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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 alto e a Maria também é. [alta]
   the João is tall-MASC and the Maria also is tall-FEM.SG

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

(3) Mickey is a mouse, 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 médico e a Maria também é. [médica]
   the João is doctor-MASC and the Maria also is doctor-FEM

b. A Maria é médica e o João também é. [médico]
   the Maria is doctor-FEM and the João also is doctor-MASC

(5) a. ?O Brad Pitt é ator e a Julia Roberts também é. [atriz]
   the Brad Pitt is actor and the Julia Roberts also is actress

b. *A Julia Roberts é atriz 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 tío y Pedro prometió visitar a la [tía] de él. (Kornfeld & Saab 2004)
   Juan visited to his uncle and Pedro promised visit to the aunt of he

(7) a. *Dracula is a count and Mina is too. [a countess] (Nunes & Zocca 2005)

b. *John is my uncle 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), aktor/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.
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