Section 5
Case Filter Violation Repair by Ellipsis?

I. The Case Filter
A. Amelioration of a constraint on Japanese ga/no conversion

Saito (2001)

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

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

(525) Taroo-ga /-no e katta hon
-NOM -GEN bought book
‘the book that Taroo bought’

(526) A null object does not block ga/no 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 e 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) John 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].

(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 by-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 be 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 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 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