

Andrew Murphy

# VOICE MISMATCHES BEYOND PASSIVES: SLUICING WITH ACTIVE IMPERSONAL ANTECEDENTS

## ABSTRACT

While ellipsis tolerates various kinds of mismatches, sluicing does not allow for a mismatch in active/passive voice between an ellipsis site and its antecedent. MERCHANT's (2013) analysis of the impossibility of voice mismatches under sluicing involves syntactic identity and different features of the Voice head. I will show that this analysis incorrectly predicts that voice mismatches should be possible in the passive-like active impersonal constructions in Polish, Irish, and Estonian. However, the syntactic identity approach can be rescued by appealing to a different source for the identity violation, analogous to argument structure mismatches.

## KEYWORDS

voice; passive; sluicing

## 1 Introduction

It is well-known that various kinds of mismatches are permitted between an ellipsis site and its antecedent, for example with tense (1a), finiteness (1b) and agreement (1b) (see e.g., SAG 1976, MERCHANT 2001). In (1a), for example, the antecedent verb *talked* is inflected for past tense, whereas the corresponding verb in the ellipsis site would bear non-finite marking (*talk*).

- (1) Inflectional mismatches under ellipsis
  - a. *Steve talked to Sally, and I will* [<sub>VP</sub> <talk to Sally>] *tomorrow*
  - b. *I can't play quarterback, I don't know how* [<sub>TP</sub> <to play quarterback>]
  - c. *We work harder than John* [<sub>TP</sub> <works>]

Furthermore, it has been noted that VP ellipsis generally permits mismatches regarding voice (active vs. passive); e.g., SAG (1976), HARDT (1993), KEHLER (2000), MERCHANT (2008, 2013), TANAKA (2011b). In (2a), an active VP can antecede ellipsis of a passive VP, and vice versa in (2b).

- (2) Voice mismatches under VP ellipsis (MERCHANT 2013, 78f.)
- The janitor must remove<sub>ACT</sub> the trash whenever it is apparent that it should be<sub>[VP</sub> <removed<sub>PASS</sub>>]*
  - The system can be used<sub>PASS</sub> by anyone who wants to [<sub>VP</sub> <use<sub>ACT</sub> it>]*

However, MERCHANT (2013) has shown that sluicing differs in this regard, where voice mismatches in either direction are ruled out (3).

- (3) No voice mismatch under sluicing (MERCHANT 2013, 81)
- \*Joe was murdered<sub>PASS</sub>, but we don't know who [<sub>TP</sub> <murdered<sub>ACT</sub> Joe>]*
  - \*Someone murdered<sub>ACT</sub> Joe, but we don't know by whom [<sub>TP</sub> <Joe was murdered<sub>PASS</sub>>]*


This mismatch is not predicted by standard semantic approaches to ellipsis identity, such as MERCHANT's (2001) e-GIVENness (4).

- (4) e-GIVENness (MERCHANT 2001:26)
- An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo  $\exists$ -type shifting
- A entails F-clo(E), and
  - E entails F-clo(A)


This requires that the respective denotations of the antecedent and ellipsis site (after existential closure) are mutually entailing. Assuming that the implicit agent of a passive is represented semantically (e.g., BRUENING 2013), then e-GIVENness is incorrectly predicted to be satisfied for examples such as (3a):

- (5) Overgeneration of e-GIVENness
- \*Joe was murdered but we don't know who <murdered Joe>.*  
 $(\exists x.x \text{ murdered Joe} \leftrightarrow \exists x.x \text{ murdered Joe})$

As a result, MERCHANT (2013) proposes a solution based on syntactic identity. In short, he assumes that there cannot be a featural mismatch between the antecedent and the ellipsis site. In the case of sluicing, the antecedent and ellipsis site are both TPs and thus necessarily contain the mismatching feature on Voice, i.e. [VOICE:PASS] vs [VOICE:ACT] in (6). Consequently, the syntactic identity is not satisfied.<sup>1</sup>




*\*but I don't know...*




The important assumption about why VP ellipsis differs from sluicing regarding voice mismatches is that it targets a projection smaller than VoiceP, namely vP. As a result, the mismatching feature values on Voice are not included in the ellipsis site and thus can be ignored for the purposes of satisfying syntactic identity (7).

<sup>1</sup> Note that MERCHANT (2013) assumes a split vP where Voice and v are distinct projections. For him, it is v rather than Voice, which introduces the external argument (see HARLEY (2017) for an alternative view, however). Nothing crucial seems to depend on this assumption.



whenever it is apparent...



The upshot of this analysis is that voice mismatches are predicated to only be possible with “small” ellipsis sites that do not contain Voice.<sup>2</sup>

Crucially, this analysis assumes the impossibility of active/passive mismatches to follow from a featural mismatch on Voice and not, for example, from the demotion of the external argument. Thus, we might expect that a language that has a passive-like construction, but with active syntax, would allow for mismatches even under sluicing, since the features on Voice would match. Indeed, some languages have been reported to have such a construction, namely the active impersonal con-

<sup>2</sup> A similar logic applies to MERCHANT’S (2008) account of the asymmetry between VP ellipsis and pseudogapping regarding voice mismatches (however, see TANAKA 2011a, NAKAMURA 2013, POPPELS – KEHLER 2019).

struction. In what follows, I will show that, contrary to this expectation, active impersonals do not permit mismatches under sluicing despite having active syntax.

## 2 Active impersonals

Some languages have been shown to have so-called active impersonal constructions which resemble passives in having a unrealized external argument. The three languages I will focus on in this paper are Polish, Irish, and Estonian; also see e.g. Sason Arabic (AKKUŞ, to appear), Icelandic (MALING – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR 2002, SIGURÐSSON 2017), Pazar Laz (ÖZTÜRK – ERGUVALNI TAYLAN 2017), Lithuanian (BLEVINS 2003), Turkish (LEGATE et al., to appear), Breton (LEGATE 2014).

In Polish, impersonal forms are realized with the *-n/-t* suffix and neuter agreement on the verb, as shown in (8).

(8) Active impersonals in Polish (LAVINE 2005, 76; RUDA 2014, 204)

- a. *Znalezi-on-o niemwolę w koszu.*  
found-IMPERS-N.SG baby.ACC in basket  
'They found a baby in a basket.'
- b. *Przy-nosz-on-o pacjent-om kwiat-y.*  
PRF-bring.IMPERS-IMPERS-N.SG patients-DAT.PL flowers-ACC.PL  
'They brought flowers to the patients.'

Despite resembling passives in missing an overt external argument, MALING – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR (2002) and LAVINE (2005) have argued that these are active constructions, unlike their Ukrainian counterparts (see section 2.2). Furthermore, Polish has a morphologically distinct passive construction in addition to impersonals (e.g., MALING – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR 2002).

Irish impersonals are formed with what is sometimes called the “autonomous” form (NERBONNE 1982; STENSON 1989; McCLOSKEY 2007). I adopt this convention in glossing this form as AUT. As the examples in (9) show, these constructions lack an overt external argument and have been argued to be active voice constructions with a silent impersonal subject.

(9) Active impersonals in Irish (McCLOSKEY 2007, 826)

- a. *Scaoil-eadh amach na líonta.*  
release-PST.AUT out the nets  
'The nets were let out.'
- b. *Cuir-tear i mboscaí iad.*  
put-PRES.AUT in boxes them  
'They are put in boxes.'
- c. *Tóg-adh suas an corpán ar bharr na haille.*  
raise-PST.AUT up the body on top the clip.GEN  
'The body was lifted to the top of the cliff.'

Finally, Estonian also has active impersonals. They are formed with the suffix *-takse* in present tense (10a) and *-ti* in past tense (10b).


- (10) Active impersonals in Estonian (BLEVINS 2003, 485; KAISER – VIHMAN 2006, 114)
- a. *Siin ehita-takse uut maja.*  
 here build-IMPRES.PRES new.PART house.PART  
 ‘They are building a new house here.’
- b. *Kütusevargad võe-ti kinni.*  
 fuel\_burglar.NOM.PL build-IMPRES.PST closed  
 ‘The gas thieves were arrested.’

Unlike the other examples, the internal argument in Estonian impersonals shows nominative or partitive rather than accusative case. However, this is independent of argument structure and instead linked to telicity (KAISER – VIHMAN 2006, 114). Nevertheless, we can show that impersonals are syntactically distinct from passives, since the latter involve an auxiliary verb, as well as participial morphology on the verb (11b).

- (11) Impersonal is distinct from passive in Estonian (LINDSTRÖM 2015, 144)
- a. *See raamat loe-ti suure huvi-ga läbi.*  
 this book.NOM read-IMPERS.PST big.GEN interest-COM through  
 ‘People read this (whole) book with great interest’
- b. *Raamat ol-i läbi loe-tud.*  
 book.NOM be-3SG.PST through read-PART  
 ‘The book was read (all the way through).’

## 2.1 The structure of impersonals

Active impersonals have been argued to differ from passives in being active constructions; e.g., MALING – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR (2002), BLEVINS (2003), LEGATE (2014), LEGATE et al. (to appear). Thus, the *vP* is transitive and contains a fully-projected external argument that I will represent as the silent impersonal pronoun IMP (12).




The impersonal morphology that we see in all three of the languages discussed above can be assumed to be the result of agreement with the impersonal subject.



Following the proposal in McCLOSKEY (2007), the Polish example in (8b) would be analyzed as in (13), where T agrees with the impersonal subject to check a feature such as [ARB].

- (13) *Przy-nosz-on-o*                      *pacjent-om*                      *kwiat-y.*  
 PRF-bring.IMPF-IMPERS-N.SG    patients-DAT.PL    flowers-ACC.PL  
 ‘They brought flowers to the patients.’



The necessity of this licensing relation will restrict the impersonal pronoun to only occurring in contexts with this particular T head bearing impersonal morphology.

## 2.2 Diagnostics for active structure

In this section, I will briefly review some of the evidence that these constructions do indeed involve active transitive syntax, unlike passive voice constructions.

### 2.2.1 Case-marking on the object

One of the clearest indications that these constructions are active comes from the fact that that the internal argument shows accusative/objective case-marking. Typically, passive constructions involve the loss of accusative case. In Irish impersonals (14b), for example, the object shows the same case-marking as in the active transitive in (14a).

- (14) Case marking in Irish impersonal (STENSON 1989, 384)  
 a. *Bhuail siad aríst iad.*  
    beat they again them  
    ‘They beat them again.’

- b. *Buail-eadh aríst iad /\*siad.*  
 beat-AUT again them they  
 ‘They were beaten again.’

The same can also be seen in Polish, where the internal argument in an impersonal bears accusative (15a), unlike in the corresponding passive construction (15b).

- (15) Case marking in Polish impersonal (MALING – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR 2002, 102)
- a. *Świątyni-ę zbudowa-n-o w 1640 roku.*  
 church-ACC build-IMPERS-N.SG in 1640 year  
 ‘The church was built in 1640.’
- b. *Świątyni-a była zbudowa-n-a w 1640 roku.*  
 church-NOM was build-PRT-F.SG in 1640 year  
 ‘The church was built in 1640.’

As was shown in (11), case-marking in Estonian is linked to telicity and does therefore not show this distinction.

### 2.2.2 Unaccusative verbs

Another major difference between active impersonals and passives is that impersonals are compatible with unaccusative verbs, whereas passives are not (e.g. PERLMUTTER 1978, BAKER et al. 1989). Relevant examples of impersonals of unaccusatives are given below.<sup>3</sup>

- (16) Unaccusative verbs in Polish impersonal (ŚPIEWAŁ – SZYMAŃSKA 1997, 150)
- Umiera-n-o tam tysiąc-ami na tyfus.*  
 die-IMPERS-N.SG there thousands-INS on typhus  
 ‘People died there in thousands from typhus.’
- (17) Unaccusative verbs in Estonian impersonal (BLEVINS 2003, 484)
- Tull-akse ja minn-akse.*  
 come-IMPERS.PRES and go-IMPERS.PRES  
 ‘People come and go.’

### 2.2.3 by-phrases

Unlike passives, impersonals are typically not compatible with *by*-phrases. In Polish, for example, while passives can take *by*-phrases (18a), impersonals cannot (18b).

3 Note that such examples could be analyzed as the impersonal pronoun being merged as the complement of the unaccusative verb:

(i) [<sub>VP</sub> v [<sub>VP</sub> V IMP ]]

A reviewer wonders how this approach can rule out the presence of an IMP direct object with canonical transitives containing an overt agent. Given the structure I will adopt in (37), we can assume that a *v* head can either license an IMP in its specifier or as a direct object under Agree, but in the latter case it may not also introduce a distinct argument in its specifier.



- (18) No *by*-phrase in Polish impersonal (BLEVINS 2003, 491)
- a. *Gazet-a* *był-a* *czytan-a* [<sub>PP</sub> *przez dzieci*].  
 newspaper-NOM.F.SG was-F.SG read-F.SG by children  
 ‘The newspaper was read by children.’
- b. \**Gazet-ę* *czyta-n-o* [<sub>PP</sub> *przez dzieci*].  
 newspaper-ACC.F.SG read-IMPERS-N.SG by children  
 ‘One read the paper by children.’

Similarly, Irish impersonals do not allow for *by*-phrases (19).

- (19) No *by*-phrase in Irish impersonals (STENSON 1989, 381)
- \**Buail-eadh Ciarraí* [<sub>PP</sub> *ag/le Gaillimh*].  
 beat-AUT.PST Kerry by Galway  
 ‘Kerry was beaten by Galway.’

If, following BRUENING (2013), the *by*-phrase is assumed to saturate the external argument position, then it is correctly expected to be incompatible with an impersonal subject, since both compete for the agent theta-role.

In Estonian, *by*-phrases are possible with some types of DPs. However, these are restricted to certain types of “committee” nouns. So, while they can occur with *val-lavolikogu* (‘county council’), they are reported to be unacceptable with pronouns (20).

- (20) *By*-phrases in Estonian are restricted (Kaiser – Vihman 2006, 132)
- Komisjon kinnita-takse* [<sub>PP</sub> *vallavolikogu* /\**meie* *by*.  
 commission.NOM confirm-IMPERS.PRES county\_council.GEN we.GEN poolt  
 ‘The commission is confirmed by the county council/\*by us.’

The consensus seems to be that this an “intrusive” use of the *by*-phrase; see BLEVINS (2003, 485f.), KAISER – VIHMAN (2006, 133). Also see FOX – GRODZINSKY (1998) on *get*-passives in English.

#### 2.2.4 Binding of reflexives and reciprocals

Another piece of evidence for the syntactic presence of the external argument (IMP) in impersonals is its ability to license reflexives and reciprocals:

- (21) Reflexive anaphors possible in Estonian impersonals (KAISER – VIHMAN 2006, 122)
- Kord päevas IMP<sub>i</sub> pes-ti end<sub>i</sub> üleni külma veega.*  
 once day.INE wash-IMPERS.PST REFL.PART overall cold.GEN water.COM  
 ‘Once a day, one washed oneself in cold water.’
- (22) Reflexive anaphors possible in Polish impersonals (RUDA 2014, 211)
- Przez kilka godzin przedstawia-n-o IMP<sub>i</sub> swoje<sub>i</sub> racje.*  
 through several hours present-IMPERS-N.SG REFL arguments.ACC  
 ‘They have presented their arguments for a couple of hours.’

- (23) Reciprocals possible in Irish impersonals (McCLOSKEY 2007, 830)

*Chuirte* IMP<sub>i</sub> *geall len- a chéile*<sub>i</sub>.  
 put.AUT.PST bet with each.other  
 'People used to place bets with each other.'

Assuming that these anaphors require a local c-commanding antecedent, this motivates the assumption of a silent impersonal pronoun.

### 2.2.5 Control

Finally, the null subject of impersonals can also control PRO. This is shown for control into infinitival clauses in Irish (24) and Estonian (25).

- (24) Impersonal subject can control in Irish (STENSON 1989, 391)

*Táth-ar* IMP<sub>i</sub> *ag iarraidh* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *airgead a bhailiú*].  
 be-AUT.PRES trying money PRT collect  
 'They are trying to collect money.'

- (25) Impersonal subject can control in Estonian (KAISER – VIHMAN 2006, 131)

IMP<sub>i</sub> *Luba-ti* [PRO<sub>i</sub> *ära minna*].  
 promise-IMPERS away go  
 'They promised to leave.'

This can also be seen with control of the subject of a secondary predicate. As the contrast in (26) shows, control into secondary predicates in Polish is not possible with implicit argument of a passive (26a), but it is with the null subject of an impersonal (26b).

- (26) Impersonal subject can control in Polish (MALING – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR 2002, 103f.)

a. *Jan<sub>i</sub> był obrabowany* [PRO<sub>i/j</sub> *po pijanemu*].  
 Jan.NOM was robbed.PASS while drunk  
 'Jan<sub>i</sub> was robbed drunk<sub>j/i</sub>.'

b. *Jan-a<sub>i</sub> obrabowano* IMP<sub>j</sub> [PRO<sub>j/i</sub> *po pijanemu*].  
 Jan-ACC robbed.IMPERS while drunk  
 'Jan<sub>i</sub> was robbed drunk<sub>j/i</sub>.'

## 2.3 Interim summary

So far, we have seen that languages such as Polish, Irish, and Estonian have active impersonal constructions, which resemble passives. However, these are not passive constructions (in fact they often exist alongside passives in the relevant languages), but instead are active transitive constructions with a fully projected external argument according to many relevant diagnostics.

In section 1, we saw that voice mismatches under sluicing are ruled out due to a mismatching feature on Voice in the active/passive antecedent. Thus, a clear

prediction of this theory is that mismatches should not be found with active impersonals and active transitives, since the specifications on Voice should match. In the following section, we will see that this prediction is not borne out, however.

### 3 Sluicing with active impersonals

This section presents novel data involving sluicing with active impersonal antecedents for the languages we have been discussing so far.

#### 3.1 Polish

First, let us consider Polish. Like English, Polish allows for sluicing with *wh*-subjects (27).

- (27) Sluicing in Polish (NYKIEL 2019, 962)
- |                |             |                     |                |          |                    |            |            |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| <i>Ktoś</i>    | <i>chce</i> | <i>kibicować</i>    | <i>Niemcom</i> | <i>w</i> | <i>niedzielę</i> , | <i>ale</i> | <i>nie</i> |
| somebody.v.NOM | want.3SG    | root for.INF        | German.v       | on       | Sunday             | but        | not        |
| <i>wiem</i>    | <i>kto</i>  | [ <sub>TP</sub> Δ]. |                |          |                    |            |            |
| know.1SG       | who.NOM     |                     |                |          |                    |            |            |
- 'Somebody wants to root for Germany on Sunday, but I don't know who.'

However, active sluices are not licensed by an active impersonal antecedent:

- (28) No sluicing with active impersonals in Polish (JOANNA ZALESKA, p.c.)
- a. \**Wczoraj przyniesi-on-o pacjentom kwiaty, ale nie*  
 yesterday bring.PERF-IMPERS-N.SG patients flowers but not  
*wiemy kto / przez kogo* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 know.1PL who.NOM by who.ACC  
 'They brought flowers to the patients yesterday, but we don't know who/  
 by whom.'
- b. \**Gazetę czyta-n-o ale nie wiem kto* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 newspaper.ACC read.IMPERS-IMPERS-N.SG but not know.1SG who.NOM  
 'They read the newspaper, but I don't know who.'

#### 3.2 Irish

Irish has also been shown to have sluicing constructions (30).

- (29) Sluicing in Irish (MERCHANT 2001, 131)
- |           |              |                 |                  |                |              |             |           |                     |
|-----------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|
| <i>Tá</i> | <i>duine</i> | <i>inteacht</i> | <i>breoite</i> , | <i>ach níl</i> | <i>fhiós</i> | <i>agam</i> | <i>cé</i> | [ <sub>TP</sub> Δ]. |
| de.PRES   | person       | some            | ill              | but not.is     | knowledge    | at.me       | who       |                     |
- 'Somebody is ill, but I don't know who.'

However, like Polish, it seems that active sluices cannot be anteceded by active impersonals:

- (30) No sluicing with active impersonals in Irish (JIM McCLOSKEY, p.c.)
- a. \**Scaoil-eadh amach na líonta, ach níl fhios agam cé* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 release-PST.AUT out the nets but not.is knowledge at.me who  
 ‘The nets were let out, but I don’t know who (let the nets out).’
- b. \**Cuir-tear i mboscaí iad, ach níl fhios agam cé* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 put-PRES.AUT in boxes them but not.is knowledge at.me who  
 ‘They are put in boxes, but I don’t know who (put them in boxes).’

### 3.3 Estonian

Finally, let us consider Estonian. To the best of my knowledge, sluicing in Estonian had not been previously reported, however it seems to be possible, as shown by the following attested example in (31).

- (31) Sluicing in Estonian
- Kardan midagi veel, aga ma ei tea mida* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 be\_afraid.1SG something else but I NEG know what  
 ‘I am afraid of something else, but I don’t know what.’<sup>4</sup>

Again, despite the antecedent being fully active, an impersonal antecedent cannot license an active sluice (32).

- (32) No sluicing with active impersonals in Estonian (MARJU KAPS, p.c.)
- a. \**Siin ehita-takse uut maja, aga ma ei tea kes* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 here build-IMPERS.PRES new.PART house.PART but I NEG know  
 who  
 ‘They are building a new house here, but I don’t know who (is building a new house).’
- b. \**Õues kakel-di, aga ma ei tea kes* [<sub>TP</sub> Δ].  
 outside fight-IMPERS.PST but I NEG know who  
 ‘People were fighting outside, but I don’t know who (was fighting outside).’

## 4 Towards an analysis

Thus, it seems that active impersonals are unable to function as antecedents for active sluices in either Polish, Irish or Estonian. On the face of it, this seems to constitute a challenge to MERCHANT’S (2013) analysis of voice mismatches. There are two possible alternative explanations. The first is semantic, namely that the impersonal

4 Online attested example: [https://www.ohtuleht.ee/826529/prooviabelu-helen-selgitab-sotsiaalse-arevuse-tagamaid-on-paevi-kus-ma-julgen-olla-mina-ise-aga-on-paevi-kus-ma-ei-suuda-toast-valja-minna-<accessed 10.03.19>](https://www.ohtuleht.ee/826529/prooviabelu-helen-selgitab-sotsiaalse-arevuse-tagamaid-on-paevi-kus-ma-julgen-olla-mina-ise-aga-on-paevi-kus-ma-ei-suuda-toast-valja-minna-<accessed%2010.03.19>)

subject does not, in some relevant sense, fulfil the licensing/identity conditions required for sluicing.<sup>5</sup> The other approach (that I will refer to as the “syntactic solution”) is that MERCHANT’S (2013) analysis is still essentially correct and the source of the feature mismatch is located somewhere outside Voice.

In what follows, I would like to pursue the syntactic solution to this problem, building on an observation that, even when Voice matches, there can be an additional syntactic identity violation that renders a particular kind of ellipsis unlicensed.

#### 4.1 Causative/inchoative mismatches


Alongside voice mismatches, MERCHANT (2013) also discusses the impossibility of argument structure mismatches under ellipsis. For example, transitivity alternations are not tolerated under VP ellipsis (33).

- (33) No causative/inchoative mismatches under VP ellipsis (SAG 1976,160; JOHNSON 2004, 7)
- a. A: *This can freeze*<sub>INTR</sub>.  
 B: \**Please do* ⟨*freeze*<sub>TR</sub> *this*⟩!
- b. \**Bill melted*<sub>TR</sub> *the copper vase, and the magnesium did* ⟨*melt*<sub>INTR</sub>⟩ *too*.

Importantly, these are still both active voice constructions, so a voice mismatch cannot be the root of ungrammaticality here. Merchant’s proposal for the impossibility of (33) still appeals to syntactic identity, but instead places the locus of the mismatch on differing transitivity specifications of *v* (34). Similar to voice mismatches, the types of *v* in the antecedent and ellipsis site also subject to a syntactic identity requirement.<sup>6</sup>

5 For example, the impersonal subject can have a generic interpretation, which would not lead to mutual entailment under *e-GIVENness* if it is bound by a Gen operator, for example. However, impersonals can also have an existential reading (BLEVINS 2003). Even if we control for this reading (e.g., with temporal adverbs), sluicing is still not licensed, suggesting that this cannot be the source of ungrammaticality. Furthermore, a feature mismatch can also be ruled out. LAVINE (2005) shows that secondary predicates reveal that the impersonal subject in Polish has masculine plural features. If feature-matching were at stake here, then we would expect that a remnant such as *kto* (‘who’), which can be licensed by a masculine plural antecedent such as *niektórz-y pracownic-y* (some-MASC.PL employee-MASC.PL) and therefore matches the features of IMP, should be possible, contrary to fact.


6 However, see e.g. SCHÄFER (2008) and ALEXIADOU et al. (2015) who assume that transitivity alternations involve different Voice heads. On this approach, the ungrammaticality of these alternations under sluicing would also follow naturally, as pointed out by a reviewer. The same also holds for approaches that would treat the active/impersonal alternation also involving distinct Voice heads, unlike MERCHANT (2013) does.




These cases involve VP ellipsis, which does not contain voice in the ellipsis site. However, MERCHANT (2013) also shows that this kind of mismatch is ruled out under sluicing as well. In the Greek examples in (35), the transitive variant of ‘close’ cannot license ellipsis of the intransitive alternant (35a), as can be identified by the case of the remnant.

- (35) No causative/inchoative mismatches under sluicing in Greek (MERCHANT 2013, 97)
- a. \*Eklisan<sub>TR</sub> ena ðromo, alla ðen ksero pjos (eklise<sub>INTR</sub>).  
 closed.3PL a.ACC road.ACC but not know.1SG which.NOM closed.3SG  
 Intended: ‘They closed a road, but I don’t know which one (closed).’
  - b. \*Eklisan<sub>TR</sub> ena ðromo, alla ðen ksero pjon (eklise<sub>INTR</sub>).  
 closed.3PL a.ACC road.ACC but not know.1SG which.ACC closed.3SG  
 ‘They closed a road, but I don’t know which one (they closed).’

As (36) shows, although the features on Voice match, the transitivity specification of *v* does not.




\**alla*    *ðen*    *ksero...*  
 but    not    know.1SG



#### 4.2 Syntactic mismatches in impersonals


I propose that we can adopt a similar approach for impersonals. In particular, let us assume that impersonals come with a dedicated  $v_{IMP}$  head that licenses the impersonal pronoun in its specifier and also hosts impersonal morphology (37).




For the all of examples in section 3, this will mean that, although the voice specifications match, there will still be a mismatch in terms of  $v$ , analogous to causative/inchoative mismatches. To see this, consider again the Estonian in (38).

- (38) \**Siin ehita-takse uut maja, aga ma ei tea kes [TP Δ].*  
 here build-IMPERS.PRES new.PART house.PART but I NEG know  
 who  
 'They are building a new house here, but I don't know who (is building a new house).'

As can be seen in (39), the Voice specifications match, but the *v* as distinct, leading to a violation of syntactic identity.



\**aga*    *ma*    *ei*    *tea...*  
 but    I        NEG    know





On this approach, the ungrammaticality of such examples is predicted, despite the Voice mismatch, just like with other illicit argument structure alternations that involve *v*. This allows us to maintain MERCHANT'S (2013) analysis of voice mismatches, despite the apparent counterexample of active impersonals.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, I discussed a potential challenge for MERCHANT'S (2013) analysis of the asymmetry in voice mismatches between VP ellipsis and sluicing. Active/passive alternations under sluicing are assumed to be illicit due to a feature-mismatch on Voice. The prediction of this analysis that we focused on here is that active impersonals, which resemble passives in that the external argument is unrealized, should in fact be possible under sluicing. Data from Polish, Irish, and Estonian seem to falsify this prediction, however. It was argued that this finding can still be made compatible with MERCHANT'S (2013) analysis by assuming that, while Voice matches, impersonals involve a different kind of *v*, just like in transitivity alternations. In each of these cases, a mismatching *v* leads to a violation of syntactic identity.

## REFERENCES

- AKKUŞ, Faruk. To appear. Variable Embedded Agent in Sason Arabic. *Journal of Linguistics*.
- ALEXIADOU, Artemis – ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, Elena – SCHÄFER, Florian. 2015. *External Arguments in Transitivity Alternations: A Layering Approach*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- BAKER, Mark – JOHNSON, Kyle – ROBERTS, Ian. 1989. Passive Arguments Raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(2), pp. 219–251.
- BLEVINS, James P. 2003. Passives and Impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* 39(3), pp. 473–520.
- BRUENING, Benjamin. 2013. By-Phrases in Passives and Nominals. *Syntax* 16(1), pp. 1–41.
- FOX, Danny – GRODZINSKY, Yosef. 1998. Children's Passive: A View from the By-Phrase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29(2), pp. 311–332.
- HARDT, Daniel. 1993. *Verb Phrase Ellipsis: Form, Meaning and Processing*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- HARLEY, Heidi. 2017. The 'Bundling Hypothesis' and the Disparate Functions of Little *v*. In: D'ALESSANDRO, Roberta – FRANCO, Irene – GALLEGÓ, Ángel J., eds. *The Verbal Domain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–28.
- JOHNSON, Kyle. 2004. How to Be Quiet. In: ADAMS, N. et al., eds. *Proceedings from the 40th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 1–20.
- KAISER, Elsi – VIHMAN, Virve-Anneli. 2006. Invisible Arguments: Effects of Demotion in Estonian and Finnish. In LYNKFELT, Benjamin – SOLSTAD, Torgrim, eds. *Demoting the Agent: Passive, Middle and Other Voice Phenomena*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 111–141.
- KEHLER, Andrew. 2000. Coherence and the Resolution of Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23(6), pp. 533–575.

- LAVINE, James E. 2005. The Morphosyntax of Polish and Ukrainian -No/-To. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 13(1), pp. 75–117.
- LEGATE, Julie Anne. 2014. *Voice and v: Lessons from Acehnese*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- LEGATE, Julie Anne – AKKUŞ, Faruk – ŠEREIKAITĖ, Milena – RINGE, Don. To appear. On Passives of Passives. *Language*.
- LINDSTRÖM, Liina. 2015. Subjecthood of the Agent Argument in Estonian Passive Constructions. In: HELASVUO, Marja-Liisa – HUUMO, Tuomas, eds. *Subjects in Constructions – Canonical and Non-Canonical*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 141–173.
- MALING, Joan – SIGURJÓNSDÓTTIR, Sigrídur. 2002. The ‘New Impersonal’ Construction in Icelandic. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5(1), pp. 97–142.
- MCCLOSKEY, James. 2007. The Grammar of Autonomy in Irish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25(4), pp. 825–857.
- MERCHANT, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MERCHANT, Jason. 2008. An Asymmetry in Voice Mismatches in VP-ellipsis and Pseudogapping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(1), pp. 169–179.
- MERCHANT, Jason. 2013. Voice and Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(1), pp. 77–108.
- NAKAMURA, Taichi. 2013. Voice Mismatches in Sloppy VP-Ellipsis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(3), pp. 519–528.
- NERBONNE, John A. 1982. Some Passives Not Characterized by Universal Rules: Subjectless Impersonal. In: JOSEPH, Brian, ed. *Grammatical Relations and Relational Gramma*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.
- NYKIEL, Joanna. 2019. Polish. In: VAN CRAENENBROECK, Jeroen – TEMMERMAN, Tanja, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 962–987.
- ÖZTÜRK, Balkiz – TAYLAN, Eser Erguvalni. 2017. Omnipresent Little v in Pazar Laz. In: D’ALESSANDRO, Roberta – FRANCO, Irene – GALLEGO, Ángel J., eds. *The Verbal Domain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 207–231.
- PERLMUTTER, David. 1978. Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. In: WOODYBURY, Anthony C. et al., eds. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 157–189.
- POPPELS, Till – KEHLER, Andrew. 2019. Reconsidering Asymmetries in Voice-Mismatched VP-Ellipsis. *Glossa* 4(1), pp. 1–22.
- RUDA, Marta. 2014. The Impersonal Subject -n/-t Construction in Polish and the Typology of Voice Heads. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 9(4), pp. 203–243.
- SAG, Ivan. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- SCHÄFER, Florian. 2008. *The Syntax of (Anti-)Causatives: External Arguments in Change-of-State Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SIGURDSSON, Einar Freyr. 2017. Deriving Case, Agreement and Voice Phenomena in Syntax. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- ŚPIEWAK, Grzegorz – SZYMAŃSKA, Izabela. 1997. Polish Impersonal Constructions: An Exercise in Head Formation and Argument Licensing. In: JUNGHANNS, Uwe – ZYBATOW, Gerhild, eds. *Formale Slavistik*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlag, pp. 145–155.
- STENSON, Nancy. 1989. Irish Autonomous Impersonals. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7(3), pp. 379–406.



- TANAKA, Hidekazu. 2011a. Syntactic Identity and Ellipsis. *The Linguistic Review* 28(1), pp. 79–110.
- TANAKA, Hidekazu. 2011b. Voice Mismatch and Syntactic Identity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(3), pp. 470–490.

*Andrew Murphy*

The University of Chicago

1115 E. 58th Street

Rosenwald Hall

Chicago, IL 60637

USA

andrew.murphy@uchicago.edu



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.

