') and this restriction is carried over to ellipsis sites. Thus, while numerals such as *odni* 'one' require a nominative plural complement, and numerals such as *pjat* 'five' and *šes't'* 'six' require a genitive plural complement, paucal numerals such as *tri* 'three' require a genitive singular complement, and *pluralia tantum* nouns such as *poxoron-y* 'funeral/rites' are incompatible with genitive singular forms:

(14) U nas bylo šes't' poxoron, a ne pjat __.
by we.GEN was six funeral-PL.GEN and not five __
'We had six funerals, not five (funerals).' (Russian)

(15)*U nas bylo šes't' poxoron, a ne tri __.
by we.GEN was six funeral-PL.GEN and not three __
'We had six funerals, not three (funerals).' (Russian)

There is an immediate breakdown of the parallelism with defective verbs such as *pret-it'* 'to repulse' from above. Recall that verbs such as *pret-it'* 'to repulse' lack a 1SG.PRES, but that ellipsis saves the non-pronunciation of such forms. Why can a similar mechanism not be at play with nouns such as *poxoron-y*?

The difference cannot be due to salvation by deletion operating differently in nouns vs. verbs, as it was shown in section 2.3 that defective nouns whose source of defectivity is clearly morphophonological, such as *mečt-á* 'dream', can indeed be saved by deletion in Russian. Rather, we propose that the defectivity of *pluralia tantum* nouns such as *poxoron-y* 'funeral/rites' is due the lack of a matching alloseme on the Encyclopedic list on the LF side. (In the Encyclopedic entry below, the feature [+plural] refers to the case-number end-

ing found within the functional structure on the noun; see Halle and Matushansky 2006).

(16) $\sqrt{\text{POXORON}} \leftrightarrow$ funeral′ / [$_{\text{KP}}$ [$_{n\text{P}}$ __ n] [+plural]] (no elsewhere item)

Similar to the manner in which nouns such as *mečt-á* 'dream' lack an allomorph on the PF Exponent list for environments in which they would occur with rhizotonic stress, nouns such as *poxoron* 'funeral' lack an alloseme on the LF Encyclopedic list for environments in which they occur with singular features.[10]

Thus, the impossibility of paucal numerals with these *pluralia tantum* nouns arises from LF defectiveness: the paucal numerals select for a genitive singular complement, and these nouns have no Encyclopedic entry outside of [+plural] environments.

On the current proposal, therefore, the ill-formedness of (15) is thus not morphophonological in nature. Morphophonological defectivity can be saved by deletion, whereas these cannot.[11]

The same effect can be demonstrated for similar examples in Greek *pluralia tantum* nouns like *kalanta* 'carols', which also differ from the genitive plural gaps in Section 2.3 above, in not being savable via ellipsis:

(17)*Mu aresun ta kalanta, alla ksero na tragudao mono ena __.
me.GEN like the carols but I know sing only one __.
'I like carols, but I know how to sing only one __.' (Greek)

To summarize, all of these cases involve *pluralia tantum* nouns that, when turned singular, lead to Encyclopedic defectivity that cannot be saved by ellipsis, as ellipsis only saves violations on the PF side. While it may be possible to formalize this defectivity in terms of a syntactic failure (e.g. the requirement that roots such as Russian $\sqrt{\text{POXORON}}$ 'funeral' and Greek $\sqrt{\text{KALANTA}}$ 'carol' must syntactically check against a [+plural] feature), the implementation in terms of Encyclopedic defectivity squares with existing accounts for

phrasal idioms such as English $\sqrt{\text{JINK}}$. Whether ultimately implemented in terms of a syntactic failure or Encyclopedic defectivity, we have demonstrated that the inability to save these cases by ellipsis demonstrates that these gaps are not morphophonological in nature.

3.3. English *beware*

The last case of non-salvation of defectiveness under ellipsis to be discussed here is found with the English verb *beware* (Lakoff 1970, p.28, Fodor 1972), which can appear in directive environments, such as imperative sentences, embedded under certain modals (e.g. *should/ must*) and command verbs (e.g. *tell, ask,* ...) as seen in the examples below:[12]

(18) a. Beware of barking dogs!
b. You should/must beware of barking dogs.
c. I told them to beware of barking dogs.

(19) a. *John bewares of barking dogs. (intended: John watches out for barking dogs)
b. *John bewared of barking dogs. (intended: John watched out for barking dogs)
c. *John didn't beware of barking dogs. (intended: John didn't watch out for barking dogs)
d. *I won't beware of barking dogs. (intended: I will not watch out for barking dogs)

One must rule out first the possibility of *beware* being parsed as *be aware* (pace Fodor 1972), which could in principle account for some of its restrictions. The restriction on tensed *beware* (**bewares*, **bewared*) would follow because *aware* is an adjective and thus cannot host tense morphology. Similarly, the restriction on *John didn't beware of barking dogs* would reflect the restriction on *John didn't be aware of barking dogs*, which doesn't seem to be related to defectiveness.

This analysis, however, faces setbacks. It is not clear that *beware* is diachronically de-

rived from *be aware*; the Oxford English Dictionary reports some ancient uses of *beware* (≈1300) where *be* is a verb prefix/particle *by* rather than a copula, and also some inflected uses (*bewares*, *bewared*, ...) after the 17th century, which were eventually discarded. Second, the fact that, for some speakers, *beware* can take a DP complement directly is difficult to reconcile with a *be aware* parsing — as adjectives can't case-mark their complements:[13]

(20) a.%You should beware barking dogs!

b.%Beware barking dogs!

Indeed, *beware* and *be aware* have different meanings. Collapsing the two would overgenerate the following type of example (Max Guimarães, pers. comm.):

(21)*They should beware of barking dogs, but they aren't.

Notice now, that *beware* can in principle appear inside ellipsis sites:

(22) a. They told me to beware of the dog, but I refused to ~~beware of the dog~~

b. They didn't tell me to beware of barking dogs, but I should ~~beware of barking dogs~~.

Crucially, the constraints on the distribution of *beware* inside ellipsis sites instantiate a case of *non-salvation* by deletion:

(23) *Beware* is **not** saved under ellipsis

a. *John should beware of barking dogs, but he doesn't ~~beware of barking dogs~~.

b. *I told them to beware of barking dogs, but they don't ~~beware of barking dogs~~.

We take the defectiveness of *beware* to come from the lack of a proper alloseme in the Encyclopedic list to fit [realis] environments.[14] The entry for $\sqrt{\text{BEWARE}}$ thus is specified with an [+irrealis] feature evoked in directive environments as a mood feature in the TP layer, which we take to be the common aspect of the environments where *beware* can

appear:

(24) $\sqrt{\text{BEWARE}} \leftrightarrow$ watch-out-for′ / [$_{\text{TP}}$ [+irrealis] [$_{\text{VP}}$ __ XP]] (no elsewhere item)

Non-salvation by deletion again implies deficiency in Encyclopedic list. (Alternatively, an account in terms of syntactic failure to check an [+irrealis] feature on this root could be pursued, although we do not take this tack here). Crucially, ellipsis, as an instance of non-pronunciation, can only save gaps that are morphophonologically problematic.

4. Conclusion

We have offered cases of two types of defectiveness: morphophonological failures, whereby the set of vocabulary entries in a language lacks an appropriate allomorph, and LF defectiveness, whereby the language lacks an appropriate alloseme to insert in a given environment. Ellipsis, as a PF-deletion operation, modeled, for instance, as an instruction to forego Vocabulary Insertion or structure removal, can track this distinction, thereby constituting an efficient probe to distinguish cases of Vocabulary Insertion failure (which can be salvaged) from Encyclopedic deficiency.

More generally, the phenomenon of non-salvation by deletion in the domain of defectiveness provides evidence for abstract syntactic structure in the ellipsis site (pace Dalrymple, Shieber, and Pereira 1991, Ginzburg and Sag 2000, Culicover and Jackendoff 2005). This is so because unacceptability in such cases comes from grammatical properties lying within the ellipsis site – precisely what non-structural approaches to ellipsis lack. Given the contrast between salvation and non-salvation by deletion, ellipsis operations must reside on the PF-branch of the grammar.

We have nonetheless left open to a certain degree whether the failure of salvation by deletion for certain kinds of gaps is due to LF-defectivity, as proposed above for the sake of concreteness, or to syntactic failure. This matter can be investigated in future research

by examination of other lexical gaps and their interaction with ellipsis, such as the pairing of gender endings with animate nouns that lack certain gender-combinations (e.g. Greek animal nouns; Sudo and Spathas 2016), English modals that lack non-finite forms (e.g. McCawley 1988, Mendes 2020), and potentially other cases of gaps such as deponent verbs (Embick 2000) and nominative anaphors. More detailed future investigations involving ellipsis will shed light on whether these gaps lie on the Exponent List, the Encyclopedic List, or via failure of syntactically convergent derivations.

References

Abels, Klaus. 2018. On "sluicing" with apparent massive pied-piping. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* URL `https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-018-9432-1`.

Adamson, Luke James. 2019. Derivational Trapping And The Morphosyntax Of Inflectionlessness. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Arregi, Karlos, and Andrew Nevins. 2014. A monoradical approach to some cases of disuppletion. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40:311–330.

Baerman, Matthew. 2008. Historical observations on defectiveness: the first singular non-past. *Russian Linguistics* 32:81–97.

Baerman, Matthew, Greville G. Corbett, and Dunstan Brown. 2010. *Defective paradigms: Missing forms and what they tell us*. Oxford: Oxford University Press and the British Academy.

Bailyn, John, and Andrew Nevins. 2008. Russian genitive plurals are impostors. In *Inflectional identity*, 237–270. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Banerjee, Neil. 2020. Ellipsis as obliteration: Evidence from Bengali negative allomorphy. In *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America 5*, ed. Patrick Farrell, 133–143.

Bartos, Huba. 2000. VP-ellipsis and verbal inflection in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 47:3–24.

Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2012. The Spanish lexicon stores stems with theme vowels, not roots with inflectional class features. *Probus* 25:3–103.

Camara Jr, Joaquim Mattoso. 1970. *Estrutura da língua portuguesa*. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Chomsky, Noam. 1972. Some empirical issues in the theory of transformational grammar. In *The goals of linguistic theory*, ed. Stanley Peters, 63–130. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Chomsky, Noam. 1977. On wh-movement. In *Formal syntax*, ed. P. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian. New York, New York: Academic Press.

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

Chung, Sandra, William Ladusaw, and James McCloskey. 1995. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:1–44.

Culicover, Peter W., and Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler syntax*. Oxford University Press.

Dalrymple, Mary, Stuart M. Shieber, and Fernando C. N. Pereira. 1991. Ellipsis and higher-order unification. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 14:399–452.

Depiante, Marcela, and Pascual Masullo. 2004. Gender is in the lexicon, number is in the syntax: evidence from nominal ellipsis in Spanish. Paper presented at GLOW 27, Aristotle University.

Depiante, Marcela A. 2000. The syntax of deep and surface anaphora: A study of null complement anaphora and stripping/bare argument ellipsis. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut at Storrs.

Elliott, Jennifer R. 2000. Realis and irrealis: forms and concepts of the grammaticalisation of reality. *Linguistic Typology* 4:55–90.

Embick, David. 2000. Features, syntax, and categories in the Latin perfect. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31:185–230.

Fodor, Janet Dean. 1972. Beware. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.4:528–535.

Ginzburg, Jonathan, and Ivan Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: the form, meaning, and use of english interrogatives*. Stanford, Calif: CSLI Publications.

Gorman, Kyle, and Charles Yang. 2019. When nobody wins. In *Competition in inflection and word formation*, ed. Franz Rainer, Francesco Gardani, Hans Christian Luschützky, and Wolfgang Dressler. Dordrecht: Springer.

Halle, Morris. 1973. Prolegomena to a theory of word formation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4:3–16.

Halle, Morris. 1997. Impoverishment and fission. In *PF: Papers at the interface*, ed. Benjamin Bruening, Yoonjung Kang, and Martha McGinnis, volume 30 of *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 425–450. MITWPL, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Halle, Morris, and Ora Matushansky. 2006. The morphophonology of Russian adjectival inflection. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:351–404.

Harley, Heidi. 2014. On the Identity of Roots. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40:225–276.

Jakobson, Roman. 1957. The relationship between genitive and plural in the declension of Russian nouns. *Scando-Slavica* 3:181–186.

Jayaseelan, Karattuparambil A. 1990. Incomplete VP deletion and Gapping. *Linguistic Analysis* 20:64–81.

Johnson, Kyle. 2009. Gapping is not (VP-) ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:289–328.

Kennedy, Chris. 2002. Comparative deletion and optimality in syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20:553–621.

Kennedy, Christopher, and Jeffrey Lidz. 2001. A (covert) long-distance anaphor in English. In *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics 20*, 318–331. Cambridge: Cascadilla Press.

Kennedy, Christopher, and Jason Merchant. 2000. Attributive comparative deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18:89–146. URL `https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006362716348`.

Lakoff, George. 1970. *Irregularity in syntax*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Lasnik, Howard. 2001. When can you save a structure by destroying it? In *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 31*, ed. Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, volume 2, 301–320. GLSA.

Lechner, Winfried. 2018. Comparative deletion. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*, ed. Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Tanja Temmerman, 624–657. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Oxford University Press.

Lipták, Anikó, and Andrés Saab. 2016. Movement and deletion after syntax. *Studia Linguistica* 70:66–108.

McCawley, James. 1988. *The syntactic phenomena of English*, volume 2. New York: University of Chicago Press.

Mendes, Gesoel. 2020. Investigations on salvation and non-salvation by deletion. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

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

Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and philosophy* 27:661–738.

Merchant, Jason. 2015. On ineffable predicates: Bilingual Greek-English code-switching under ellipsis. *Lingua* 166:199–213.

Merchant, Jason. 2018. Ellipsis: A survey of analytical approaches. In *The oxford handbook of ellipsis*, ed. Jeroen van Craenenbroeck and Tanja Temmerman, 19–45. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Oxford University Press.

Nakao, Chizuru. 2009. Island repair and non-repair by PF strategies. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

Nevins, Andrew. 2014. Book review of "Defective paradigms: missing forms and what they tell us". *Revista Linguística* 4.

Nevins, Andrew, Gean Damulakis, and Maria Luisa Freitas. 2014. Phonological regularities among defective verbs. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos* 56:11–21.

Palmer, Frank Robert. 2001. *Mood and modality*. second edition. Cambridge University Press.

Pertsova, Katya. 2005. How lexical conservatism can lead to paradigm gaps. In *UCLA working papers in linguistics, number 11: Papers in phonology 6*, 13—38. Los Angeles: University of California.

Pertsova, Katya. 2016. Transderivational relations and paradigm gaps in Russian verbs. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 1. URL `http://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.59`.

Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and categories. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Portner, Paul. 2018. *Mood*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ross, John. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Ross, John Robert. 1969. Guess who? In *Chicago Linguistics Society*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and Jerry L. Morgan, 252–286. Chicago, Illinois.

Saab, Andrés. forthcoming. Grammatical silences from syntax to morphology. In *The derivational timing of ellipsis*, ed. Güliz Güneş and Anikó Lipták. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sims, Andrea. 2006. Minding the gaps: Inflectional defectiveness in a paradigmatic theory. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Sudo, Yasutada, and Giorgos Spathas. 2016. Nominal ellipsis and the interpretation of gender in Greek. In *Proceedings of sinn und bedeutung 20*, 132–153. Cambridge University Press.

Notes

[1]The *V in the tables and examples we present do not represent the judgement itself, but rather that speakers are uncomfortable with potential forms that could arise for the gap.

[2]For a phonological take on the missing theme vowel, see Camara Jr 1970; see also Bermúdez-Otero 2012 on Spanish.

[3]We assume that structural description of vocabulary insertion rules in general do not make reference to linear order, which we take to come from an independent linearization algorithm.

[4]See Ross 1967, Pesetsky 1982, Jayaseelan 1990, among others, though see Johnson 2009 for a different analysis.

[5]A reviewer asks whether in examples like (3b) the ellipsis could contain instead a different, non-defective, verb with the same selectional requirement. Brazilian Portuguese, for instance, has the verb *destruir* 'to destroy', which is not defective. Both *destruir* 'to destroy' and *demolir* 'to demolish' select a DP complement:

(i) Você **demole** a casa, e eu ~~**destruo**~~ o prédio.
you **demolish** the house and I **destroy** the building
'You demolish the house, and I destroy the building.'

However verbs like *apreciar* 'to like/appreciate' select a DP complement, whereas *gostar* 'to like' selects a PP complement. If one could replace the verbs inside the ellipsis site in this way, one would erroneously predict that selectional connectivity effects would go away (iib):

(ii) a. Eu **aprecio** pessoas caridosas, e John ~~**aprecia**~~ pessoas inteligentes.
I **appreciate** people charitable, and John **appreciates** people intelligent
Intended: 'I like charitable people and John likes intelligent people.

b. *Eu **aprecio** pessoas caridosas, e John ~~**gosto**~~ de pessoas inteligentes.
I **appreciate** people charitable, and John **likes** of people intelligent
Intended: 'I like charitable people and John likes intelligent people.

Allowing this type of mismatch would be at odds with Chung's No New Words Condition (Chung 2006), as well as the empirical absence of repair effects reported in Section 3.

[6]The reason for choosing these two particular verbs is twofold. First, the competition analysis we will develop is easily stated with verbs whose stems end in *-t*. Second, these verbs assign different cases to their

complements, which makes it possible to demonstrate that the gaps can be syntactically active in the ellipsis site.

[7]See Halle 1973; Sims 2006; Baerman 2008; Pertsova 2016 and Gorman and Yang 2019 for discussion.

[8]These data may be consistent with LF-copying (Chung, Ladusaw, and McCloskey 1995), though some amendments would be needed to account for case-connectivity and selectional connectivity, which do not come for free in this type of approach; see Merchant 2001, Ch 3-4 for further discussion.

[9]We thank a reviewer for pointing us to this fact and proving the example in (8).

[10]In order to circumvent such restrictions, speakers use a collective numeral that combines with a genitive plural form of the noun.

(i) U nas bylo šes't' poxoron, a ne troe ~~poxoron~~.
by we.GEN was six funeral-PL.GEN and not three.COLL funeral.PL.GEN
'We had six funeral, not three (funerals).' (Russian)

As these collective numerals select for GEN.PL complements, the nouns find a matching Encyclopedic entry.

[11]Indeed, parallel restrictions have been found in languages without such rich case-number paradigms, as noted by Depiante and Masullo (2004) for *pluralia tantum* nouns in Spanish such as *nupcias* 'nuptials'.

(i) *Asistí a las nupcias del príncipe, pero no a la _ de la princesa.
I attended to the.PL nuptials.PL of-the prince, but not to the.SG _ of the princess
'I attended the prince's wedding, but not the princess's.' (Spanish)

Similarly, Merchant (2018) provides examples such as the following:

(ii) Beth's nuptials {were /*was} in Bond Chapel, and Rachel's _ {were/ *was} in Rockefeller Chapel.

[12]We thank Howard Lasnik for the observation that restrictions on *beware* are not rescued by ellipsis.

[13]Consider the following examples of *beware* with a direct DP complement:

(ii) 'Beware the Jabberwock, my son!
The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!
Beware the Jubjub bird, and shun
The frumious Bandersnatch!' (Lewis Carroll, *Jabberwocky* [1871])

[14]The idea of [±irrealis] as a grammatical feature is widely discussed in the literature. See Palmer 2001, Elliott 2000, Portner 2018, and references therein, for discussion.