



• **Problem 1: Parallelism** Structural parallelism can be enforced via an LF identity requirement on VP ellipsis (Sag 1976), but this requirement is known to be far too strong. If structural parallelism is stated as a constraint in its own right, an additional constraint is then required on unbound/referential pronouns within elided VPs. Heim (2007) notes that the resulting disjunctive definition of Parallelism, which Fox adopts, does not derive from any independently motivated constraints on VP ellipsis. My revision of Fox’s analysis relies on constraints on VP ellipsis deriving from Rooth’s theory of focus.

• **Problem 2: Embedded Dahl** Roelofsen (2011) discusses the variant of the Dahl paradigm in (8):

- (8) Every worker says that he knows when he can take home his tools, and that the boss does too.  
 (9) a. TB knows when TB can take home TB’s tools. b. TB knows when TW can take home TW’s tools.  
 c. TB knows when TB can take home TW’s tools. d. \*TB knows when TW can take home TB’s tools.

Fox’s theory incorrectly blocks all of the readings in (9) except for (9a). For example, to derive reading (9b) while respecting structural parallelism, it is necessary to have the first and second pronouns in the first conjunct bound by *every worker*, as in (10). However, binding of the second pronoun violates Rule H, since the same interpretation could be derived by having the second pronoun bound by the first.

- (10) [EW] [ $\lambda_1$ [ $t_1$  says that [ $\alpha$   $he_1$  [knows when  $he_1$  [ $\lambda_2$ [ $t_2$  can take home  $his_2$  tools]]]]]] (\*Rule H)  
 and that [ $\beta$  THE BOSS does [know when  $he_1$  [ $\lambda_3$ [ $t_3$  can take home  $his_3$  tools]]]] too]]]

On my analysis, the pattern of binding dependencies in the first conjunct of (10) is irrelevant. With regard to licensing of VP ellipsis, the only relevant property of the antecedent constituent, labeled  $\alpha$  in (10), is its semantic value. Taking [ $he_1$ ] as the alternative to THE BOSS, one of the members of the FSV of the constituent labeled  $\beta$  is the proposition ‘the worker knows when the worker takes home the worker’s tools,’ which is identical to the semantic value of  $\alpha$ . The semantic value of  $\alpha$  is the same regardless of whether the pronouns are linked to *every worker* directly or indirectly. Thus, if the second pronoun is bound instead by the first pronoun — so that Rule H is satisfied — VP ellipsis is still licensed.

Why is reading (9d) unavailable? This reading requires the LF in (11) for the second conjunct. The sole Rule H competitor to (11) is (12):

- (11) and that [ $\beta$  THE BOSS does [know when  $he_1$  can take home  $his_3$  tools] too]  
 (12) and that [ $\beta$  THE BOSS does [know when  $he_1$  [ $\lambda_3$  [ $t_3$  can take home  $his_3$  tools] too]]]

For VP ellipsis to be licensed, the semantic value of  $\alpha$ , the proposition ‘the worker knows when the worker can take home the worker’s tools’, must be one of the members of the FSV of (11). However, this proposition is one of the members of the FSV of (12), derived by taking [ $he_1$ ] as the alternative to THE BOSS. The proposition is therefore not a member of the FSV of (11), and VP ellipsis is not licensed.

• **Problem 3: Co-binding** Roelofsen (2011) points out that co-binding is required in the first conjunct of examples such as (13) in order to satisfy structural parallelism. Rule H is violated in the first conjunct of (13), since binding *his* by *he* instead of by *every student* yields the same interpretation:

- (13) Every student [ $\lambda_1$  [ $t_1$  said that  $he_1$  loved  $his_1$  essay]], but  
 NO STUDENT [ $\lambda_2$  [ $t_2$  said that THE TEACHER did [love  $his_2$  essay]]].

Once again, the pattern of binding dependencies in the first conjunct is irrelevant on my analysis. For VP ellipsis to be licensed, the FSV of the second conjunct must contain the proposition derived by taking *every student* as the alternative to *no student*, and [ $he_2$ ] as the alternative to *the teacher* (‘every student said that he loved his essay’). The question is now whether any of the Rule H competitors to the second conjunct of (13) also contain this proposition. In fact, none does. The sole Rule H competitor to the second conjunct of (13) is (14):

- (14) NO STUDENT said that THE TEACHER [ $\lambda_2$  [ $t_2$  did [love  $his_2$  essay]]].

There is no choice of alternatives to NO STUDENT and THE TEACHER that derives the proposition ‘every student said that he loved his essay’. Thus, this proposition remains a member of the FSV of the second conjunct of (13), and VP ellipsis is licensed.