

Ellipsis in the extended projection: the view from Russian  
**Vera Gribanova**

Merchant (2001) conceives of ellipsis as mediated by an E feature, borne on a head that licenses ellipsis of its complement (L), silences the elided material (S), and imposes a formal identity relation between the elided constituent and an antecedent (I). Recent developments suggest that these three functions can be separated out, and associated with distinct syntactic positions. For example, the licensor of ellipsis (L) can in some instances be some distance away from the constituent that goes unpronounced (S) (Aelbrecht 2010; Saab and Stigliano 2023). Likewise, a growing body of work argues that the constituent evaluated for formal identity with an antecedent (I) is in some cases a proper sub-part of the constituent that goes unpronounced (S); this includes English sluicing (Rudin 2019; Anand, Hardt, and McCloskey 2025), Hebrew CP ellipsis (Landau 2023), and Spanish Topic-Remnant Elided Wh-Questions (Stigliano 2022, 2025). Such approaches raise the possibility of a greater degree of variation in ellipsis constructions than is expected if the relevant properties are always subcomponents of a single E feature. What is the degree of predicted, and attested, variation in this space? I leverage a comparison of four different types of TP ellipsis in Russian — contrastive polarity ellipsis, sluicing, stripping, and fragments — to demonstrate that there is variation with respect to the size of the formal identity domain within the same language, despite the size of the elided constituent itself (TP) remaining constant. These discoveries feed into a theoretical conception of this possible variation, in which the three functions {L,S,I} correspond to features — either separate or bundled together — whose distribution is analogous to the distribution of categorial features in extended projections (Grimshaw, 2005).