1. Introduction

English was long considered the only language to possess Verb Phrase Ellipsis (VPE), a process in which a verb phrase, identified in many standard accounts with the \( vP \), goes missing under identity with the \( vP \) of an antecedent clause. An example of VPE in English is given in (1), where the elements struck through are not pronounced. A schematization of the relevant part of the structure is given in (2).

(1) Jasper likes pecans and Mona does [\( \text{like pecans} \)] too.

(2) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{T} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{T} \\
\downarrow \\
v \\
\downarrow \\
VP \\
\uparrow v \langle V \rangle \\
\end{array}
\]

Recent research has shown that VPE does indeed exist in other languages, though in a slightly different guise. Some verb-raising languages, specifically Hebrew, Irish, and Swahili, possess a variety of VPE that Goldberg (2005) calls V-Stranding VPE in her extensive survey of the phenomenon. In these language, only the internal arguments go missing, as the main verb raises into a higher functional projection before the \( vP \) is deleted, as shown schematically in (3).

*I thank Annahita Farudi, Lotus Goldberg, Kyle Johnson, Jason Merchant, Line Mikkelsen, the participants of the Berkeley Syntax Circle, and the audience at NELS36 for their insightful comments and criticisms.
The existence of VPE in these languages suggests that it may occur in yet other languages as well, though in a similarly nontransparent manner.

In this paper, I will examine an ellipsis construction found in Farsi (Persian) in which part of a complex predicate goes missing. As this construction is, to my knowledge, the first attested instance of ellipsis targeting part of a complex predicate, my primary purpose here is to contribute the basic data to the general linguistic knowledge base. An example of the construction is given in (4); here, the nominal component of a complex predicate (otu ‘iron’) goes missing along with the internal argument (piranhārā ‘shirts’), leaving behind the light verb zad ‘HIT’.1

Assuming Folli et al.’s (2005) analysis of Farsi complex predicates, I treat the light verb of the complex predicate as an overt v head. In this type of ellipsis, then, it is the complement of v, XP in the schematization of (5), that is deleted. I call this type of ellipsis v-Stranding VPE.

Unlike in English, Hebrew, Irish, or Swahili, ellipsis in Farsi targets a constituent smaller than the vP.

---

1The judgments presented here were obtained from several native speakers of Farsi residing in Iran and the United States. Their speech represents the colloquial variety of the language spoken in Tehran. The abbreviations I use are: 1, first person; 2, second person; 3, third person; acc, specific accusative marker (-rā); adv, adverbial suffix; imprf, imperfective; neg, negation; past, past tense; prf, perfect; pl, plural number; pres, present tense; sg, singular number; subj, subjunctive.
The second aim of this paper is to show that \( v \)-Stranding VPE, despite its surface differences with English VPE, does not differ in its licensing requirements. \( v \)-Stranding VPE also requires the satisfaction of an antecedence condition enforcing identity of the target and antecedent phrases. Following much current research, I assume that this antecedence condition is semantic in nature, specifically the e-GIVENness condition of Merchant (2001). I consider a potential obstacle to this goal in the form of light verb alternations that make ellipsis bad even though the light verb is not contained inside the elided constituent. In the end, I conclude that e-GIVENness is indeed sufficient to exclude these cases of ungrammatical ellipsis.

This paper is structured as follows: First, in §2, I provide some background on the phrase structure of Farsi. §3 advances the primary purpose of this paper, presenting the diagnostics that show that the construction in (4) patterns with English VPE. In §4, I show how \( v \)-Stranding VPE obeys the same licensing requirements as English VPE. In §5, I account for the light verb alternations that make ellipsis ungrammatical. Finally, in §6, I provide a short conclusion.

2. Farsi Phrase Structure

Farsi is an inflectional, pro-drop language that allows scrambling but has basic SOV word order. Most of the predicates in the language are complex predicates that are composed of two parts, a light verb and a nonverbal element. The formation of complex predicates is productive and they comprise an ever expanding segment of the verbal system; the class of simplex verbs is mostly closed and numbers some 115 members.

The light verbs are homophous with simplex verbs that bear a full, lexical meaning (the ‘heavy’ meaning). Some light verbs, glossed with their heavy interpretations in small caps, include: kardan ‘TO DO’, dâdan ‘TO GIVE’, zadân ‘TO HIT’, kešidan ‘TO PULL’, āvardan ‘TO BRING’, bordan ‘TO TAKE’, šodan ‘TO BECOME’, xordan ‘TO EAT’, āmandan ‘TO COME’. The light verbs themselves do not contribute to the core semantics of the complex predicate; as we will see, however, they do play a crucial role in determining its argument structure.

Possible nonverbal elements include nouns, adjectives, and PPs, as illustrated in (6), (7), and (8) respectively. The meaning of the entire complex predicate is often idiomatic, e.g. (6a), though it may also be quite transparent, e.g. (7a).

\[ (6) \quad \text{Noun} \]
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{čune zadân} \\
& \quad \text{chin HIT} \\
& \quad \text{‘to bargain’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{edâème dâdan} \\
& \quad \text{continuation GIVE} \\
& \quad \text{‘to continue’}
\end{align*} \]
The complex predicates’ argument structure is highly predictable. The choice of light verb determines whether the complex predicate selects for an external argument or not. The minimal pair in (9a–b) displays a transitive-unaccusative alternation that is achieved solely by substituting one light verb for another. Here, zad ‘hit’ selects for an external argument, rostam (9a), while xord ‘eat’ does not. The internal argument DP of the unaccusative complex predicate in (9b) is the subject and so cannot receive the specific accusative marker -rā; nor, can a subject simply be inserted (9c).

(9) a. rostam sohrāb-rā laqat zad
   Rostam Sohrab-acc kick HIT:past:3sg
   ‘Rostam kicked Sohrab.’ [transitive]

b. sohrāb(-rā) laqat xord
   Sohrab kick EAT:past:3sg
   ‘Sohrab got kicked.’ [unaccusative]

c. * rostam sohrāb(-rā) laqat xord
   Rostam Sohrab(-acc) kick EAT:past:3sg

The nonverbal element selects for the complex predicate’s internal arguments. Keeping the light verb constant, the complex predicate can be made to alternate between unergative and transitive structures depending on which nonverbal element is chosen, as in (10a–b). Complex predicates can also be ditransitive, as in (10c) which I take to involve a bivalent nonverbal element.

---

2As argued convincingly by Moyne (1974), Farsi does not possess a passive construction. In the unaccusative construction, the agent (if one exists) cannot be expressed except through extremely circumlocutous means.
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(10) a. rāmin gerye kard
Ramin crying DO:past:3sg
‘Ramin cried.’ [unergative]

b. rāmin farš-rā jāru kard
Ramin carpet-acc broom DO:past:3sg
‘Ramin swept the carpet.’ [monotransitive]

c. rāmin vis-rā be mehmānī da’vat kard
Ramin Vis-acc to party invitation DO:past:3sg
‘Ramin invited Vis to the party.’ [ditransitive]

The division of labor between the light verb and the nonverbal element in determining the complex predicate’s argument structure leads Folli et al. (2005) to posit a structure like that in (11). Under their analysis, the complex predicate is as an unconfated Hale and Keyser-style structure (1993 and subsequent work), in which movement of the nonverbal element to v does not occur, unlike in English, and v is realized overtly as a light verb. Thus, for a complex predicate like that in (10b), the light verb kard takes as its complement the phrase headed by the nonverbal element jāru. The internal argument DP, faršrā, being selected for by the nonverbal element, is contained within its maximal projection.

The proposed structure allows us to understand v-Stranding VPE as deletion of a single constituent, the phrase headed by the nonverbal element that contains the complex predicate’s internal arguments.3

}\footnote{I assume Karimi’s (1999a, 1999b) analysis of the position of objects in Farsi, in which specific and nonspecific object DPs are assigned distinct structural positions within the VP or nonverbal element phrase. The motivation for this analysis is the differential marking of direct object DPs depending on their specificity. If the direct object is nonspecific, it follows a PP goal, as shown in (i). In contrast, if it is specific, it receives the specific accusative marker -rā and appears before the goal PP (ii).}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[i.] rāmin be vis gol dād
Ramin to Vis flower give:past:3sg
‘Ramin gave Vis flowers.’

\item[ii.] rāmin gol-rā be vis dād
Ramin flower-acc to Vis give:past:3sg
‘Ramin gave the flower to Vis.’
\end{enumerate}
(12) rostam hamîste harf mizan-e vali sohrâb hiçvaxt [NP harf]
Rostam always speech HIT:pres-3sg but Sohrab never speech ne-mizan-e
neg-HIT:pres-3sg
‘Rostam always talks but Sohrab never does talk.’

(13) sohrâb pîranhâ-râ otu na-zad vali rostam [NP pîranhâ-râ otu]
Sohrab shirts-acc iron neg-HIT:past:3sg but Rostam shirts-acc iron zad
HIT:past:3sg
‘Sohrab didn’t iron the shirts but Rostam did iron the shirts.’

(14) rostam māsin-eš-râ be sohrâb nešān dād vali râmin [NP māsin-eš-râ be sohrâb nešān]
Rostam car-his-acc to Sohrab showing GIVE:past:3sg but Ramin car-his-acc to Sohrab showing neg-GIVE:past:3sg
‘Rostam showed his car to Sohrab but Ramin didn’t show his car to Sohrab.’

Having laid out the basic facts of Farsi, I now move on to a diagnosis of the process that has operated on the sentences of (12–14) as ellipsis.

3. Diagnosing Ellipsis

Ellipsis is distinguished from other types of null anaphora on the basis of a number of well-established diagnostics. All rely on ellipsis being a type of ‘surface anaphora’, in Hankamer and Sag’s (1976) terms. Surface anaphora, like ellipsis, involves a fully-articulated syntactic structure, constructed in the usual way, that is deleted under identity with a linguistic antecedent at some later point in the derivation. Earlier work in the generative tradition achieved this through a transformation; more recently, Merchant’s (2001) prominent approach to Sluicing and VPE posits nonpronunciation of the missing constituent at PF. I will return to how the identity requirement is captured formally, but first I will show how Farsi V-stranding VPE patterns with English VPE as a type of surface anaphora with respect to three diagnostics: 1) pragmatic control; 2) the Missing Antecedent Phenomenon; and 3) extraction.

3.1. Pragmatic Control

As argued by Hankamer and Sag (1976), the relationship between a surface anaphor and its antecedent is a syntactic one. VPE, as a type of surface anaphora, cannot have a purely contextual antecedent (it does not allow what they call ‘pragmatic control’), as illustrated

Karimi (2005) offers an alternate interpretation of these data, in which all direct object DPs are Merged as the complement of the nonverbal element or V. Specific object DPs subsequently raise to Spec-vP in order to check case; nonspecific objects do not need to receive case. I believe that V-stranding VPE, as a test for constituency, will be useful in deciding which of these two analyses is the correct one.
in (15a). Deep anaphora like Null Complement Anaphora, in contrast, receives its interpretation in a discourse model, and so can have a purely pragmatic antecedent, as shown in (15b).

(15) [Observing Hankamer attempting to stuff 12′′ ball through 6′′ hoop]
   Sag:
   a. # I don’t see why you even try to. [surface anaphora]
   b. I don’t see why you even try. [deep anaphora]
   (Hankamer and Sag 1976, 414)

\textit{v-Stranding VPE} does not allow pragmatic control, as illustrated in (16) for the complex predicate \textit{jāru zadan} ‘to sweep, lit. broom + HIT’. The nonverbal element and internal arguments cannot be elided with a solely nonlinguistic antecedent.

(16) [Child picks up broom to sweep the carpet]
   Mother:
   a. motma’eyn bāš xub farš-rā jāru be-zani
      sure imper:be:2sg well carpet-acc broom subj-HIT:2sg
      ‘Be sure to sweep the carpet well.’
   b. # motma’eyn bāš xub [NP farš-rā jāru] be-zani
      sure imper:be:2sg well carpet-acc broom subj-HIT:2sg

3.2. Missing Antecedent Phenomenon

Even though it is not pronounced, surface anaphora has a fully articulated syntactic structure. As such, we expect that a pronoun elsewhere should be able to corefer with a referential DP contained within it. This is the Missing Antecedent Phenomenon, identified by Grinder and Postal (1971) and illustrated for VPE in (17). Deep anaphora, being syntactically atomic, does not exhibit a similar effect, as shown for Null Complement Anaphora in (18).

(17) I’ve never ridden a camel, but Ivan has [\textit{ridden a camel}] and he says it stank horribly. [surface anaphora]
(18) * I’ve never managed to ride a camel, but Sue succeeded, and it was the two humped variety. [deep anaphora]
   (Hankamer and Sag 1976, 403,412)

\textit{v-Stranding VPE} shows the Missing Antecedent Phenomenon; in (19b), the pronoun \textit{ān} is able to find an antecedent in the gap. This is the only possible antecedent, as the indefinite DP \textit{farši} in the first clause occurs within the scope of negation and cannot serve as a licit antecedent, as illustrated in (19a).
(19) a. * rostam hičvaxt farš-i jāru na-zade va be man
Rostam never carpet-indef broom neg-hit:past:3sg and to me
goft ke ānī xeyli xāki bud
say:pst:3sg that it very dirty be:past:3sg
*‘Rostam has never swept a carpet; and he told me that it was very dirty.’

b. rostam hičvaxt farš-i jāru na-zade vali sohráb
Rostam never carpet-indef broom neg-HIT:past:3sg but Sohrab
[farš-i jāru] zade va be man goft ke ānī xeyli
carpet-indef broom HIT:past:3sg and to me say:past:3sg that it very
xāki bud
dirty be:past:3sg
‘Rostam has never swept a carpet but Sohrab has swept a carpet; and he told
me that it was very dirty.’

3.3. Extraction

If v-Stranding VPE is surface anaphora like VPE then we expect to be able to extract from
the elided constituent (Schuyler 2002). This is illustrated for English in (20), where an
object DP has undergone topicalization to clause-initial position.

(20) John will eat ice cream, but cake, I know he won’t [eat {cake}]

Similarly, for Farsi, an object can be scrambled out of the elided phrase to clause-initial
position, where it receives contrastive focus, as shown in (21).

(21) rostam PIRAN-RĀ ḍutu na-zad vali ŠALVĀR-RĀ midunam ke
Rostam shirt-acc iron neg-HIT:past:3sg but pants-acc know:pres:1sg that
[Śalvār-RĀ ḍutu] zade iron HIT:prpart:3sg
‘Rostam didn’t iron the shirt, but the pants, I know he did iron.’

Since Farsi is wh-in situ, wh-movement out of the elided constituent cannot be demon-
strated.

In this section, I have attempted to show that v-Stranding VPE in Farsi exhibits
some of the same properties as VPE in English, properties characteristic of surface anaphora:
the inability to be pragmatically controlled, the Missing Antecedent Phenomenon, the
availability of extraction from the missing constituent.

4. Licensing Ellipsis

Ellipsis is constrained by an antecedence condition that requires that the elided constituent
be identical, in some sense, to its antecedent. Merchant (2001) argues for a semantic
identity requirement, which he calls e-GIVENness, defined in (22), that is imposed on the
missing constituent via a feature, E (23). (The E feature also triggers deletion of the same constituent at PF.)

(22) **e-GIVENness**

An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo ∃-type shifting,⁴

1. A entails F-clo(E), and
2. E entails F-clo(A)⁵

(Merchant 2001, 26)

(23) \( E = \lambda p : p \) is e-GIVEN . p

Assuming Kratzer’s (1996) composition of the vP, the nonverbal element and light verb denote independent predicates that take their own arguments and are combined by the noncompositional rule Event Identification (122). With these semantics, we can try the e-GIVENness identity check on the example of v-Stranding VPE in (24), in which the target and antecedent nonverbal element phrases are APs.

(24) Q: sohrāb \( [\lambda p \text{ lebāshā-rā xosk}] \) kard?
    Sohrāb clothes-acc dry DO:past:3sg
    ‘Has Sohrab dried the clothes?’

A: na, vali rostam \( [\lambda p \text{ lebāshā-rā xosk}] \) kard
    no but Rostam clothes-acc dry DO:past:3sg
    ‘No, but Rostam just went to (dry them).’

In order for the mutual entailment condition to apply, the target and antecedent phrases must be of type \( t \). But both the target and antecedent APs are of type \( \langle s, t \rangle \), that is the type of functions from events to truth values. The open event variable \( e \) in both the target and antecedent phrases must be closed off through ∃-type shifting, yielding (25–26). The first part of the definition of e-GIVENness now requires that the antecedent AP, \( AP_A' \), entail the F-closure of the elided AP, F-clo(\( AP_E \)); this is clearly the case as they are identical.⁶

(25) \( AP_A' = \exists e [\text{dry(clothes, } e)] \)
(26) \( \text{F-clo}(AP_E) = \exists e [\text{dry(clothes, } e)] \)

The second part of the definition for e-GIVENness requires that \( AP_E' \) entail F-clo(\( AP_A \)), which also is the case, as shown in (27)–(28).

(27) \( \text{F-clo}(AP_A) = \exists e [\text{dry(clothes, } e)] \)
(28) \( AP_E' = \exists e [\text{dry(clothes, } e)] \)

Mutual entailment is satisfied, and so the ellipsis is good.

---

⁴∃-type shifting is a type shifting operation that raises an expression to type \( t \) by existentially-binding any open argument variables.

⁵The F-closure of \( \alpha \), written F-clo(\( \alpha \)), is the result of replacing F-marked parts of \( \alpha \) with ∃-bound variables of the appropriate type (modulo ∃-type shifting)’ (Merchant 2001, 14).

⁶Note that in these examples the F-closure operation plays no significant role, as nothing in the target or antecedent clauses is F-marked.
5. Light Verb Alternations

A potential problem arises in Farsi for the e-givenness approach to identity when we consider illicit cases of v-Stranding VPE like that in (29). The complex predicate \( \text{xošk šodan} \) ‘dry+become’ in the antecedent clause is replaced by \( \text{xošk kardan} \) ‘dry+do’ in the target clause.

\[(29)\] Q: \( \text{lebāshā xošk šod-an?} \)  
                clothes dry become:pres-3pl
                ‘Have the clothes dried yet?’

A: * \( \text{na, vali rostam alān raft} \) \[AP lebāshā-ra xoš] bo-kon-e  
                no but Rostam now go:past:3sg clothes-acc dry subj-do-3sg
                Intended: ‘No, but Rostam just went to dry them.’

The nonverbal element and internal arguments of the target and antecedent clauses are superficially identical, even though their light verbs are different. The e-givenness identity constraint predicts that the identity of the light verbs should not matter for the purpose of determining when ellipsis may occur. The light verb, as a \( v \), is not contained within the domain of elision.

This restriction on the light verbs that may occur in v-Stranding VPE has a seeming parallel in V-Stranding VPE. Goldberg (2005) observes that in Hebrew and Irish (and perhaps Swahili as well) the main verb that has raised out of the elided verb phrase must be identical in everything but inflection to the main verb of the antecedent clause. This is a generalization that she calls the Verbal Identity Requirement and states as follows:

\[(30)\] Verbal Identity Requirement

The antecedent- and target-clause main Vs of VP Ellipsis must be identical, minimally, in their root and derivational morphology.

(Goldberg 2005, 187)

This is illustrated for Hebrew below; varying the root, as in (31), or the derivational morphology (binyan), as in (32), of the stranded verb results in ungrammaticality.

\[(31)\] Q: \( \text{Rivka hisi’a otax le-beit ha-sefer?} \)  
                Rivka drive[past3Fsg] ACC.you[Fsg] to-house the-book
                ‘(Did) Rivka drive you to school?’

A: * \( \text{Ken, hi hevi’a.} \)  
                yes she bring[past3Fsg]  
                ‘Yes, she brought [\text{me} to school].’

(Goldberg 2005, 178)

\[(32)\] Q: \( \text{Hisat’a etmol et Li’ora le-Tel Aviv?} \)  
                drive[past2Msg] yesterday ACC Liora to-Tel Aviv
                ‘(Did) you drive yesterday Liora to Tel Aviv?’
For V-Stranding VPE languages, however, the Verbal Identity Requirement does not need to be stated as an independent constraint on ellipsis. Since the stranded main verb originates inside the elided \( vP \), indeed as the head of the entire extended verbal projection, Goldberg argues that it mostly falls out from the more general e-GIVENness identity constraint. Either the raised \( V \) undergoes obligatory reconstruction at LF or all head movement takes place in the PF component after the syntactic object constructed in the narrow syntax is sent off to the LF interface; in either case, the main verb will be contained within the \( vP \) when it is interpreted and thus will be included in the mutual semantic entailment calculation.\(^7\)

At first glance, it seems as if we are observing similar phenomena in Farsi and Hebrew; alternating one light verb for another between the target and antecedent clauses results in ellipsis being ungrammatical. If the Verbal Identity Requirement given in (30) were strengthened to an actual constraint governing when ellipsis may or may not occur, it would be able to correctly rule out the ungrammatical sentence in (29). Instead of positing a new constraint on ellipsis, however, I will show that e-GIVENness is in fact sufficient.

Even though the complex predicates of the target and antecedent clauses in (29) mean the same thing, as shown by the English glosses, they differ in one important respect. The light verb of the antecedent clause, \( \check{s}od\-\check{a}n \), is unaccusative, and so does not select for an external argument. Accordingly, the internal argument, \( \text{leb\-\check{a}sh}\-\check{a} \) ‘clothes’, must raise out of the \( vP \) into subject position, leaving behind a copy:

\[
\text{(33)} \quad Q: \quad \text{leb\-\check{a}sh}\-\check{a} [A_P (\text{leb\-\check{a}sh}\-\check{a}) \text{xo\-\check{k}}] \check{s}od\-\check{a}n? \quad \text{clothes \quad dry \quad BECOME\-pres\-3pl} \\
\quad \text{‘Have the clothes been dried yet?’}
\]

\[
\text{A:} \quad * \quad \text{na, vali rostam al\-\check{a}n raft} \quad [A_P \text{leb\-\check{a}sh}\-\check{a}\-\check{ra} \text{xo\-\check{k}}] \text{bo\-kon\-e} \\
\quad \text{no \quad but \quad Rostam now go\-past\-3sg \quad clothes\-acc \quad dry \quad subj\-DO\-3sg} \\
\quad \text{‘No, but Rostam just went to (dry them).’}
\]

Assuming that A-movement does not reconstruct,\(^8\) at the point in the semantic derivation when the e-GIVENness check applies, the nonverbal element will have an unsaturated \( e \)-type argument, which must be \( \exists \)-bound along with the open event variable. This yields the representation for \( AP_A' \) in (34).

\footnote{Reduction of the Verbal Identity Requirement to Merchant’s e-GIVENness is ultimately not successful, since, as Goldberg notes, we predict that focussing the raised main verb should then make cases of V-Stranding VPE in which the main verb of the target and antecedent clauses are different grammatical, which is not the case (197–199).}

\footnote{Kyle Johnson points out that this is not an innocent assumption. Barss (2001) argues, contra longstanding views, that A-movement can optionally reconstruct. While the availability of such reconstruction impinges on the success of the account I am proposing for why light verb alternations that result in a change of argument structure are bad, I cannot address the issue within the scope of this paper.}
Notice, however, that the complex predicate of the target clause is transitive. As such, the internal argument remains inside the nonverbal element phrase. When we compare $AP_A'$ to $F\text{-clo}(AP_E)$, given in (35), we see that the former does not entail the latter: an event in which something dries does not entail that clothes dry.

$AP_A' = \exists x \exists e [\text{dry}(x,e)]$

$F\text{-clo}(AP_E) = \exists e [\text{dry}(\text{clothes},e)]$

Under the second part of the definition for e-GIVENness, the ungrammatical ellipsis in (29) is ruled out.

If the account I have given is on the right track, we predict that light verb alternations that do not result in an argument structure alternation should be grammatical. There are only a few complex predicates that match this profile, but for *otu kardan* and *otu zadan* ‘to iron, lit. iron + DO/HIT’, two variants of the same transitive verb, this prediction is borne out. As illustrated in (36), substituting one light verb for the other does not result in the ellipsis being ungrammatical.

(36) Q: piran-rā *otu* kard-i?
shīrt-acc iron DO:past-2sg
‘Have you ironed the shirt?’

A: āre, diruz [NP piran-rā *otu*] zad-am
yes, yesterday shirt-acc iron HIT:past-1sg
‘Yes, I did iron the shirt yesterday.’

6. Conclusion

I have argued here for the existence in Farsi of a type of ellipsis that targets the nonverbal half of a complex predicate. I have also tried to show that v-Stranding VPE obeys the same e-GIVENness identity condition on ellipsis that English VPE does. It was not necessary to appeal to an additional constraint on ellipsis akin to Goldberg’s Verbal Identity Requirement in order to rule out the light verb alternations that make ellipsis ungrammatical. Even though the light verb is never located inside the elided phrase, substituting one light verb for the other can result in ellipsis being bad as a result of the selectional interactions that exist between the light verb and the nonverbal element.

Given the long-standing assumption that ellipsis applies to phrases of any category as long as its licensing requirements are met, we perhaps predict that a process like v-Stranding VPE in Farsi should exist. In Farsi, unlike other languages, v receives an independent morphological realization as a light verb. This property of the language enables ellipsis to target a constituent that does not include the v.
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