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The aim of this paper is to show that Park’s (2009) arguments against Ahn & Cho (2009) are not conclusive. We confirm the premise that CP ellipsis as well as DP ellipsis is not possible and that there is still no convincing evidence for genuine CP ellipsis. We present more evidence to support the claim that apparent DP ellipsis in Korean should be analyzed as an instance of null pronouns.
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1. Introduction

Ahn & Cho (2009) propose that only functional heads such as C, T, and D can bear the [E] feature (cf. Merchant 2001)1 which enables to license the ellipsis of their complements (cf. Lobeck 1995).2 Thus, DP and CP which are directly

---

1 Merchant (2001) shows functional categories can have an [E] feature, but he doesn’t explicitly indicate that lexical categories cannot have an [E] feature.

2 This is a necessary condition for ellipsis. As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, some functional category cannot license ellipsis of their complement.

(i) *I think [CP (that) [TP John loves Mary]].

In (i), the functional category C, whether it is overt or not, doesn’t license ellipsis of its complement. TP. Lobeck (1993) suggests that functional heads can license ellipsis of their complement only when they undergo Spec-head agreement. Lee (2005), on the other hand, suggests that VP ellipsis is licensed only by the first auxiliary verb in both infinitival and finite clauses. We believe that necessary and
selected by V/v cannot be elided since they are complements of the lexical category V or semi-lexical category v which gives a theta role.

\[(1) \quad \text{VP/\textit{vP}} \text{ Ellipsis is barred.} \]
\[\text{V/\textit{v}} \text{ XP = DP, CP and so on.}^4 \]

In English, CP and DP ellipsis is barred as shown in (2-3).

(2) A: I saw/met John's brother.
   B: *I also saw/met [CP John's brother].

(3) A: I regret that we bought the charcoal grill.
   B: *I don't regret [CP that we bought the charcoal grill].

In Korean CP ellipsis is not allowed, either, as shown in (4).

   I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C think-Pres-Dec
   'I think Yenghi loves Toli.'
B: *Na-to __ sayngkakha-n-ta.
   I-also think-Pres-Dec
   'Lit. I think too.'

Sufficient conditions for licensing ellipsis require deeper considerations that we will put aside in this squib.

3 An anonymous reviewer points out that if ellipsis/deletion is licensed only by functional categories, movement can no longer be understood as copy plus deletion. Recent minimalist approaches attempt to unify licensing conditions on movement, ellipsis, and binding. Ahn (2009), however, proposes that conditions on movement, ellipsis (surface anaphora in general), and binding (perhaps only deep anaphora) are not reducible to a single principle. In other words, the tripartite dimensions are subject to independent licensing principles in UG roughly put, movement is regulated by narrow syntax-like conditions (antecedent government or relativized minimality), while ellipsis and binding are sensitive to phonology-like (lexical government or cliticization) and semantics-like (relevance or coherence) conditions, respectively. If Ahn (2009) is correct, movement (and binding) should be treated distinctly from ellipsis/deletion operation that may be subject to separate licensing conditions. Hence, the premise "move = copy + deletion" should also be reconsidered.

4 PP and IP/IP, for example, cannot undergo ellipsis when they are complements of lexical categories, as shown in (i). (Johnson 2001: 641-644)

   b. "Jim started running down the street, but only after Jose started [IP running down the street].
   c. "John seems to solve the problem, and Mary also seems to solve the problem."
Apparent CP ellipsis, however, is observed in Korean, as shown in (5):^5

   I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C believe-Pres-Dec
   'I believe Yenghi loves Toli.'
B: Na-to ___ mit-nun-ta.
   I-also believe-Pres-Dec
   'Lit. I believe too.'

According to Ahn & Cho (2009), the missing constituent in (5b) is not a CP complement but a DP complement. Note that (5b) can be also paraphrased as:\^6

^5 The notable difference between sayngkakha 'think' and mit 'believe' is that the latter can take a DP complement while the former can't. Park (2009) suggests that the elided part of (5b) may be like (i):
(i) Na-to kulehkey mit-nun-ta.
   I-also so believe-Pres-Dec
   'I also believe so.'

Note, however, that the anaphoric expression kulehkey 'so' can occur with sayngkakha 'think', as shown in (ii):
(ii) Na-to kulehkey sayngkakha-n-ta.
    I-also so think-Pres-Dec
    'I also think so.'

Under the analysis, we should explain why kulehkey 'so' cannot be deleted only when it occurs with the verb sayngkakha 'think'. It could be stipulated as an idiosyncratic property of sayngkakha 'think'. Park (2009) notes that so in English cannot be deleted in both the case of believe and think (Park 2009: fn. 2).

^6 Unlike mit 'believe', sayngkakha 'think' doesn't seem to take a DP complement. Consider (i):
    I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C think-Pres-Dec
    'I think Yenghi loves Toli.'
B: Na-to ku cem-ul/ku kes-ul sayngkakha-n-ta.
    I-also the point-Acc/that thing-Acc think-Pres-Dec
    'I also think so.'

(iB) isn't well-formed. Hence, Pro, a possible covert counterpart of ku cem or ku kes isn't well-formed, either.
(ii) Na-to Pro sayngkakha-n-ta.
    I-also think-Pres-Dec
    'I also think so.'

However, there is a case that sayngkakha 'think' seems to take a DP as its complement.
(iii) Na-to ku cem-ul/ku kes-ul sayngkakha-y-po-ass-e.
    I-also the point-Acc/that thing-Acc consider-try-Past-Dec
Ahn & Cho (2009) further propose that the Korean examples of apparent DP ellipsis such as (5B) are all instances of Pro (null pronoun) which are absent in English (cf. Huang 1984). Hence, (5B) should be represented as:

    I-too Y.-Nom T.-Adv love-Pres-Dec-Adn fact-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
    'I believe the fact that Yenghi loves Sol.'

b. na-to ku kes/sasil-ul mit-nun-ta.
    I-too that thing/fact-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
    'I believe the fact.'

Recall that parallel to ban on CP ellipsis, there is no genuine DP ellipsis in Korean, either, since its licensor cannot be a functional head (i.e. it should be V or v for instance), and hence cannot bear ellipsis licensing feature [E] by assumption.


Concerning the status of Pro, see Ahn & Cho (2006) and Huang (1989, 1991) for further discussion.
Park (2009) argues that Ahn & Cho's (2009) analysis of (5B) has several problems. Firstly, Park (2009) doubts whether (6a) meets the identity condition on ellipsis, which requires that deletion applies in identity with its antecedent. The elided element in (5B) is a nominal clause (CP followed by the nominal kes), but its antecedent in (5A) is a non-nominal, verbal clause [Yenghi-ka Toli-lul salangha-n-ta-ko].

Secondly, he points out that the well-formedness of (8B) can be problematic under the analysis advanced by Ahn & Cho (2009).

   I-Top Y.-Nom any book read-Past-Dec-C believe don't 'I don't believe Yenghi read any book.'

   B. Na-to _ mit-ci anh-nun-ta.
      I-too believe not-Pres-Dec
      'Lit. I don't believe, either.'

Park (2009) indicates that if non-elliptical counterpart of (8B) is (9) under the analysis of Ahn & Cho (2009), the grammatical contrast between (8B) and (9) cannot be explained.

(9) ?* Na-to [Yenghi-ka amwu chayk-to ilk-ess-ta-nun kes-ul] mit-ci
    not-Pres-Dec

Note that non-elliptical counterpart (9) is much degraded while its elliptical counterpart (8B) is not. Thus he argues that the non-elliptical form of (8B) cannot be (9) but like (10) and that CP ellipsis should be allowed to yield (8B).

    I-too Y.-Nom any book read-Past-Dec-C believe not-Pres-Dec

Thirdly, although extraction/scrambling is marginally allowed out of the nominal clause, as shown in (11b), it seems that such operation is completely

---

9 Sohn (1994:9), however, judges the similar example degraded in contrast to (8A).
   I-top John-Nom anybody hit-Past-Dec-C believe not-Pres-Dec
   'I don't believe that John hit anybody.'
ruled out in an elliptical context, as shown in (12B) and (12B').

   I-Top Y-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-Adn thing-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
   'I believe Yenghi loves Toli.'

   b. ?Toli-lul, na-nun [Yenghi-ka t, salangha-n-ta-nun kes-ul]
      T.-Acc I-Top Y.-Nom love-Pres-Dec-Adn thing-Acc
      mit-nun-ta.
      believe-Pres-Dec

    I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-Adn thing-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
    'I believe Yenghi loves Toli.'

    B: *Yenghi-ka, Toli-lul, Na-to [CP t, salangha-n-ta-na kes-ul]
       Y.-Nom T.-Acc I-also love-Pres-Dec-Adn thing-Acc
       mit-nun-ta.
       believe-Pres-Dec
    'I also believe Yenghi loves Toli.'

    B': *Toli-lul, na-to [CP Yenghi-ka t salangha-ta-ko]
       T.-Acc I-also Y.-Nom love-Pres-Dec-C believe-Pres-Dec
       'I also believe Yenghi loves Toli.'

Thus, he concludes that apparent CP ellipsis in Korean cannot be analyzed as DP ellipsis, as advanced in Ahn & Cho (2009).

3. A Reply to Park (2009)

An isomorphism problem between antecedent and its elided part, in fact, doesn't occur in (5B) under the analysis given in Ahn & Cho (2009). The example in (5B), repeated here as (13B), isn't an instance of ellipsis at all. It rather contains a Pro under our proposal.10

---

10 This contrast is reminiscent of the distinction of surface vs. deep anaphora (Hankamer & Sag 1976). Hoji (2003:19) analyzes the following constructions in Japanese as instances of deep anaphora.

   (i) a. Null Object Construction
      Bill-mo [CP-er] katta.
      Bill also bought er.
   b. Stripping without case-markers
      Bill-mo da.
      'Bill, too.'
   c. Soosu/do in that way
In (13), the clause CP [Yeol-kha Tohl-lul salangha-n-ta-te] can directly serve as the antecedent of Pro.\(^{11}\) Note, also, that clauses can be interpreted as the antecedent of pronoun *it* in English (Radford 1981:65).

(14) Speaker A: Mary has finished her assignment.
    Speaker B: I don’t believe it.
(15) They say he’s planning to give up his job, but it may not be true.

We suggest that (13b) and (15b) parallels (i-a) and (i-c) in that they are also instances of deep anaphora, not ellipsis (i.e., surface anaphora). A surface anaphora and a deep anaphora are observed in VP ellipsis and *do it* in English, respectively, as shown in (ii-iii).

(ii) A: I’m going to [vp stuff this ball through this hoop].
    B: It’s not clear that you’ll be able to [vp ].
(ii-a) A: I’m going to [vp stuff this ball through this hoop].
    B: It’s not clear that you’ll be able to [vp do it].  (Hankamer & Sag 1976:392)

According to Hankamer & Sag (1976), the two constructions are constrained differently.

(iii) [Hankamer attempts to stuff a 9-inch ball through a 6-inch hoop]
    Sag: *If* it’s not clear that you’ll be able to.
    Sag: It’s not clear that you’ll be able to do it.

As indicated in (iv), the use of VP ellipsis requires a linguistic antecedent while that of *do it* does not. Surface anaphora such as VP ellipsis in English is not pragmatically licensible and needs a linguistic antecedent while deep anaphora such as *do it* is pragmatically licensible and does not need a linguistic antecedent. See Haj (2003) for further discussion.

\(^{11}\) Note, in particular, that (15b) cannot be derived from the ellipsis of the following DP clause since DP ellipsis (as well as CP ellipsis) is not possible under our analysis:

(i) Na-to [Yeol-kha Tohl-lul salangha-n-ta-te] mit-nun-ta.
    T-too Y-Nom T-Acc love-Pres-Dec-Adn thing-Acc believe-Pres-Dec

Ahn & Cho (2009) fail to fully articulate this point, hence confusion and misinterpretation of our proposal may arise. We, thus, want to clarify this issue here as a reply to Park (2009).

\(^{12}\) It is not difficult to find a case that a clause can serve as the antecedent of *Pro*

(i) A: Chelswu-ka ecey ovuk-ess-e.
    C-Nom yesterday die-Past-Dec
    *Chelswu died yesterday."
    B: Pro Na-hantey chungkyeek-i-ess-e.
    me-to shock-Cop-Past-Dec
    *It was a shock to me.*
   I-Top Y.-Nom any book read-Past-Dec-C believe don't
   'I don't believe Yenghi read any book.'
B: Na-to _ mit-ci ahn-nun-ta.
   I-too believe not-Pres-Dec
   'Lit. I don't believe, either.'
(17) Na-to Pro mit-ci ahn-nun-ta.
   I-too believe not-Pres-Dec
   'Lit. I don't believe, either.'

(17) is well-formed like (18). Such parallelism is well captured under the analysis of Ahn & Cho (2009).

(18) Na-to ku kes-ul mit-ci ahn-nun-ta.
   I-too that thing-Acc believe not-Pres-Dec
   'Lit. I don't believe that thing, either.'

Given that the overt counterpart of Pro is ku kes/ku sasil 'the fact', we can account for ill-formedness of (12b) and (12b'), repeated here as (19). The deviance of (19) is parallel to that of (20).

    Y.-Nom T.-Acc I-also believe-Pres-Dec
    'I also believe Yenghi loves Toli.'
    T.-Acc I-also believe-Pres-Dec
    'I also believe Yenghi loves Toli.'
    Y.-Nom T.-Acc I-also that thing/the fact-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
    'I also believe Yenghi loves Toli.'
    T.-Acc I-also that thing/the fact-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
    'I also believe Yenghi loves Soli.'

Like (20a), (19a) violates the principle of full interpretation because Yenghi-ka and Toli-lul don't get theta roles. The ill-formedness of (19b) and (20b) is explained in
Similarly, we can account for the ill-formedness of the following examples (cf. Chung 2008, 2009).\footnote{The embedded subject Yenghi in (21B) may remain within the embedded clause. In the case, Chung’s (2009) analysis based on constituency may well account for the ill-formedness of (21B). Chung (2009) assumes the following structure.\footnote{(i) \text{[cP [Top [NP Yenghi-ka] Toli-lul salangha-n-ta-ko] mit-nun-ta.\]}}}

   I-Top Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C believe-Pres-Dec
   ‘I believe Yenghi loves Toli.’
B: *Na-to Yenghi-ka, Toli-lul, \text{[cp \ t \ t salangha-n-ta-ko]} mit-nun-ta.
   I-also Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C believe-Pres-Dec
   ‘I also believe Yenghi loves Toli.’
B': *Na-to Yenghi-ka, \text{[cp \ t Toli-lul salangha-n-ta-ko]} mit-nun-ta.
   I-also Y.-Nom T.-Acc love-Pres-Dec-C believe-Pres-Dec

Ahn & Cho (2009) assume that (21B) and (21B') have the representation like (22a) and (22b), respectively.

(22) a. *Na-to Yenghi-ka Toli-lul \text{i} mit-nun-ta.
   I-also Y.-Nom T.-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
b. *Na-to Yenghi-ka \text{i} mit-nun-ta.
   I-also Y.-Nom believe-Pres-Dec

Examples in (22) violate the principle of full interpretation parallel to (23).

   I-also Y.-Nom T.-Acc that thing-Acc believe-Pres-Dec
   I-also Y.-Nom that thing-Acc believe-Pres-Dec

The ill-formedness of (24B) is explained in the same way.

(24) A: Cheli-ka Yenghi-ekey [Toli-ka ku chayk-ul kaci-ko iss-ta-ko]
Under our analysis, (24B) violates the full interpretation principle, as shown in (25) which parallels (26).14

S.-too the book-Acc Y.-Dat say-Past-Dec

(26) *Swuni-to ku chayk-ul Yenghi-eykey ku kes-ul malhay-ss-ta.
S.-too the book-Acc Y.-Dat that thing-Acc say-Past-Dec

4. Concluding Remarks

In this squib, we have shown that Park’s (2009) arguments against Ahn & Cho (2009) are not convincing. We argue that CP ellipsis as well as DP ellipsis is not theoretically possible, and it turns out to be true in Korean (and English, as discussed in Ahn & Cho (2009)). Under the assumption that only heads that have an E feature license the ellipsis of their complement, we suggest that the absence of CP deletion results from the fact that lexical categories such as V or v do not bear an E feature. We further claim that the apparent CP ellipsis (surface anaphora) should be analyzed as an instance of Pro (deep anaphora), which elegantly accounts for isomorphism problems of Ahn & Cho (2009), as indicated in Park (2009).

14 Park (2009) attributes the ill-formedness of (i) to illicit movement to Spec-v, which parallels the degradedness in (21B-B).

(i) ?Cheli-ka [\[\epsilon ku chayk-ul, Yenghi-eykey [\[\epsilon Toli-ka \ kaci-ko iss-ta-ko]]] malhay-ss-ta.
C-Nom the book-Acc Y.-Dat T.-Nom have-Pres-Dec-C say-Past-Dec

‘Cheli told Yenghi that Toli had the book.’

However, he should account for why (21B) is (much) more degraded than (i). We think the degradedness of (i) might hinge on some kinds of processing difficulty. The ill-formedness of (21B), by contrast, is due to a grammatical constraint (the principle of full interpretation or theta-criterion and the like). That’s why (21B) is much worse than (i) (at least to our ears).
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