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(1) **Gender and ellipsis generalization** When gender is variable (as on determiners, clitics, adjectives, and some nominals under certain conditions), it may be ignored under ellipsis. When gender is invariant (on nouns in argument positions, and on some nominals in predicative uses), it may not be ignored under ellipsis.

(2) This generalization can be accounted for with either

- a semantic theory of ellipsis, if ‘ellipsis’ is heterogeneous, following van Craenenbroeck 2010, with both PF-deletion of nP and a null proform $e_N$ available, or
- a syntactic theory of ellipsis, using LF-copy and lots of bells and whistles

1 **Predicate adjectives under ellipsis**

Greek predicate ellipsis:

(3) a. O Petros ine ikanos, ala o Alexandros dhen ine.
*The Petros is capable.m.sg but the Alexander not is*

b. I Maria ine ikani, ala i Anna dhen ine.
*The Maria is capable.f.sg but the Anna not is*

c. To koritsi ine ikano, ala to agori dhen ine.
*The girl.neut.sg is capable.n.sg but the boy.neut.sg not is*

d. I pateradhes ine ikani, ala i papudhes dhen ine.
*The fathers.m.pl are capable.m.pl but the grandfathers.m.pl not are*

e. I miteres ine ikanes, ala i jajadhes dhen ine.
*The mothers.f.pl are capable.f.pl but the grandmothers.f.pl not are*

f. Ta koritsia ine ikana, ala ta agoria dhen ine.
*The girls.n.pl are capable.n.pl but the boys.n.pl not are*

2 **Nouns under ellipsis**

2.1 Nonalternating nouns (*adherfos/adherfi* ‘brother/sister’)

(4) As predicates:

a. # O Petros ine kalos *adherfos*, ala i Maria ine mia kakia.
*The Petros is good.masc brother.masc but the Maria is a fem bad.fem*

(b on the meaning ‘Petros is a good brother, but Maria is a bad one (sister).’)

b. # I Maria ine kali *adherfi*, ala o Petros ine enas kakos.
*The Maria is good.fem sister.fem but the Petros is a masc bad.masc*

(c on the meaning ‘Maria is a good sister, but Petros is a bad one (brother).’)

c. Controls: when gender matches, these are fine:

i. O Petros ine kalos adherfos, ala o Kostas ine enas kakos.

ii. I Maria ine kali *adherfi*, ala i Anna ine mia kakia.

---

1 Part of the huge, well-known generalization that inflectional morphology is usually irrelevant to ellipsis. Number is irrelevant even in argument positions.

2 I use a nominal subdeletion (‘N*-ellipsis) construction here, but the results are the same with canonical predicate ellipsis (after *ine* ‘be’) and with predicate stripping (both positive and negative).
As arguments:

(9) a. # O Petros exi enan adherfo stin Veria, ala dhen exi mia stin
    the Petros has a masc brother in.the Veria but not has one.fem in.the
    Katerini.
    Katerini.
    (‘Petros has a brother in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (sister) in Katerini.’)

b. # O Petros exi mia adherfi stin Veria, ala dhen exi enan stin
    the Petros has a fem sister in.the Veria but not has one.masc in.the
    Katerini.
    Katerini.
    (‘Petros has a sister in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (brother) in Katerini.’)

c. Controls: when gender matches, these are fine:
   i. O Petros exi enan adherfo stin Veria, ala dhen exi enan stin Katerini.
   O Petros exi mia adherfi stin Veria, ala dhen exi mia stin Katerini.
   ii. O Petros exi enan kalo adherfo, ala dhen exi enan kako.
       O Petros exi mia kali adherfi, ala dhen exi mia kakia.

Noun pairs that do not alternate at all (neither as predicates nor as arguments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adherfo</td>
<td>‘brother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adherfi</td>
<td>‘sister’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krios</td>
<td>‘mister/gentleman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiri</td>
<td>‘ma’am/woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksdadherfo</td>
<td>‘(male) cousin’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksdadherfi</td>
<td>‘(female) cousin’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engonos</td>
<td>‘grandson’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engoni</td>
<td>‘granddaughter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaftistikos</td>
<td>‘godson’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaftistikia</td>
<td>‘goddaughter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antras</td>
<td>‘man, husband’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jineka</td>
<td>‘woman, wife’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pateras</td>
<td>‘father’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitera</td>
<td>‘mother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>babas</td>
<td>‘dad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mama</td>
<td>‘mom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jos</td>
<td>‘son’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kori</td>
<td>‘daughter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papus</td>
<td>‘grandfather’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaja</td>
<td>‘grandmother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gambros</td>
<td>‘groom, son-in-law’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nifi</td>
<td>‘bride, daughter-in-law’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raptis</td>
<td>‘tailor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modhistra</td>
<td>‘seamstress’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kureas</td>
<td>‘barber’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komotria</td>
<td>‘hairdresser’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prinkipias</td>
<td>‘prince’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prinkipissa</td>
<td>‘princess’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vasilias</td>
<td>‘king’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vasilissa</td>
<td>‘queen’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far, compatible with Barbiers’s (2005) suggestion that ‘[gender] is interpretable
on nouns and uninterpretable on adjectives and determiners’.

2.2 Two-way alternating nouns (jatros ‘doctor’)

Epicene (or ‘hybrid’ or ‘variable gender’; see Corbett 1991 and Aikhenvald 2000) nouns have only one form, but their concord and agreement patterns are determined by the natural (or ‘semantic’) gender of their referent (seen in the article, attributive adjectives, predicate adjectives, relative pronouns, and personal pronouns):

    the.fem good.fem doctor was happy,fem her loved.3p
    ‘The good doctor (female) was happy. We loved her.’

b. O kalo jatros itan xarumenos. Ton agapusame.
    the.masc good.masc doctor was happy,masc him loved.3p
    ‘The good doctor (male) was happy. We loved him.’

NB: This isn’t just ‘natural’/‘semantic’ agreement (agreement ad sensum) overriding grammatical/syntactic agreement (agreement ad formam), as is possible with certain neuter nouns denoting animates (koritsi ‘girl’, agori ‘boy’, pedhi ‘child’, melos ‘member’) and personal pronouns:

(13) a. To kalo koristi itan xarumeno. {To/tin} agapurame.
    the.neut good.neut girl.neut was happy,neut it/her loved.3p
    ‘The girl is happy. We loved it/’her.’

b. i. * I koristi itan eki.
    the.fem girl,neut was there

   ii. * Kales koritsia itan eki.
       good.fem girls,neut were there

   iii. * To koritsi itan xarumene.
        the.neut girl,neut was happy, fem

As predicates:

a. O Petros ine kalo jatros, ala i Maria ine mia kakia.
    the Petros is good.masc doctor but the Maria is a.fem bad.masc
    ‘Petros is a good doctor, but Maria is a bad one.’

b. I Maria ine kali jatros, ala o Petros ine enas kakos.
    the Maria is good.fem doctor but the Petros is a masc bad.masc
    ‘Maria is a good doctor, but Petros is a bad one.’

1 These nouns in Greek are thus different from better known cases of ‘hybrid’ agreement as in (i), from Corbett 1991, discussed in Wechsler and Zlatić 2003 and Villavicencio et al. 2005 (cf. also Collins and Postal 2011 on ‘imposters’):

(i) Su Majestad Suprema está contento. (Él ... )
    Poss.3 Majesty.fem Supreme.fem is happy.masc (He.masc ... )
    ‘His Supreme Majesty is happy. (He ...)’

1 use both adjectival and PP modifiers to supply contrastive elements in these examples; the point is the same, and these don’t differ in their distribution (the former show agreement, while the latter avoid a possible confound with nominalized adjective uses; see Giannakidou and Stavrou 1999 for tests to distinguish NPE from such adjectives in Greek. The distribution of the indefinite article is fairly complex in Greek, and in general is dispreferred with predicates, being more acceptable when the head noun is missing.
(15) As arguments:

a. # O Petros exi enan jatro stin Veria, ala dhen exi mia stin
the Petros has a.masc doctor in.the Veria but not has one.fem in.the
Katerini.
Katerini
(Petros has a (male) doctor in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (female doctor) in
Katerini.)

b. * O Petros exi mia jatro stin Veria, ala dhen exi enan stin
the Petros has a.fem doctor in.the Veria but not has one.masc in.the
Katerini.
Katerini
(Petros has a (female) doctor in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (male doctor) in
Katerini.)

(16) Epicene nouns alternate under ellipsis in either direction as predicates (but in neither
direction as arguments):

‘judge’, proedrios ‘president’, prothipurgos ‘prime minister’, mixanikos ‘engineer,
‘philologist’, istorikos ‘historian’, glossologos ‘linguist’, pedagogos ‘peda-
gogue’, jeponos ‘agrologist’, jeografos ‘geographer’, idhravlikos ‘plumber’, asti-
martiras ‘witness’, sizigos ‘spouse’, marangos ‘carpenter’, antipalos ‘oppon-
ent’, odhigos ‘driver’, iereas ‘priest/pastor’, epitimomas ‘scientist’, asthenis ‘pat-
tient’, tamiros ‘cashier’, kalitechnis ‘artist, listis ‘thief’, politis ‘citizen’, ipailos ‘em-
ployee’, ipurgos ‘minister’, dramateas ‘secretary’, dierimineas ‘interpreter’, epa-
gelmatais ‘professional’, sinergatis ‘collaborator’, apostoleas ‘sender’, asthenis ‘pa-
tient/sick person’, singenis ‘relative’, goneas ‘parent’

(17) Predicate vs. argument use, minimal pairs:

a. O Petros ine enas jatros stin K., ke i Maria ine mia stin Athina.
the Petros is a.masc doctor in.the K. and the Maria is one.fem in.the Athens
b. # O Petros exi enan jatro stin K., ke i Maria exi mia stin Athina.
has has
‘Petros [is/has] a (male) doctor in Katerini, and Maria [is/*has] one (female doctor)
in Athens.’

Who has sex? Evidence from Greek

2.3 One-way alternating nouns (dhaskalos/dhaskala ‘teacher’)

(18) As predicates:

a. # O Petros ine kalos dhaskalos, ala i Maria ine mia kaksia.
the Petros is good.masc teacher:masc but the Maria is a.fem bad.fem
‘Petros is a good teacher, but Maria is a bad one.’

b. # I Maria ine kali dhaskala, ala o Petros ine enas kaxos.
the Maria is good.fem teacher:fem but the Petros is a masc bad.masc
‘Maria is a good teacher, but Petros is a bad one.’

(19) As arguments:

a. # O Petros exi enan dhaskalo stin Veria, ala dhen exi mia stin
the Petros has a.masc teacher.m in.the Veria but not has one.fem in.the
Katerini.
Katerini
(Petros has a (male) teacher in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (female teacher)
in Katerini.)

b. O Petros exi mia dhaskala stin Veria, ala dhen exi enan stin
the Petros has a.fem teacher .in.the Veria but not has one.masc in.the
Katerini.
Katerini
(Petros has a (female) teacher in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (male teacher)
in Katerini.)

(20) Noun pairs in which the masculine form can antecede ellipsis in a predicate of the
feminine, but not vice versa (and in neither direction in argument position)

masculine feminine

dhaskalos dhaskala ‘teacher’
mathitis mathitria ‘pupil’
pianistas pianistria ‘pianist’
tragudhistis tragudhistria ‘singer’
theos thea ‘god’
nosokomos nosokoma ‘nurse’
katharistis katharistria ‘cleaner’
papas papissa ‘pope’
stratiotis stratiotina ‘soldier’
latriris latrissa ‘worshiper’
kumbaros kumbara ‘best man’ / ‘maid
of honor’
thios thia ‘uncle’/‘aunt’

Masculine is unmarked by the usual test for gender markedness:

(21) a. i dhaskales[fem] = a group of female teachers only
b. i dhaskali[masc] = a group of male teachers, or a mixed group
2.4 Summary of data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Can N vary under ellipsis as (part of) a(n)...</th>
<th>examples of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...predicate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...argument?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.  No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m \leftrightarrow f )</td>
<td>( m \leftrightarrow f ) adherfos/adherfi ‘brother/sister’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m \leftrightarrow f )</td>
<td>( m \leftrightarrow f ) jatros/jatros ‘doctor’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.  One way only:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m_A \rightarrow f_{g} )</td>
<td>( m_A \rightarrow f_{g} ) dhaskalos/dhaskala ‘teacher’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3 A semantic theory of gender on animates

(22) Cooper 1983: Gender features on animate pronouns are presuppositions (implemented as partial identity functions by Heim and Kratzer 1998, et al.):

- masculin = \( \lambda x : x \text{ is male} \)
- feminin = \( \lambda x : x \text{ is female} \)

(23) Heim 2008: If \( \beta \) is a pronoun and \( i \) an index, then for any assignment \( g \), \( [\beta_i]^g = g(i) \) (or undefined, if \( i \) is not in the domain of \( g \)):

\[ \text{he}_i = \]

3rd singular masc pronoun

(24) Simple extension to noun denotations:

- masculin = \( \lambda P : \forall x [P(x) \rightarrow \text{male}(x)][P] \)
- feminin = \( \lambda P : \forall x [P(x) \rightarrow \text{female}(x)][P] \)

(25) Basic idea: the values of gender (masculine, feminine) on nouns come in two ‘isotopes’; either the gender is part of the meaning of the root, or it is separate:

- a. \( [\text{adherfos}] = \lambda x : x \text{ is male}[\text{brother}(x)] \)
- b. \( [\text{adherfi}] = \lambda x : x \text{ is female}[\text{sister}(x)] \)

(26) A uniform syntax:

(27) Can \( N \) vary under ellipsis (viz., nPE) in Greek for some of the usual reasons (see Johnson 2001, Merchant 2011a, van Craenenbroeck and Merchant 2012, etc.)

1. Extraction out of the ellipsis site (the genitive argument tis glossologias in (33))
2. Agreement out of the ellipsis site (the determiner ton and AP kenurio in (33))

(30) nP masc NP fem NP masc NP fem NP

(31) van Craenenbroeck 2010 showed that we need at least two mechanisms for analyzing silence: PF-deletion (for sluicing, esp. swiping and spading) and null proforms (for short do replies)

(32) Kluck 2011 shows that even amalgams can be given a PF-deletion analysis (that is, brought into the fold of truth and justice)

A heterogeneous theory of ellipsis identity: PF-deletion and null proforms

(33) Tis storias idha ton palio [proedhro __], kai ... the history.gen I saw the.m old.m chair.m and ‘I saw the former chairperson(masc) of the history department, and...’

a. ... tis glossologias tha dho ton kenurio.

the linguistics.gen fut I see the.m new.m (lit.) ‘of linguistics, I’ll see the new(masc) (one).’
b. [tis glossologias]₂ tha dho DP

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ton} \\
\text{NumP} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{NumP} \\
\langle\text{nP}\rangle \\
\text{masc} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{proedhro} \\
\end{array}
\]

(34) a. Variable gender elements such as the determiner and the adjective enter the derivation without \(\phi\)-feature specifications (e.g., ton: [\(\phi : \__\)]) and acquire them under Agree with masc (see Baker 2008, Kratzer 2009); this is consistent with the architectural assumption that Agree happens on a branch of the derivation that does not feed LF (if the resulting features would have to be interpreted) or with the assumption that such inflectional features have no semantic effect at all.

b. The [E](llipsis) feature (here, on Num, or on some head lower than the AP, but higher than masc): [Eₙ] is compatible with Num, but not Gender. (This is the local morphosyntactic ‘licensing’ requirement; see van Craenenbroeck and Lipták 2006, 2010, Aelbrecht 2010, Kluck 2011 for more discussion of the variation here.)

c. Roughly, the E-feature imposes semantic identity between the meaning of the node it ‘deletes’ and that node’s antecedent: [XP₁] = [YP₂].

d. This strategy will be available for all gender-matching ellipses, and only for those: for gender-mismatches, the [E] feature is too high:

e. Peter has DP *he doesn’t have DP

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{enan} \\
\text{Num} \\
\text{nP₁} \\
\text{masc} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{fem} \\
\text{jatro} \\
\text{Num} \\
\text{[E]} \\
\text{nP₂} \\
\text{fem} \\
\text{jatro} \\
\end{array}
\]

(35) ...because [nP₁] \(\neq\) [nP₂]

Since uniform PF-deletion of nP can’t handle the gender mismatched cases, we need another mechanism:

### 3.1.2 A null proform

(36) A null pro-noun: \(e_N\) (cf. Panagiotidis 2003a, 2003b, Barbiers 2005, Corver and van Koppen 2011, etc., on analogs: English one, Afrikaans eent/eene, etc.)

(37) \(e_N\) must be indexed: it introduces a free variable over noun meanings whose value is given by the contextual assignment function: 

\[
[e_N,i] = g(i)
\]

(38) Typically, \(e_N\) will need an antecedent; this requirement can be implemented with coindexing with an antecedent noun. In other words, indices matter—they indicate antecedence relations among elements that may not (and typically do not) stand in a c-command relationship (the particular index used on bound variables is irrelevant to \(g\): these indices are bound by a \(\lambda\)-operator, and \(g(i)\) for them is not relevant).

The assignment function can be constrained by this indexing, on antecedents:

(39) a. Bill bought an old ballₙ and I bought a new oneₚ.

b. \([\text{one}ₙ] = [\text{ball}ₙ] = [\text{ball}ₚ] = [\text{one}ₚ]\)

(40) If \(i\) is a noun and \(i\) is an index, then for any assignment \(g\) where \(i\) is the domain of \(g\), \([\beta] = [\beta] \models g(i) = [\beta] \) (else it is undefined)

(41) Hypothesis: Greek \(e_N\) is a pro-noun selected for by Num (or is a pro-nP)⁶

### 3.2 Derivations

#### 1. One-way nouns: feminine is presuppositional, masculine not

(42) As predicates \((m \to f)\):

a. O Petroš ine kalos dhaskalos₂, alai Maria ine mia kakia \(e_{N₂}\).

b. *Petroš is good masc teacher masc, but the Maria is a fem bad fem

‘Petroš is a good teacher, but Maria is a bad one.’

We also need a theory of which kinds of variables need what kinds of antecedents: the old ‘surface/deep’ anaphora distinction is too coarse; we need something like Giannakidou’s (2001) ‘dependent’ variables: a type-logical distinction within types that distinguishes variables that can be text-level existentially bound from those which require closer binders, etc.

⁶However we decide to encode such distributional restrictions; for example, Déchaine and Wiltschko 2010 claim that pronouns can pronominalize either DPs or \(\phi\)Ps (lower bits of structure), while van Riemsdijk 2002:187 gives the following for his empty light motion verb: “[e]₇ \(_{V, +DIB}\) must be licensed by M.”
b. PF-deletion won’t apply here, because \[ nP_1 \neq nP_2 \]:

```
Peter is DP
D NumP
AP NumP
kalos \[ \phi : masc \]
masc NP
\]
\]
N dhaskalos
```

Maria is DP
```
D mia \[ \phi : fem \]
AP NumP
kakia \[ \phi : fem \]
fem NumP
\]
\]
N dhaskalos
```

d. So we need the proform analysis here: since dhaskalos itself has no gender presupposition, it can supply the meaning of \( e_{N_2} \) even when this latter is in an environment normally requiring the other gender:

\[
\[ e_{N_2} \] = g(2) = [dhaskalos_2] = \lambda x : x \text{ is female}[teacher(x)] \quad \text{(by (28b))}
\]

e. The gender specifications on the determiner, adjective etc. are supplied via Agree with the subject, not with \( e_{N} \) (which has no gender feature)\(^7\):

\( ^7 \)See Baker 2008 for a theory that allows upward agreement in such cases (where the usual, closer controller is missing).

(43) **As predicates** (\( f \rightarrow m \)):

a. #1 Maria ine kali dhaskalos_2, ala o Petros ine enas kakos \( e_{N_2} \).

the Maria is good.fem teacher.fem but the Petros is a masc bad.masc

‘Maria is a good teacher, but Petros is a bad one.’

b. The reverse, using the proform, yields the anomalous result that Petros is a female:

\[
\[ e_{N_2} \] = g(2) = [dhaskalos_2] = \lambda x : x \text{ is female}[teacher(x)] \quad \text{(by (28b))}
\]

c. And the PF-deletion option is of no use here, for the same reason it can’t be used to derive the \( m \rightarrow f \) examples: \[ nP_1 \neq nP_2 \]

Neither strategy will work for gender mismatches in argument positions, though:

1. the PF-strategy won’t work for reasons we’ve just seen (the ellipsis targets a constituent containing Gender, forcing equivalence), and

2. the proform strategy won’t work because the needed values for the unvalued \( \phi \)-features on the determiner, etc., cannot be supplied: there is no available controller for the agreement targets.

(44) **As arguments**:

a. * O Petros exi enan dhaskalo stin Veria, ala dhen exi mia stin the Petros has a masc teacher.m in the Veria but not has one.fem in the Katerini.

Veria, Katerini

(‘Petros has a (male) teacher in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (female teacher) in Katerini.’)

b. * O Petros exi mia dhaskala stin Veria, ala dhen exi enan stin the Petros has a fem teacher in the Veria but not has one masc in the Katerini.

Katerini

(‘Petros has a (female) teacher in Veria, but he doesn’t have one (male teacher) in Katerini.’)
2. Epicene nouns: both gender values are structurally supplied

(45) As predicates:
   a. O Petros ine kalos jatros, ala i Maria ine mia kakia e\(_N2\).
      the Petros is good.masc doctor but the Maria is a.fem bad.fem
      ‘Petros is a good doctor, but Maria is a bad one.’
   b. I Maria ine kali jatros, ala o Petros ine enas kakos e\(_N2\).
      the Maria is good.fem doctor but the Petros is a.masc bad.masc
      ‘Maria is a good doctor, but Petros is a bad one.’

(46) \([e_{N2}]^\phi = g(2) = [jatros_2]^\phi = \lambda x[doctor(x)]\) (by (29))

(47) As arguments:
   a. # O Petros exi enan kalos jatro; dhen exi mia kakia.
      the Petros has a.m good.m doctor not has a.f bad.f
      (‘Petros has a good (male) doctor; he doesn’t have a bad (female) one.’)
   b. # O Petros exi mia kali jatro; dhen exi enan kakos.
      the Petros has a.f good.f doctor not has a.m bad.m
      (‘Petros has a good (female) doctor; he doesn’t have a bad (male) one.’)
   c. Proform option fails to supply the agreement values needed:
      ...*he doesn’t have

(48) As predicates:
   a. # O Petros ine kalos adherfos, ala i Maria ine mia kakia
      the Petros is good.masc brother.masc but the Maria is a.fem bad.fem
      (on the meaning ‘Petros is a good brother, but Maria is a bad one (sister).’)
   b. # O Petros ine enas kakos adherfi, ala o Petros ine enas kakos
      the Maria is good.fem sister.fem but the Petros is a.masc bad.masc
      (on the meaning ‘Maria is a good sister, but Petros is a bad one (brother).’)

(49) a. *PF-deletion: \([adherfos][\phi] \neq [adherfi][\phi]\)
   b. \(e_{N2}^\phi = g(2) = [adherfos_2][\phi] = \lambda x : x \text{ is a male } [\text{brother}(x)]\)
4 Conclusions

(50) Gender on animate nouns is interpretable, but varies in where it comes in: some nouns (adherferos, adherfer, dhaskala) have gender presuppositions as part of their lexical meanings, while others (dhaskalos, jatros) get their presuppositions only as a result of combining with a Gender node in the syntax (whose value for gender is also interpretable).

(51) We need a heterogeneous theory of ellipsis: PF-deletion and null proforms

(52) All this can be cast in an LF-copy theory, but such a theory is one that only its mother could love.9

(53) Even seemingly recalcitrant ellipsis phenomena can be handled with E’s ([E] and e, to be precise).
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