This paper advances the conjecture that all syntactic processes that silence an otherwise overt expression α accomplish this with a “silence me” feature [E], an instruction to silence every element (reflexively) dominated by α. Focusing on the silencing of syntactic heads, we argue that (at least some) ellipsis phenomena arise from the following rule:

**E-extension (optional):** If a head Hº bears [E], copy [E] to the smallest node containing Hº and its selected complement.

Crucially, the reasons Hº receives [E] may be heterogeneous, but the consequences of E-Extension are uniform: the broader silencing traditionally described as ellipsis. We argue that E-Extension applied to a complementizer silenced by the Doubly-Filled Comp effect yields Sluicing, while E-Extension applied to the silenced trace of a moved head yields Head-Stranding Head-Projection ellipsis. Ellipsis is thus not a thing unto itself, but parasitic on head silencing.

In **Sluicing**, E-extension applies to a complementizer silenced by a Doubly-Filled COMP rule (yielding Merchant’s *Sluicing-Comp Generalization*), silencing material moved to C as well as the complement of C — crucially leaving adjuncts to C overt.

In "**VP-ellipsis**", E-extension applies to a trace of verb movement, silencing the complement of this trace. again excluding adjuncts of the relevant VP. We argue that this generalization subsumes the phenomenon Landau (2018) discusses under the name *Adjunct Exclusion*. Though Landau used Adjunct Exclusion to argue against Verb-Stranding VP ellipsis, we argue that Adjunct Exclusion and other restrictions that do not involve adjuncts actually favor a VVPE analysis.