Three Types of Gender Marking in Predicative Nouns
Cynthia Levart Zocca
University of Connecticut

Features resulting from agreement do not seem to affect the identity requirement for licensing ellipsis (cf. Stjepanović 1997, Sauerland 2004, Nunes and Zocca 2005, *inter alia*).

(1) O João é <u>alto</u>   e   a Maria também é.   [alta]
     the João is tall-MASC.SG and the Maria also   is   tall-FEM.SG

(2) Nós sempre <u>comprávamos</u> aqui, mas eles não.   [compravam]
     we always bought-1P.PL. here but they not   bought-3P.PL.

(3) Mickey is a <u>mouse</u>, but Donald and Daisy aren't.   [mice]

This generalization does not hold uniformly for gender in ellipsis involving predicative nouns. For example, in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) some gender mismatches are allowed, as in (4), while others are not. In (5), masculine antecedents can license feminine elided nouns, but not vice versa.

(4) a. O João é <u>médico</u>   e   a Maria também é.   [médica]
        the João is doctor-MASC and the Maria also   is   doctor-FEM
    b. A Maria é <u>médica</u>   e   o João também é.   [médico]
        the Maria is doctor-FEM and the João also   is   doctor-MASC

(5) a. ?O Brad Pitt é <u>ator</u> e   a   Julia Roberts também é.   [atriz]
        the Brad Pitt is actor and the Julia Roberts also   is   actress
    b. *A Julia Roberts é <u>atriz</u> e   o   Brad Pitt também é.   [ator]
        the Julia Roberts is actress and the Brad Pitt also   is   actor

One possible account for this contrast relies on a theory of markedness like Jakobson's (1931/1984). If feminine is marked, [-fem] means "no statement of gender". Thus, for [-fem], the morphology will pick the most specific form to realize the morpheme. In ellided forms, [-fem] is compatible with either masculine or feminine, while [+fem] is only compatible with feminine, and ellipsis of a masculine form will not be licensed.

However, in certain cases, markedness will not be enough. In (6) and (7), we can see that not even the masculine form can license feminine ellipsis.

(6) *Juan visitó a su <u>tío</u>   y   Pedro prometió visitar a la ~~tía~~ de él. (Kornfeld & Saab2004)
     Juan visited to his uncle and Pedro promised visit to the aunt of he

(7) a. *Dracula is a <u>count</u> and Mina is too.   [a countess] (Nunes & Zocca 2005)
    b. *John is my <u>uncle</u> and Mary is too.   [my aunt]

Taking ellipsis evidence such (1)-(3) to indicate that ellipsis is not sensitive to φ-features that result from agreement, the mismatches in (4)-(7) suggest that at least some gender features in predicative nouns are marking more than agreement. In short, then, there are three types of gender marking in predicative nouns:

(9) Type A - no marked gender, mismatches are possible
     e.g. *medic-o / medic-a* 'doctor' (BP, Spanish)
     Type B - one of the genders is marked; unmarked can license marked, but not vice-versa
     e.g. *waiter/waitress* (English), *ator/atriz* (BP), *aktjor/aktrisa* (Russian) 'actor/actress'
     Type C - no mismatches are allowed at all
     e.g. *tio/tia* 'uncle/aunt' (BP, Spanish), *Kaiser/Kaiserin* 'emperor/empress' (German)

The behavior of the three types in (9) crosslinguistically suggests that neither a purely morphological nor a purely semantic approach will be enough, and nor is a theory of markedness alone. Taking ellipsis as a test for pure agreement, we can conclude that Type A predicative nouns get their gender mark through morphological agreement; Type B ones have one of the forms containing a morphologic and semantic mark; and Type C ones always have semantic content on their gender mark, regardless of their morphological shape.

In conclusion, the existence of these three types crosslinguistically suggests that neither a purely morphological nor a purely semantic approach will be enough, and nor is a theory of markedness alone.

References

Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2007. Where's Phi? lingBuzz/000529

Embick, David and Rolf Noyer. 1999. Locality in Post-Syntactic Operations. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 34, 265-317.

Jakobson, Roman. 1931. "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums" in *Charisteria Gvilelmo Mathesio qvinqvagenario a discipulis et Circuli Lingvistici Pragensis sodalibus oblata*, Prague, 1932. Translated as: Structure of the Russian Verb. In *Russian and Slavic Grammar - Studies 1931-1981*. Edited by Linda R. Waugh and Morris Halle, 1984, Mouton, pages 1-14.

Kornfeld, Laura and Andrés Saab 2004. "Nominal Ellipsis and Morphological Structure in Spanish". In Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2002, Bok-Bennema, Reineke, Bart Hollebrandse, Brigitte Kampers-Manhe and Petra Sleeman (eds.), 183 ff.

Marantz, Alec. 1991. Case and licensing in German Westphal. In *Proceedings of ESCOL 91*, Cornell Linguistics Club, 234-253.

Nunes, Jairo, and Cynthia Zocca. 2005. Morphological identity in ellipsis. In Leiden working papers in. linguistics 2.2, 29–42. Leiden: Leiden University

Sauerland, Uli. 2004. A Comprehensive Semantics for Agreement. Ms., ZAS.

Stjepanović, Sandra. 1997. VP-Ellipsis in a Verb-Raising Language. Proceedings of *ESCOL*.