Ellipsis in a modular perspectn   ns, though one persister

- "Ellipsis is deletion at PF."

To evaluate this statement, I adopt a strictly modular perspective regarding the interft218(e)-0.13

- Assuming we don't want to give up on strict modularity, then, we must pursue alternatives.

After presenting some cyclic interactions between ellipsis and morphology as explananda, I consi
friendly approach to ellipsis might look like.

- The most promising candidate seems to be one that takes the silence of ellipsis to be non-applic

2   Starting assumptions

I adopt the following initial assumptions:

(1)   a.   Derivation by phase and the PIC (Chomsky 2001, et seq.)
     b.   Late Insertion (Halle 1990, Halle and Marantz 1993, et seq.)
     c.   Strict Modularity (inc. a feed-forward Y-model of grammatical architecture: Chomsky 196

▸ (Most of the vast ellipsis literature is concerned with this question.)

• The   *en n* question: what syntactic configurations can ellipsis arise in?

▸ Guiding observation: identity / recoverability isn't enough; we can construct examples of ellipsis that "you can think but you can't say" (*

Even overlooking the details, it seems any PF-deletion approach will fail. A more general problem looms:

- If we take "deletion" to mean "removal of phonological material",[4]

(6)   **na-si A-sin m-khi**, **A-hui ma b-e**
        if   **A-Sin** NEG-**go A-Hui also** NEG-

- If correct, the facts above would be telling us little more than "the silence of ellipsis arises at some point before the very end of phonology"—a trivbece (l)4(d)-250isy(c)5.78184(.)4.9557423-14.00885

- If correct, the facts above would be telling us little more than "the silence of ellipsis arises at some point before the very end of phonology"—a trivbece (l)4(d)-250isy(c)5.78184(.)4.9557423-14.00885

▸

    ▸ **Immediate bonus: no phonological deletion operation required; makes use of independently-needed machinery; can deliver p-side Segregated Transfer effects (but not s-side effects).**

- **A minority view, even though it's been around as long as Merchant's 'deletion at PF':**

    ▸ **First proposed in Bartos (2000, 2001), and adopted and/or explored in Kornfeld and Saab (2004), Saab (2008), Sailor (2021), and even Merchant (2015:207), among others.**

- **But how does it actually work?**

One implementation: licensing marks terminals internal to the ellipsis site with "don't insert on me" features.

- **When Late Insertion encounters such a feature, it simply doesn't add List 2 material to that terminal.**

- **Seems promising: Late Insertion requires access to the syntactic vocabulary anyway, so no Domain Specificity violation (hence these features aren't "diacritics", strictly speaking)**

-

References

Aelbrecht, Lobke. 2010. *e n   en n o e p* . Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins.
Banerjee, Neil. 2020. Ellipsis as obliteration: Evidence f

Appendix: syntactic arguments for Segregated Transfer (Sailor *o pp*)

Segregated Transfer and phrasal movement

XP-movement out of ellipsis sites is generally possible: this is now treated as definitional of ellipsis (Merchant 2013).

- Wh-movement out of TPE and VPE are cases in point (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001, Schuyler 2001):

(10)   I know what I like and what I don't [~~like~~].

- Thus, syntactic operations like wh-movement can therefore proceed unhindered by ellipsis. But must they?

    ▸

Sailor