Section 5
Case Filter Violation Repair by Ellipsis?

I. The Case Filter
 A.   Amelioration of a constraint on Japanese <u>ga</u>/<u>no</u> conversion
<div align="right">Saito (2001)</div>

(521)   Taroo-ga / -no itta tokoro
             -NOM   -GEN went place
      'the place where Taroo went'

(522)   A Case-marked object blocks <u>ga</u>/<u>no</u> conversion.

(523)   Taroo-ga /*-no hon -o   katta mise
             -NOM/ -GEN book-ACC bought shop
      'the shop where Taroo bought a book'

(524) An object relative gap does not block <u>ga</u>/<u>no</u> conversion.

(525)   Taroo-ga /-no <u>e</u> katta hon
             -NOM -GEN   bought book
      'the book that Taroo bought'

(526) A null object does not block <u>ga</u>/<u>no</u> conversion.

(527) Hanako-ga /*-no Ziroo-o tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
             -NOM -GEN   ACC take   place -TOP Nagoya Castle is
     'The place that Hanako is taking Ziroo is the Nagoya Castle.'

(528) Hanako-ga / -no   <u>e</u>   tureteiku tokoro-wa Nagoya-zyoo -desu
             -NOM -GEN   take   place -TOP Nagoya Castle is
     'The place that Hanako is taking (him) is the Nagoya Castle.'

(529) If relative gaps can be null pronouns, as argued for by
      Perlmutter (1972), Murasugi (1991), then these two instances are
      one.
(530) Now suppose these null pronouns are actually the results of
      ellipsis. Then if the blocking effect is the result of
      accusative Case checking, failure to check can be repaired by
      deletion.

 **B. A kind of exceptional Case marking normally available only under
      A'-movement**

(531) *I alleged John to be a fool

(532)   Verbs of this class cannot normally license 'exceptional' Case

(533) ?John, I alleged to be a fool
(534) ?Who did you allege to be a fool
(535) But they can under A'-movement (as first discussed by Kayne).

(536) John, I alleged to be a fool. *Mary alleged John to be a fool
      too.
(537) John, I alleged to be a fool. Mary did ~~[allege John to be a
      fool]~~ too.

(538) <u>John</u> in (537) should be in violation of the Case Filter, but it
       is fine, evidently repaired by deletion. This, along with
       Saito's analysis above, suggests the early version (Chomsky
       (1980)) of Case theory, where the Case Filter reflects a morpho-
       phonological requirement.

(539) There are two possible alternative analyses of (537) that should
       be considered, since if either is tenable, the argument for Case
       Filter repair is undermined.

(540) The first alternative relies on the proposal of Merchant (2001)
       that there is no formal identity requirement for ellipsis, just a
       purely semantic one. Under this approach to ellipsis, the elided
       material in (537) could be *allege that John was a fool*, rather
       than the indicated infinitival.

(541) However, there is reason to believe that formal identity is at
       least to some degree relevant in licensing ellipsis. One such
       reason is provided by Merchant himself. Active-passive pairs
       typically do not alternate:

(542) *Someone shot Ben, but I don't know by whom ~~[Ben was shot t]~~

(543) In the absence of any formal identity condition, it is not clear
       why ellipsis is not possible here. Merchant proposes that the
       subject of the active transitive induces relevant entailments
       that the <u>by</u>-phrase does not. This might turn out to be the right
       direction, but as it stands, it is just a promissory note.

(544) There are other residues of formal identity. One is the fact
       that for many speakers, sloppy identity is disfavored if there is
       a mismatch of agreement features:

(545) ??Mary washed her car and John did ~~[wash his car]~~ too

(546) The second is the restriction on VP ellipsis with forms of <u>be</u>
       discussed above and illustrated here:

(547) *Mary is a doctor and John will ~~[be a doctor]~~ too

(548) Here again it is hard to see how any semantic identity could be
       at issue.

(549) The second alternative is based on the observation that while
       the *allege* class of verbs do not license Case on full DPs, they
       do on weak pronouns (perhaps via incorporation):

(550) I alleged *John/?him to be a fool

(551) The elided material in (537) could then be *allege him to be a
       fool* once again obviating any Case difficulty even without
       ellipsis.

(552) Even accounts of ellipsis demanding formal identity necessarily
       allow this kind of 'vehicle change' in the sense of Fiengo and
       May (1994).

(553) But this kind of account cannot cover examples like (554).

(554) His$_i$ mother, John alleged to be beautiful. Bill did too.

(555) Tomo Fujii observes that sloppy identity is possible here, unexpected if the elided material were simply *allege her to be beautiful*.

(556) Another kind of example due to Kayne is also relevant in this connection:

(557) a John, I assure you to be the be the best candidate
      b *I assure you John to be the best candidate

(558) *I assure you him to be the best candidate

(559) John, I assure you to be the best candidate, and Mary will too